

Annex

Official Journal
of the
European Communities

No 1-255

English edition

Debates of the Eūrōpēan Parliament

1980-1981 Session
Report of Proceedings
from 14 to 18 April 1980
Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Monday, 14 April 1980	1
Resumption of session, p. 2 — Membership of Parliament, p. 2 — Petitions, p. 2 — Documents, p. 2 — Texts of Treaties, p. 2 — Appropriations, p. 2 — Referral to committee, p. 2 — Cancellation of a document, p. 3 — Statement by the President, p. 3 — Order of business, p. 3 — Speaking-time, p. 5 — Tabling of amendments, p. 5 — Procedure without report, p. 5 — Visit of the President of Venezuela, p. 5 — Action taken on Parliament's opinions, p. 6 — Question Time, p. 6 — Food aid to Cambodia, p. 20 — Urgent procedure, p. 28 — Next sitting, p. 28 — Annex, p. 29	
Tuesday, 15 April 1980	47
Minutes, p. 48 — Documents, p. 48 — Committees, p. 48 — Urgent procedure, p. 48 — Urgent procedure, p. 52 — Welcome, p. 52 — Food aid to Cambodia (contd), p. 53 — ERDF — Involvement of Northern Adriatic in European unification process, p. 56 — Votes, p. 83 — Human rights in Chile, p. 88 — Situation in Nicaragua, p. 96 — Human rights in Czechoslovakia, p. 101 — Right of residence, p. 105 — Urgent procedure, p. 115 — Next sitting, p. 115	
Wednesday, 16 April 1980	116
Minutes, p. 117 — Documents, p. 117 — Urgent procedure, p. 117 — Welcome, p. 124 — Decision on early vote, p. 124 — Urgent procedure, p. 125 — Relations between Parliament and Commission — report by Committee of Three — Institutional aspects of Greek accession, p. 125 — Order of Business, p. 129 — Iran, p. 129 — Relations between Parliament and Commission — Report by Committee of Three — Institutional aspects of Greek accession (contd), p. 129 — Iran (contd), p. 143 — Relations between Parliament and Commission — Report by Committee of Three — Institutional aspects of Greek accession (contd), p. 144 — Order of Business, p. 165 — European Monetary System, p. 165 — Question Time, p. 168 — Urgent procedure, p. 179 — Membership of Parliament, p. 179 — Committees, p. 179 — Next sitting, p. 180 — Annex, p. 181	

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)	Thursday, 17 April 1980	187
	Minutes, p. 189 — Agenda, p. 189 — Documents, p. 189 — Statement by the President, p. 189 — Urgent procedure, p. 190 — European Monetary System (contd), p. 191 — Welcome, p. 194 — European Monetary System (contd), p. 195 — Urgent procedure, p. 207 — Committees, p. 207 — Agenda, p. 207 — Iran, p. 207 — Energy saving, p. 208 — Agenda, p. 213 — Credentials, p. 214 — Iran, p. 214 — Votes, p. 229 — Energy saving (contd), p. 240 — Shipping routes and Community supplies, p. 245 — Code of conduct for oil-tankers, p. 259 — Urgent procedure, p. 268 — Next sitting, p. 268 — Annex, p. 271	
	Friday, 18 April 1980	277
	Minutes, p. 279 — Documents, p. 279 — Committees, p. 279 — Petitions, p. 279 — Authorization of reports, p. 279 — Procedure without report, p. 279 — Agenda, p. 279 — Decision on early vote, p. 280 — Urgent procedure, p. 280 — Food aid for 1980, p. 281 — Fish conservation measures, p. 283 — Assassination of Archbishop Romero, p. 283 — Asylum for Cuban citizens, p. 285 — Political prisoners in Guinea, p. 288 — Brittany and oil pollution, p. 290 — Votes, p. 291 — EEC-US relations in steel, p. 293 — Tunisia, p. 298 — Electronic voting-system, p. 298 — Agenda, p. 299 — Plutonium research, p. 299 — EEC-India cooperation, p. 306 — Agenda, p. 306 — World Conservation Strategy, p. 307 — Public supply contracts, p. 309 — Agenda, p. 312 — Votes, p. 312 — Committees, p. 314 — Next part-session, p. 314 — Minutes, p. 314 — Adjournment, p. 314)	

Resolutions adopted at the sittings of 14 to 18 April 1980 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 117 of 12 May 1980.

SITTING OF MONDAY, 14 APRIL 1980

1. Resumption of the session	2	Question No 5 by Mr Ippolito: Aids to prospection in the energy sector:	
2. Membership of Parliament	2	Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission;	
3. Petitions	2	Mr Ippolito; Mr Brunner; Mr Rogers;	
4. Documents received	2	Mr Brunner; Mrs Ewing; Mr Brunner . . .	10
5. Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council	2	Question No 6 by Mrs Pruvot: Social situation of workers in the cultural sector:	
6. Transfer of appropriations	2	Mr Brunner; Mrs Pruvot; Mr Brunner;	
7. Referral to committees	2	Mr Price; Mr Brunner	11
8. Cancellation of a document	3	Question No 7 by Mr Collins: Effect of Community policies on consumer prices:	
9. Statement by the President	3	Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission;	
10. Order of business:		Mr Collins; Mr Cheysson; Mr Kirk;	
Mr Seal; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Pranchère, Mr Bangemann; Mr Sutra	3	Mr Cheysson	12
11. Speaking time	5	Question No 8 by Mr Rogers: Guatemala:	
12. Deadline for tabling amendments	5	Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Rogers; Mr Haferkamp . .	12
13. Procedure without report	5	Question No 9 by Mr Linde: Human rights in the USSR:	
14. Visit of the President of Venezuela	5	Mr Haferkamp; Mr Linde; Mr Haferkamp. .	13
Points of order: Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Scott-Hopkins	5	Question No 10 by Mr Berkhout: Postal system in the Community:	
15. Action taken by the Commission on the opinions and proposals of Parliament . . .	6	Mr Davignon; Mr Berkhout; Mr Davignon; Mr Prag; Mr Davignon; Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr Davignon; Mr Cottrell; Mr Davignon	13
16. Question Time:		Question No 12 by Mr Balfe: Social Fund:	
Questions to the Commission of the European Communities:		Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission: Mr Balfe; Mr Vredeling; Mr Welsh; Mr Vredeling; Mr Lomas; Mr Vredeling . .	15
Question No 1 by Mr Dankert: Exceeding of the 1979 budget:		Question No 13 by Mr Dalsass: Brenner tunnel to expedite rail traffic:	
Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission; Mr Dankert; Mr Tugendhat; Mr J. M. Taylor; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Tugendhat	6	Mr Burke, Member of the Commission; Mr Dalsass; Mr Burke; Mr Moreland; Mr Burke; Mr Turner; Mr Burke	16
Question No 2 by Mr Seal: Labelling of clothing imports:		Question No 14 by Mr Provan: Subsidization of fishing fleets:	
Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mr Seal; Mr Davignon; Mr Turner; Mr Davignon	8	Mr Gundelach; Mr Provan; Mr Gundelach; Miss Quin; Mr Gundelach; Mrs Ewing; Mr Gundelach; Mr Hutton; Mr Gundelach; Mr Harris; Mr Gundelach; Sir Fred Warner; Mr Gundelach; Mr Kirk	17
Question No 3 by Mrs Chouraqui: The common agricultural policy vis-à-vis Spain:		17. Food aid to Cambodia — Report by Mr Wawrzik on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation (Doc. 1-734/79):	
Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission; Mrs Chouraqui; Mr Gundelach; Mr Marshall; Mr Gundelach; Mrs De March; Mr Gundelach; Lord Douro; Mr Gundelach	9	Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur	20
		Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission;	

*Mr Haagerup, draftsman of an opinion;
Mr Cohen (S); Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti
(EPP); Mr Purvis (ED); Mr Gremetz
(COM); Mr Flanagan (EPD); Mrs Macciocchi* 20

18. Urgent procedure	28
19. Agenda for next sitting	28
Annex	29

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

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

President. — The sitting is opened.

1. Resumption of the session

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament which was adjourned on 26 March 1980.

2. Membership of Parliament

President. — I have been informed, pursuant to Rule 4 (4) of the Rules of Procedure, that Mr Colombo has been appointed Foreign Minister of the Italian Republic.

Mr Colombo has sent me a telegram tendering his resignation, conveying his sincerest good wishes to the Assembly and expressing his determination to work, in his capacity as President-in-Office of the Council, for wholehearted cooperation with this Parliament. Mr Colombo expects to be with us on Wednesday next.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Treaties, we establish that there is a vacancy and inform the Member State concerned.

3. Petitions

President. — I have received twelve petitions, the titles and authors of which you will find listed in the minutes of this sitting.

These petitions have been given Nos 1/80 to 12/80 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.

4. Documents received

President. — Since the adjournment of the session I have received from the Council, the committees of Parliament, the political groups and Members of Parliament various documents, a list of which you will find in the minutes of this sitting.

5. Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council

President. — I have received from the Council certified true copies of various agreements and legal acts. These documents, which are listed in the minutes of this sitting, will be deposited in the archives of the European Parliament.

6. Transfer of appropriations

President. — The Council has informed me that pursuant to the provision of Article 101 of the Financial Regulation it has approved on 9 April 1980 the transfer of appropriations set out in Doc. COM(80) 135 final within the framework of the budgetary estimates for the EAGGF Guarantee Section for the financial year 1980.

We take note of this information.

7. Referral to committees

President. — The motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Battersby and Mr Harris, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the establishment of a European Fisheries Centre (Doc. 1-28/80), receipt of which was announced on 24 March 1980 and which had been referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport for an opinion, has now also been referred to the Committee on Energy and Research for an opinion.

8. *Cancellation of a document*

President. — Document 1-606/79 (Annual Reports on the progress achieved towards European Union), receipt of which was announced on 14 January 1980, has been cancelled.

9. *Statement by the President*

President. — The chairman of the Political Affairs Committee has informed me that his committee has decided not to draw up a report on Docs 1-444/79, 1-644/79 and 1-663/79. You will find a detailed statement of the reasons for this decision in the minutes of this sitting.

10. *Order of business*

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

At its meeting of 13 March 1980 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed to you (PE 63. 826/rev.II).

As the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection has not adopted the Muntingh report on the conservation of European wildlife, this item, which had been down for debate on Thursday, has been withdrawn from the agenda.

I have also received the following requests for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- from Mr Glinne and Mr O'Connell, on behalf of the Socialist Group, for a motion for a resolution condemning the assassination of Archbishop Romero (Doc. 1-74/80)
- from Mr Diligent and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) and Mr Baudis, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, for a motion for a resolution on the granting of asylum to Cuban citizens (Doc. 1-84/80).

The reasons supporting these requests for urgent debate are contained in the documents themselves.

- from the Council for a proposal for a regulation laying down, for 1980, certain measures for the conservation and management of fishery resources applicable to vessels flying the Swedish flag (Doc. 1-35/80).

The request for urgency is justified by the fact that current arrangements are due to expire on 30 April next.

I shall consult Parliament on these requests for urgent debate at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

Finally, I have received two proposals that the agenda be amended, pursuant to Rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure.

Sir Fred Catherwood, chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations, has asked that an interim report by Mr Seal on the trade and economic cooperation agreements between the Community and India be placed on the agenda of this part-session.

At a meeting held this morning the chairmen of the political groups have expressed the wish that this report should be considered instead at the May part-session, particularly with a view to giving the Committee on Development and Cooperation the opportunity to deliver its opinion.

I call Mr Seal.

Mr Seal. — Madam President, I would like to support strongly Sir Fred Catherwood's request that this report be put on the agenda for this plenary session. One of the things that this House has tried to do is debate things at a time when it can influence the Commission and the Council of Ministers. If we postpone this report until the next part-session it will be too late to influence the Commission and the Council. This is an extremely important report. It is one that the House ought to discuss, and it is one that we ought to discuss in time so as to make our influence felt. So I beg that we uphold the request that it be considered at this plenary session.

President. — I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

Sir Fred Catherwood. — I would point out, Madam President, that we were going to discuss this with you in the enlarged Bureau. I have made protests on behalf of our committee. Time and again Parliament delivers its opinion after things have happened. Our committee has to work in accordance with the timetable of negotiation with other countries. Yet all the time we find that the agenda of the part-sessions is taken up by items which, unlike the matters referred to our committee, are not tied to a strict time-table. The matters discussed in our committee fall within the competence of the Community and are topics on which Parliament has been asked officially for an opinion. I would like very much not only to support Mr Seal, but to ask you to reconvene as soon as possible the cancelled meeting with the chairmen of the committees.

The President. — I put this request to the vote.

It has been decided therefore to include this report on the agenda for this part-session.

I propose that this debate be put on Thursday's agenda as the last item.

President

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

Mr Pranchère and others ask that a new debate on the fixing of agricultural prices be placed on the agenda for this part-session.

As this request reached me only after this morning's meeting at which, with the chairmen of the political groups, we considered the problems relating to the organization of this part-session and as the matter is such an important one, I shall consult the Assembly.

I call Mr Pranchère.

Mr Pranchère. — (F) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the powerful resistance by the farmers, which has even made itself felt in this Chamber, has already borne its first fruit with the abolition of the monetary compensatory amounts leading to a rise in guide prices of 3.5 % for some products in France.

The farmers are continuing their fight with vigour, and their action is a condemnation of the attitude of a majority in this House which has taken upon itself the heavy responsibility of leaving the whole matter in the hands of the Commission, whose agricultural price proposals have been described as nothing short of a provocation.

We now ask for the agenda of this part-session to be changed to enable the House to pronounce clearly on a precise rate of increase in the agricultural prices: we believe that the figure should be 7.9 % arrived at by a calculation using the objective method.

In making this proposal we, the French Communists and allies, believe we are answering the wishes of farmers in France and in the other Community countries.

We have often criticized the attempts made in this House to take over powers which do not rightly belong to the European Parliament. On this occasion, however, we note that Parliament has failed to use its right to support a justified social demand. We believe that the fixing of agricultural prices at a level corresponding to the evolution of production costs and inflation is a decisive factor if we are to put an end to the decline in farmers' earnings which has been continuing for six years now in France. A majority (including ourselves) in the Committee on Agriculture felt that the price increase should be 7.9 % and not 5 % and that this figure could be arrived at by adding the national monetary measures already taken or remaining to be taken. Our farmers were satisfied by this. We have asked for this change in the agenda in order to bring Parliament face to face with its responsibilities.

(Applause from some benches on the extreme left)

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Madam President, we have a special session behind us which did not result in the definition of a precise figure to be proposed by Parliament to the Council of Ministers. All the political groups regretted this fact; Madam President, the fact was that not all the groups in this House were able to accept a compromise; in fact it was first and foremost the French Communists who rejected the compromise submitted by two major groups with the support of all the members of all the other groups. They rejected our decision to fix a figure of at least 5 % based on application of the objective method.

(Applause from the centre and right)

You have sold the interests of the French farmers to protect the interests of your own party, and you are now engaged in nothing more than a cheap political manoeuvre.

(Mixed reactions)

Madam President, I am fed up of hearing from the French Communists that they are defending the interests of the farmers. On the last occasion they defended the interests of their own party, and that was all. Today they are insulting the French farmers by making the request that they have now put forward.

(Applause from the centre and right)

President. — I call Mr Sutra.

Mr Sutra. — (F) I have asked to speak on behalf of the French Socialists because we consider that Parliament did not live up to its true responsibilities at our last part-session. The press in my own country was almost unanimous in expressing the view that Parliament had suffered a serious defeat in failing to use its powers to the full and in leaving the decision to the Commission.

Secondly, there seems to be a problem of procedure, but it is too late to return to that now. We had decided to reject Mr Delatte's request for the normal voting system to be reversed and to vote first, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, on the amendments which departed furthest from the motion. But to the extent that we began with the amendment of the Committee on Budgets which quoted no figure...

Mr Bangemann. — (D) The Socialists wanted that!

Mr Sutra. — (F) ... and ended with the amendment by Mrs Barbarella which was very similar, it seems rather surprising that one amendment was felt to be closest to and the other furthest removed from the report. This difficulty could be remedied if we re-opened the debate to enable Parliament to pronounce clearly, fully and unambiguously making use of all its rights.

President. — I put this request for inclusion of this item on the agenda to the vote.

The request is rejected.

The order of business is therefore agreed.¹

11. *Speaking time*

President. — In agreement with the enlarged Bureau I propose that speaking time be allocated in the manner proposed in the draft agenda.

Are there any comments? That is agreed.¹

12. *Deadline for tabling amendments*

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

- at 6 p.m. this evening for the items on the agenda for 15 and 16 April
- at 6 p.m. tomorrow for the items on the agenda of 17 April
- at 6 p.m. on Wednesday for the items on the agenda of 18 April.

Are there any comments?

That is agreed.

13. *Procedure without report*

President. — In the minutes you will find the titles of the proposals from the Commission to the Council that have been placed on the agenda of this sitting for consideration without report, pursuant to Rule 27A of the Rules of Procedure.

Unless any Member has asked leave in writing to speak on these proposals or amendments are tabled to

them before the opening of the sitting on Friday, 18 April, I shall declare the proposals to be approved.

14. *Visit of the President of Venezuela*

President. — Next Thursday Mr Luis Herrera Campins, President of Venezuela, will be visiting Strasbourg to meet the Members of the European Parliament.

On this occasion we shall suspend our proceedings from 5 p.m. to 5.45 p.m. in order to enable him to address us in this Chamber.

I hope that a very large number of Members will attend this meeting in order to underline the importance our Parliament attaches to relations with the Latin American countries, and particularly with the Republic of Venezuela.

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

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Madam President, I merely wished to make the observation that following the most unfortunate happening on the last occasion, when there were some very narrow defeats or narrow votes and on three occasions Members cheated and voted for persons who were not present, a number of us removed our cards in order to keep them under proper supervision, as is the custom in the United States Congress. Now we have come back and found that we have had a second card put in our places. Now this must mean that there are a certain number of dual cards floating around, and I would respectfully suggest that it would be as well to check up to see how many cards have been repeated; those Members who have got two cards could then be approached to relinquish the second card.

(*Laughter*)

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — I wish, Madam President, to raise two points of order, if I may.

First, I have no wish, of course, to oppose the President of Venezuela talking to this House on Thursday, because it has already been arranged and it would be a great discourtesy if it were now changed in any way at all; but may I ask you and the House to accept that this creates no precedent for future Presidents or Prime Ministers to come to this House and to take the floor. It would, in my view and in that of many of my colleagues, be the wrong attitude for this House to adopt. This case is unique and must not set a prece-

¹ See minutes of this sitting.

Scott-Hopkins

dent, and I hope that will be recorded in the Report of Proceedings.

My second point is a short one, Madam President. Tomorrow morning I shall be moving a request for urgent procedure under Rule 14 for a debate to take place concerning the reaction of the Community to the situation in Iran following the statements of President Carter, and, to show the self-sacrifice of my group, it has been proposed that it should take the place of the debate which my group would be initiating on Wednesday.

I say this merely as a point of information and as a courtesy to you, Madam President, and to the House.

President. — To Mrs Kellet-Bowman I should like to say that as a result of the incidents that disrupted the voting at the last part-session, we have asked the firm that installed our electronic voting system to repair it.

The problem of the correct use of the voting cards had to be brought to the attention of the enlarged Bureau. However, because its last meeting was so short, the matter had to be postponed to next Thursday's Bureau meeting. We shall consider an arrangement whereby each member could retain his card, a copy of which would be kept by the Secretariat. In any case the enlarged Bureau, as you rightly point out, will have to give a clear ruling on the conditions under which cards are made available to Members.

I would add that it was no doubt by mistake that a certain number of members voted for absent colleagues. There are national parliaments where this practice is permitted, though it is contrary to our Rules of Procedure.

To Mr Scott-Hopkins I would say that I have taken note of his remarks. We shall bear them in mind tomorrow when we come to deal with the motion for a resolution of which he has informed us.

15. *Action taken on the opinions and proposals of Parliament*

President. — The next item is the statement from the Commission on action taken on the opinions and proposals of the European Parliament.¹

I note that no one wishes to speak on this item.

16. *Question Time*

President. — The next item is Question Time.

We shall begin with the questions addressed to the Commission.

Question No 1 by Mr Dankert (H-70/80):

Is it true that the Commission has exceeded the appropriations available for the Guarantee section of the EAGGF during the 1979 financial year by over 200 million EUA? If so, on what legal basis were commitments made beyond the appropriations available? When did it become apparent that appropriations were going to be exceeded? Why did the Commission only inform one part of the Budgetary Authority and not alert both parts immediately and what administrative, financial and legal measures does the Commission propose to regularize the situation relating to the 1979 budget?

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — At no stage in the 1979 budgetary year were commitments made by the Commission beyond the appropriations available. Indeed, the House will recall that the granting of advances was interrupted in November 1979 precisely because, pending the adoption of the Third Supplementary Budget, credits were not available. From 10 December onwards, however, the Commission was, in accordance with Article 7 of the Financial Regulation, entitled to give the EAGGF advances which would be charged against the 1980 budget. It therefore did so. It is, however, true that amounts paid out by the Member States under the EAGGF (Guarantee Section) before the end of the 1979 financial year exceeded the total credits which were finally made available under the 1979 budget by 203.5 million European units of account. The late adoption of the Third Supplementary Budget on 13 December, coupled with the normal granting of advances against the 1980 budget in December 1979, may have caused some uncertainty in the paying agencies of the Member States as to the amount of money held by them which represented appropriations actually available under the 1979 budget. This probably accounts for the spending in December of 203.5 m EUA. This final figure only became available when the Member States' declarations of expenditure were submitted at the end of February. The Commission informed both arms of the budgetary authority simultaneously of the situation when it submitted its final request for transfers within the EAGGF (Guarantee Section) of the 1979 budget.

No special financial or legal measures need to be taken in order to regularize the situation relating to the 1979 budget. The amount of 203.5 m EUA cannot, of course, be charged to the 1979 budget, but in accordance with Article 5 of the Financial Regulation is chargeable to the 1980 budget.

¹ See Annex.

Mr Dankert. — (NL) I am pleased to note that the Commission has in effect conceded that the 1979 budget was exceeded. I regret that the Council was informed of this and the information withheld from Parliament.

I should like now to hear from the Commissioner to what extent the excess has been deducted in calculating the twelfth for January and whether, as a result, the Commission has exceeded the provisional twelfth in January this year.

I should also like an assurance from the Commissioner that in future the Parliament and Council will be informed simultaneously of any similar occurrences.

Mr Tugendhat. — Two points, I think, arose from Mr Dankert's intervention. The first concerned the times at which we informed the two arms of the budgetary authority. We did, in fact, inform both arms of the budgetary authority at the same time, but as the paying agencies, the intervention boards, are located within the Member States and are indeed more or less closely connected with the governments of the Member States, it is, of course, the case that the governments of the Member States and thus the Members of the Council were aware of the situation from their own sources before we had provided the information to the two arms of the budgetary authority. We did, however, provide the information to the two arms of the budgetary authority in our first official communication, and we did so at the same time — on 19 March.

So far as the twelfths are concerned, the amount of money which was carried over and which can be taken into the 1980 budget hardly affects the twelfths in the first instance. It obviously reduces by 200 million the total amount available under the twelve twelfths, but in the early part of the year, as I think the House will agree, the twelfths pose very little problem; they get worse and worse the longer it goes on. So the sum of 200 million undoubtedly comes off the total amount available, but it does not make a difference in the immediate January-February situation.

Mr J.M. Taylor. — As a supplementary to this very important question by Mr Dankert on this very serious matter indeed that has to do with the way we conduct our affairs in the Institutions of Europe and the authority which is attributed to our budget — or the lack of it — may I follow through by asking whether it is not true to say that the Commission failed very badly to observe budgetary cover in 1979, and in particular sold no less than 250 000 tonnes of butter without budgetary cover; that this and similar matters gave rise to the sheer size of the Third Supplementary Budget; and that when that Third Supplementary Budget was debated in December, the Commission surely must have known of this absence of legal and

budgetary cover and did not disclose it at that time? And I should like to know why not. We should also like clarification of the areas in which the excess monies were spent and of the precise operations on which they were spent. With respect, Madam President, I give you notice, if I may that I have the signatures of five colleagues to a notice here to you, under Rule 47B (1), requesting an immediate debate on the Commission's answer to this question of Mr Dankert's.

Mr Tugendhat. — Mr Taylor's questions obviously went rather wider than the immediate ones posed by Mr Dankert, but there are a number of points which I should like to make quite clear. The first is that, as I am sure the House will recall very clearly, in the run-up to the Third Supplementary Budget, before indeed this House had actually passed the supplementary budget, the Commission — very properly, in my view — decided to interrupt payments precisely because we did not have budgetary cover, and therefore the important point which Mr Taylor makes about budgetary cover is one to which I think there is a very clear answer.

Now I of course accept, and believe, that it is a very serious matter that this overspending should have occurred. But I would like to make two points to the House, if the House will bear with me; the first is that in the past we have always been criticized because we had overestimated the amount we had made available for the EAGGF, but on this occasion we produced a supplementary budget request of 802 million European units of account — 802. The Council, in its wisdom, reduced that by 100 million to 700 million, and the Parliament, in its wisdom, accepted the Council's lower figure of 700 million and not our higher figure of 800 million.

Now I think it is very important to understand that if it is true — and it is true — that the Commission underestimated the amount of money that was required, both arms of the budgetary authority under-shot to an even greater extent.

We were not pressed at the time of the supplementary budget to increase our appropriations — far from it; we were pressed to lower them. When the Commission, realizing that things were going to be very tight — not realizing that they were going to be as tight as they were, but realizing that they would be very tight — decided that it would ask to transfer 130 million from the Guidance Section to the Guarantee Section of the EAGGF in order to make sure that that money which would otherwise not be spent would be spent, the House, as it had a perfect right to do, lopped off 30 million, so that we only had 100 million instead of the 130 million.

So, Madam President, let me be quite frank and certainly take the blame for the fact that we underestimated; but let me remind honourable gentlemen and,

Tugendhat

indeed, the Council as well that they were not at that time pressing us to appropriate more, they were pressing us to appropriate less, and had we in fact got what we wanted, the amount of overspending, though still serious, would perhaps have been only half what it has in fact been.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Would not the Commissioner agree that the whole issue gets more and more curious as things go on and the answers are unveiled? I am not arguing whether he or we undershot more, but would he not accept that his interpretation of the one-twelfth is a little strange, to put it mildly? He says that in the early months of the one-twelfth rule it does not matter if he overspends, because he can borrow it from the later twelfths. Since when has that been a rule? Since when has that been allowed under the regulations? It is not so, and he knows it is not. Is he not, in point of fact, finding a method of payment which is completely *ultra vires*, and will he look again at the answer that he gave to the honourable gentlemen over there, Mr Dankert, in reply to his original question? He has been *ultra vires* in the method whereby he has had to rectify the mistake that he and we and the Council made. Will he not accept that?

(Applause from certain quarters)

Mr Tugendhat. — Not being a lawyer, Madam President, I am not actually entirely sure what *ultra vires* means ...

(Laughter)

... but at all events I do not accept that we have been out of order in what we have done, because, as I said in my answer, in accordance with Article 5 of the Financial Regulation this extra amount of money is chargeable to the 1980 budget.

The second point I should like to make is that as the extent of this serious overspending on the part of the intervention agencies only became apparent well over half-way through the first quarter, it obviously follows that one could not have made any adjustment at the beginning of the first quarter. Now, as I understand it — and it would, perhaps, be unwise of me to become involved in a discussion at this stage about the twelfths — the total amount the Community can spend under the one-twelfth rule is twelve twelfths of what was spent last year, and therefore if you spend more at the beginning you have less to spend at the end; but you cannot alter the total, and that is the problem. On this basis certainly the money has to be subtracted, there is no doubt about that, but it could not have been subtracted before we knew where we stood.

(Cries from some quarters)

President. — I have received a request, pursuant to Rule 47 B of the Rules of Procedure, for a debate on

this subject immediately after Question Time. I shall give a decision on this in due course.

Question No 2 by Mr Seal (H-464/79):

In view of the increase in the number of origin marking frauds and the unilateral action of the French government in introducing its own origin marking regulation will the Commission open immediate negotiations with the AEIH and other interested bodies with a view to a Community regulation requiring all clothing to be clearly marked with its country of origin and establishing machinery to ensure effective enforcement?

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) The Honourable Member is perfectly right; the falsifications and lack of clarity in a number of commercial transactions relating to textiles and clothing give rise to concern. I have had occasion to refer to this during previous debates. The Commission accordingly submitted to the Council on 17 March a communication on various aspects of the verification of origin in order to make sure that there can be no fraud in that particular area. The document in question is now being considered by the Council with a view to early juridical measures to strengthen control.

These matters are of course also being discussed with the professional organizations concerned, and I have had occasion to give detailed explanations to the European clothing union.

Mr Seal. — I hope that a quick decision is reached by the Council, but it does bother me that labelling of the country of origin is more important than ever now in view of a decision which was made concerning the free circulation of low-cost textiles by the Commission on 21 January. I would like to know from the Commissioner why this decision about limiting the surveillance on free circulation was made before any decision had been taken by the Council on indicating the countries of origin.

Mr. Davignon. — (F) Mr Seal, two different aspects must be considered. Firstly, the Commission is responsible for ensuring that goods can circulate freely within the Community and that there are no barriers to such movement. On the basis of Article 30, we therefore took certain measures when free movement was being impeded. On the other hand when goods enter the Community it is important for their origin to be clearly known and for freedom of movement to be allowed only if this condition is complied with.

The communication which we have submitted to the Council is therefore complementary to and consistent with freedom of movement and with an assurance that there is no fraud or falsification. Our measures are therefore perfectly in order in that sense. Proof of this is provided by the fact that a measure taken by one

Davignon

Member State to impose specific national marks of origin was suspended pending the outcome of Community discussions on the basis of the Commission's proposal.

Mr Turner. — Can Parliament take part in these discussions on the document the Commissioner has put to the Council, because many of us have had representations from the industry on this and I think we could be of use in trying to find some procedure which would deal with this origin fraud we are all so concerned about?

Mr Davignon. — (F) I shall see to it that this document is immediately made available to the committee — no doubt the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs — responsible for dealing with matters of origin and technical barriers.

President. — Question No 3 by Mrs Chouraqui (H-488/79):

Would the Commission not agree that the common agricultural policy has proved to be a signal European achievement and that its application has made it possible to forge close links with many Mediterranean countries, which cannot be jeopardized by unrealistic and costly concessions to Spain — particularly as regards citrus fruit — during the negotiations on Spanish accession to the Community?

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission.

— (DK) I would first like to point out to the honourable Member that the object of our negotiations with Spain is not the exchange of trade concessions on citrus fruits for concessions on industrial goods or whatever, but Spanish accession to the European Communities, that is to say the assumption of all the obligations and benefits entailed by full membership under the Treaties. The negotiations therefore relate to the transitional arrangements required to ensure the reasonable and just implementation in full of the Treaties between Spain and the Community. They are therefore not, as the question would give us to believe, negotiations on a number of different products, bargaining one concession for another.

However I would agree with the honourable Member that the Community, under the common agricultural policy in particular, has produced a number of sensible and mutually beneficial trade arrangements with several Mediterranean countries, and the Commission takes the view that, in the process of enlargement to include Spain, the Community must ensure that the benefits of the cooperation with other Mediterranean countries are not eroded. The Commission stated this view very clearly in its communication to the Council and Parliament on the agricultural problems arising from the enlargement of the Community.

Mrs Chouraqui. — (F) Europe has certain links with the Mediterranean countries; we have already received delegations from Morocco and Israel and we have had contacts with certain delegations from the Maghreb countries and even from the Mashreq, to mention only Egypt. The Accession of Spain will clearly cause disturbance and perhaps even economic disorder in trade between the Mediterranean countries and Europe. Will the treaty which is to be negotiated with Spain contain a clause to allow for the damage suffered by the Mediterranean countries? How is that damage to be remedied?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) As I have already said, the Commission takes the view that Spanish accession to the Community, for which transitional arrangements are essential, is an acceptance of the 'acquis communautaire' as it stands when Spain becomes a member. But at the same time the Community must maintain contact and negotiate with other Mediterranean countries to ensure that, in the process, adverse effects are avoided or compensated for by measures to benefit the Mediterranean countries concerned, with whom we need to maintain good relations.

Mr Marshall. — Perhaps the Commissioner will not be surprised if some of us comment on the original premise of the question, which relates to the success of the common agricultural policy, because many of us feel that the common agricultural policy is so costly that other developments which could make the European ideal more of an everyday reality are prevented. In the negotiations for Spanish entry, can we have an assurance that the right of sherry-producers both in England and in Cyprus to describe their fortified wine as sherry will be retained, especially as the legality of that was confirmed in a long-standing English case in, I think, 1953?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) I do not think that the question as put related to the common agricultural policy as a whole, but to the effects on Mediterranean countries of Spanish accession to the Community. That was the question I answered. And my reply applies just as much to the problems raised by the honourable Member as to those originally mentioned.

Mrs De March. — (F) Even now, as I have been able to see in the Mediterranean regions of France, particularly in Languedoc-Roussillon, agricultural products from Spain are invading our southern markets where they arrive by the truckload — lettuce is one of the products involved. The French growers find themselves in a situation where there are no more buyers for their products; sometimes they cannot sell anything at all.

Does this situation not foreshadow the effects of enlargement with the accession of Spain? Does the

De March

Commission not think that safeguard measures must be taken and that the plans for further enlargement of the Community should now be abandoned?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) With all due respect, I feel we are widening this question, on certain effects of Spanish accession to the Community on the Mediterranean countries, into a discussion of Spanish accession and its effect on the Community itself. That was not the question but, without entering into a new debate on this point, I would point out that, in our communication to the Council and Parliament, we drew attention to a number of difficulties which must be dealt with before this welcome enlargement of the Community takes place on mutually acceptable terms. In the negotiations we have to reach suitable transitional arrangements, of course including safeguards, and there may be some question of adapting the 'acquis communautaire' to a new situation, but to go into that in detail would be beyond the scope of this Question Time.

Lord Douro. — Would the Commissioner agree that at the moment the Community is only self-sufficient in citrus fruits for about 40 % of its consumption, and that even after Spanish accession the Community will not be self-sufficient in citrus fruits, so that the danger to Community producers from Spanish accession is minimal?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) It is true that at the moment the Community is far from self-sufficient in citrus fruits and is hardly likely to become so even after Spanish accession, unless the Community's various agricultural schemes encourage an increase in citrus fruit production in Spain. That might happen. If so, our trade relations with Mediterranean countries such as Morocco would be seriously affected as has been suggested. The aim in negotiating these transitional periods must be to ensure future stability, and it should be possible to solve the problems of the citrus sector without too much difficulty. Other commodities, such as olive oil, will probably present more problems.

President. — As its author is absent, Question No 4 by Mr Rossi will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 5 by Mr Ippolito (H-515/79):

In view of the present serious crisis concerning supplies of raw materials and energy, is the Commission studying any system of direct aids or assisted loans which would give

industrial concerns in the Member States practical support whilst they were prospecting for deposits of fossil fuels, fissile materials or raw materials?

Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission. — (D) The European Community should give its support to investments which involve a high risk but can be of assistance to the Community's energy supplies. It is already doing so. We are at present assisting 144 oil exploration projects and encouraging uranium extraction in the Community. 136 million EUA have been made available for oil exploration and 16 million EUA for the uranium sector. In other areas we are investigating the possibility of technical improvements in production; this research falls under the four-year research programme and 3.6 million EUA have been earmarked for it.

Mr Ippolito. — (I) My question was designed mainly to highlight the present deficiencies in Community aid for energy research.

In the oil exploration sector, an operator engaged in deep-sea drilling is eligible for aid from the Commission, and an undertaking which discovers a deposit — once it has been found — can receive loans from the European Investment Bank; but there is an intermediate period between the technological development and the increasingly expensive offshore exploration during which in practice the undertaking receives no aid whatever under the existing provisions.

The purpose of my question was to ask the Commission to examine ways of filling this gap between advanced technological research and the commencement of exploitation of a deposit once it has been found.

In the case of fissile materials, the Euratom Treaty provisions — now under review — stipulate that the Commission may apply restrictions to supplies to those countries which have not made all the necessary effort to locate such materials on their own territory. Here too I think specific measures are called for.

Mr Brunner. — (D) I am able to assure the Honourable Member that we shall continue our efforts to close this gap and shall present further proposals to the Council of Ministers.

Mr Rogers. — In view of the vast profits made by multinational oil companies operating in the energy field, referred to by my Communist friend, is the Commission studying any system for recovering direct aid given to these companies which, as he said, is another method of providing the risk capital for these companies while at the same time allowing them to retain the profits after production, which is, of course, the very antithesis of the capitalist system with which we are burdened?

¹ See Annex.

Mr Brunner. — (D) This is an aspect of the European Community's general policy to promote investments in the energy sector; that policy has been discussed here already. Community proposals to encourage investments in this sector have already been submitted to the European Council. These proposals envisage that, subject to the approval of the European Council, special levies should be raised as one means of obtaining additional financial resources. We must now await the debate in the European Council on this subject.

Mrs Ewing. — As this House has already lent a sympathetic ear to the faraway Orkney Islands in another context, could I ask Commissioner Brunner to bear in mind that if he were to visit the Orkney Islands — which I would not advise him to do at the present time — he would find on every house and every shop a sign that simply says 'no uranium'? It is a small deposit, but it lies immediately under the only populous area of these islands, between the ancient, medieval city of Kirkwall and the ancient town of Stromnes. Is he aware that the people of this area are not going to allow this German firm to prospect for this material because they are not going to allow the machinery to get on to these islands to look for it? This is an issue which unites the churches, the locally elected people, every association and every citizen in these islands. Would this House perhaps — if Commissioner Brunner will not listen — understand that there will be no looking, prospecting or digging for uranium in the Orkney Islands?

Mr Brunner. — (D) Under these circumstances I should naturally not travel to the Orkneys without the protection of the Honourable Member.

(Laughter)

To return to the point, we have said from the outset that we shall only promote uranium exploration if we have the approval of the local authorities. In this particular instance the local authorities have not yet given their approval, and the question therefore does not arise in practice. There is accordingly no real justification for the wall slogans to which the Honourable Member referred.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

President. — Question No 6 by Mrs Pruvot (H-519/79):

In its resolution of 18 January 1979 embodying an opinion on the communication from the Commission concerning 'Community action in the cultural sector' the

European Parliament stated that there was a need for information on the social situation of persons working in the cultural sector and requested the Commission to instruct its Statistical Office to undertake the necessary work. Has the Commission simply ignored this request or has it taken steps to obtain figures through its Statistical Office on the employment, remuneration and social security (level of benefits) of cultural workers, so that we may analyse them in the same way as figures on workers in industry and agriculture?

Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission. — (D) The Commission views the position of workers in the cultural sector as an extremely important matter. We have not as yet been able to meet Parliament's wishes but are making efforts to do so. The reason why we have been unable to effect a comprehensive survey of the situation is this: we are dependent on data provided by the national statistics offices, but we have not yet received enough information. We shall continue to press the national statistics offices for a better allocation of priorities so that we do soon receive the documentation which we require. We share the view of Parliament that this is an important matter and take a close interest in the position of workers in the cultural sector.

Mrs Pruvot. — (F) I have noted the fact that the Commission shares Parliament's views and I hope that it will keep its promise to ensure that Parliament, and in particular its Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, receives the desired answers and statistical data as quickly as possible.

Mr Brunner. — (D) I share the Honourable Member's view and assure her once again that we shall continue our efforts.

Mr Price. — The Commissioner has put the blame for this very long delay on the national statistics offices. Could he indicate on what date the various national statistics offices were asked to provide this information, and which of them have so far replied and which have not?

Mr Brunner. — (D) I shall provide the details in writing. Over the past twelve months we have made constant efforts to obtain this information. We have also scheduled a working meeting to discuss not only the matter of the provision of information but also that of the priorities followed in the work of the national statistics offices.

President. — Question No 7 by Mr Collins (H-60/80, formerly O-110/79):

Will the Commission say whether at any time they have calculated the effect of changes in Community Policy on

President

prices to European consumers and whether in future, they will undertake to do so and to make the figures public?

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) The Commission clearly takes account of the economic implications of the policies which it proposes and implements. With that end in view it has regard in particular to the consequences of common policies for price formation just as it assesses their impact on other economic variables. It must be stressed, however, that no common policy has a direct influence on consumer prices. There can be no detailed statistical appraisal of the effects on consumer prices of competition policy, policies on the domestic market and consumer protection or, more generally, of any Community action.

As regards the common agricultural policy, the Commission assesses, in each specific case, the impact of the measures proposed by it on consumer prices and will continue to do so. These estimates are published with the price proposals.

Mr Collins. — I was very interested to hear the Commissioner refer to the common agricultural policy, but I am sure that he would appreciate that nothing could have been further from my mind when I raised the question. However, since he has raised the matter, may I say that the reason I put the question in this way was that I think that Community policy tends to be thought out in a rather one-sided way and frequently considers the common agricultural policy in terms of farm incomes almost to the exclusion of consumer expenditure. I wonder, therefore, whether the Commission will not agree that, at a time when unemployment is rising and poverty in industrial areas is increasing, a more balanced approach is necessary, and that this can only be achieved if consumer prices are considered and indeed published? I do not think it is enough to consider them; these figures must be published. I wonder if he will further undertake, when looking at this, to publish the effect on food prices of the recent imposition by one of the Member States, the United Kingdom, of positive MCAs. I wonder whether the Commissioner will not agree that this is a piece of considerable hypocrisy by the Minister for Agriculture concerned, which will not only have an effect on consumer prices but will also have a deleterious effect on the balance, or rather the imbalance, of contributions to the Community budget by Member States.

Mr Cheysson. — (F) The Honourable Member has raised two subjects: firstly he is suggesting that the Commission should provide more frequent information on the evolution of consumer prices in relation to new common policies or the improvement of policies already adopted. The Commission will look into this suggestion closely. I would stress that when the last

agricultural price proposals were forwarded by the Commission to Parliament, my colleague, Vice-President Gundelach, and the Commission gave precise details on the impact of the Commission's proposed price rises on food expenditure, i.e. an increase of 0.8 %, or 0.1 % of average household expenditure. In other words the Commission has already acted along the lines recommended by the Honourable Member.

I was asked a second question which, it must be conceded, is more a matter for the Government concerned than for the Commission itself. The reversal of the monetary compensatory amounts in the case of the United Kingdom results from the fortunate trend in the value of that country's currency and from the British Government's justified request for a change in its monetary compensatory amounts. But this reversal and its possible consequences for consumer prices clearly show that, no matter what may be said in some quarters, the evolution of agricultural prices is a complex matter which cannot be dealt with solely by a freeze on prices.

Mr Kirk. — (DK) Mr President, I agree with Mr Cheysson that the Commission has provided clear information on the effect of the common agricultural policy on consumer prices.

I should also like to take this opportunity of asking — and perhaps my question would be better put to Mr Gundelach — whether, as a result of our debate last month, the Commission has considered amending its 1980-1981 farm price proposals, and whether it has taken into account the fact that Parliament regarded the Commission's proposal of 2.4 % as completely unacceptable, and regretted that the Commission had ignored objective findings that farm incomes had fallen behind by at least 7 %. I hope that Mr Gundelach will answer the question.

Mr Cheysson. — (F) May I point out that this question has no bearing whatever on the question that we are discussing.

President. — Question No 8 by Mr Rogers (H-65/80, formerly O-142/79):

Will the Commission in conducting trade relations with Guatemala bear in mind the appalling record of the present regime in power there in the matter of human rights, including imprisonment without trial for political offences and numerous political murders of trade unionists and others, as documented by Amnesty International?

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — (D) The Community maintains no special bilateral trade relations with Guatemala. Any trade policy problems which may arise are dealt with in a multilateral framework, i.e. in GATT and UNCTAD.

Mr Rogers. — I am quite amazed at the Commissioner's answer. It is quite contrary to some of the information that I have been able to ascertain.

Could I ask the Commissioner another question then arising from his answer? Political murders are being carried out in Guatemala by special death squads that often include uniformed members of the military and security forces. Recently a new death squad, the ESA, has been set up which serves as an umbrella group for military and security forces, land owners and businessmen whose primary aim is a 'final solution' for the problems of land titles, union organizing and economic development. In view of these considerations, will the Commission provide Parliament with the fullest possible information on trade by the Community with Guatemala, thus updating the 1978 figures which have been provided to me and which show that the EEC imports from Guatemala goods to the value of 211 million units of account per year and that exports to Guatemala earn 161.6 million units of accounts each year?

Mr Haferkamp. — (D) I should like to begin by pointing out that the general figures quoted here in no way contradict the observations I made just now. They are not based on special trade relations with Guatemala; the trade in question is effected under the general rules of GATT and UNCTAD. Parliament and the Honourable Member concerned can of course be provided immediately with further data on trade patterns within the international organizations. As to the Member's comments on the infringement of human rights, I would add that the Commission condemns all such infringements no matter where they may occur. The Commission continues to subscribe to the position set down in 1977 in the Joint Declaration of this Assembly, the Council and the Commission.

President. — Question No 9 by Mr Linde (H-69/80, formerly 0-146/79):

In view of the continuing arrests of members of the group inside the USSR monitoring the political situation following the Helsinki and Belgrade agreements, will the Commission obtain a full report from Amnesty International on this deteriorating situation?

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — (D) Mr President, the Commission maintains permanent contact with Amnesty International on the subject of human rights. This clearly applies to the situation of persons or groups who are speaking out in the Soviet Union in favour of fulfilment of the agreements contained in the Helsinki Final Act. The Commission shares the view expressed by the Community Member States that the victimization of persons who speak out in their own countries in favour of implementation of the Helsinki Final Act is incompatible with the objectives of that Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Mr Linde. — (D) Am I to understand from the Commissioner's answer that the Commission generally and in this specific instance looks favourably on the work of Amnesty International?

Mr Haferkamp. — (D) We not only look favourably on its work but also cooperate very closely with Amnesty and give it our support, while respecting its rules and statutes.

President. — Question No 10 by Mr Berkhouwer (H-385/79):

Would the Commission be willing to take the initiative in establishing a postal system under which all residents in the Community would be able to use for normal postal communication a common stamp of the same value valid throughout the Community in addition to their national stamps?

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) The Commission shares the Honourable Member's view that it would be altogether appropriate and psychologically desirable to develop a public awareness by issuing an identical postage stamp valid throughout the Community. That is our political position. The legal situation is as follows: only the member countries of the Universal Postal Union are entitled to issue stamps, in other words the individual countries but not the Community as such. I therefore think that it would be useful to open a debate on the possibility of finding juridical solutions which would enable a politically useful step to be taken and which should not raise any particular difficulty. If Parliament were to take an initiative in this sense — since the matter falls within the competence of the Member States and not directly within that of the Community — it would have the Commission's support.

Mr Berkhouwer. — (NL) Mr President, I am delighted at the Commission's extremely positive and constructive answer. In the past the situation was unfortunately different, but things now seem to have taken a turn for the better. I would like to put one supplementary question: I share Commissioner Davignon's view that a postage stamp valid in all the countries of the Community would be of great value. However, the position at present — and perhaps the Commission can do something about this pending further measures — is that there are even different postal tariffs in the Community. I shall quote you an example: to send a letter from Rotterdam to London we pay 80 cents in the Netherlands but only 60 cents for a letter from Rotterdam to Messina. That is a difference of 25 %, and if you have enough letters to post from Rotterdam to London it is worth taking the boat — a ridiculous state of affairs. I am very interested in London, Mr President, which is why I have mentioned that city, but the situation is quite ridiculous. You have

Berkhouwer

to pay 25 % more for a letter to London than for a letter to Paris.

I should like to ask Mr Davignon whether the Commission can put an end to this situation pending its further action. England has now been a member of the Community since 1 January 1973 and I hope that it will remain a member. I sincerely hope so and I assume that my view is shared in this House.

(Laughter — applause from some benches of the European Democratic Group)

We have now been involved in a period of adaptation for six years — you too, Mr President. As a mayor you do not of course pay any postage, but an ordinary citizen does have to pay these different rates.

(Laughter)

President. — You may be assured that I pay for my stamps!

(Laughter)

Mr Davignon. — (F) If we were to follow the Honourable Member's reasoning, it would appear that there is an increase in maritime traffic in proportion to increases in postal charges and in the distribution of mail... On a more serious note, Mr President, the Commission submitted to the Member States in May of last year, i.e. nearly one year ago, a recommendation for the introduction of a single tariff within the Community for letters of up to 20 g. Why was the figure of 20 g chosen? Because these letters account for 80 % of all mail in circulation. We made this recommendation to the Member States at a meeting of the Ministers of Posts, but up to now we have not received an answer from the postal administrations of the three new Member States. It would, however, be necessary to introduce this harmonization progressively. I think this would be a useful step to take, and the Commission will continue to insist on the recommendation being put into effect.

Mr Prag. — The post between the Member countries is an essential element in the free movement of goods, people and capital. I wonder whether the Commissioner, during his profound and extensive reading, saw in the *Bild am Sonntag* last autumn the result of a practical test carried out by the *Bild am Sonntag* in response to a written question of mine to the Commission, which showed that the eighteenth century stagecoach post was faster than the present-day post.

Is the Commission prepared to reintroduce a stagecoach post or to do anything else to improve on the present lamentably inadequate speed of the post between the Member countries?

(Laughter)

Mr Davignon. — (F) However much the Commission may wish to bring about a reduction in energy costs within the Community, our proposals, and those of my colleague, Mr Brunner, do not yet include the reintroduction of stagecoaches to transport mail or a restoration of the monopoly enjoyed by the family of Thurn und Taxis for this purpose. We are therefore in a clear situation at present, under which responsibility for the postal service rests with the national administrations. The Treaty gives the Community no particular competence in this area.

Mr de Courcy Ling. — Will the Commissioner agree that this situation could hardly be worse if the many surplus cattle in the Community were used to draw the stagecoach to which Mr Prag referred? Will he not also acknowledge that this is now such a serious barrier to trade within the Community that the Commission ought to consider putting the question of postal communications, particularly between France and the United Kingdom and between Paris and London, on the agenda of a European Council later in the year. This is something which the electorate of the Community really cares about. It is a small matter, perhaps, as compared with some of the major strategic Community matters we are considering, but if we, as a Community, cannot organize ourselves better on this score we will certainly be disappointing our electorate very badly. We want some urgent action, an initiative from the Commission, to spur the Member governments into action.

Mr Davignon. — (F) However much I may wish to assist the Honourable Member, I must say that the Commission does not intend to submit the problem of postal organization to the European Council. We have in fact found that because of an increase in costs the internal postal systems of the Member States function less satisfactorily than the system for deliveries between States, because other means of communication are used. This matter either relates to an improvement in legislation, in which case it concerns all the countries of Europe and should more normally be dealt with by the Council of Europe, or else it is linked with the dissatisfaction felt by the general public with the postal system in the respective countries.

I do not think we should be doing a service to the European Community if we were to give the impression that it can take up responsibilities which do not normally rest with it to settle a problem which should normally rest with the individual States. If there were a special problem affecting relations between two States in such a way as to run the risk of impeding free movement, the Commission would then intervene with the powers which it has. On this specific point I can assure the Honourable Member that the Commission will act efficiently and speedily.

Mr Cottrell. — Mr President, I should like to help the Commissioner, if I may, with what he may find is a useful suggestion. It seems to me that we are tackling this very difficult problem the wrong way round in trying to persuade the Member States to agree to a common tariff for postage. Why do we not, as the European Commission, as the European Parliament, as the European Investment Bank, issue our own postage stamps? What is to stop this organization, which after all generates a great deal of paper and a great deal of correspondence, from becoming a postal authority in its own right? I have heard it suggested that perhaps there is a useful propaganda value in having a common postage identified with Europe. The United Nations does it already; it makes an enormous profit out of running its own postal service. I should like to ask the Commissioner, or any other Commissioner who has perhaps dealt with this problem, whether this has been considered in the past and whether it is likely to be considered in the future.

Mr Davignon. — (F) I answered the first question by stating that the Commission looks favourably on a political gesture in the shape of the issue of a European postage stamp. However, as things stand at present, neither the Commission nor Parliament nor the Council of Ministers has any authority to decide that a uniform postal tariff should be applied within the Community for all correspondence within the same category. That is perfectly clear. Today the situation is different, and the issue of a new stamp would not lead to a reduction in charges for posting letters between the Netherlands and the United Kingdom or vice versa.

Moreover, the authority empowered to issue stamps must, in the case of all UN Member States, belong to the Universal Postal Union which lays down the rules for issuing stamps. The Community as a juridical body does not belong to the Universal Postal Union and is not entitled, as such, to issue stamps. We are perfectly willing to contact the Universal Postal Union and we shall support initiatives towards that end if the Nine, who also belong to the Union, indicate their wish for the Community to join likewise, thus giving it the right to issue stamps. As you will see, I have arrived at the same conclusion as you although by a rather longer route — even though I do not travel by stagecoach — because I am obliged to take account of all the constraints of a juridical nature which make the European Community, however powerful it may be in its own right, also a part of the wider international community of nations.

President. — As its author is absent, Question No 11 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 12 by Mr Balfe (H-476/79):

Does the Commission consider that the present rules concerning the operation of the Social Fund prevent applications by, and grants to, projects fulfilling the purposes for which the Fund exists, but intended to help people outside areas designated for regional development by national Governments?

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission.

— (NL) I must answer the Honourable Member's question in the negative. Only in the case of interventions for the benefit of backward regions must the criterion be met, by definition, that the projects concerned are intended to help the population of areas earmarked by the national Governments for regional development purposes. In practice, thanks to the application of the Social Fund guidelines, the overwhelming bulk of intervention from this Fund benefits the regions concerned. In 1978 this was the case for 80 % of the total and in 1979 for 85 %. This is one consequence of the Commission's efforts to concentrate aid on areas in which the need is greatest.

Mr Balfe. — Would the Commissioner accept that there is grave concern in London, which is the area that I represent, that the Social Fund is increasingly being seen as just an adjunct to the Regional Fund? The area that I represent has, in fact, seen virtually no money at all out of the Social Fund, although there are many projects which are eminently eligible in some of the smaller areas of London. I wonder whether the Commissioner could make it clear that monies from the Social Fund are not necessarily and solely tied to the regions, because there does seem to be an impression growing up in England that the Social Fund is merely another variant of the Regional Fund and worthy projects which do not happen to be in regional areas stand very little chance of success. This of course means that areas such as London, which would not qualify as a region but does have very heavy levels of unemployment and deprivation in the inner city, see very little money from the Community at all. I hope the Commission can give us an assurance that it will try, as they say in England, to spread the jam a bit more evenly.

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) I willingly support the Honourable Member's suggestion and am able to inform him that there is no truth in the assertion that the Social Fund can do nothing whatever for big cities like London. Priority is, however, given to regional areas which receive 80 % of the available appropriations. There then remains 20 %, and of this 20 % very high priority is given to projects to assist migrant workers or to special projects for the vocational training of women over the age of 25 and of handicapped persons. Such projects could thus easily be subsidized in a big city like London by the Social Fund provided that the criteria laid down are met.

¹ See Annex.

Mr Welsh. — Would the Commissioner not accept that the Commission will, in fact, have no policy of its own on the Social Fund, the Regional Fund, or any other of its development funds, until it frees itself from the shackles of the criteria set by Member States' governments for short-term political reasons, and will he recommend to his colleagues in the last few months of their term of office that this would be a very good cause for them to fight for and to go out on, in other words to leave an inheritance for their successors which will enable them to run the Commission and run the Community as an independent force?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) The Honourable Member clearly has a lack of information on the situation regarding the Social Fund. I can only answer that the Commission, and not the Member States, is fully responsible for applying the criteria relating to Social Fund projects notified to us by the Member States. It would be a grave misunderstanding to suppose that in this respect the situation regarding the Regional Fund and the Social Fund is identical.

Mr Lomas. — I appreciate the difficulties of the Commissioner working as he does under the present rules. But it is not quite true to say that other cities suffer to the same extent as London, in the sense that many other cities in the Community benefit from regional aid, which London does not. I wonder whether he has ever visited the East End of London, which I represent, and seen the deprivation and poverty and unemployment there and whether the Commission has thought of any new ways, apart from the present structure of aid, by which aid could be given to areas such as that. I had a reply recently, Mr President, a written reply from the Commission, telling me that in the seven years that Britain has been a member of the Community no aid has been given to the East End of London, apart from a couple of small projects under the anti-poverty programme, and even they are ending this year. It is no wonder, Mr President, that most people in that area are so bitterly hostile to the Community, and I wonder whether the Commissioner can give any sort of optimistic reply regarding the future for the people of such areas.

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) The Honourable Member is in fact justified in feeling some degree of optimism.

I imagine that the reply he received in respect of the East End of London did not relate to the Social Fund but to the Regional Fund or some other fund. In the case of the Social Fund it is often impossible to ascertain exactly where the money is used. We therefore cannot refute his suggestion that no money has ever reached the East End of London. As to the substance of his question, I would say that in considering projects for the vocational training of young people in particular, we use criteria which are not based solely

on statistical data in respect of the percentage of young unemployed. We also determine which urban areas are involved. It is often the category of young people rather than the actual percentage of young unemployed which is the decisive consideration. To use a word with which the Honourable Member is familiar, I would say that we are far more concerned with the drop-outs of society than with percentages. We take account of this aspect too and wish to give additional attention to this category when it comes to the matter of vocational training for young people in our big cities.

President. — Question No 13 by Mr Dalsass (H-477/79):

In view of the need to make fundamental improvements to transalpine rail traffic does the Commission not think that the capacity at which the Brenner railway needs to operate can only be achieved and greater energy savings ensured by the construction of a long base tunnel and has the Commission considered the possibility of providing finance for this major European construction project, and if so, how much?

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — The construction of long base railway tunnels does make it possible to increase the capacity of railway lines and to improve the average speed. Furthermore, theoretical studies have shown that such structures could, in some cases, lead to significant reductions in energy consumption, particularly if heavy road vehicles and private cars are carried by rail. However, it would not be advisable to give an opinion on a particular case until thorough cost-benefit studies have been carried out, using all the data concerning this case and comparing the results with other possible options. The possibility of providing financial aid for a major Alpine project such as the proposed Brenner tunnel is, of course, not to be excluded. On numerous occasions when discussing other projects the Commission has stated that it would be wrong to give an opinion either on the principle or on the amount of Community financial aid before the procedures established for this purpose have been completed.

The Commission attaches great importance to the creation of a new financial instrument capable of meeting the needs of transport infrastructure. The Council is still examining the proposal for a regulation concerning financial aid to infrastructure projects of Community interest. The Commission has submitted a proposal for an amendment to extend the scope of this regulation to projects located on the territory of non-member countries. The adoption of the regulation and amendment by the Council would make it possible to consider applications for assistance to projects like the Brenner tunnel.

Mr Dalsass. — (D) I am surely right in saying that this is a highly important initiative of the utmost inter-

Dalsass

est to several countries. Several studies have already been made. Now I want to put a supplementary question to the Commissioner: is the Commission prepared to determine the cost of this project at an early date and is it willing to intervene to speed matters up, since we all know that rail traffic over the Brenner no longer meets the present requirements?

Mr Burke. — The Commission does not wish to use the complexity of the problem as an excuse to avoid making decisions. However, it would be irresponsible for it to give an opinion *ex abrupto* without a thorough knowledge of the facts. For this purpose, after the necessary consultation with Parliament, Council has adopted those parts of our overall policy which consist of a consultation procedure and a Committee on Transport Infrastructure. I would put it to the House and to the honourable Member that this committee could take an interest in projects such as this, if Member States were to submit them at an appropriate time, provided always of course that the essential regulations and the amendments to extend the scope of our regulations are passed. So the Commission hopes that the Committee on Transport Infrastructure will subsequently be able to help to deal with some of those concrete problems, including the problem of whether a transalpine tunnel deserves, from the Community's point of view, to be given priority, and, if so, which Member States should submit the application through the normal procedures.

Mr Moreland. — The Commissioner said that he would not give his opinion on particular projects, but he has been quoted, rightly or wrongly, in the United Kingdom as giving comments on a certain tunnel which has the laudable objective of bringing France and the United Kingdom closer together. Comments have been attributed to him on financing, suggesting, for example, that 20 % might eventually come from the Community. Furthermore, on this particular venture there is a suggestion that he supports the British Rail project. There is also a Professor Foster wandering around the United Kingdom giving views occasionally, it appears, on behalf of the Commission. Could he clarify the Commission's views on this particular project?

Mr Burke. — The Commission has published a discussion paper in November, and the project alluded to by the honourable Member is included by way of example of the kind of project which could be used, if the institutions of the Community passed the necessary regulations. The honourable Member has referred to statements attributed to me. These possibly arose from a press conference at which we indicated certain results of studies we had commissioned with the help of Parliament on a number of options of this kind. Nobody could reasonably understand me to have come down in favour of one or other project, because

I must allow the necessary procedures already set in motion with the institutions of the Community to take their course.

As to any percentage figures attributed to me, of course these would be inaccurate, because I am not in possession of any facts and knowledge as to how much, at this stage in advance of the passing of legislation, a Community contribution might be. By the way, I do not want to be understood as being other than benevolently neutral in this situation. The laws and the regulations which I have proposed to the institutions of the Community do not allow me to prejudice any of these matters.

Mr Turner. — Has the Commissioner made arrangements for a colloquium or any other form of meeting in the near future, where the various possible candidates for transport support might be put forward and, if so, what are the details of that meeting?

Mr Burke. — I would hope that the colloquium could be held on 6 June in Brussels. The purpose of the colloquium would be to draw the conclusions from this six-month debate, which would terminate at about that time. We can then see whether or not the initiative we took in starting up discussion of this matter will have led to any increase in public awareness and whether any political authorities with the necessary power to take decisions will have advanced their positions by that time.

While it is not for me to exclude anyone, I cannot give any precise details as to the exact projects, if any, which might be discussed at that time.

President. — Question No 14 by Mr Provan (H-504/79):

There is a large amount of fish being dumped at below intervention prices. Will the Commission give details of all aids given by national Governments to their own fishing fleets including tax concessions and fuel subsidies?

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DK) The question asks for details of subsidies and aid for fishing fleets introduced by certain Member States because of the fuel crisis.

However, the introduction to the question refers to low fish prices, frequently *lower than* intervention prices. To avoid misunderstandings, although the question does not relate to fish prices, I will say that I do not see a direct link between subsidies to mitigate the effect of high energy prices and the fall in fish prices in the last few months by comparison with the previous two years. The reasons for the latter are far more complex.

Gundelach

Moreover the question asks the Commission to give details of subsidies to fishermen to relieve the effects of energy price increases. The Commission is entitled to receive information on the matter, in accordance with Articles 92, 93 and 94 of the Treaty, and has received a great deal of information and a number of requests for approval and notifications. I am sure that the honourable Member does not wish me to embark on a lengthy account of what is being done in the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy and so on, but rather to undertake to provide these details in writing. This matter is of course vitally important to the fishing industries of other countries as well.

Mr Provan. — I think Mr Gundelach may have slightly misread the question, when he said that it was tying the whole prospect and the whole tragedy, in fact, of the slump in fish prices to the energy situation. What I believe, and what I believe we as a Community have got to realize, is that we cannot enforce withdrawal prices or have autonomous fish prices on a basis that is not common to all fishermen within the Community. What I tried to say to the Parliament and what I asked the Commission is how can we enforce or try to impose fish prices in the Community on a basis that is not a basis of fair competition to start off with. This is one fundamental thing that must be established in the Community, if we are going to have fair and free competition, and I hope that Mr Gundelach as Commissioner can accept that. Can I just follow on by saying that autonomous fish pricing is perhaps the cause of the slump in fish prices in the United Kingdom and especially in the North-East of Scotland, the area which I represent. Because fish prices at the withdrawal price that the Community imposes can be lower in certain areas, fish can be transported by lorry to other areas within the Community, so as to benefit by the reduced withdrawal price. Would the Commission accept that and what does it propose to do about it?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) I do not think I misread Mr Provan's question; I was simply trying to avoid any misapprehension in this House that a firm connection could be established between the energy situation and the fall in fish prices, and I did not take that to be Mr Provan's view either. My answer to his first supplementary question, whether I can accept his thinking on that point, is yes.

The next point is that no proper policy on fish prices in the Community, or any other prices, can be introduced without reasonable uniform conditions for competition. One of the Community's main objectives in its development of a common fisheries policy, as in other sectors, must be to ensure reasonable and equal conditions for the fishing industry in the various parts of the Community, and in saying that I am accepting Mr Provan's third point, that at present, with the system of autonomous fish pricing, we are seeing unnatural patterns of trade. In some areas of the Commu-

nity we are taking fish off the market to keep prices up, and that draws in fish from other parts of the Community, giving rise to these unnatural trade flows. In working out our market policy, which will be a vital part of the common fisheries policy, we must avoid these artificial trade patterns.

Miss Quin. — As has been pointed out, in parts of the United Kingdom we have seen a flood of cheap imports which have completely disrupted the market for fish. And there is a feeling that there must be a great deal of overfishing going on to have created this situation, which is very serious. Will the Commission give an assurance that under the powers given it by Article 22 of the Council Regulation of 19 January 1976 it will come up with measures to deal with this situation and to restore fair trading conditions?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) As I said, the Commission takes the view that fish prices are unusually low at the moment, and it intends to take action to ensure reasonable fish prices. I should like to add that I was interested to note the honourable Members clearly expressed support for higher prices for fish products. It is usually the other way round when the honourable Member is talking about other foodstuffs.

Mrs Ewing. — I thank the Commissioner for his reiteration of the principle that there should be no unfair competition and limit my supplementary to the part of Mr Provan's question about the details of aids, — although I support his point and Miss Quin's point. I want to tell Mr Gundelach that I have in front of me a paper from my group's Bureau, which I will make available to his office, alleging breaches of the Treaty of Rome by Belgium, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and the Netherlands, all in relation to the unfair interest rates offered when boats are purchased. This enables their owners to compete quite unfairly with those who purchase boats in the United Kingdom and in Ireland and presumably other parts of the Community. I will make these figures available. They have come from fishermen to fishermen. If they are correct, then I would call on Mr Gundelach, after he receives my paper, to undertake to have an enquiry and expose this series of breaches of the Treaty of Rome.

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) I shall be glad to accept Mrs Ewing's paper, and will of course reply on the information it contains once the requisite enquiries have been made. It frequently happens that, when an industry is in trouble, suspicions arise that conditions are better elsewhere in the Community, and I should like to point out here that special arrangements have been introduced in the United Kingdom too, simply to make the point that we are not dealing with a problem

Gundelach

affecting some Member States and not others. I shall reply on the matter raised by Mrs Ewing when I have the information, which I hope will be as soon as possible.

Mr Hutton. — Would the Commissioner accept that the present position among the builders of fishing boats in the Community has led to considerable redundancies — in Scotland the figure is 20 % — and that the very low interest rates in Norway are imperilling the survival of these yards, not only in Scotland but in the Community as a whole? Would he confirm that he is considering a proposal to provide 8 % loans over an 8½ year period for new vessels built in the EEC for EEC owners and would he say when he thinks this proposal, which would certainly be welcomed by Scottish builders, might come into effect?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) I shall not enter into a debate on the honourable Member's assumptions; many of the boats being laid up in the Community are obsolete in terms of the opportunities open to Europe in a changing world. But as Parliament will realize, a common fisheries policy must include a structural policy with the resources to give Community financial aid to adapt the fishing fleet to future circumstances.

There have been various interim funds, and at the moment we are working on proposals for one for 1980, but we cannot expect to see political acceptance of the actual amounts until a common fisheries policy is adopted as a whole — some time in 1980, we hope. Details of how the aid is to be given can be left to a future debate on structural policy for the fishing industry; I therefore do not propose to go into interest rates and borrowing rates at this point.

Mr Harris. — Will the Commissioner publish the information he now has as quickly as possible, because there is widespread suspicion, particularly among my own fishermen, for example, that their competitors are getting very large subsidies on fuel which makes fair competition impossible? Does he accept that this issue becomes all the more important if we are to get a common fisheries policy? I incidentally want a common fisheries policy.

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) I quite agree with the honourable Member that, as I have repeatedly said, aids and subsidies of this kind are a problem in any common policy, and that applies to a common fisheries policy as well. But I should like to make the point that this should not be regarded as a phenomenon occurring in some Member States and not others, and that the United Kingdom itself recently introduced quite substantial aid arrangements, including a price mechanism which has helped bring about the artificial trade patterns we discussed at the beginning of this debate. The phenomenon is therefore not restricted to

a few Member States, but unfortunately occurs throughout the Community. I did not say we would publish our information; we are not authorized to do so. What I did say was that I would make it available to Parliament, and this will be done.

Sir Fred Warner. — I refer specifically to aids given by national governments. Even Mrs Ewing's figures do not afford a complete picture of the aids available to the builders of fishing fleets and their purchasers. Could the Commissioner, in providing these figures, consider whether he could include any aids which may be given, not by national governments, but by regional governments or bodies financed from public funds.

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) When we refer to national aids we mean any kind of aid involving the transfer of public funds, whether by national governments or regional authorities. In addition there is of course the matter raised by Mrs Ewing. The problem of widely varying rates of interest affects a great many sectors within the Community, and is not going to disappear overnight. It is of course a major factor here, and in the fishery sector we can alleviate its effects by establishing the fisheries fund to which I referred earlier.

Mr Kirk. — (DK) I was beginning to feel that this was developing into an exclusively British debate.

It is known for a fact that the problem affecting the European market in fish is not simply an internal problem caused by national aid arrangements. I should therefore like to ask Commissioner Gundelach what he intends to do to raise the reference prices applying to third country imports into the Community. For it is a fact that those countries outside the Community which dealt harshly with the British, Danish and West German fishing fleets, cutting down their traditional fishing grounds in Icelandic, Canadian, Swedish and Eastern European waters, have now begun to increase their exports of fish products to the Community. It is also a fact that the Commission has a weapon which it can use if it wishes, which is to raise the reference prices in respect of these imports. I should like to know when the Commission intends to use the weapon it has in its hands.

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) As I said before, I believe that there is no simple explanation for the fall in fish prices. It is not just cheap imports either. Rising imports are becoming a standard excuse for difficulties in any industry. But they are not the sole reason. It is true that imports of certain types of fish have risen, and as I earlier told Parliament in more general terms, I consider that our reference prices are out of line with the present situation, both in our own market and internationally, and the Commission intends to use its powers in the next few weeks to make substantial adjustments to them.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS DE MARCH

Vice-President

President. — The first part of Question Time is closed.¹

I have decided not to give a favourable response to the request by Mr J. M. Taylor and others that a debate be opened after Question Time on Mr Dankert's question on the exceeding of the 1979 budget. Nevertheless, the Commission's attention is drawn to the fact that, from the point of view of sound financial management, the question raises serious problems with regard to, on the one hand, the use by the Commission of EAGGF advances as commitment appropriations and, on the other hand, the allocation, whether to January alone or to the entire financial year 1980, of the 203 million units of account mentioned in Mr Dankert's question.

17. *Food aid to Cambodia*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-734/79) drawn up by Mr Wawrzik on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation on food aid to Cambodia and the South-East Asian refugees.

I Call Mr Wawrzik.

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the Assembly referred the two resolutions by Mr Cariglia and by Mr Sarre and others to the Committee on Development and Cooperation. The committee has considered them and now submits its own resolution to you.

In discussing this point we clearly recognized that this resolution must be seen in a broader context in relation to the political situation throughout the world, since the Cambodian refugees who are present mainly in Thailand are no more than a small part of the overall refugee problem in the world. According to UN estimates, there have been 11 million refugees since 1975, some 10 million of whom have come from countries under Communist governments. Over 80 % of these refugees have sought to reach non-Marxist countries. That is one side of the coin. The other aspect is that this whole problem forms part of the debate on world hunger, since world hunger is not attributable solely to climatic, geological and other factors but, as we can see from the total number of refugees, is also caused by political failure or by certain political trends which take no account of human

factors. Cambodia occupies a special position in this respect since there appears to be no certainty that food sent to that country actually reaches the starving people for whom it is intended. We cannot be sure that this food aid is not also being used to supply the national army which has been the cause of this flood of refugees.

Mr Cheysson has now submitted an emergency aid plan on behalf of the Commission and we are most grateful to him for doing so. The observations made in this plan suggest that there has been a substantial improvement in the situation in this area.

Most of the refugees from Cambodia are now in Thailand. Thailand has to bear the full burden of the flood of refugees, and this burden has not only financial but naturally also political consequences for it; it creates uncertainty in regions where there are large numbers of refugees and this even disturbs the political equilibrium of the country as a whole. In the light of this realization we have worked on the assumption that it should not simply be the task of the Community to safeguard food supplies but that we should also assist Thailand in its difficult task by helping to finance projects designed to improve supplies to the camps. We have included this aspect in the motion for a resolution, because in the long run a country like Thailand which, not least in response to international pressure, has declared its readiness to accept over 750 000 refugees cannot be expected to bear on its own the cost of the entire camp infrastructures. It is no longer merely a matter of supplying food to the refugees; they must also be provided with accommodation, medical care and clothing; the camps must be equipped with all the necessary sanitary facilities and the necessary access roads must be built to enable food to be brought to the camps. All these projects cost a great deal of money. We consider it essential to help this country to carry out its tasks and this involves more than just supplying food as we have done up to now. Some assistance has already been provided through bilateral aid measures but we in the Community should make a special contribution of our own.

Madam President, the Committee on Development and Cooperation has submitted a report on the two motions to which I referred earlier and calls upon the House to approve its resolution now.

President. — The list of speakers is closed.

I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) Madam President, since direct elections, this Parliament has made it a point of honour to discuss the problems of refugees at almost all of its part-sessions. The rapporteur has very rightly drawn attention to the reasons for this. There are ten million refugees

¹ See Annex.

Cheysson

in the world! There can be no doubt that this section of the population is suffering from the greatest deprivation. Once again we are discussing the fate of the refugees in South-East Asia, more specifically the unfortunate Cambodians who are suffering great hardship in Cambodia itself, in the frontier regions and in Thailand.

I want to thank the rapporteur, Mr Wawrzik, and also all those who had already tabled resolutions: Mr Cariglia and the Socialist Group, and Mr Purvis who was intending to put a question during Question Time but has added it to this debate.

Madam President, every report about the Cambodians uses the words distress, despair and misery. After years under a bloodthirsty regime, the Pol Pot regime, which killed, massacred and displaced whole sectors of the population, the country is now living under a foreign military occupation and the misery is increasing. The Community recognized this fact very early on. Allow me to remind you that at a time when we were hearing only of the boat people, the Vietnamese refugees, this Parliament and the Council of Ministers voted, in July, an initial appropriation from Chapter 950 to enable us to intervene immediately in the first phase recommended by the non-governmental organizations and then by the UN Secretary-General, Mr Waldheim; that phase was to cover aid to refugees who had reached other countries and to the Cambodians in their own country; it represented a total of 220 million dollars and covered the period from Autumn 1979 to April 1980. The Community and its Member States covered more than one third of the total of 220 million dollars, i.e. 36 %. The Community on its own accounted for 20 % or 31 million units of account, consisting of 24 million in cash, augmented by 25 000 tonnes of rice and 1 500 tonnes of milk powder, the total value being 43 million dollars. This Community aid has been paid out in full: one half has gone to Thailand and the other half to Cambodia itself. 90 % of this aid — I refer to aid from the Community budget — passes through two UN agencies: UNHCR in Thailand, UNICEF and WFP in Cambodia, and also through the Red Cross. The other 10 % is handled by 18 European non-governmental organizations such as Oxfam, Catholic Relief, Catholic Relief Service, Secours Populaire etc.

The distribution of this aid, which rightly concerns those Members of Parliament particularly responsible for the budgetary sector, must be viewed from the angle of the regions in which the refugees or displaced persons are located. In Thailand itself, two big camps, at Sa Kao and Kao I Dang, under UNHCR control, have provided accommodation for 145 000 Cambodians. Sanitary conditions are adequate. Of course these unfortunate people are refugees, but the basic amenities are respected. Mr Haferkamp has himself visited these two camps only recently. In the frontier regions things are now improving and the number

of persons living in camps on the frontier has fallen from 200 000 to 140 000. On the other hand, a larger number of Cambodians are living within Cambodia itself in zones controlled by different forces — some by Pol Pot, others by the Serei Khmers and the majority in areas under Vietnamese control. The number of Cambodians living at home but seeking food in the frontier region from the aid which we make available has risen from 300 000 to 600 000. Thus, the frontier region provides subsistence for some 750 000 Cambodians.

For these two regions all of our aid, representing one half of the total or some 15 million units of account, has been paid out. Over 80 % is available locally and the remainder is now en route; 71 % has been distributed under UNHCR and Red Cross supervision and we are satisfied with the conditions of distribution.

Madam President, the biggest problem arises in Cambodia itself where there are five million suffering persons with insufficient crops. It is true that our aid has actually reached Cambodia: on 15 March, 83 % of our aid was available in the country itself, but as of January practically nothing had been actually distributed. The risk was not so much that aid would be diverted to the occupying armies, but that it would remain in storage with trucks at the door but the authorities refusing to allow the medical, sanitary, clothing and food supplies to reach the population. As I told the Political Affairs Committee a few days ago, things have now improved and, as of 15 March, we consider that about two-thirds of the aid available on the spot had been distributed. There has thus been a material improvement. It is characterized by a further important factor, namely, the decision of the Phnom Penh government to allow the peasants to keep their present small rice crop. This will enable the peasants to nourish themselves from this crop under relatively easy conditions at a time when distribution throughout the country is extremely difficult, and they are being encouraged to sow for the major crop at the end of the year.

Would it then be true to say that the situation in Cambodia is satisfactory? Madam President, I would be misleading Parliament if I made that claim. We are far from a satisfactory situation. The small rice crop which the peasants have been allowed to keep will not tide them over to the end of the year and we have at present no means of distribution outside the towns. In the towns themselves, which now depend entirely on foreign aid since the small crop has been left to the peasants, the conditions of distribution are shrouded in mystery since the local authorities and the Vietnamese authorities flatly refuse foreign personnel, regardless of nationality, the right to establish contact with the local people. We have done all in our power to strengthen the local personnel. There has been an increase from 12 persons in October last to 46 early in March; but 46 persons for all the governmental and

Cheysson

non-governmental organizations is a highly inadequate number. I must stress that up to now only 22 medical staff have been brought to Cambodia through cooperation with the Soviet Red Cross: 10 doctors and 12 nurses from the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe have been brought in through the Red Cross; 22 persons, not one more, for a population of more than five million. The Phnom Penh authorities, and primarily the Vietnamese, systematically refuse any contact whatever between foreign nationals and the local population.

Madam President, we must not allow this to dismay us. The world community bears a responsibility, and I am happy to note that in discharging that responsibility the Eastern and Western countries are working side by side; Soviet deliveries to the country are now substantial and they are being effected in close conjunction with the supplies supervised by the United Nations, the Red Cross and our non-governmental organizations. The second phase, proposed only recently by the UN Secretary-General, must therefore be implemented at the earliest possible date. It comprises, to begin with, the supply of seeds and fertilizers to enable a normal main harvest to be obtained; 40 000 tonnes are to be moved out very soon.

It comprises also intervention in the towns while the peasants are left to live on their small harvest. Finally, it comprises provision for the second half of the year during which more substantial means of distribution will need to be brought into action, primarily in Cambodia.

The whole enterprise represents, Madam President, 325 million dollars between April and the end of 1980, to which must be added deliveries from the Soviet Union and Eastern countries; as I said just now, these are being effected on a basis of close coordination and under satisfactory conditions. The 325 million dollars will go mainly to Cambodia since this is where the most serious problems arise. 245 million will go to the camps in Thailand, 10 million to the Cambodian refugees in Vietnam, 13 million to the people of Thailand affected by this influx of refugees, as the rapporteur very rightly pointed out just now, and, finally, 55 million to the frontier region, the bulk of this being intended for the people of the interior who come to fetch food supplies here. A small amount of aid will be used for road construction under the conditions indicated by the rapporteur.

Madam President, under these conditions the Commission has recently proposed a fresh effort from the Community budget of 40 million units of account, to which must be added 35 000 tonnes of cereals and rice via the world food programme. These deliveries represent in all 61 million dollars, or some 20 % of the second phase planned by the non-governmental organizations. We have discussed this effort with UNICEF, UNHCR and the non-governmental organizations at a series of meetings held in mid-March.

The Nine were informed by me on 26 March, and I had occasion to speak on the subject in Washington too on 27 March. The document is now before the Council and Parliament and I very much hope, Madam President, that Parliament will be able to adopt a favourable position of principle. We hope that the next meeting of the Council of Ministers of the Nine will adopt the same position of principle, thus only confirming the solemn declaration made by the nine Foreign Ministers in Kuala Lumpur a few weeks ago when they met with the five Foreign Ministers of ASEAN.

The situation is serious, as is indicated in the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Wawrzik and the Committee on Development and Cooperation. A disaster has been warded off but it may be with us again at any time. I am not asking for a decision from Parliament today. We have not yet made any detailed budgetary proposals which would enable the budgetary authority to reach a decision because we are not aware of the phases for the supply of this cash and food aid and because, as you know, we are experiencing a difficult budgetary situation because of the provisional twelfths. The Commission would be grateful to Parliament if it would put on record its interest and anxiety at this serious situation and its desire to see the Community participate in an international effort uniting, God willing, all the nations of the world; in short, its resolve to give its approval of principle to the recommendation made by the Commission. That recommendation will be converted into a precise proposal as soon as we have your reply of principle and that of the Council and as soon as we are able to see how, in budgetary terms, we can navigate between the shoals of the provisional twelfths.

President. — I call Mr Haagerup to present the opinion of the Political Affairs Committee.

Mr Haagerup, draftsman. — (DK) Madam President, the Political Affairs Committee has been asked to deliver its opinion orally, and to do so will take very little time. The Political Affairs Committee completely endorses the views expressed in the report on the need to continue aid to the large numbers of refugees in South-East Asia and to the people of Cambodia. This positive attitude is unreservedly shared by my group.

Since the report was drawn up, new information has come to light to indicate the gravity of the situation in the area, and the Commission, and especially Mr Cheysson, have given the Political Affairs Committee, and tonight Parliament as a whole, detailed information on the aid being given and the further assistance required from the Community and from the nine individual Member States.

The Political Affairs Committee has taken a position on two other factors in the South-East Asian situation.

Haagerup

Both stem from the resolution adopted by Parliament on 15 February on the basis of a motion tabled by Mrs Macciocchi and others, amended by Mr Adam Ferguson and myself. That resolution called on the President of the European Parliament to invite the UN High Commissioner for Refugees to appear before a joint meeting of the relevant parliamentary committees, i.e. the Political Affairs Committee and the Committee on Development and Cooperation, in order to ascertain how the European Community could best bring aid to the affected peoples both inside and outside Cambodia. Since then Parliament has sent an invitation to the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, Mr Poul Hartling, who indicated his acceptance. It has now been confirmed that a meeting between Mr Hartling and the two committees will be held, in the presence of the Commission, at 10.30 a.m. on 22 April in Brussels.

In the same resolution Parliament instructed 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 was being properly distributed. The Political Affairs Committee has since done so, and as its rapporteur I can state that it has decided to postpone a decision on whether to send a parliamentary delegation to South-East Asia, including possibly Cambodia, until it has had the opportunity of hearing Mr Hartling's account of the situation in the refugee camps administered by the UN High Commission for Refugees in Thailand. I should like to stress that the Political Affairs Committee has never contested the reasoning behind the proposal to send a parliamentary delegation to South-East Asia as originally proposed by Mr Sarre and others in a motion for a resolution last October.

On the contrary, the Political Affairs Committee gave careful consideration to the political implications, and came to the conclusion that the dispatch of a delegation at this point would be untimely, both in respect of its opportunities for acquainting itself with the situation and possibly helping improve the distribution of aid to the people of Cambodia, and because a delegation from this Parliament could in present circumstances be politically exploited for purposes which would not benefit the local population inside and outside Cambodia, and might discredit the European Parliament.

I should like to point out, however, that the Political Affairs Committee does not regard this as a complete rejection of the proposal to send a delegation to the area. It could be revived later, but only after there has been an opportunity to hear the UN High Commissioner on Refugees.

I should like to say in conclusion that too much should not be made of any disagreement in this House on the desirability of sending a delegation now or later or even at all. Our prime concern must be how we in the

European Community can render substantial and practical aid to the unfortunate people of South-East Asia, and to ensure the distribution of that aid under the difficult conditions which will presumably continue in the future.

President. — I call Mr Cohen to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Cohen. — (NL) Madam President, on behalf of the Socialist Group, I wish to express our full support for the motion tabled by the Committee on Development and Cooperation. I am assuming that if not the entire Parliament, at least an overwhelming majority of its Members will be able and willing to support this resolution unreservedly. I believe that to be very necessary since although we discussed the problem of the refugees in Cambodia and South-East Asia a few months ago, memories are very short. At the time when Mr Sarre and Mr Cariglia tabled their resolutions the newspapers were full of reports about Cambodia and the refugee problem. But now these reports no longer make the headlines. Other events have attracted our attention and we tend to forget what is still happening in South-East Asia. Hunger and misery still prevail there. Mr Cheysson has clearly pointed out that the situation is now really more serious than it was a few months ago. We therefore give our full support to this resolution and above all to the passages in which emphasis is placed on the need to reach the affected sectors of the population and the need to improve communication routes which are extremely inadequate. We agree entirely that the international organizations must be called in to provide aid, because they are often better placed than official bodies to do this.

I gather from Mr Cheysson's speech that there are very real problems. It is not easy to make contact with the population. The political situation in that part of the world is still such that the problems cannot be solved as easily as we should wish. My group will certainly support the Commission in its efforts to provide aid under the best possible conditions. I hope that we shall very soon be able to discuss the new proposals which the Commission has forwarded to the Council and Parliament. It is obviously impossible to say anything definitive at this stage because we are not familiar with all the details of the proposals, but we shall study them carefully. It is of course also necessary for efforts to be made at this stage to create a favourable climate towards these proposals in the Council, and here I believe that the Commission itself can play an important role.

I shall end by repeating the point I made earlier on: the general situation in Cambodia and South-East Asia is just as sad and hopeless as it was a few months ago.

It is the duty of this Parliament to do all in its power to see to it that help arrives as rapidly and efficiently as possible.

President. — I call Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti to speak on behalf of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti. — (1) Madam President, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, the European Parliament has concerned itself repeatedly in recent months with the dramatic situation of the Cambodian people and of the refugees from South-East Asia, and the Community has already sent food and medical aid to the affected areas.

In stressing the need for more intensive assistance, the Committee on Development and Cooperation, through the resolution contained in the Wawrzik report, has asked the Commission to report in detail on the situation. As always, Mr Cheysson has come here with full information and asked Parliament and the Council to adopt a more precise position.

The Wawrzik report asks in particular for funds to be made available to improve access routes to the refugee camps on the Cambodian border. The Group of the European People's Party stresses that it is not important merely to resolve the problem of hunger, but equally important to solve that of individual freedom. The barbed wire round the refugee camps clearly shows the need to approach this political situation with great seriousness, and the Commissioner was right to call the attention of the institutions responsible for taking political decisions to these problems and right to indicate the possible ways of working towards a solution.

The explanatory statement in the Wawrzik report also stresses the desirability of sending a delegation of European parliamentarians to this region in order to investigate the real needs and the arrangements that must be made in order to bring aid to the civilian population and not to the combatants in the field. On this aspect of verification, I consider it important and courageous on the part of the Committee on Development and Cooperation and its rapporteur to have highlighted this point.

Mr Cheysson has told us that there is a lack of active health personnel and social assistants in this region. We should then appeal not only to intergovernmental bodies but to all free associations — denominational and non-denominational, which have obtained new funds through the Commissioner's efforts — to bring active, operational support to the afflicted population.

In the committee's report on world hunger which is now in preparation we call upon the Commissioner to make a greater effort to ensure the release of the funds

earmarked for this aid. I would add that it would be an act of courage of the next Presidency to release the funds for operational activities in the medium and long term.

President. — I call Mr Purvis to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Purvis. — Madam President, the Commissioner stressed that we have warded off one tragedy in the refugee camps, but that another could come forth at any time, and in particular in Kampuchea itself. I appreciate that Mr Wawrzik's report was approved in committee on 11 February and that this pre-dated by four days the highly-charged debate we held on 15 February on the resolution tabled by Mrs Macciocchi and approved in amended form by this Parliament. I too support the resolution of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, but it seems to me necessary that some of the spirit of that debate and of that resolution should be incorporated in this particular motion.

To my mind, the critical element is urgency; we must not allow the urgency of the situation to be watered down or overlooked; it must be stressed and it must be restressed. The problem facing us is in Kampuchea itself, as Mr Cheysson has said, and indeed I am very pleased to hear from him that two-thirds of the aid that has arrived in Phnom Penh has now been distributed. It was only one-tenth on 16 January. But if that is the case, we are left with only one-third and a critical period of six months to get through. Are you all aware that the monsoon in Kampuchea starts in May? That is in about three weeks, by which time the next crop must be sown. The wharf at Phnom Penh, I am informed just today by one of the relief agencies, has collapsed. The non-governmental organizations are faced with three weeks to get enough seed in for planting before the monsoon and obviate food shortages from the autumn onwards. With three weeks to repair the wharf at Phnom Penh so that the seed can get in, they are using up their available funds by having to fly in from Singapore, by two flights a day, a new wharf system and all the port machinery. They are flying in seed for planting, while Kampong Sen, the other port, is hopelessly clogged and internal distribution, as we have heard repeatedly, is quite unreliable. Even if they succeed in bringing in the seed for next autumn's harvest, there will be a grave shortage of food, medicines and medical assistance between now and the autumn. The next six months are therefore critical, perhaps more critical than any yet. So we must not allow ourselves to be lulled into a sense of complacency, a feeling that we have done all that is possible, that things are improving, the worst is over and we can now relax. We cannot relax.

Nor must we mince our words. There is still great difficulty in gaining cooperation from the *de facto* gov-

Purvis

ernment authorities. No Western observer can venture readily outside Phnom Penh. There is great difficulty in ensuring proper distribution within Kampuchea and in introducing the necessary medical aid and administrative personnel, and Parliament itself will have to bear its share of responsibility when the budgetary consequences of what we are talking about now come to face it.

I therefore move an amendment in my name which stresses the urgency, the continuing urgency, of this situation. It calls on the Commission to ensure continuing and adequate supplies of food and medical aid and to monitor their efficient distribution.

President. — I call Mr Gremetz to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Gremetz. — (*F*) Ladies and gentlemen, the attitude adopted up to now by the reactionary, social-democratic and socialist members of this Parliament on the subject of Cambodia and Vietnam is unworthy of the peoples of our countries. I remember how a little while ago on these same benches those Members who are absent this evening — there were plenty of them when a reactionary majority was needed — sneered when we, the French Communists, cited the irrefutable evidence of all those who, including their friend Sihanouk, announced that life was slowly returning to normal in this country which has suffered the martyrdom of four years under one of the most ferocious dictatorships ever seen, that of Pol Pot.

Since then a great deal of evidence has been gathered to confirm this. Would you dismiss as liars the most senior officials of UNICEF, of the International Red Cross, OXFAM, or Professor Minkovsky of Cochin Hospital when they all assert that life is returning to normal in Cambodia and that international aid is being distributed, thanks in particular to the assistance provided by Vietnam — by Vietnam whose people have agreed to make the greatest sacrifices to bring aid to the people of Cambodia, Vietnam towards which you direct your chorus of hatred and from which you have cut off food aid by a decision which was unworthy of you? Mr Cheysson, who is so keen on acquiring the image of a progressive man in the Third World, will be marked for ever as the Commissioner who took the decision to starve a whole nation and did not hesitate to use food as a weapon.

In reality the Community governments know well that Cambodia is undergoing a rebirth and developing once again. They also know exactly what the role of Vietnam has been. The French government knows this so well that it is opposing the broadcasting of a film which shows the truth about Cambodia, even though it commissioned the film itself for television.

In fact the reactionaries and revanchists of all kinds have not been able to stomach the defeat of imperialism in South-East Asia. They are once again trying to exploit the difficult economic situation of these countries in an attempt to impose a neo-colonialist solution. Your motion for a resolution bears witness to this: you are trying once again to make a choice among the victims. If you really want to help the people of Cambodia, not by words but through deeds, you must recognize the present Cambodian government which has given proof of its legitimacy.

We, the French Communists, believe that all the Community Member States should immediately establish normal diplomatic relations with the legal authorities of Cambodia. Realism demands that measure. It alone can make a genuine contribution to the aid which the Community has a duty to provide to Cambodia. We also demand restoration of the 'suspended' food aid which, Mr Cheysson, has been cut off for too long from Vietnam. We demand a decision from the Community, with no strings attached, to provide aid in accordance with the needs of Cambodia, i.e. on a much larger scale than agreed up to now. Finally, we want to see serious and comprehensive plans worked out for development and cooperation to assist Cambodia and Vietnam in the process of reconstruction and advance. The French Communists will do all in their power to gain acceptance for the measures I have just outlined. The motion before you today in no way reflects the real needs of the present situation. We shall vote against it.

President. — I call Mr Flanagan to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Flanagan. — Madam President, much has been said already along the lines that I would have spoken. Apart from entirely disagreeing with the attitude of the last speaker, I wish positively to say that I welcome Mr Wawrzik's report and on behalf of my group pledge our support to him.

I should be less than honest if I did not admit that I regard some of the delay as reflecting little credit on the institutions of this Parliament — in particular, the fact that it took six weeks to appoint a rapporteur. How many people die in six weeks? Indeed, the rapporteur specifically referred to this when he said that the misery and despair of the people are so great that we cannot afford to spend weeks, or months, discussing the problem or reflecting on resolutions. So from that point of view I think it is not unfair to say, as one other speaker said, that we have spent too long talking and wasted too much time in seeking to fulfil our moral and humanitarian duty to the people of Cambodia and South East Asia.

I think we are all well aware of the problems, some of which have been spelled out by Mr Cheysson and oth-

Flanagan

ers — in Mr Purvis' speech too. It is a tragic fact — and I refer to my own report to the Committee on Budgets, where, in connection with the Commission's proposals for food aid for 1980, draw attention to the fact — that 'several irregularities have occurred in that entire shiploads have disappeared without trace, or food has either failed to reach its destination and/or been used for other purposes. The Community should not continue to supply the aid to those beneficiaries where such aid consistently fails to reach its destination'. However, in view of the points raised by the rapporteur on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, I would not at this stage weigh in with the suggestion that there should be a delegation from the Parliament appointed now. I think that the points he made in his speech were cogent and acceptable and that we should therefore postpone a decision on that matter, while at the same time keeping very much in mind the things that are happening, or which we hope are happening — namely, that the dry-season harvest which, we hope, is now going down will be a success. It will make the situation even worse if that harvest should fail. The resolution refers to practical matters like clothing and blankets and tents, and expresses the hope that they will reach the destination for which they are intended. I heartily endorse that hope and I heartily approve of the statements made by various Members in regard to the steps the Council and the Commission should take to try to ensure that the aid gets through to the people for whom it is intended. So, I join with others in asking that we redouble our efforts.

Finally, Madam President, I refer briefly to the resolution at the Dublin Summit in which member governments were urged to pursue a solution of the wider problems which confront Cambodia, a solution that would be based on an independent and neutral Cambodia with a genuinely representative government and without a foreign military presence. Whether you call a government legal or otherwise, it is either oppressive or it is not, and when it is oppressive I do not care whether it is legal or not, because it does not represent the ordinary people who are now starving; and I do not care if the so-called legal government uses the supply of some food and blankets and other aids to the people concerned as a cover-up for the effects of military interference. I therefore totally reject the attitude of the last speaker and join with the rest of the House in approving this resolution and hoping that, as I say, at all levels we will redouble our efforts to see that the aid actually gets to its intended destination.

President. — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

Mrs Macciocchi. — (*I*) Madam President, in listening to this debate I have been left with the impression that the resolution now before us is still couched in excessively general terms. However, we are willing to support it because it represents an important act of will

on the part of this Parliament. I became convinced of that when I listened to the grotesque and ludicrous remarks of the Communist speaker who said that Cambodia was flourishing once again, that life was resuming there and that we should regard that country as one in which the Russo-Vietnamese Socialist spring was blossoming with all the red flowers of the imagination.

I have read with interest the report submitted to us and listened above all to the important speech by Commissioner Cheysson and to those by Mr Purvis and Mrs Cassanmagnago. I was deeply moved by their words because they confirmed the reality of the tragedy which confronts us. As the last speaker pointed out, we have an abnormal situation in which an army has taken control of a country with its occupying forces and we do not even know whether the supplies which we send out actually reach the people or serve to fatten the occupying troops. I shall never tire of underlining the abnormality and monstrosity of this situation and I ask the Honourable Member who spoke in such grotesque terms to reflect on the fact that the freedom and independence of the peoples are sacred values in which we set our faith — the same holds good for the occupation of Afghanistan. Reports reaching us and the information given by Commissioner Cheysson ...

Mr Gremetz. — (*F*) Your information is wrong: you are getting your information from the colonialists!

Mrs Macciocchi. — ... I know that the Russian colonialists keep you carefully informed about the occupation of South-East Asia ...

From all the reports reaching us, we now know perfectly well that if the situation has improved, Mr Cheysson, it is because 1 700 grammes of rice are now being distributed per person per month in some of the villages, (where before there was none). We know too, as you probably also know, because this report has been published several times, that the occupying government, which has been placed in power by the occupying forces, is a totally illegal government which discriminates between those who are faithful to the regime and those who do not give it their support. We know from a personal report from Phnom Penh that the chauffeur of an official of the regime receives eighteen kilos of rice per month with a similar quantity for his wife and half for his children; that is his salary. And it is in this monstrous fashion that the aid is being distributed.

Admittedly a delegation from this House might travel to Cambodia, as Mr Haagerup has suggested, but it is highly likely that it will not see everything. I would draw a parallel here with what Mr Solzhenitsyn has said about the well-meaning delegations of Westerners who come to visit the Russian concentration camps.

We also know from other testimonies that on the day when the photographers and television reporters arrived, the Vietnamese began to distribute a great deal of rice which they then took back on the day the reporters left; but their reports could give the impression in the West that spring is blossoming in Cambodia. We are thus faced with an extremely complex and delicate situation. I would say to Mr Haagerup that I find it difficult to follow his argument that a delegation might be inopportune because it could be used politically to harm the image of the European Parliament. I do not know if the interpreter conveyed the message correctly. But if he did we must then agree with the speakers — including the Communist — who claimed that everything is going well and that there is a distinct improvement. On the contrary, Mr Purvis is right when he says that the reports are alarming, that there is no longer a wharf at Phnom Penh and that aid must be carried by air to the starving people who are experiencing a tragedy that has no equal in our age since the fall of Nazism.

I insist on the need for a return to the spirit which infused our debate on 15 February when I had just returned from the camps in Sakeo and Kao I Dang and had seen with my own eyes, in company with other parliamentarians, the immense tragedy that people are suffering there. I appeal to you, Madam President, I appeal to all the Honourable Members and to the Commissioner who has reassured us through his desire to make available sufficient appropriations to enable the Community to intervene — I appeal to you all to see to it that the delegation does set out, even if it is surrounded by derision; I do so because I am convinced that the lies which we have heard in this Chamber will be repeated elsewhere.

I should like it to be known that we in the European Parliament are at the very least able to exert pressure and serve as a moral conscience. We have no other powers.

I should like it to be known that we remain vigilant and show full respect for the future independence of the people of Cambodia. It is therefore extremely important for the delegation to set out, even if it can do little. The importance is not so much political as humanitarian. I realized this last Sunday, Easter Sunday, when I was marching through the streets of Rome with an enormous crowd of citizens from various parts of Europe who were holding up dozens of placards calling for action to be taken in response to the appeal launched by the Italian Radical Party; in other words Europeans are looking to this Parliament for action. Well then, we must give concrete form to the demands that we are making here or in street demonstrations.

On 22 April the High Commissioner for Refugees will be speaking to the Political Affairs Committee. But the problem remains to supervise the distribution of this aid, to see to it that it does not reach the army of

occupation and is not used to feed the sycophantic officials of the new regime; we do not want to see a vast bureaucracy established over the bodies of all those who have died of hunger in Cambodia and in the camps around Cambodia.

I would ask you to take note of the following point: Mr Haagerup and I both belong to the Political Affairs Committee and we shall be continuing this debate in the committee, but I would urge the President of this Parliament to remember that we have approved by an absolute majority of our members a resolution asking for a delegation of European parliamentarians to be sent to Cambodia. It will probably be difficult for them to gain admission to the country; perhaps, Commissioner, you will be able to help them in this. Perhaps too the President herself can suggest measures to be taken not with a view to recognizing the illegal Samrin government but to obtain the right — since this aid is coming from our Community and since it is the citizens of Europe who are sending it — to send observers to report back to the Europeans on the way in which aid is distributed in Cambodia. On this basis I think we will be able to gain access to the country, even though it is now surrounded by a ferocious iron curtain.

I am coming to the end of my speech; I believe that in general we should approve this resolution and support everything that can be done, even if the action we can take is limited. But above all I appeal to you most strongly not to continue with the tiresome procedure that we have witnessed here: the first resolution was tabled on 20 or 22 October, then there was a second, then six weeks passed before a rapporteur was appointed and then we went to Cambodia; we held a second debate on 15 February and now, in April, we are reopening the same debate and moving on from one delay to the next. We cannot countenance any further delay unless we ourselves are to become murderers or accomplices in the murders, extermination and genocide now under way in Cambodia. I therefore appeal to you, Madam President, and above all to you, Commissioner Cheysson, to point out the need for extremely concrete action. This is not only a budgetary problem, as you have rightly pointed out. You have our support, and I am sure we are all united on this. Above all we need an initiative to show that the presence of this Parliament is not merely that of a charitable benefactor who, closing his eyes and holding his nose to keep out the stench of a military occupation, continues to send such aid as he can. As we see it, the problem of aid must be seen in relation to another dimension, which is that of the independence of a nation and the freedom of a people who are nourished not only with bread and rice but also with freedom. We know that the first task is to provide food, but we also know that it will be all the more easy to distribute this aid equitably through the country the greater our vigilance and the firmer we are in our condemnation of the attacks and crimes against the lives

Macciocchi

of men and the lives of children. In this connection, I want to make a brief reference to Commissioner Cheysson's report: you spoke of Soviet aid to Cambodia and I should like you to be more specific on that point, since all the information which we have received is uncertain — and you yourself were extremely vague, you only made general statements. I should like to know exactly what this aid consists of, how much it amounts to, and I should also like you to inform us whether you do not find it monstrous — despite the elegance which is characteristic of all your speeches and the calmness of your reasoning — and horrible that there should only be 22 doctors and nurses for a remaining population of five million persons. Faced with all this suffering, are we now to claim that everything is fine and that the spring is blossoming, as we heard from a certain Member who now seems to have left — perhaps to bask in the sun of his own future? Faced with this shameful situation, should we not once again consider the terrible problem that faced our own delegation on the frontiers of Cambodia, that of sending doctors and nurses to the country?

President. — The debate will be continued tomorrow, as it is now time to adjourn our proceedings.

18. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received four requests for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- from Mr Caborn and others for the inclusion on the agenda of this part-session of the report by Mr Donnez on the Adams affair (Doc. 1-44/80);
- from Mrs Pruvot and others for a motion for a resolution on the situation of the political prisoners in the People's Republic of Guinea (Doc. 1-86/80);

- from Mr Josselin and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, for a motion for a resolution on Community financial aid for the regions of Brittany affected by an oil slick (Doc. 1-87/80);
- from the Commission for its communication to the Council concerning the proposals for food aid programmes in the form of cereals, skimmed milk, powdered milk and butteroil for 1980.

I shall consult Parliament on these requests for urgent procedure at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

19. Agenda for next sitting

President. — The next sitting will be held tomorrow Tuesday, 15 April 1980 from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. to 7 p.m., with the following agenda:

- decision or urgency
- Wawrzik report on food aid to Cambodia (continuation)
- joint debate on the Delmotte report on the fourth annual report on the ERDF and an oral question to the Commission on the inclusion of the Northern Adriatic in the European unification process
- Van Miert report on human rights in Chile
- Antoniozzi report on the situation in Nicaragua
- Hänsch report on human rights in Czechoslovakia
- Gonnella report on the right of residence of nationals of the Member States in another Member State

3 p.m.

- voting time.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 8.15 p.m.)

ANNEX

Commission Action on Opinions Delivered by the European Parliament at the March Part-Sessions

1. At its first part-Session in March 1980, the European Parliament delivered 23 opinions in response to Council requests for consultation. In four cases the no-report procedure was used, to deliver favourable opinions on:

- a proposal for a Regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1119/78 laying down special measures for peas and field beans used in the feeding of animals.
- a proposal for a Regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2925/78 suspending application of the condition to which the importation into the Community of certain types of citrus fruit originating in Spain is subject.
- a Commission proposal to the Council for a Regulation amending Regulation No 1081/77 on the temporary suspension of aids for the purchase of dairy cows and of heifers intended for milk production.
- proposals for
 - a directive on statistical returns in respect of the carriage of goods by inland waterway, for the purposes of a possible statistical survey
 - a directive on statistical returns in respect of the carriage of goods by rail, for the purposes of establishing regional statistics.

2. At the first part-Session in March, Parliament debated the following 14 reports which received favourable opinions or did not give rise to requests for formal amendments:

- Report by Sir Frederick Catherwood on four proposals concerning the CCT for beef and veal and for processed fruit and vegetable products
- Report by Mrs Barbarella on the Directive on the modernization of farms
- Report by Mr Spinelli on a decision empowering the Commission to contract loans with a view to promoting investments within the Community
- Report by Mr Buchou on a proposal to fix the quantities of basic products considered to have been used in the manufacture of goods
- Report by Mr Ligios on a regulation on the common organization of the market in fruit and vegetables
- Report by Mr Sablé on two proposals relating to the 1979 food aid programmes
- Report by Mr Seal on trade with Cyprus
- Report by Mr Seal on the negotiation of a transitional protocol to the association agreement with Cyprus
- Report by Mr Helms on the measures for the conservation and management of common fishery resources off the west coast of Greenland
- Report by Mr Nielsen on three proposals for regulations concerning the management of fishery resources and applicable to Norwegian vessels
- Report by Mr Enright on a fisheries agreement between the Community and Guinea-Bissau
- Report by Mr Woltjer on a fisheries agreement between the Community and Guinea-Bissau
- Report by Mr Provan on two regulations concerning fisheries agreements with Canada
- Report by Mr Kirk on two proposals for regulations on the storage of fish

3. Parliament proposed the amendment or withdrawal of Commission proposals in five cases and in three of these cases the Commission agreed to such amendment:

- (a) Report by Mr Cronin on the proposals for regulations providing for specific Community measures to promote regional development pursuant to Article 13 of the ERDF regulation

An amended proposal is being drawn up and will shortly be forwarded to the Council

- (b) Report by Mr Angelosante on a directive concerning the periodic information to be published by companies whose stocks and shares are officially quoted at a stock exchange

An amended proposal will shortly be forwarded to Parliament and to the Council

- (c) Report by Mr Filippi on a decision introducing special aid for small and medium-sized industrial undertakings in Portugal.

An amended proposal will shortly be forwarded to the Council

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

- Report by Mrs Barbarella on the proposals relating to the policy on agricultural structures.
- Report by Miss Quin on a regulation concerning the collection by the Community of a fee on licenses authorizing vessels flying the flag of a Community Member State to fish for salmon in Swedish fishing zones.

4. At its second part-Session in March, Parliament dealt solely with agricultural issues and delivered three opinions, approving the Commission proposals in two cases:

- Report by Mr Früh on the Commission proposals to the Council for:
 - (i) a regulation concerning monetary compensatory amounts;
 - (ii) a regulation concerning the value of the unit of account and the conversion rates to be applied for the purposes of the common agricultural policy
- Report by Mr Woltjer on the Commission proposal to the Council for a regulation laying down, for 1980, certain measures relating to the conservation and management of fishery resources and applicable to vessels flying the Norwegian flag.

As regards the report by Mr Delatte, who suggests a number of amendments to the Commission proposals, Mr Gundelach made it known in the course of the debate that the Commission would maintain its proposals.

*

* *

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

*

* *

Question No 4 by Mr Rossi (H-509/79)

Subject: Data processing in the Community

The Commission recently arranged a meeting of representatives of the main electronics industries in the Community; does it now intend to develop major programmes for efficient and pragmatic implementation by these industries? For example, does the Commission not consider that the necessary industrial cooperation could be secured with a view to setting up a 'telematics' network for the acquisition, transmission and processing of data required for the management of the common agricultural policy?

Answer

1. Yes. Along the lines proposed in the document adopted by the Commission and forwarded to Parliament: 'European society faced with the challenge of new information technologies: a Community response'.

2. The Commission has proposed a feasibility study with the aim of linking up the independent data processing systems of the customs authorities in the Member States, the Commission and the bodies responsible for the administration of the agricultural policy. This proposal was adopted by the Council at the end of September 1977. It is entitled the 'CADDIA project' (Cooperation on the Automiza-

tion of Data and Documentation concerning Imports and Exports and Agriculture). Its secondary aims are to develop standards for exchanges of information and to identify the need for other projects to be developed on a cooperative basis.

The Commission regards this issue as having high priority.

3. The Commission is also studying other projects.

*

* *

Question No 11 by Mr van Aerssen (H-465/79)

Subject: Differing subscription rates for newspapers in the European Community

Newspapers and magazines are important and detailed sources of news, purveyors of culture and provide a linguistic bridge in the European Community. Owing to the different rates charged by the national postal authorities the cost to the subscriber of individual newspapers varies widely depending on the country to which they are delivered.

Does the Commission intend to submit proposals and take measures to remove these cultural barriers in the European Community?

The Commission is aware of the problem raised by the Honourable Member. The differences in newspaper subscription prices may be the result of the different rates charged by the national postal authorities.

On 29 May 1979, within the framework of the approximation of postal charges between Member States, the Commission issued a recommendation to Member States. In this recommendation it 'recommended Member States to apply internal rates in intra-Community postal traffic to letters in the lowest weight category' (these are letters of up to 20 grammes which represent 80 % of all postal traffic) and for 'postcards'.

Given the lack of response on the part of the Member States, the Commission does not intend to undertake any further steps until this first initiative has met with some success.

*

* *

Question No 15 by Mr Ruffolo (H-524/79)

Subject: Bagnoli steel plant

Can the Commission indicate its progress in considering the plans for restructuring the Bagnoli steel plant and what commitments does the Commission intend to make with regard to this programme?

Answer

Before issuing an opinion, the Commission reached an agreement with the Italian Government on a preliminary verification procedure for the plans for restructuring the Bagnoli steel plants.

This procedure comprised an assessment of the economic effects and a review of the implementation procedure for investments and the volume of production of wide-strip mills in the light of the need to ensure a balance between supply and demand on the Community market. These studies were carried out between the middle of January and the middle of February 1980.

The Commission will issue its opinion on this investment within the next few weeks.

*

* *

Question No 16 by Mrs Ewing (H-4/80)

Subject: Parliamentary access to the Commission's data bank systems

Following the Commission's reply to written question No 690/79 from Mr Gillot¹ relating to access to the CIRCE automated data system, in view of the fact that a security device has been built into the computer programme of the Commission's data bank system which prevents unauthorised access to certain categories of confidential information, and given the large expense of creating a parallel system for the Parliament's own use, how can the Commission justify withholding direct Parliamentary access to all CIRCE files—notably the PRC and ASMODEE sub-files which comprise basically open information?

Answer

The Commission readily accepts the need to avoid duplication in the provision of data-processing services between Community Institutions and is actively examining ways of enabling Members of Parliament to have direct access to the open information on the PRC and ASMODEE sub-files.

*

* *

Question No 17 by Mr O'Connell (H-2/80)

Subject: Employment of physically handicapped people

In view of its interest in promoting the employment of physically handicapped people would the Commission agree to ascertain the number of handicapped people employed in each Community institution with a view to maximising the employment of the disabled through a policy of positive discrimination including the use of minimum quotas where such an instrument would prove useful?

Answer

The Commission does not consider that it would be justified in making a special study of the number of handicapped officials in Community institutions. As the Commission indicated in answer to the previous question of the Honourable Member on this subject (453/79) and in answer to the written question No 30/78 of Mr Müller the association of handicapped officials in the Commission has estimated the number of physically handicapped persons employed by the Commission as being somewhat in excess of 5 %. This compares favourably with the minimum percentages required by those Member States which have statutory provisions obliging employers to have a quota of handicapped persons in their employment. There is no reason to believe that the position is markedly different in other Community institutions. In general, as has been pointed out in previous replies, there are relatively few manual jobs in Community institutions and physical handicap is unlikely to be a bar to entering employment provided that the candidate meets the requirements of the post.

*

* *

Question No 18 by Miss Hooper (H-3/80)

Subject: International sugar agreement

What steps are being taken by the Commission to ensure that the Community may join the international sugar agreement at the earliest possible stage?

Answer

1. The Commission has submitted a detailed opinion to the International Sugar Council indicating what equivalent provisions would make it possible for the Community to join the agreement under the conditions set out in Article 76 (3).

¹) OJ No C 19, 24. 1. 1980, p. 10

2. The International Sugar Council has not yet reacted specifically to these proposals, and seems to be waiting for the Community to make the next move.

3. From the Community point of view, it will not be possible to take any further action on the matter until the Council has determined its future sugar policy. The relevant Commission proposals are now before it for consideration.

*

* *

Question No 19 by Mr Adam (H-6/80)

Subject: Consumer protection

Considering that consumers have differing levels of income can the Commission show that lower income groups are receiving more attention than higher income groups in the field of consumer protection and can the Commission show that at least an equivalent value for money is obtained for a cheaper article as with a more expensive article?

Answer

The measures provided for in the first programme for a Community consumer policy ⁽¹⁾ and in the draft second programme ⁽²⁾ are general measures for the protection and promotion of consumer interests. They are based on the five basic rights common to all consumers.

Thus, none of these proposals is aimed at promoting the interests of a specific income group.

In practice, however, some of the proposed measures may be of more particular benefit to consumers in lower income groups. This could be the case, for example, in relation to the proposal for a directive on doorstep selling and to that on consumer credit.

The question of relative value for money as between cheaper and more expensive articles is ultimately a matter for the consumer's own judgement.

The Commission has, however, put forward a number of measures designed to assist the consumer in making this judgement. Some examples are:

- Council Directive No 79/581/EEC ⁽³⁾ on price indication for foodstuffs
- Directives Nos 79/530/EEC and 79/531/EEC on energy labelling of domestic appliances ⁽⁴⁾

The Commission's activities in relation to the quality of foodstuffs clearly also have a bearing on value for money. Finally, the application of the competition rules of the Treaty has the effect of protecting consumers against excessive pricing policies.

*

* *

Question No 20 by Mr Christopher Jackson (H-10/80)

Subject: Tax on fuel leaving Italy

It is reported that Italy has imposed a new fuel tax on vehicles leaving the country with full, or partially full, fuel tanks. The tax was introduced on January 1st without advance warning and a limit of 50 litres (about 11 gallons) has been set as the maximum amount of fuel that commercial vehicles can take out of the country. If the vehicle's tank has more than this, the driver must pay a tax of 1 000 lire (55 p) for each litre over the amount. Is such action in accordance with the Treaty of Rome and as this new tax clearly hinders intra-Community traffic what action does the Commission propose to take?

¹⁾ OJ No C 92 — 25. 4. 1975

²⁾ OJ No C 218 — 30. 8. 1979

³⁾ OJ No L 158 — 26. 6. 1979

⁴⁾ OJ No L 145 — 13. 6. 1979

Answer

1. These arrangements infringe Article 34 of the EEC Treaty (which prohibits quantitative restrictions on exports and all measures having equivalent effect in trade between Member States).
2. Following contacts between the Commission and the Italian authorities, measures are being taken to make the arrangements more flexible:
 - (a) The right to re-export, within the permitted limits, the same amount of diesel fuel as had been contained in a vehicle's fuel tank on entering Italy and declared by the driver;
 - (b) With the conversion of Decree-Law No 660 of 30. 12. 1979 into Law No 31 of 29. 1. 1980, the limits were fixed at 10 to 30 litres and 50 to 150 litres respectively.
3. However, since this relaxation of the original arrangements is not sufficient to end the infringement, the Commission has decided to initiate the infringement procedure provided for in Article 169 of the EEC Treaty against the Italian Government for violation of Article 34 of the Treaty.

*

* *

Question No 21 by Sir Peter Vanneck (H-11/80)

Subject: Relations between the Community and the oil producing states

Will the Commission communicate to the Parliament's Committee for Energy and Research a written record of the meeting with representatives of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, 30 June 1979, and if not, why not?

Answer

The meeting of 30 June 1979 between representatives of the Member States and the Commission on the one hand, and the OPEC Strategy Group on the other was confidential, and the Commission is therefore unfortunately not in a position to submit a written record to Parliament's Committee on Energy and Research.

The meeting of 30 June 1979 dealt with matters relating to short and medium term supply and demand developments on the market in mineral oil. The Commission has already referred to this in its answer to a written question (764/79) by the honourable Member.

*

* *

Question No 22 by Mr Poncelet (H-14/80)

Subject: Compliance by the Members States with the recommendation dealing with the serious difficulties confronting the synthetic-fibre tights (panty-hose) industries

In view of the steady increase in imports of synthetic-fibre tights into the Community and the serious difficulties confronting our industries, the Commission issued a recommendation in 1976 asking Member States to discourage any expansion in production capacity and the practice of having finishing carried out in third countries. To what extent have the Member States followed this recommendation?

Answer

1. Following the recommendation of 20 September 1976, the Commission has approached Member States on a number of occasions to discourage any initiative which would be likely to increase new production capacities.
2. As far as outward processing traffic is concerned, where the abovementioned recommendation also seeks to prevent incentives to the production of goods manufactured in this form, the present statistics show a declining trend in the order of 6.6 % (1977/1978) for Nimex item 60 04 31

(Panty-hose of yarn of a fineness of 6.6 tex or less) while during the same period overall EEC imports from third countries rose by approximately 0.3 %.

The Honourable Member is referred to the answer to Written Question No 1413/79 on processing traffic in the textile sector.

*

* *

Question No 23 by Mr Ansquer (H-16/80)

Subject: Developments on the sugar market

What conclusions does the Commission draw from the developments on the world sugar market? Does it intend to revise its restrictive proposals on the organization of the internal market?

Answer

The present extremely high world market prices for sugar and their extraordinary volatility are mainly due to speculative factors which are affecting almost all commodity markets in the world. We do not believe that these prices are justified by the position as regards supply and demand on the sugar market.

The main priority in the arrangements which we proposed was to provide more balanced financing for agricultural policy in the sugar sector and we shall adhere closely to this goal.

Yes. But world sugar stocks are more than sufficient to make up the deficit without these being reduced to below their normal level.

With a normal annual harvest, our proposals would lead to a surplus for export of 2.1 million tonnes of sugar guaranteed by Community resources. The Community producers would moreover be free to produce as much sugar as they wish. Our aim is solely to maintain the volume of production guaranteed by Community resources within reasonable limits.

*

* *

Question No 24 by Mr Welsh (H-17/80)

Subject: Research into machine translation systems

Is the Commission satisfied that money being invested in research into machine translation systems is being spent in the best possible way?

Answer

1. The Commission has been financing research into machine translation systems since 1975. It has done so because, in view of the importance of the language problem in the Community, it wishes to take every opportunity to improve communication between Community citizens and within the Community Institutions.

2. Appropriations of approximately 1.6 m EUA made available over the last five years have been used principally for two projects:

- Firstly, an automatic translation system was acquired and further developed. Following completion of the necessary trial period, this system, known as 'SYSTRAN' in Western countries, now meets the expectations associated with the machine translation of technical and scientific texts. Among other things, the development of practical applications of this system was essential to the multilingual use of the EURONET-DIANE information network which became operational in Parliament last December.
- The second project supported by the Commission is a research programme for the development of a multilingual translation system based on the most up-to-date linguistic concepts. Known as

EUROTRA, this project is being run jointly by nine universities representing all linguistic areas of the Community, and is regarded by specialists as the most promising venture of its kind.

*

* *

Question No 26 by Mr Newton-Dunn (H-19/80)

Subject: Fishing

Would the Commission confirm that there have been numerous breaches of the zero TACs which were agreed on behalf of all Member States by the Council on 29th October 1979, viz. German fishing for Cod in Area XIV (Greenland), Irish fishing for Herring in VII g-k (Celtic Sea), French fishing for Herring in Area IV (North Sea), and what action does the Commission intend to take to ensure that all Member States fulfill their obligations in this respect?

Answer

The Commission has in fact been informed of several instances of failure to respect the interim measures decided on a number of times by the Council towards the end of 1978 and during 1979, where by the Member States undertook to conduct their fishing activities in such a way that when catches were made by their vessels account would be taken of the TACs submitted by the Commission to the Council and of the portion of the TACs allocated to third countries under agreements and arrangements concluded with them by the Community.

It has considered the circumstances leading to the situation that has been created, and is following developments with the closest attention.

With the adoption by the Council on 26 March 1980 of two regulations, one on the TACs and the other on the registration and notification of catches, the Commission now holds legal instruments requiring the Member States to forward to the Commission on the 15th of each month details of catches in the preceding month. The system has actually been in operation on an informal basis since 15 February 1980.

Implementing measures relating to the system are now in preparation; Commission proposals concerning an on-board register, declarations of catches and transshipment will shortly be placed before the Council.

These will constitute a supplementary set of provisions which should be crucial in enabling the supervisory authorities to ensure that conservation measures adopted by the Council are observed by fishermen.

*

* *

Question No 27 by Mr Griffiths (H-23/80)

Subject: European Development Fund

Is the Commission aware of the criteria, if any, on which the figures for job creation forecasts (table 11 of the 4th Annual Report of the European Regional Development Fund) are based and what value does the Commission place on them when assessing the impact of regional assistance?

Answer

The information in Table 11 of the Fourth Annual Report of the European Regional Fund is supplied to the Commission by the Member States pursuant to Article 6 (6) of the Fund Regulation, which requires a statistical survey of the results achieved and the employment generated as a result of assistance from the Fund. The data consist of forecasts prepared by the firms concerned of the additional jobs created as a result of investments undertaken with the help of regional development incentives.

The Commission believes that these statistical forecasts are not in themselves a sufficient basis on which to evaluate the effects of aid provided by the Fund and that figures on the numbers of jobs actually created as a result of regional development incentives must also be taken into account. As the Commission clearly states in point 123 of the Fourth Annual Report of the European Regional Development Fund, the data provided give only a rough picture of the situation.

*

* *

Question No 28 by Mr Remilly (H-24/80)

Subject: Revival of the European telematics sector

What proposals does the Commission intend to make with a view to reviving the possibility of a concerted European strategy in the telematics sector?

Answer

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to two documents which have been sent to Parliament and which answer his question:

1. 'European society faced with the challenge of new information technologies: a Community response' (COM (79) 650 final of 23 November 1979).
2. 'Employment and the new micro-electronic technology' (COM (80) 16 final of 5 February 1980).

*

* *

Question No 29 by Mrs Barbarella (H-31/80)

Subject: Renewal of the agricultural advisory committees

As the agricultural advisory committees are shortly to be renewed can the Commission state what criteria it proposes to adopt for the selection of representatives from farmers' associations, cooperatives and the trade unions? Does it feel that these criteria are sufficient to ensure adequate representation of all those involved in agriculture?

Answer

The Commission has always adopted a pragmatic approach when assessing the representativeness of professional organizations given the difficulty of establishing strict valid criteria for the Community as a whole.

At the same time the Commission only takes account of proposals made by professional organizations established at Community level which precludes national professional organizations from participating directly in the appointment of members of advisory committees.

The Commission is currently conducting a major enquiry among users of advisory committees.

The results of this enquiry should provide a better understanding of certain problems which arise when committees are being renewed.

In this connection, the Commission is willing to take account of other criteria of representativeness.

*

* *

Question No 32 by Mr Pranchère (H-35/80)

Subject: Introduction of a premium for suckling cows

The introduction of a premium for suckling cows has been under discussion for some time. Does the Commission intend to introduce such a premium and can it indicate the likely consequences on future production of beef and veal of which the Community still produces insufficient quantities?

Answer

The Commission proposes to introduce a premium of 60 EUA per head on a maximum stock of 15 suckling cows. If the Commission proposal were to be modified by increasing the maximum limit as certain members wish, this would clearly mean that the sum per head would be reduced given the overall sum available to finance the premium.

Granting this premium for approximately 3 500 000 cows out of a total headage of 31 234 000 will barely affect total production of beef and veal.

*

* *

Question No 34 by Mr Pininfarina (H-37/80)

Subject: Product liability

Further to Mr Sieglerschmidt's question to the Council and the debate on this matter during question time at the February part-session and with particular reference to the request made by Mr Hord at that time, can the Commission give an assurance that any new version of the directive on product liability will be referred to Parliament for consideration prior to a decision by the Council?

Answer

First of all it should be borne in mind that:

- the Commission referred a draft Council directive on the approximation of the laws, regulations and other administrative provisions of the Member States on product liability to the Council on 9 September 1976;
- this proposal was referred to Parliament for its decision on 5 October 1976 and this was delivered on 26 April 1979.

The Commission therefore sees no reason to consult Parliament yet again.

On the contrary, Parliament's deliberations allowed each detail of this draft directive to be discussed and I took part in these deliberations on several occasions. Finally Parliament adopted the resolution embodied in the report by the Honourable Member, Mr Calewaert. In this resolution, Parliament welcomed this proposal and called on the Commission to adopt a number of amendments.

The Commission acceded to this request except for the issue of the inclusion or non-inclusion of 'development risks' a matter which was debated exhaustively. Parliament thus had an opportunity to comment on all the measures proposed by the Commission. Indeed the retention by the Commission of the inclusion of 'development risks' in no way affected the content of the Commission's initial 1976 proposal. It is therefore neither necessary nor, as far as I can see, desirable for Parliament to be consulted again. In addition, I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply which I gave on Thursday, 17 April 1980, to the Oral Question by the Legal Affairs Committee (0-152/79).

*

* *

Question No 35 by Mrs Desmond (H-38/80)

Subject: Abolition of headage grants in disadvantaged areas in Munster

Is the Commission aware of the hardship caused in certain areas in Munster by the Irish Government's decision to abolish headage grants for part-time farmers whose off-farm income exceeds £ 3 550 p.a., but whose holdings are not viable, and of the detrimental effects this will have on the development of agriculture in those areas?

Answer

The Commission is not aware that the payment of headage grants to part-time farmers, whose off-farm income exceeds £ 3 550 p.a., had been abolished in any part of Ireland. The Commission has contacted the Irish Government to ascertain the situation.

*

* *

Question No 37 by Mrs Lizin (H-43/80)

Subject: Data-processing equipment

Could the Commission indicate whether the restrictions on the use of ICL equipment, as announced after the meeting of the C.D.I.C. (Steering Committee on Data-processing at the Commission) of 18 January, are purely temporary and, if so, when they will be lifted. Would it be possible to return to the previous situation including, for example, the use of the Mac system on Tuesdays and Thursdays, without having to purchase additional equipment?

Answer

The ICL computer was saturated at the beginning of the year and, as a result, provided poor turn-round times to the Commission's users.

It was therefore decided to reduce the work-load on the computer until further notice — for example, by reducing the MAC work on Tuesdays and Fridays.

As a result of the measures taken the service to users has improved considerably. However, given the expanding informatics work-load of the Commission, it will not be possible to remove the present constraints until extra ICL capacity is available.

*

* *

Question No 44 by Mrs Castle (H-44/80)

Subject: Massacre of seals

Following the resolution of the European Parliament of 11 October 1978 in which the European Parliament expressed its concern about the massacre of seals and requested that the Commission of the European Communities intervene, would the Commission please state what action it has taken to ask governments to publish the scientific evidence used to authorize the slaughter of seals and would the Commission please further state what measures it intends to take to ensure that Member States ban the importation of seal products into the EEC?

Answer

As the Honourable Member has already been informed, the programme for the culling of adult grey seals and the massacre of seal pups introduced by the Scottish Department for Agriculture and Fisheries was suspended in 1978 as a result of the pressure of public opinion.

In the meantime the Commission has awarded a research contract to the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) to study the management of the grey seal population and their interference with certain types of fishing.

The Honourable Member is no doubt aware that the grey seal problem is only one small aspect of the overall problem of the conservation of seals. There are other species facing graver threats and for

which conservation measures are more urgently required. The grey seal is hunted primarily to protect fish stocks. Hunting for commercial purposes is restricted and for this reason rules on imports of sealskins would not be very effective.

The UK Nature Conservancy Council has conducted a general study of the main European marine mammals with a view to obtaining a broader picture of the situation.

The results of this report are being studied and will be used by the Commission as a basis for proposals for Community measures in this field.

The Commission is also in favour of voluntary restrictions on imports of the skins of young seals similar to those already applied in France and the Netherlands.

*

* *

Question No 39 by Mr Normanton (H-48/80)

Subject: Invitations to tender for public contracts

To ask the Commission whether they are satisfied with the implementation by Member States of the Community policy requiring publication of invitations to tender for public contract? Since this is binding upon Member States, by what authority is the Commission exempt from this requirement?

Answer

I.

1. The Commission is satisfied that the Member States have adopted the necessary measures to comply with Directive 71/305/EEC coordinating procedures for the award of *public works contracts*.

2. The situation with regard to Directive 77/62/EEC coordinating procedures for the award of *public supply contracts* is influenced by two factors. First, only four Member states had taken steps to comply with this directive by the time it entered into force on 24 June 1978. A further four Member States complied in July 1979 and one has not yet done so.

Second, the Commission is in the process of checking that the measures adopted by the eight Member States to implement the directive on supply contracts actually comply with the directive.

II:

3. The directives on public contracts are not directly binding on the Community institutions as they are addressed to the Member States pursuant to Article 189 of the Treaty of Rome.

4. The Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Communities does, however, require each institution to comply with the measures adopted by the Council in the field of public works contracts, notably those which call for the publication of invitations to tender.

*

* *

Question No 40 by Mr O'Donnell (H-50/80)

Subject: Local Communities

Has the Commission any proposals to enable local communities to play a more active role in the economic development and social progress of their own localities and regions?

Answer

It is not for the Commission to make proposals to allow local communities to play a more active role in the economic and social development of their regions.

However, the proposals the Commission makes and the activities it carries out within its various fields of responsibility often increase the scope for local communities to take a more active part in the development of their own localities and regions.

As the Commission is aware of the positive role played by local communities, it seeks regular contacts with the representative organizations of local and regional communities, though it is careful to respect institutional rules.

*

* *

Question No 41 by Mr Maher (H-51/80)

Subject: Subsidisation of shipbuilding

Will the Commission clarify the Rules and Regulations applicable to subsidisation of shipbuilding within the Community, either through Community Funds or National Government Funds, either by way of direct grant to the shipbuilder or shipowner or through preferential interest aided funds?

Answer

Member states' aid schemes for the shipbuilding industry are governed by Article 92 of the EEC Treaty and in particular by Directive 78/338/EEC, which was adopted pursuant to Article 92(3). These provisions cover virtually all the aid granted in this sector, the main category being production aid. Production aid is compatible with article 6 of the above directive if it is granted in order to remedy the present crisis in the industry and if it is linked to the attainment of industrial restructuring objectives. The aid must be degressive and may not exceed the limit laid down by the Commission.

In addition, the Commission will look into the possibility of providing more specific support from Community funds on the basis of the position to be adopted by the Council on a plan currently being prepared for the financing of scrap and build projects for ships.

Assistance for investment in the shipbuilding industry may be provided from the Regional Fund and through Community loans, though only in conjunction with measures to restructure and restore the competitiveness of this industry.

The Commission is currently studying the possibility of extending the existing range of aids from the Social Fund in order to provide more assistance for workers in the shipbuilding industry.

*

* *

Question No 42 by Lord Douro (H-53/80)

Subject: Whaling

Is the Commission prepared to consider a partial or complete ban on the import of whale products into the Community?

Answer

As announced in the memorandum annexed to the 1980 programme address, the Commission intends to transmit to the Council as soon as possible a proposal for a regulation concerning common rules for imports of whale products. Experience has shown that the conservation measures taken by the International Whaling Commission (IWC) are almost always inadequate or belated, as they are adopted when stocks of the threatened species are already extremely low.

Furthermore, with a view to strengthening international measures, various Member States have adopted or are planning to adopt measures designed to guarantee the survival of whales. Community measures are necessary in order to ensure the uniformity of the common commercial policy in this area. The Commission therefore proposes to impose a licensing system for the importation of the main whale products into the Community. The relevant authorities may grant licences only after they have established that the products concerned will not be used for commercial purposes.

The European Parliament will have an opportunity to give its opinion on the proposal in question.

The Commission also considers it essential that the Community as such should accede to the international convention governing whale hunting and has already submitted a proposal to the Council to this effect.

*
* *

Question No 43 by Miss Quin (H-55/80)

Subject: Testing levels of fungicide in citrus fruits

Will the Commission, as a matter of urgency, re-examine its directive on preservatives with a view to introducing effective methods for testing the levels of fungicide 2-hydroxybiphenyl in citrus fruits?

Answer

2-hydroxybiphenyl is a fungicide which is applied to the skin of citrus fruits. The present method of analysis used to monitor the quantities of fungicide employed is set out in Annex IV, paragraph 5 of the Council Directive of 27 July 1967 on the use of certain preservatives for the surface treatment of citrus fruits (67/427/EEC, OJ No 148, 11 July 1967, p. 1).

This directive was adopted before the first enlargement of the Community in 1973. The new Member States accepted the version drafted in their respective languages and published in a special edition of the Official Journal with their assistance and approval.

The English version contains a translation error. By letter of 30 January 1980 the Commission was informed that, because of this the method could not be used. On 25 March the Commission asked the Council to publish a correction to the Official Journal to rectify the situation.

The Commission does not agree that the method of analysis, which was devised by chemists from all the Member States and used since 1967, is ineffective. It is, however, aware that a number of criticisms can be made, in addition to the translation error I mentioned, and since the method has already been in use for 13 years, it has decided to call a meeting of experts from the Member States to review the method in June.

*
* *

Question No 44 by Mr Forth (H-64/80)

Subject: Dumping of tyres

What action does the Commission propose to take on the dumping in the Community of tyres manufactured in Eastern Europe?

Answer (H-64/80)

The Commission's investigations have shown that there has been dumping of certain types of car tyres imported from various state-trading countries; which has considerably harmed the Community tyre industry.

Exporters in the countries concerned have declared their willingness to adjust their export prices in order to remedy this situation.

These proposals are now being studied by the Community bodies responsible. They will probably be accepted and the antidumping procedure can thus be completed.

*
* *

Question No 45 by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-72/80)

Subject: Attitude of Euroforum to the question of equality of treatment at work

Issue No 5/80 of Euroforum contains two cartoons (pages 8 and 9) exhibiting an attitude to the problem of equal treatment of women at work that is at once banal, superficial, facetious, old-fashioned and, indeed, inconsistent with the position adopted by the Commission. While accepting that Euroforum, as is made clear, does not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Community Institutions, I consider it urgent and essential for information provided on women to be both scrupulously fair and accurate. Would the Commission not agree, therefore, that — starting with its own information services — efforts should be made to eliminate fatuous and outmoded attitudes to women, which may be considered as a form of discrimination against women?

Answer

The Commission regrets that the Honourable Member found the Euroforum illustrations offensive. As with all the other cartoons in the magazine, they were intended to be humorous and to draw attention to the article that they illustrated. The article clearly demonstrated the Commission's fundamental commitment to the principle of equal treatment for men and women.

*
* *

Question No 46 by Mr von Wogau (H-73/80)

Subject: Bulk of documentation necessary in applying for EAGGF aid

Is the Commission aware that a wine-grower requesting EAGGF aid under Regulation 355/77 must submit an application of some 70 pages in length, amounting practically to a mini-thesis?

Does the Commission agree that in this way small and medium-sized holdings are discouraged from benefitting from such aid, and that the purpose of such measures is therefore not fulfilled? Is the Commission prepared to take the necessary steps to reduce the bulk of such documentation to reasonable proportions?

Answer

1. The Honourable Member is confusing the area of application of the regulation concerned which applies to investments for the commercialization and transformation of agricultural products and not investments in the farming sector. Even investments which affect one single winegrower are quite considerable. Moreover, the majority of beneficiaries are small and medium-sized undertakings and cooperatives.

2. Regulation (EEC) No. 355/77 requires projects to lead to an improvement in structures which excludes extremely small projects. And, as the capital subsidies average 300 000 EUA and may amount to as much as several million EUA per project, the Commission must be supplied with sufficient information to judge the validity (both in economic and financial terms) of the project.

*
* *

Question No 47 by Lord O'Hagan (H-74/80)

Subject: Fish and Chips

It is widely rumoured that the Commission of the EEC plans to make it impossible for the British to continue to buy Fish and Chips, with traditional vinegar, wrapped in newspapers. Is this true and if so why? Will the Commission now withdraw all such proposals?

Answer

The Commission does not know where the rumours to which the Honourable Member refers originated. At any event, they are completely unfounded, as the Commission has never felt nor expressed the slightest concern as regards the sale of fish and chips in the United Kingdom.

*

* *

Question No 48 by Mr Kavanagh (H-76/80)

Subject: Proposed Directive on free movement and right of establishment of pharmacists

What progress has been made in the drafting of the proposed directive on free movement and the right of establishment for pharmacists?

Answer

1. On 12 February 1980 President Jenkins presented to Parliament the Commission's programme for 1980. In the memorandum annexed to his address it was indicated that the Commission would transmit to the Council during the first half of the year proposals for directives on the free movement of pharmacists and the mutual recognition of diplomas in pharmacy.

2. After numerous wide-ranging consultations the work of finalizing these proposals is now nearing completion. A final meeting between the leaders of the European pharmacists' associations and Mr Davignon will be held in the coming weeks and consultations will take place with the Greek Government to seek the latter's views on the Commission's plans.

*

* *

Question No 49 by Mr Clinton (H-77/80)

Subject: Carpet Industry

Is the Commission aware of the damage being done to the carpet industry and the unemployment being created in Europe by the enormous amount of American carpets being allowed into the European market?

Answer

The Commission is well aware that imports of carpets into the Community from the United States rose sharply in 1979. The higher level of imports, consisting mainly of tufted synthetic carpets, affected the United Kingdom market in particular.

However, despite the recent increase, these imports still represent only a small proportion of the Community market (1.3 %) and of the United Kingdom market in particular (3.7 %).

It would therefore be difficult to say to what extent these imports are responsible for the loss of jobs or the redundancies announced in the United Kingdom carpet industry.

The Commission is keeping a close eye on the situation in conjunction with the British Government.

*

* *

Question No 50 by Mr Ligios (H-80/80)

Subject: Imports of pasta products into France

Is the Commission aware that there is considerable opposition in France to Italian pasta products, the composition of which is determined and expressed on the basis of national methods? What steps does

it intend to take to prevent the present controversy from resulting in the introduction by a Member State of quantitative restrictions on imports of pasta products that are of a traditionally high quality, produced in accordance with the relevant regulations and marketed in Italy?

Answer

1. This problem has already been raised by the honourable member in identical terms in Written Question No. 1502/79 to which the Commission replied on 27 March 1980.

2. The Commission is aware of the difficulties encountered when marketing Italian pasta products in France; these are linked to differences arising from national regulations on the marketing of pasta products.

A complaint has been lodged with the Commission on this subject which is currently being examined in the light of Article 3 *et seq.* of the EEC Treaty.

3. The Commission will examine with the utmost care the content of the national regulations in question in accordance with the principles in Decision 120/28 of 20. 2. 1979 of the Court of Justice to which the honourable member has referred and which specifies that any product produced and marketed in accordance with the relevant regulations in a Member State must be allowed access to the market of any other Member State unless the differences resulting from national regulations on product marketing are necessary on cogent grounds and unless the provisions concerned have as their objective a general interest of which they constitute an essential safeguard.

On this basis the Commission will establish whether it is necessary or not to invoke the procedure provided for in Article 169 of the EEC Treaty in relation to the French Government.

*

* *

Question No 52 by Mr Nyborg (H-82/80)

Subject: Lengthy customs formalities

Lorry drivers have recently blocked the frontier crossing points between Denmark and the Federal Republic of Germany and between the Federal Republic and Austria (at Kiefersfelden) according to reports, in protest against lengthy and unnecessary customs formalities. What changes in the customs formalities has this action prompted, and will the Commission be able to obviate the need for such action in the future by negotiating more flexible customs procedures with the national authorities?

Answer

Further to my letter of 25 March 1980 to the Honourable Member on the blockade of the German-Danish border by lorries, I would point out that recent incidents on this border and the others on the German-Austrian border are mainly due to the build-up of vehicles on these borders as a result of the prohibition placed on heavy goods traffic in Germany between midnight and 10 o'clock on Sundays and holidays.

In view of these difficulties, the customs authorities responsible have decided to introduce a number of improvements to facilitate trans-frontier traffic.

As far as the situation at Padborg (German-Danish border) is concerned, the following improvements have already been made or are being introduced:

- office opening hours have been extended on Sunday night from midnight until 2 o'clock and on other days of the week from midnight to 1 o'clock;
- in addition it has been decided to try to speed up generally the various formalities required for crossing the border;
- finally in order to permit transit vehicles to cross the borders outside normal office hours, it has been decided to build a special lane for these vehicles to prevent them finding their route blocked by vehicles undergoing the normal customs clearance.

As far as the situation at Kiefersfelden (German-Austrian border) is concerned, the following improvements have been agreed on or are planned for the near future:

- the extension of office hours on Saturdays from 6 to 8 p.m.;
- checks carried out already on lorries in transit at the Italian-Austrian border at the Brenner will be recognized at Kiefersfelden and vice-versa;
- in addition the Austrian authorities have announced their intention to increase the staff at the border substantially in the near future.

As regards the other points, the Honourable Member's attention is drawn to the fact that the Commission has entrusted a number of committees and working parties with the task of examining all obstacles to frontier traffic for the various forms of transport and with seeking effective solutions to the difficulties encountered.

The German authorities have announced that the situation has since improved at the two border crossings mentioned.

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 15 APRIL 1980

1. Approval of the minutes	48	Amendment after paragraph 6:	
2. Documents received	48	Mr Wawrzik	84
3. Membership of committees	48	Explanations of vote: Mrs Bonino; Mrs Macciocchi; Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mr Haagerup	
4. Decision on urgent procedure	48	Adoption of the resolution	84
Mr Caborn; Mr Bangemann; Mr Balfe; Mr Ferri, chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee; Mr Maffre-Baugé; Mr Boyes; Mr Bangemann; Mr Coppieters; Mrs Pruvot; Mr Calvez; Mrs Le Roux	49	Delmotte report (Doc. 1-789/79): Fourth Annual Report on the ERDF:	
5. Discussion on urgent procedure	52	Amendment after paragraph 5:	
6. Welcome	52	Mr Delmotte, rapporteur; Mrs Ewing	86
7. Food aid to Cambodia (continuation)		Amendment after paragraph 8:	
Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur; Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission	53	Mr Delmotte	86
8. Fourth Annual Report on the ERDF — Involvement of the Northern Adriatic in the European unification process — Joint debate on a report by Mr Delmotte on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning (Doc. 1-789/79) and an oral question, with debate (Doc. 1-32/80)	56	Amendment after paragraph 18:	
Mr Delmotte, rapporteur (Doc. 1-789/79)	56	Mr Delmotte	87
Mr Cecovini, author (Doc. 1-32/80)	57	Amendment after paragraph 21:	
Mr Burke, Member of the Commission; Mr Griffiths (S); Mr Pöttering (EPP); Mr Harris (ED); Mr Gouthier (COM); Mr Irmer (L); Mr Cronin (EPD); Mrs Bonino; Mr Gendebien; Mr Gabert; Mr O'Donnell; Mr J.D. Taylor; Mrs Ewing; Mr Blaney; Mr Petronio; Mr Hume; Mr Modiano; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Cariglia; Mr Travaglini; Mr Husson; Mrs Cresson; Mr Habsburg; Mr Glinne; Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission; Mr Bocklet; Mr von der Vring; Mrs Gaiotti de Biase; Mr Delmotte; Mr Burke, Member of the Commission; Mr Giolitti	59	Mr Delmotte	87
9. Votes	83	Explanations of vote: Mr Fich; Mr Moreland; Mrs Ewing; Mr Moreland; Mrs Ewing; Mr Moreland; Mrs Ewing	87
Wawrzik report (Doc. 1-734/79): Food aid to Cambodia:		Adoption of the resolution	88
Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission	83	10. Human rights in Chile — Report by Mr Van Miert on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee (Doc. 1-821/79):	
Amendment after the second indent:		Mr Van Miert, rapporteur	88
Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur	84	Mrs Van den Heuvel (S); Mr Penders (EPP); Lord Douro (ED); Mrs Baduel Glorioso (COM); Mr Galland (L); Mr Blaney (I); Mrs Gaiotti de Biase; Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Van Miert	89
Amendment to paragraph 6:		11. Situation in Nicaragua — Report by Mr Antoniazzi on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee (Doc. 1-723/79):	
Mr Wawrzik	84	Mr Antoniazzi, rapporteur	96
		Mr Lomas (S); Mr Chambeiron (COM); Mr Haagerup (L); Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission	97
		12. Human rights in Czechoslovakia — Report by Mr Hänsch on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee (Doc. 1-815/79):	
		Mr Hänsch, rapporteur	101
		Mr Pelikan (S); Mr Habsburg (EPP); Lord Bethell (ED); Mr Irmer (L)	102
		13. Right of residence for nationals of Member States in another Member State — Report by Mr Gonella on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee (Doc. 1-40/80):	
		Mr Gonella, rapporteur	105

*Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission;
Mr Janssen van Raay (EPP); Mr Tyrrell
(ED); Mr Berkhouwer (L); Mr Gillot (EPD);
Mr Bøgh (I)* 107
*Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Megahy; Mr Ferri; Mr
Gonella; Mr Davignon* 111

Personal comment: Mr Bøgh 114
Point of order: Mr Bonde 114
Mr Davignon 115
14. *Urgent procedure* 115
15. *Agenda for next sitting* 115

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

Vice-President

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

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

The minutes are approved.

2. *Documents received*

President. — I have received the following documents:

(a) from the Council, requests for opinions on:

- proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation laying down for 1980 certain measures for the conservation and management of fishery resources applicable to vessels flying the flag of Spain (Doc. 1-82/80)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture;

- the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for:

- I. a directive amending Council Directive 77/541/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to safety belts and restraint systems of motor vehicles
- II. a directive amending Council Directive 76/115/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to anchorages for motor-vehicle safety belts

III. a directive amending Council Directive 74/408/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the interior fittings of motor vehicles (strength of seats and of their anchorages)

(Doc. 1-83/80)

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

(b) the following motion for a resolution:

- motion for a resolution by Mr Cariglia, Mr Ferri, Mr Orlandi and Mr Puletti, pursuant to Rule 25, on the violations of international law and the Charter of Human Rights in Iran (Doc. 1-81/80)

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee;

3. *Membership of Committees*

President. — I have received from the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) a request to appoint Mr Estgen member of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

Are there any objections?

This appointment is ratified.

4. *Decision on urgent procedure*

President. — The next item on the agenda is the decision on a number of requests for urgent procedure.

I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure in respect of *the Commission proposals for food aid for 1980* (Doc. 1-5/80).

The adoption of urgent procedure is agreed.

President

I propose that this debate be entered on the agenda for Friday, 18 April.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I ask the Committee on Development and Cooperation to present a text on these proposals as soon as possible.

*
* *

President. — I now put to the vote the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *Commission proposal for certain measures for the conservation of fishery resources (Doc. 1-35/80)*.

The adoption of urgent procedure is agreed.

I propose that this item be entered on the agenda for Friday, 18 April.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I ask the Committee on Agriculture to table a report as soon as possible.

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the request by Mr Caborn and others for urgent procedure in respect of the *Donnez report on the Adams affair (Doc. 1-44/80)*.

I call Mr Caborn.

Mr Caborn. — Mr President, the Adams affair has been before this Parliament for a number of years and has been taken up by a number of people. It is a topic that cuts across all party boundaries. I just want to inform the Parliament that there has been a development in the Adams-versus-Hoffmann-LaRoche affair in the last two or three days.

As some of you will know, this case has, over the years, placed a heavy financial burden on Mr Adams. Very briefly, on 9 June 1976 the Commission accepted the information given by Mr Adams. This has been very useful. On 13 February 1979, when Hoffmann-LaRoche appealed, the Court of Justice upheld the decision against the Swiss Confederation. Since then the financial implications for Mr Adams have been so great that he has been brought before the courts for

bankruptcy and served a further 53 days in jail over Christmas and the New Year. Mr Adams has in fact been released from jail, but in the last two days he has been told that he must again appear before the courts in Rome where he faces the possibility of further imprisonment, if he is convicted. Moreover, he is involved in eight bankruptcy suits which have been brought for non-payment of debts to his lawyers, which amount to some Lit. 63 million.

So this man is in one hell of a mess, to say the least!

What I am trying to do by moving urgent debate — and I do not think there is any difference between the political groups, as the report under discussion was agreed by all the parties in the Legal Affairs Committee — is to bring the debate forward by one month so that Parliament can give assistance to a man who, I would suggest, has been victimized by this very big company.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) I have been familiar with this affair as long as I have been a Member of the European Parliament, and Members who belonged to the old Parliament are familiar with it too. It is true to say that we have never disagreed on the substance of the matter. There has always been a relatively large measure of unanimity in this House in support of Mr Adams in his efforts to escape prosecution in Switzerland, because we all felt that he should not be prosecuted under Swiss penal law for conduct which, after all, did not contravene European law. There is no difference of opinion at all about that. All I should like to say to Mr Caborn is absolutely nothing of what he has said here is new. We have been aware of it for years, and there is therefore positively no reason why the matter should be debated by the urgent procedure.

The Donnez report will in all probability be on the agenda next month. So you see, the Legal Affairs Committee is discussing the question. Even if his report is now placed on the agenda in this way, it is doubtful whether Mr Donnez can be present. It is possible he will not be here. But, apart from this, there is absolutely no reason why the report should be debated this week. It will be quite early enough if we do so next month. You say Mr Adams faces Bankruptcy suits. They will certainly not end this week, and even if they did, what do you think you could do to help the man? Hoffmann-LaRoche has every right to appeal.

So there is absolutely nothing, Mr President, that makes the matter urgent. I do not therefore see why we should agree to this request for an urgent debate.

President. — I call Mr Balfe.

Mr Balfe. — Mr President, I only want to make a very simple point in reply to Mr Bangemann. The case comes up in Rome on 28 April — that is, before the next meeting of this Parliament, so clearly a debate now, especially as some of the charges concern alleged fraud, would carry greater weight than if we postponed it to the May part-session. Now that the Donnez report has been through the committee, if we do not accept a request to move it along at a reasonable pace it will look as though we are beginning to lose interest in the matter. It is a matter of taking up a document which has been approved by the committee, and in view of the interest we have shown in the Adams case and the fact that it is coming before a court which is within the Community before the next part-session, of dealing with it expeditiously at this part-session to show that our commitment to Stanley Adams and to the case remains as strong as it has been in the past. If we start failing on this sort of issue we shall really be letting ourselves and these people down and we shall have no right to expect help in implementing the standards that we chose to set for commercial and other agreements. I hope the House will pass this matter and allow it to be debated, presumably on Friday.

President. — I call Mr Ferri.

Mr Ferri, chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee.

— (I) Mr President, in the absence of the rapporteur, Mr Donnez, I have asked to speak pursuant to Rule 14 (2) of the Rules of Procedure. Let me say right away that I support Mr Caborn's request. The report was adopted by the Legal Affairs Committee unanimously, with three abstentions, on 19 March, thereby demonstrating its continuing support for the substantially unanimous approach of Parliament to the Adams affair, as confirmed by Mr Bangemann.

Since Mr Caborn's statements could be given a wrong interpretation, however, I should like to make the point that the legal proceedings facing Mr Adams in Italy at the moment are of course quite unconnected with the problems of the Adams-versus-Hoffmann-LaRoche affair, which has been and continues to be Parliament's concern and on which the report of the Legal Affairs Committee has once again taken a firm stand.

This must be quite clearly understood, because Parliament could not and ought not to even consider trying to influence the course of justice in Italy. Italy is a constitutional state and the Italian judiciary applies the law regardless of any political pressures from any body, whatever its standing.

The Legal Affairs Committee's Donnez report does, however, exhort the Italian government — the government, you will note, not the judiciary — to exercise the greatest possible leniency towards Mr Adams in

order to help him resolve his financial problems, which are at least indirectly a consequence of his unfortunate experiences arising out of the Hoffman-LaRoche affair. In the light of these considerations and given the importance of the case, which has been before Parliament for some time now, I believe Mr Caborn's request should be approved and a decision taken for an urgent debate during the present part-session.

President. — I put the request to the vote.

The request is rejected.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the assassination of Archbishop Romero (Doc. 1-74/80)*.

I call Mr Maffre-Baugé.

Mr Maffre-Baugé. — (F) Mr President, I have to say that I am personally in favour of urgent procedure in this instance. Archbishop Romero was not only a victim of his faith in the people of his own country, whose sufferings can be put down to the fact that the agriculture of San Salvador is entirely controlled by just fourteen families, but also a martyr to his Christian beliefs. I therefore support the request for urgency.

President. — I put the request to the vote.

The adoption of urgent procedure is agreed.

I propose that this item be entered on Friday's agenda.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

*

* *

President. — We come next to the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution by Mr Diligent and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group), and by Mr Baudis, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the granting of asylum to Cuban citizens (Doc. 1-84/80)*.

I call Mr Boyes.

Mr Boyes. — I just want to compare and contrast the last decision with this resolution here. There we had a case where a lot of detail was known, a lot of facts were known, the person who spoke on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Caborn, has been in continual contact with Mr Adams and his lawyers and yet this Parliament decided, in its wisdom, to reject that resolution. I am hoping that it will also reject this request for urgency, because I am willing to bet that, apart from a few newspaper reports on what is happening in Cuba, there is nobody in this Parliament who has got any real information on what the situation is there.

(Laughter from certain quarters on the right)

Well I expect that level of debate from our Christian-Democratic friends, because I do not doubt that half of these people here have been across on a fact-finding mission and know exactly what the situation is. They talk of tens of thousands, loose terminology like that; that really does not mean anything. We have had no request from the Cuban Government for any help . . .

(Loud laughter from the European Democratic Group)

or from any other government in that area for any help. This Parliament continually refuses to debate matters that are related to fascist regimes in other countries, yet, if anything happens in any East European country or Cuba, immediately there is a resolution down here. I would hope that we shall start debating resolutions for which we have information and facts, and people have been to find out what the situation is and not simply read it in the newspaper. I would really hope that all those people who voted against the Adams' case being debated, although, as Mr Bangemann himself said we have had evidence of the persecution of that man for years, will reconsider their priorities. I remember one of my colleagues saying, we debate everything, everywhere, except what is happening in our own Community. There are a number of things wrong in this Community and time after time we are not prepared to debate them; yet in the case of any country outside the Community, and especially if it is a Socialist country, this Parliament immediately, wants a debate.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* Mr President, I find myself in an embarrassing position. I wanted to speak in favour of the motion for a resolution, but everything the previous speaker said supports the motion and the request for an urgent debate. I ought really therefore to speak against it now. But as I do not want to do that, I endorse what the previous speaker said.

(Laughter)

President. — I put the request to the vote.

The adoption of urgent procedure is agreed.

I propose that this item be put on Friday's agenda.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure in respect of the motion for a resolution by Mrs Pruvot and others on the *political prisoners in Guinea* (Doc. 1-86/80).

I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — *(NL)* Mr President, I oppose the request for an urgent debate, not because of the content of the motion, which is laudable, but because a large majority of this Parliament constantly rejects urgent debates when the subject is the violation of human rights and political prisoners in our Community. If we discuss Guinea, we must also discuss, for example, the prisoners in Northern Ireland and the trial of autonomists which will be taking place in France this week.

President. — I call Mrs Pruvot.

Mrs Pruvot. — *(F)* Mr President, I should like first of all to tell Mr Coppieters that I agree with him absolutely and to assure him that I, too, have all of the prisoners very much in mind.

With this motion for a resolution we are not seeking to intervene in the national affairs of a signatory state of the Lomé Convention. The purpose of the motion is to draw the attention of European public opinion and the Community authorities to the tragic situation and state of uncertainty of the European wives of political prisoners still being held in Guinean gaols. There are more than ten wives whose husbands have been held for seven, eight, ten years — perhaps even longer. Most of these women had been expelled from Guinea and the children of several of them kept back as hostages. In spite of all their efforts through various European organizations and prominent personalities they have been quite unable to obtain any news at all, directly or indirectly. The stubborn refusal of the local authorities to even talk about them and reports from recently released detainees give just cause for the gravest anxiety over their fate.

On the eve of his visit to the United States, President Sékou Touré made a gesture of clemency by freeing Archbishop Tchidimbo of Conacry and several other

Pruvot

detainees. Other *démarches* concerning prisoners of European or dual nationality also bore fruit, as the last of these was freed in January 1980. Unfortunately, we are still without news about a final category of political prisoners, those married to European women. I believe — and this is the motive behind my request for urgency — that if we can take prompt action now we should be able this time to achieve some positive results. The forthcoming official visit to Europe by President Sékou Touré is undoubtedly the last chance we shall have to put an end not only to the anxiety and terrible uncertainty of these families but also to the serious legal, financial and social injustices brought about by the lack of any official information. That is why we are calling for an urgent debate. We hope in this way to give support to the Council of Ministers which will enable it to obtain precise information on the fate of these prisoners, and perhaps secure their release.

President. — I put the request to the vote.

The adoption of urgent procedure is agreed.

I propose that this item be put on Friday's agenda.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure in respect of the motion for a resolution by Mr Josselin and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on *the oil slick in Brittany* (Doc. 1-87/80).

I call Mr Calvez.

Mr Calvez. — (F) Mr President, it will come as no surprise to you that I, as a Breton, endorse the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Glinne and Mr Josselin, especially as I, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, have already forwarded to the Commission a question in the same vein as that of the Socialist Group. In fact, since nearly all of the 500 million tonnes of oil passing off the coast of Brittany is destined for discharge at European ports it seems only fair and consistent with the idea of Community solidarity that the Community should share the cost of monitoring and prevention of oil pollution off the coast of Brittany, which is a present being borne entirely by France. For this reason our group supports the request for urgent debate.

President. — I call Mrs Le Roux.

Mrs Le Roux. — (F) Mr President, during the last part-session I tabled a motion for a resolution on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group calling in particular for financial aid for Brittany, which has once again been hit by an oil slick. We are therefore all the more strongly persuaded to vote in favour of this request for urgency. The Tanio has spilled onto our shores an oil whose characteristics constitute a potentially even greater threat, ecologically and economically, than any previous oil slick. Moreover, the effects of this slick are compounding the effects of the Amoco Cadiz disaster, which occurred exactly three years ago. The losses suffered by the Breton people have been considerable. Brittany must have help now. It is therefore vital that we have an urgent debate to decide what aid the European Community could provide.

President. — I put the request to the vote.

The adoption of urgent procedure is agreed.

I propose that this item be put on Friday's agenda.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

5. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received from Mr Scott-Hopkins and others, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, a motion for a resolution, with request for urgent procedure, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on *the plight of the Americans held captive in Teheran* (Doc. 1-89/80).

The reasons supporting the request are contained in the document itself.

I shall consult Parliament on this request for urgent procedure at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

6. Welcome

President. — I should like to welcome to the official gallery of the European Parliament the delegation of the House of Assembly of Gibraltar, led by Sir Joshua Hassan, the Chief Minister, and Mr Pete Isola.

I wish you a very interesting stay and I hope that the contacts between you and us will be most rewarding. Thank you very much for coming here.

(Applause)

7. *Food aid to Cambodia* (continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the report (Doc. 1-734/79) by Mr Wawrzik on food aid to Cambodia.

I call Mrs Baduel Glorioso.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — (I) Mr President, we were unfortunately unable to conclude this debate last night but in one sense this was lucky because it gave me the chance to read an important article in the penultimate issue of *'Le Nouvel Observateur'*, which I commend to you all, on the refugee racket in Kampuchea.

However, let me preface my remarks by saying that, overall, we approve the Wawrzik report, although we have tabled three amendments to bring the resolution closer into line with our own thinking. On behalf of the Italian members of the Communist and Allies Group I wish to point out that, far from arguing against, we have always insisted on the need for rich Europe to distribute as much food aid as possible, and certainly more than in the past, to all who need it: to refugees and to all the people that have suffered hardship as a result of wars or natural disasters. But we do need to have some guarantees concerning the distribution of our food aid. And as regards the refugee camps along the Thai frontier with Kampuchea, the value of such guarantees has been seriously called into question by René Backman in his long article for *'Le Nouvel Observateur'*. No one would challenge the integrity of either the journalist or the periodical. The article speaks of racketeering, of corrupt people who are selling the rice, cereals and butteroil given by the International Red Cross, UNICEF and the Community in exchange for gold and jewellery, in exchange for women. Such reports are bound to arouse the gravest concern. I beg you to read the article for yourselves and I ask Commissioner Cheysson to give us some kind of guarantee regarding this operation, because otherwise it would be quite pointless for anyone to talk to us, in the antiseptic atmosphere of this Chamber, of increasing food, medical and other aid to the Kampuchean refugees if it is going to be used in this way. Apart from which, none of this does anything to improve the popularity of the West in the eyes of the peoples of South-East Asia. My second point is that we have never believed in express or implied political discrimination in the matter of food aid. The Commission has always assured us that political discrimination did not exist. But how else can we explain the suspension, at the end of last year, of aid set aside for Vietnam in the form of cereals, butteroil and milk powder? How else can we explain the fact that in the 1979 aid programme the 86 000 tonnes of cereals that had been intended for Vietnam are now to be distributed to other countries? By such actions we are playing the

poor off one against the other while the allocations, at least of butteroil and milk powder, are being put into store. What is this if not political discrimination?

I have listened in this House to the words of those who are committed to defending the Kampuchean people perhaps without realizing that in doing so they are subscribing to an anti-Soviet campaign that is without parallel in our times. I have also heard in this House the more moderate voice of those who can look beyond the problems and the conflict between the Soviet Union and China — in which the Western powers are also taking sides — who can look beyond these realities and are coming to understand, in a way that for Europe is morally easier to justify and politically more prudent, exactly what form our commitment should take and what our position should be.

In the strongest possible terms we call for an end to this form of discrimination in the matter of aid to Vietnam and for the resumption of deliveries of cereals, butteroil and milk powder to that country. That the European Community should use food aid as a political weapon is repugnant to us and degrading and will certainly have serious consequences not only in the sense of influencing the moral judgment that these peoples will pass on the European Community, because in the final analysis it is the West that is responsible for the destruction of their country — like it or not, that is the truth of the matter — but also because, politically, we should once again be embarking on a suicidal course.

President. — I call Mr Wawrzik.

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, I should just like to add a few remarks at the end of this debate. Firstly, I must thank all those who have spoken on behalf of political groups prepared to support this motion for a resolution. I feel that if at the end of this debate we can agree with Mrs Cassanmagnago-Cerretti that there should be less talk and more action, we should perhaps add that above all action should be taken more quickly. I should like to thank Mr Cheysson once again very warmly for the fact that the new emergency aid plan is ready and to assure him that this Parliament will be examining this plan as soon as possible and, as I see it, approving it.

On the debate itself, just one comment: yesterday a speaker on behalf of the French Communists, whose speech I did not, however, hear, saw fit to throw insults at Mr Cheysson in a provocative and evil manner before this House, insinuating that he was partly to blame for the hunger in Vietnam. Mr Cheysson and the Commission have pursued a policy in this matter which has had the approval of the large majority of this House, and Mr Cheysson had done what this Parliament called on him to do. I thank him for that, and I completely reject the malicious attacks made on him

Wawrzik

during this debate yesterday. I should like to say to him that he has my confidence, the confidence of my group and of many colleagues in this House. We will join with him in fighting hunger in the world and in helping refugees, regardless of the country from which they flee and of the country to which they flee, and — I quoted a few figures here yesterday — we will support him in this policy.

(Applause)

I should also like to express my gratitude for this debate, and I feel that we should proceed to the vote as quickly as possible.

President. — I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, may I first of all express my appreciation to the rapporteur for what he said about the Commission. Clearly, we could not take on our responsibilities in so delicate an area without Parliament's support and, in this connection, I am grateful also to the various groups that have placed their confidence in us.

Mr President, I should like to reply to a series of specific questions that have been raised. I will touch briefly on a subject that is not strictly on the agenda for today but which, because it concerns South-East Asia, is nonetheless relevant: I refer of course to the question of food aid to Vietnam. It is true that such aid was suspended last year and that the last supplies of food aid therefore arrived in Vietnam last autumn. It has not been possible to do anything more since then. I would remind this House that in the many debates in which this matter has been raised the Commission has repeatedly given assurances that it would propose resumption of food aid to Vietnam as soon as a satisfactory agreement was reached between the High Commission for Refugees and the government in Hanoi for the orderly departure of those who have sadly come to be referred to as the 'boat people'.

I regret to have to tell you that, according to the report by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, this agreement is still far from satisfactory since barely a few hundred of these 'boat people' have been able to leave the country in the orderly manner envisaged, whilst thousands are still being pushed out to sea. Then, just as we were nevertheless ready to propose the resumption of food aid, the Vietnamese authorities placed under embargo — and I am choosing my words carefully here — the Vietnamese authorities placed under embargo the food aid that had been delivered to Kampuchea. At one time we had over 100 000 tonnes of foodstuffs in storage in Kampong Som and Phnom Penh; 217 lorries, to be exact, given by the Community were lined up in front of the depots but permission was refused to enter the depots

to remove these foodstuffs and distribute them to a population that was actually starving to death! This was not the time to recommend — and I take full responsibility for it — resumption of food aid to the countries responsible for this embargo. Fortunately, as I said yesterday, some progress has now been made and we are currently holding discussions with several non-governmental organizations to decide on the terms under which food aid to Vietnam could be resumed, with distribution entrusted to governmental and non-governmental organizations on terms providing adequate guarantees.

Mr President, let us now return to the actual subject of today's debate. I should like first to take up a question put by Mrs Macchiocchi, who expressed astonishment, delighted astonishment I may say, at my report of the scale of Soviet aid to Kampuchea and the degree of cooperation that has been established within UNICEF, together with the International Red Cross, particularly as regards the despatch of personnel and supplies by the Soviet Union and its East European allies and ourselves. We know that the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc countries are presently carrying out a programme delivering 100 000 tonnes of cereals to Kampuchea. As the total food deliveries required between now and the end of the year stands at around 300 000 tonnes, theirs is therefore no mean contribution.

It is interesting to note, moreover, that the port facilities at Kampong Som are at present only kept operational with the help of technical experts from Eastern Europe and that UNICEF and the Red Cross have quite rightly asked the Soviet Union and their allies to continue to provide this technical assistance. Lastly, let me say that the pitifully small number of medical personnel that have been allowed to enter Kampuchea — 10 doctors and 12 nurses for a country of 5 million inhabitants is really very few — are Soviet. At the present moment, therefore, we are seeing a united humanitarian effort involving Eastern Europe, the Community, the United States and the rest of the international community under the supervision of the Red Cross and UNICEF, which I for one am very pleased to see.

Mrs Macchiocchi also asked some questions relating to the way in which aid was utilized. Let me say that there are no restrictions on the use of aid provided by the Community. Right now, part of our cash aid is being used to build roads to some of the camps, to construct shelters, to provide blankets and medical supplies. There are absolutely no restrictions. The allocation of the sums we make available is left entirely to the United Nations agencies and other recognized non-governmental organizations on the spot. Neither are there any restrictions in the form of controls on distribution. And here I must account for my actions before this House and take the Commission's responsibilities entirely on my shoulders. In Thailand itself two camps have been set up in the traditional way and,

Cheysson

as I said yesterday, the conditions of distribution can be satisfactorily supervised by the High Commission for Refugees. At the frontier the situation is a great deal more fluid, with people coming and going, and with a gratifying mixture of men, both armed and unarmed.

What Mrs Baduel Glorioso has had to report about the situation in this region is unfortunately true. It has improved to the extent that there is no longer any bombing in this zone, as there was particularly in December and January. At the time the Commission was obliged to keep a very close watch on developments to forestall the resumption of military operations in the midst of these refugees. All the same, refugees living in makeshift camps, in unbelievable squalor — Mrs Macchiocchi has seen them for herself — in these makeshift camps along the frontier the refugees are living in grave and constant peril of their lives. We are pleased to be able to report therefore that the numbers of these refugees are constantly diminishing. Most of them have returned to their own country, coming back to the camps only to replenish their food stocks and then returning again to their farms and their homes. I intimated yesterday that close on 600 000 refugees are now making the return trip. This is infinitely preferable to living in these camps, which are in fact a target for brigands. What can we do? These camps are located in Kampuchea itself. The Thai army cannot therefore go in. To do so would be classed as an act of aggression. These camps are located in not very clearly defined control zones: side by side — almost — you have regions controlled by Pol Pot, others by the Khmers and still others by the Vietnamese, the three parties having between them — I was going to say a gentleman's agreement but the term is singularly inapt because as far as I am concerned there are no 'gentlemen' in this region at the present time — the three parties, then, in effect respect each others' territorial control.

So the question is, should we suspend food aid? Mr President, the Commission will not be responsible for such a decision. Every non-governmental organization, without exception, is pressing us to continue, even though we have no guarantee that all our aid is in fact getting through to the refugees. The problem is not of supplies being misappropriated by the warring parties. I have repeated on numerous occasions that there is not the least evidence to suggest that any aid at all has gone to the warring parties, in particular the Vietnamese army or the forces of Heng Samrin. On the other hand, it is highly probable that some of the aid is being diverted by brigands or by the de facto authorities in a given region. The point is this: Should we leave the rest to starve just because 5 % or 7 %, or whatever, of our aid might be diverted? The Commission will not take that responsibility.

Mr President, these few illustrations show to what extent the situation differs from one region to another. And in yesterday's debate it worried me to hear one or

two speakers bracket together the Kampuchean refugees living in organized camps in Thailand, those in the vulnerable frontier zone and the Kampuchians living, often in abject poverty, in Kampuchea itself. The conditions are entirely different from place to place. One of the committees of Parliament will shortly be receiving a visit from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Mr Poul Hartling, a man for whom I have the deepest respect, and I am pleased that he will be able to give evidence before this committee. But I must say right away, as he will confirm himself, that he is only in a position to give evidence about the camps in Thailand. For the High Commissioner for Refugees does not work in Kampuchea and indeed has never been there. It is primarily the non-governmental organizations and UNICEF that are working in Kampuchea itself and that is where conditions are sometimes the most difficult.

What I have said, this distinction between Thailand proper on the one hand and the region bordering on Kampuchea on the other, answers many of the observations made by various Members. Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, for example, wondered if it was possible to increase the numbers on the spot of personnel belonging to the international agencies and non-governmental organizations. The problem is not in finding volunteers. There is any number of people in Europe, America, Canada and Australia who are ready to go. The problem lies in obtaining permits for them to enter Kampuchea. We are having no difficulties at all with personnel in Thailand itself, or even in the frontier zone. Our difficulties are in Kampuchea and these arise not out of a shortage of available personnel but from the difficulty in obtaining the necessary permits.

At the same time, Mr President, I should like to refer, in drawing this distinction, to the proposed parliamentary mission that several speakers have mentioned — the rapporteur, Mrs Macchiocchi and Mr Purvis among others — to make an on-the-spot visit. This mission will experience no problems in Thailand, of course. And there is not the slightest doubt that this token of interest by the European Parliament in the plight of the refugees in Thailand will be welcomed. But will this mission be allowed to enter Kampuchea? Personally I am convinced that it will. The authorities in Phnom Penh are most anxious to increase their political contacts with other countries. And in this context, Mr President, perhaps I may be permitted to raise what I realize is a delicate matter: desirable as this mission is as a way of ascertaining the conditions of distribution on the spot, and of keeping up the pressure on the authorities in Phnom Penh to speed up distribution — we need to increase our distribution capacity by 40 000 tonnes per month — as I say then, desirable as this mission is for all these reasons, it would be particularly undesirable if it were to risk becoming confined to a political dialogue with the authorities in Phnom Penh. I am sure that the members of this parliamentary mission are aware of the need to avoid this, but I must confess, Mr President, that I was

Cheysson

disturbed to hear one of the speakers yesterday declare that all that was required for all these problems to be resolved was to recognize the government of Heng Samrin. I do not believe that this is the best way to safeguard the refugees or the Kampucheans in Kampuchea.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

8. *Fourth Annual Report on the ERDF*
— *Involvement of the Northern Adriatic*
in the European unification process

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

- the report (Doc. 1-789/79) drawn up by Mr Delmotte, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, on the Fourth Annual Report (1978) of the Commission of the European Communities on the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) (Doc. 1-789/79)
- the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-32/80) by Mr Cecovini on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group to the Commission.

Subject: Plan to involve the Northern Adriatic in the European unification process by using the ports of Trieste and Monfalcone

The Community is faced with two highly topical issues, namely its expansion into the eastern Mediterranean as a result of the forthcoming accession of Greece, and also the energy crisis.

The first problem means that fast transport links with the south will have to be established, and the second that this will have to be done in the most economic way, i. e. with a view to saving energy.

This must be borne in mind when considering the proposal that the natural waterway of the Adriatic Sea be used instead of the existing or planned land routes to the eastern Mediterranean, the Near and Middle East and countries beyond the Suez Canal, by constructing a modern, expanded system of direct road and rail links between Munich and the most northerly ports on the Adriatic, Trieste and Monfalcone and by developing these ports as required.

This route would be 2 400 nautical miles, i. e. 5 days' travelling time shorter than the traditional Hamburg-Suez route and would also promote the economic recovery of one of Italy's frontier areas (Friuli-Venezia-Giulia), which was hit by the closure of the San

Marco Shipyard, Fabbrica Macchine and Vetobel after the war and is now facing a serious economic and employment crisis.

As the plan would not only solve the above Community problems, but would also be welcomed by the people in the area concerned, and as the EIB has already approved a loan to the IRI (Institute for Industrial Reconstruction) totalling Lit. 27 thousand million for the construction of a 40 km section of motorway from Udine to Carnia as part of the German road link between Munich and Trieste:

1. Is the Commission prepared to recognize that the said project is of Community interest and to finance it appropriately?
2. Does the Commission intend to urge the governments concerned to participate as actively as possible in the future in financing those sections of the project within their territory?

I call Mr Delmotte.

Mr Delmotte, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, it is now mid-April 1980, and the item on the agenda is the Fourth Annual Report (1978) of the Commission of the European Communities on the European Regional Development Fund. We might be tempted to regard this report as a belated statement on the workings of one of the wheels in the Community machine, some kind of list of achievements drawn up by the authority responsible for its operation. We might also be tempted to take note of it and, imprisoned, as it were, by the framework of a regulation that is unchangeable before the expiry date of 1 January 1981, to confine ourselves to taking note of it for the discussion on the revision at a forthcoming conciliation meeting with the Council. That was not my intention or that of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, as a member of which for the last seven years I have had the honour to present a number of reports relating to the Community's regional policy.

At the beginning of this introductory statement I might be tempted to apologize for presenting a report some 66 pages in length, 10 or so devoted to the work and the opinion of the Committee on Budgetary Control, which adopted it unanimously without a single deletion. On reflection, however, and I hope this does not sound like an author's conceit, I should like to say to my colleagues that the content of this report is in line with my intention to make available to them, and more specifically those who have joined us since the elections of June 1978, various items of information, an assessment of the situation in the past which can only partly be found in the Community's records on this subject. I hope, discreetly and in all humility, that this document will be of some use to them in the future.

While Parliament was composed of appointed Members before June 1978, it protested on several occasions against the deficiencies and shortcomings of the

Delmotte

ERDF regulation, against the Council's inconsistency, against the bad faith of the governments, their anxiety to pursue a policy of *juste retour*, if not against the scandalous way in which some Member States, France in particular, derive benefit from the meagre Community endowment to grab from the sections of the population concerned laurels which ill conceal the shortcomings of their national regional policies. The example I give, Corsica, is a perfect illustration of this, and I have other examples to give the House.

The Council of Ministers adopted the regulation setting up the European Regional Development Fund on 18 March 1975, 15 months after the date set by the Heads of State or Government at their meeting in Paris in October 1972. The regulation adopted by the Council differs appreciably from the Commission's proposals. It introduced national quotas in place of the list of priority regions drawn up on the basis of Community criteria. In its resolution of 12 March 1975 the European Parliament expressed reservations about the Council's proposals. In particular it felt that Community aid should be additional to national aid. This accorded with the principle of complementarity frequently defended in this Chamber by the whole of Parliament. It also called for a broad interpretation of the notion for infrastructure and felt that proper results could only be obtained by launching genuine regional development programmes. Such programmes only became compulsory on 1 January 1978, the year to which the Commission's report relates, and we know that their content is unsatisfactory. In its conclusions at that time, Parliament noted that the provisions proposed were based on diverse national policies and still only amounted to a policy of simply assisting national regional policies.

These among other examples of inadequacy show that the fund can be no more satisfactory than the provisions of the basic regulation were themselves. The European Parliament refrained in 1975 from proposing any amendments to the proposal for a regulation setting up the fund, but only on condition that its recommendations were taken into account when the basic regulation was re-examined. Article 18 of the regulation lays down that the Council, on a proposal from the Commission, must re-examine the regulation 'before 1 January 1978'. The Council did not observe the deadline for the revision of the regulation. In 1978 the Regional Fund operated on the basis of an unrevised regulation. This revision was not effected, owing to the usual procrastination, until 6 February 1979, a delay of more than one year, as was the case when the fund was established in 1975, so history was simply repeating itself. The activities of the Regional Fund in 1978 were therefore subject to the provisions of the old regulation, as adopted in 1975, which the old Parliament had always criticized as seriously deficient.

The operation of the Regional Fund in the years 1975 to 1978 could not therefore have been satisfactory. Parliament in fact had an opportunity to criticize its

operation, when discussing the reports on its activities in the years 1975, 1976 and 1977.

Parliament's opinion on the Fourth Report on the activities of the ERDF at last gives us an opportunity to recall all the criticisms of which the Council must take account when next revising the Regional Fund regulation, which it must do before 1 January 1981. What I should say is that Parliament will be pointing out in fact that the revision made on 6 February 1979 falls well short of what Parliament considered necessary. Article 2 (2) of the basic regulation lays down that when re-examining the regulation, which it was to have done before 1 January 1978, the Commission must make, and I quote 'the appropriate proposals for the Community's regional policy and for aid from the fund during the subsequent period'.

The regulation therefore makes a very significant distinction between, on the one hand, the Community's regional policy, and, on the other, aid from the ERDF, which is no more than one of the instruments of that policy. In accordance with the European Parliament's recommendations, the Commission submitted to the Council on 3 June 1977 a communication concerning guidelines for Community regional policy and including a proposal for the amendment of the regulation establishing the Regional Fund. That proposal provided in particular for the creation of a non-quota section. On 13 October 1977 Parliament noted that the Commission had very largely taken account of these proposals, and I congratulate it on having so done.

The Commission must therefore put forward some time this year proposals for the new revision of the Regional Fund. The object of the report now before the House was to recall the criticisms expressed by Parliament regarding the regulation on the operation of the fund and to recall its proposals on them. In its proposals the Commission must take account of the concern of this Assembly, and an examination of the fund's activities in the past will allow certain conclusions to be drawn on how its operation can be improved. That essentially is what I wanted to say in the report I have presented. Mr President, I should have liked to say a little more, but as time is short, I will conclude by calling on the Commission to take account in its proposals of the requests Parliament has reiterated. Parliament must keep a close watch to ensure this has been done when it comes later this year to discussing the Commission's proposals to the Council on the revision of the regulation establishing the ERDF.

President. — I call Mr Cecovini.

Mr Cecovini. — (I) Madam President, at the time that I, with some skilled colleagues, was preparing the plan to which the question we are now debating refers,

Cecovini

the EEC — Yugoslavia agreement had not yet been finalized. The plan was therefore produced for other — and quite definitely separate and sufficient — reasons which may be summed up briefly as two points of predominantly Community interest and a third, also highly important, of regional interest.

The first problem that the plan tackles and endeavours to solve, in a manner that will bring great benefits to the Community, is to provide Europe with a rapid and direct route to the South which has become absolutely necessary and can no longer be postponed in view of the expansion of the Community into the Eastern Mediterranean.

The second problem that it endeavours to solve, directly related to the present grave energy crisis, is the provision of as economic as possible a route to the South, in other words one permitting maximum energy conservation.

The plan which the Liberal and Democratic Group wants adopted as a Community project is a linked-up system of direct and short road and rail communications between Munich in Bavaria and the ports of Trieste and Monfalcone, the northern-most ports of the Adriatic and in this case proposed as the gateway between land and sea routes on the way to the Eastern Mediterranean, the Near and Far East and the countries beyond Suez, consisting for the most part in the natural waterway, already there and available, of the Adriatic Sea.

The choice of this combined land and sea route should not, however, be seen as an alternative to the land — only links that already exist to some extent but for the most part are still on the drawingboard; the construction and maintenance of those — let it be said in passing — are far more costly than those of this land-sea route, another advantage of the latter being its freedom from all the obstacles associated with crossing the frontiers of countries that are not in the European Community.

In other words the Adriatic waterway is not being put forward in opposition to the all-land route but as a complementary alternative to the latter of which no-one can deny the economic and strategic relevance.

Europe has imperative need of a North-South transalpine route and the existing Austrian network or even that country's new plans are not sufficient for this purpose; in the last ten years freight traffic transiting through Austrian territory has increased by a factor of 24.

Though it does not belong to the Community, Austria nevertheless lies at the very heart of Europe and already carries twice as much transit traffic as Switzerland. Italy, Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey put together and this is likely to increase still further, for one thing because of Greece's forthcoming accession

to the European Community — and this in a country where the roads are already congested.

Ways of relieving the situation must therefore be found. Greece, with the biggest fleet in the Mediterranean, needs to be offered sea routes. Our plans does exactly that, offering the Adriatic route to supplement and relieve the land routes.

As far as Austria is concerned, if financial support was obtained from the Community for its North-West-South-East artery, that country would not fail to confirm its readiness to bore the Monte Croce Carnico tunnel, which would be a vital part of the land-sea route proposed. Italy in its turn would certainly be more convinced and have greater interest in supporting, in the Community, the other requests and various requirements of its neighbour Austria, including the financing of the Passau-Spiefeld motorway.

Another point is that, compared with the traditional sea route in use today for freight from Central Europe to destinations in the Eastern Mediterranean and Suez and vice versa, the Adriatic route would shorten the journey by 2 400 nautical miles, i. e. 5 days' travelling time, and no-one can ignore the fact that, given the present energy crisis, devices such as preferential rail tariffs and concessionary sea freight are not sufficient to outweigh the big difference in distance, because it is the physical shortening of distance that brings savings in energy, the prevailing and essential objective of European policy today and for the immediate future.

On top of these two reasons of specifically Community interest and for which the plan can rightly be claimed to be European, there is one of a regional nature. In the final land part of the route, the plan concerns the full spread of the Friuli-Venezia Giulia Italian frontier area which would be crossed from North to South by the proposed road and rail route (already partly constructed), and it obviously implies the use of the integrated ports of Trieste and Monfalcone as the interface between sea and road routes. In this way it is a perfect example of Community action for the benefit of a frontier, peripheral area. From there, the sea route skirts Italy along the whole Adriatic coast. The marginal position in which the Friuli-Venezia-Giulia area, and Trieste its capital in particular, is situated, has already had the most severe economic, social and demographic effects. The unemployment rate in this area is higher than the Italian national average. There are 53 000 people looking for work and this in spite of the high rate of migration to richer European countries and even to countries outside Europe like Australia and Canada.

The big San Marco shipyard in Trieste and the famous Fabbrica Macchine, which used to build big marine turbine engines, have closed down together with Vetobel and a whole series of small and medium satellite firms.

Cecovini

Unique in Italy, the city of Trieste is in a state of steady and now worrying demographic decline. The ratio between births and deaths is now 1:3, the average age is 43 and the percentage of retired people is higher than in the rest of the country.

Nevertheless the Trieste area and its port could well come back to life if a major European artery were to feed it with the life blood of new traffic, new work, new hope and faith. Among other things, this port of Trieste is equipped for the functions it is hoped to perform.

Already, 90 % of the traffic handled, with the help of a workforce of engineers, shipping and forwarding agents and specialists of all kinds — already available because of the city's long tradition as a trade centre in the service of Central Europe — has neither its point of origin or destination in Italy.

Lastly, then, the project which meets all the criteria of Community and regional policy would be looked upon with the greatest favour by the populations concerned.

Its implementation would obviously call for contributions, along with Community aid, from the countries concerned — Italy, Germany and Austria. Italy is already providing funds through the Istituto per la Ricostruzione Industriale and the loans of lire 27 billion raised with the EIB, used to build 40 km of the Udine-Stazione motorway via Carnia which is the central section of the through route from Munich to Trieste in Italian territory. The Southern part, already in use, connects up, not only with the ports of Trieste and Monfalcone, but also with the port of Venice in the West and neighbouring Yugoslavia to the East. All that is left is to build the Stazione motorway via Carnia — Monte Croce Carnico and the Tunnel I have already referred to.

The project does not stop at the motorway but includes two alternative rail routes, one being straight through and completely new, shortening the distance between Munich and Trieste by 150 km and reducing travelling time to six hours for goods and four for passengers, and the other, straightening out the route already in use and shortening the distance by 72 km, reducing travelling time to 7 hours for freight and 5 hours for passengers.

I would like to add that, though an outline plan, it does include a rough estimate of costs and time necessary for design and implementation and an indication of the organisations on the Italian side to whom the work might possibly be entrusted. For the rail part of the plan it is suggested that a 'Gruppo d'asse Adriatico-Baviera' be set up, on the model of the Brennero, Tauri and Adriatico-Vienna groups that already exist.

I would like to end by drawing Members' attention again to the new factor — the EEC-Yugoslavia agree-

ment — which to my mind makes the adoption of the plan by the Community institutions not only useful and timely but a matter of bounden duty.

It is a fundamental rule of the Community that its action on behalf of third countries should not have harmful effects on any of its own frontier areas and this would be precisely the case with the EEC-Yugoslavia agreement and its effect on the Friuli-Venezia-Giulia area which would be completely bypassed and sealed off from any European traffic by the new Europe-Greece route, unless Europe itself takes its own remedial action, offsetting by appropriate measures the harm that would otherwise be inevitable.

Let there be no doubt that Italy, the Friuli-Venezia-Giulia area, and the Italian and European city of Trieste accept and approve without reserve the EEC-Yugoslavia agreement, being fully aware that Yugoslavia, as an outpost of the West, must be helped and sustained. But this 'European' attitude should not and cannot justify harm that can and should be avoided.

This, Mr President, is what the Liberal and Democratic Group wishes to ask Parliament with the motion for a resolution that will be tabled at the end of the debate.

President. — I call Mr Burke.

Mr Burke, — Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I shall confine myself in this reply to that part of the discussion which arises from Mr Cecovini's question.

In its memorandum on the Community's role in the development of transport infrastructures, the Commission gave particular attention to transport links which would permit more effective integration of new Member States into the Community. Among the transport links which merit particular attention in this regard, it mentioned land and sea links with Greece. The construction of better road and rail links with the Adriatic ports could, without doubt, contribute to the solution of transport problems arising in the framework of the Community's trade relations both with Greece and the countries of the Middle East. There can be no doubt of the Community's interest in such projects.

As the honourable Member points out, the Community has certain means of assisting such projects. Mention should also be made of the proposal for a regulation concerning support for transport infrastructure projects of Community interest. This proposal, which is currently being examined by the Council, provides for the granting of loans, loan guarantees, interest subsidies and grants for the construction of projects of Community interest. Under Article 4 of this proposal the initiative in seeking Community aid lies with the

Burke

Member State on the territory of which the project is to be carried out.

The Commission clearly cannot anticipate the result of the examination of any given project under the procedure provided for. The decision instituting a consultation procedure and setting up an infrastructure committee provides that projects of Community interest be notified to the Commission. At its own request or at that of a Member State, the Commission consults the Member States on the projects in question. This procedure provides the Member States and the Commission with an opportunity to express their points of view. Up to now no project connected with the link referred to by the honourable Member has been notified on the basis of this decision.

President. — I call Mr Griffiths to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Griffiths. — Mr President, I would first like to pay tribute to Mr Delmotte for the thorough review he made in his report of the 1978 Report of the Commission on the European Regional Development Fund and also to point out that for new members like myself he added an excellent historical perspective. In that perspective it soon became clear that year by year the problems of the Regional Development Fund are the same, problems of lack of funds, difficulties in establishing the non-quota sector and the continuing difficulties with that sector, the problem of establishing real additionality on Community spending in the regions, the question of effective control of and publicity for Community operations in the region and the difficulties in trying to achieve local and regional involvement in the operation of the Regional Development Fund.

Another problem which is high on the list year by year is that of the great disparity between the words uttered by the Council and its action at the time of the budget. As long ago as 1972 the Council of Ministers promised to give a high priority to regional problems and to reducing the disparities in wealth between the different regions of the Community. However, we have seen that these regional disparities continue to increase. The gap between the rich and the poor gets greater instead of smaller, and with the imminent enlargement of the Community this problem will get even worse.

Now, in referring to the difficulties over the size of the Fund I would not wish to mislead the House into thinking that merely by increasing the amount of money available for the Regional Fund we will thereby overcome the problems of the regions. It seems to me there is within the Community an inherent paradox between the free movement of capital and the attempt to direct capital to the regions. In looking therefore at the whole problem of trying to evolve a common

regional policy, we must ask the Commission whether it does not think that there is a conflict between the operation of the ideal enshrined in the Treaty of Rome, i.e. free movement of capital, and the attempt to divert this capital, to encourage this capital to go to the regions. We must ask the Commission whether there is not a conflict between its industrial and competition policies and what it is trying to do by encouraging the establishment of industry in the regions. We must ask the Commission whether it believes that the regional initiatives at present being undertaken, whether in agriculture, transport, social affairs, energy or the environment sector, can be properly coordinated to make sure that help for the regions is maximized.

Then, when we look at the report, we see reference again to this problem of additionality. Now I know that in the United Kingdom successive governments have taken what can only be described as a relaxed or even a complacent view about making sure that there is real additionality. Although the report says that some attempt is being made to respect this principle, I can only say that, by and large, most governments do not make much effort to see that additionality is observed, and I would suggest the Commission must now really take steps to ensure that we do get real additionality.

We need also to look at the questions of publicity and control. I think the two go hand-in-hand, because if governments give adequate publicity to the way in which money is spent from the Regional Fund in their areas, then we can also get better help in respect of control. One example stands out, in the report, of lack of control which must also be due to a lack of publicity. The report tells us that in Corsica, where a considerable amount of money is spent from the Community's Regional Fund, the local and regional authorities did not have any idea about what the money was being spent on. I would like to point out that there is a great need to draw in the regions and the local authorities so that there can be effective control and effective publicity of the Regional Fund.

President. — I call Mr Pöttering to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD-group).

Mr Pöttering. — (D) Mr President, we are discussing today an aspect of European policy which we hope will become one of the most important aspects of European policy in the foreseeable future, which is why my group, the Group of the European People's Party, would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Delmotte, very sincerely for his work. A word of thanks also goes to the Commission, represented here today by Mr Giolitti. My group would like to see so large a measure of agreement in this Parliament on all areas of European policy as there is on regional policy.

Pöttering

Allow me to recall the following principle: the regional policy concerns a genuinely human aspect of European policy because it sets out to create jobs where people were born and where they live, and this must continue to be the focal point of any European regional policy. We see our efforts to use the regional policy to create an infrastructure and to establish small and medium-sized undertakings in the structurally weak areas as a means of helping people to help themselves, as an incentive for the people concerned.

Mr Delmotte referred to the financial limits. In 1978 about 581m EUA was available in commitment appropriations. When we look at the major tasks facing the European regional policy, this is undoubtedly a small amount, which must be increased in the future if we are to solve the problems. But an increase in resources is justifiable only if we create the necessary controls over their use, in other words if the Commission and this Parliament succeed in carrying out the necessary investigations, on the spot and elsewhere, into where the money has gone. It is completely unacceptable — and the rapporteur, Mr Delmotte, kindly pointed this out — that the Commission should not be permitted in one Member State to conduct the necessary investigations and that the attempt should be made to use European resources on a purely national basis. My group feels that if a Member State refuses to make the necessary on-the-spot checks, no resources should be made available to that Member State of the Community in future while it refuses such checks.

(Applause)

The European regional policy also represents an opportunity to demonstrate Europe's identity as a Community.

That is why we expect the necessary public relations work to be done, so that the people of Europe know that European Community money is being made available, to show the people who need our support that they are actually getting this support from Europe. This again means that Europe must show itself as a Community in actual projects, and that means aid granted from the European Regional Fund must go to those concerned and not flow back into the national budgets, where it is offset against national resources. No, European resources must go to those concerned so that they personally experience what Europe is.

One further comment on the question of controls. Although controls over the utilization of resources are needed, we would ask the Commission to do everything in its power to ensure that we keep the process of bureaucratization and red-tape down to a very limited level, because the people do not sympathize when they see the European Community only in terms of the flood of paper to which it gives rise. Unfortunately, in my country at least, the European Community is frequently seen in these terms. We should play

our part in restricting this bureaucratization as far as possible.

A word about the future: Portugal, Spain and Greece will soon be members of the Community, adding 56 million to its population. Two-thirds of these people have a standard of living at the level of the poorest regions of the Community. We feel that, after we have welcomed these three nations into our Community, we should also show our solidarity in future by increasing regional policy resources. We must tell the Council that this is possible only if the Community's revenue is raised to a level at which we can meet requirements and that this should not be done by placing a greater burden on the citizens of Europe but by transferring more tasks from national to European level, so that more resources are available to the European budget. When showing solidarity with the weaker regions of the Community, I would call on the Members of this Parliament not to forget that in the wealthier countries also there are structurally weak regions in which many jobs need to be created because of a fast growing population. It would be befitting for Europe not to overlook these regions in the 'wealthy' countries.

A brief comment on Britain's budgetary problems. My group welcomes the fact that possible compensation is being discussed in the context of Britain's contribution to the budget, that funds are being made available to Britain for structural measures and regional policy projects. My group and I consider this an excellent move, and I also feel that there should be no pettiness in this respect. But I would also call on our British colleagues to give a sign that will make it possible for a really satisfactory solution to be found — a sign that Britain is in favour of the Community, so that we can adopt a joint position in these matters.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Harris to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Harris. — Mr President, anyone reading this excellent report by Mr Delmotte could be forgiven for wondering whether there is such a thing as a Community regional policy. We have heard already this morning about some of the difficulties. Member States apply completely different criteria when submitting applications to the Regional Development Fund. We have heard a lot about breaches of the principle of additionality; I have to say that my own country has been in the forefront in breaching this principle and I say that with regret.

But the Community policy is important, and I think the role of this Parliament is to champion that policy. Indeed, some member nations rather tend to look upon the fund as nothing more than a means of correcting financial differences. I am very grateful for the

Harris

remarks made by Mr Pöttering, in which he says that he believes the fund can be used to help overcome the particular problem which Britain faces with its budget. I agree with him. But I think the fund and the regional policy of the Community must be much more than just that.

Partly because of the election to this House, the regions with high unemployment are looking to Brussels for help in building up stronger economies in their areas. This, I believe, presents us with a challenge and it is my personal opinion that we should move fairly quickly to a position in which the regions have direct access to Brussels, have stronger links with Brussels, make their applications to Brussels rather than having to go through national governments. Of course national governments must retain some say in the way in which the money is spent and perhaps they can have a veto, but I do not think that we shall have a really meaningful Community policy in this field until the links with the regions are much stronger than they are at the moment.

Reference has been made to some of the disgraces which have occurred already in the operation of the fund. Mr Griffiths referred to the position in Corsica, and Mr Delmotte said that there are other examples which he could make available to the House. I do not want to pick on just one country, but I really do think that it is a scandal that one country — and I am sorry to say that it is France — has absolutely refused to allow the Commission's inspectors in to see how the money is being spent in the industrial sector. This cannot go on and I would ask, or rather demand, from the Commissioner who is here today an up-to-date report on what is happening in this respect; because if France does persist in this attitude, then really we must not go on paying money if we have no means of assessing whether that money is being used in accordance with the principles of the fund.

Mr President, I am sorry if my brief remarks in this debate have been on the difficulties of the fund. I personally believe in a Community regional policy and I look to this Parliament to champion, as it has done in the past, the need for a regional policy to improve the operation of the fund, so that in future our report to this House will be just as full as the one presented by Mr Delmotte but will tell a story which shows that we are succeeding in the object which those of us in this Chamber today hold dear.

President. — I call Mr Gouthier to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Gouthier. — (*I*) Mr President, I shall be speaking both on Mr Delmotte's report and on the problems of Trieste and Friuli-Venezia Giulia.

On the former subject I wish to make two points. We fully agree with the report, and with the information and suggestions it contains, but we feel we have to raise two policy developments that, in our view, are crucial. What emerges from the work of Parliament, which, so far this year has been tackling mainly budgetary problems and has recently dealt with the problems of agricultural prices? More generally, what do we see emerging as the Committee on Regional Policy and Parliament, with progressively greater authority and incisiveness, tackle complex matters such as transport problems and problems relating to specific areas in our continent like Friuli-Venezia Giulia? To my mind an important policy trend is emerging in broad sectors of Parliament — as we see happening today. Not only is there appreciation of the great value of this fund as an instrument of action but also, and this is the political fact, there is increasing awareness in various political groupings — democratic political groupings — that regional policy from now on is increasingly to be viewed in close association with the Community's general policy orientations. Why does this basic question arise with such urgency? The answer is that we are witnessing a grave development which is that, inside the Community and contrary to what was provided for and sanctioned by the Treaties, the disparities and imbalances, far from diminishing, are spreading and worsening even to the point of interfering with the Community's very capacity to operate. This is why the problem of regional policy has to be related to this basic requirement. This is why, as things stand and given the mechanism available to us and the extremely limited resources as regards the welcome non-quota system, we cannot hope to do anything about this worsening in the disparities and the economic and social tensions within the Community purely with this instrument, with the Social Fund or with the EAGGF Guidance section. This is why, therefore, the problem has to be seen in broader and more comprehensive terms.

Having approached the question from the standpoint of practical application, I find I have to stress one thing with particular reference to Italy. Compared with commitments, the percentage of payments from the Regional Fund by the end of 1979 was, on average, very low and this was the fault of our country and therefore of the government and of the Cassa del Mezzogiorno, which were responsible, as we know, for allocating these resources. These problems need to be seen against this background.

Moving on to the question of Trieste and Friuli, we have always considered with care, and without any preconceived ideas or prejudices, the proposals produced by other political parties and we therefore have given careful consideration to Mr Cecovini's proposal as well. After a careful analysis, however, we feel we can say that our conclusions set out in the motion for a resolution, that we, together with our Socialist colleagues, have tabled, not only seem to us to be more complete but they also appear to us to be more feasible

Gauthier

and more realistic — and I say this above all in the light of the statements made a few moments ago by Mr Burke. Why? Clearly, our starting point is a positive assessment of the EEC-Yugoslavia agreement which certainly raises problems for Trieste and Friuli-Venezia Giulia but also opens up broad perspectives and new opportunities. We know that if use is made of these prospects and these opportunities not only will it be possible to prevent any further decline and marginalization of Trieste and similarly placed regions but the role of this city and area as a bridge with Eastern Europe, from the economic, political and commercial standpoints, can be strengthened. We are aware of the need to assess these problems in the light of the big projects under way in the European setting — EIB financing for the trans-Yugoslavia route, in substance provided for in the EEC-Yugoslavia treaty, and the opening of the Rhine-Danube link in five or six years' time.

Coming now to practicalities, our specific proposals are basically four in number. The first concerns the urgent need to define a system of road and rail infrastructures to provide more rational and rapid links between the areas of Central Europe and the sea ports of the Northern Adriatic and in particular Trieste, Monfalcone and Venice. Here we are working on solid ground, knowing that the Chamber of Deputies, the special commission on Friuli-Venezia Giulia and the Committee on Transport have identified the specific items that concern Trieste and this area — the boring of the Monte Croce Carnico tunnel, the doubling of the track and the improvement of the Pontebbana line, the completion of the Udine-Tarvisio-Coccau motorway and the widening and improvement of highway No 13 to eliminate the serious bottlenecks affecting it today. In particular, as regards Trieste and in the light of what Mr Burke has just said, it seems to us that the most practical line to follow is to apply pressure for action in two directions. The Commissioner confirmed that the Commission has a proposal for a regulation now under study by the Council on support for transport infrastructure projects of Community interest. We are therefore, as a first point and as set out in a motion for a resolution tabled by our group on this subject, asking the Council to approve these proposals for a regulation on support for transport infrastructure projects of Community interest. Secondly, as widely discussed at the joint meeting of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning and the Committee on Transport, we want ports to be included among the infrastructures eligible for Community finance. In the Commission's recent memorandum, too, the special importance to be attached to the development of ports is stressed. Here therefore, close at hand, is a direct, concrete and positive lever that can be used at the European level to get the Italian government doing something about having these Adriatic ports and in particular those of the Northern Adriatic included in the infrastructures qualifying for Community finance in the general framework of aid for ports. In our view these initiatives

should be given special attention. In the third place we feel that it is necessary — in the framework of the application of the EEC-Yugoslavia agreements and the trans-Yugoslavia highway project — to have a high-speed through link not only between North and South but also between East and West, so that Trieste and Gorizia — because the problem concerns these two centres in particular — can have the necessary links with Fiume and Ljubljana. Fourthly, we hope that, in the light of these initiatives and these possibilities for practical and early intervention, the Commission will put forward a programme of action based on co-ordinated control of the Community's financial instruments.

These, we feel, are the points on which concrete and realistic action can be taken, bringing in the whole spectrum of available instruments. It seems to us that Mr Cecovini's plan, which rightly refers to the general requirement that use be made of the Northern Adriatic and its port infrastructures, is wholly legitimate and acceptable. In our view, however, I repeat, our proposals and the fact that they are based not on the main or almost exclusive use of the Regional Development Fund but on a wider spectrum of mechanisms, are more realistic and more capable of producing quickly the positive results we are seeking in correction with our general policy of co-operative relations with Austria and Yugoslavia, two countries which, through the neutrality of the one and the non-alignment of the other, perform an exceptionally positive role in the present situation of grave international tension. We hope that these measures at the political, economic and social level will help to provide solutions to the problems I have referred to.

President. — I call Mr Irmer to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Irmer. — (D) Mr President, my group has taken on board the proposals by Mr Cecovini because we take the view that this plan could prove to be a model for rational and constructive Community policy. In the first place it is a regional policy measure, since it proposes support for the regional structure of Friuli and Giulia-Venezia and would create jobs. But at the same time — and in this we regard the plan as exemplary — it is a measure that would embrace other sectors of Community policy.

Firstly, energy policy. Mr Cecovini has already pointed out that considerable energy savings could be made by implementing this plan. Secondly there is the linking of the Member, Greece, with the Community and thirdly, and lastly, there are the relations with our neighbours Austria and Yugoslavia. I would also stress, as a representative of Bavaria, that I look for advantages for the Bavarian economy in the implementation of this plan. In addition, it is urgently necessary — not least for holiday traffic reasons — to take

Irmer

some of the pressure off the Brenner route which is the only reliable link we have today between Munich and Northern Italy. In our opinion, therefore, this plan should be carefully scrutinized even though it is not possible to say today whether it can be carried out in every detail in the form in which it is now proposed.

My last point is environmental acceptability. Various alternative corridors have been discussed. It seems to us that the proposed route offers the least risk of endangering the Alpine environment.

One further comment on regional policy in general. The non-quota section of the Regional Fund unfortunately comes to only 5 % — 5 % of a Regional Fund which is too meagre so start with. This makes it that much more difficult to understand, and that much more scandalous, that even this small amount of 5 % is blocked because one government, one Member-State, refuses to allocate these 5 % by Community criteria. This we just cannot understand. What is the logic of governments agreeing together to distribute 5 % solely on the basis of Community criteria if one government then makes certain that the principle cannot be applied in practice. To my mind it is particularly provocative that the government concerned is precisely the one that otherwise loudly complains that its own contribution to the Community budget is too high. I feel that these complaints by the government concerned would receive more understanding and sympathy if it were ready to lift this blockade and make an effort to ensure that the disadvantaged regions of the Community could be helped on the basis of Community criteria.

President — I call Mr Cronin to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Cronin. — Mr President, I too would like to thank Mr Delmotte for the very thorough approach he has adopted in presenting his report on the Commission's fourth annual report on the European Regional Development Fund. The motion for a resolution contains no fewer than 65 paragraphs, and consequently I would like to concentrate on the facts that I believe to be the most important.

The period we are dealing with is a period of lost opportunities, in which the Community failed to live up to the high ideals of the 1972 Paris summit. The Heads of State and Government meeting in Paris recommended that a high priority be given to the aim of correcting in the Community structural and regional imbalances which might affect the achievement of economic and monetary union. They invited the Community institutions to establish a regional development fund, which was to be ready to operate by the end of 1973. The Community failed to introduce the fund in 1973 and 1974. By the time it was

implemented in 1975, it had become a watered-down document of compromise at the lowest level. As a result of the delay in adopting the regulation, inflationary economic forces dealt a further serious blow to its effectiveness. Instead of creating a valuable fund which would correct structural and regional imbalances, it merely made a nominal and insignificant contribution to the problem. The sums allocated to the Regional Fund are so meagre and so un-attractive that projects which would normally be submitted for inclusion to benefit under a fund such as this are not being put forward. These projects would make a major improvement in industrial and infrastructural development in the less well-off regions: this fact is borne out by the ever-widening disparities between regions under the present fund.

Before 1 January 1981, the Council is due to take particular account of Parliament's point of view in its review of the regulation establishing the ERDF. I would like to support the rapporteur in urging the Council to recognize the limits imposed by the operation of the original fund, and take the necessary remedial steps when next reviewing the fund. Failure to do so could lead to disintegration of the Community.

One of the central issues of the debate is the level of national quotas. In our EPD election programme we stated that the system of allocating the fund's appropriations according to national quotas should be revised, since it has increased disparities and wastefulness. Aid should be concentrated in the most needy regions. Nothing has happened to alter our view in this respect. The motion for a resolution points out the need to draw up a list of regions eligible for aid from the fund, based on a comparatively low *per capita* product, a high percentage of workers engaged in agriculture or in a declining industrial sector, structural underemployment, a consistently high unemployment rate and high emigration figures. Ireland is more than qualified for increased aid under all the above criteria.

If we are to reduce existing economic disparities, then these points must be seriously considered by the Council when reviewing national quotas. Furthermore, a real and larger regional fund must be additional to national expenditure and must be used, as is necessary under the present system, as partial repayment for national aid to industrial projects.

Commission proposals that the percentage for the non-quota section of the fund should amount to 13 % have been more than halved by the Council. The Ministers are for 5 %, which greatly limits the use of the fund.

The fund fails to live up to the expectations of achieving regional, social and economic convergence. I would ask the Council to recall the conclusions of the Presidency in Dublin last November. On the subject of convergence and budgetary questions the European Council reaffirmed that 'steps must be taken to streng-

Cronin

then the economic potential of the less prosperous countries of the Community'.

By reducing the non-quota section, we are limiting the fund's effectiveness in areas where a large quota is most badly needed — for example, the border areas between the North and South of Ireland. Further delays deny the potential value of the proposed aids for initiative, aimed at allowing communities to help themselves. I have no doubt that communities on both sides of the Irish border, given the means of achieving economic progress through the existence of the non-quota section, will reap rewards not only for themselves but for the Community as a whole.

My group entirely agrees with paragraph 20 of the resolution. Priority must be given to the development of infrastructures which would be eligible for Community aid amounting to 50 % of the total investment. The Council figure of 40 % is unacceptable. I would also wholeheartedly support paragraph 21, which deplores the fact that the Council has not accepted the five particularly deprived regions, including Northern and Southern Ireland, which the Commission proposed should qualify for the higher rate of assistance for infrastructural projects.

Bearing in mind the effects of inflation on an already small fund, paragraph 36 of the motion for a resolution should be stressed, together with paragraphs 37 and 41: the smallness of the fund did nothing to ease unemployment levels, and the speeding up of payments is crucial if the fund is to be effective. Our electors will not understand why 58 % of the fund payments for 1978 were not utilized at the end of that year. The red tape which is discouraging applicants must be done away with by the Commission, the Council and the Member States. The fund must have a simple coordinated approach taking into account local and regional characteristics. The operation of the ERDF must demonstrate publicly a resolute commitment to reduce imbalances and guarantee a fair distribution of wealth.

Finally, Mr President, one might well wonder at the urgency of these matters in view of the fact that while the Council sought to get Parliament's view on the non-quota section of the fund last December and the report was submitted in March, no action has yet been taken.

President — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — (I) Mr President, I want to speak not so much on the general problem of the Regional Fund as on the specific matter raised by Mr Cecovini's oral question.

Clearly none of us wants to argue about the EEC-Yugoslavia treaty, convinced as we are that the

enlargement of the European Community to other areas obviously implies relations and agreements with other countries. Furthermore we fully realize the importance of a treaty with Yugoslavia, particularly at this political juncture.

What surprises us is the fact that though the intention in this treaty is to tackle and find positive solutions to the problems of new relationships — which implies better communications and better infrastructures — no thought has been given, even for the purposes of satisfactorily implementing the treaty itself, to the impact that this situation will have on the economies of the frontier zones and in particular the Trieste-Monfalcone area.

It is clear that the communications network that it is the intention to bring into being totally ignores the Friuli-Venezia Giulia and Carnia frontier area and the tensions that may be generated between neighbouring populations.

I feel that Mr Cecovini's initiative deserves to be taken up as a matter of urgency and supported with courage. Indeed, the proposal is put in economic terms of complementarity as far as the neighbouring regions are concerned, so these would find themselves at the centre of an area of traffic with appreciable advantages from the viewpoints of the shorter distance and energy conservation.

Implicit in these thoughts is my criticism of the attitude taken by the Italian government that has failed, in this situation, to protect the just rights of the populations concerned.

We all realize — I repeat — the importance of what has been decided in political, security and 'good neighbour' terms, but I feel that it is very wrong as a policy to create tension between frontier populations that should instead be encouraged to co-operate with each other. Under Article 4 of the Treaty it is up to the Italian government to ask for action by the Committee on Infrastructures. So far, the Italian government has taken no initiative of this kind and there is no ignoring the fact that when it is a question of concluding agreements that are disadvantageous for us it is always ready to do so. I refer in particular to the economic part of the Osimo treaty which was brought up for discussion although none of us raised the question of the definition of boundaries in the discussion.

I would therefore follow this criticism of the Italian government with my endorsement of Mr Cecovini's proposal that a study be made of this supplementary plan.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Gendebien.

Mr Gendebien. — (*F*) Mr President, I must first draw attention to the importance and quality of Mr Delmotte's report. It is not just a review of the situation, but a real analysis. It also points to directions to be followed in the future.

At this time when the European Parliament is assessing the Community's regional policy, most of our Members agree on the need to increase the appropriations for the ERDF. However, regional policy decision-making and implementing mechanisms need to be improved as well. We believe that integrated programmes should be selected in priority regions on the understanding that the non-quota section — freed from the paralysing right of veto — should be increased by stages. All this requires a significant increase in the Commission's staff — and I am perfectly willing to be the advocate of such an increase. It is one of the essential conditions for the more efficient management of the Regional Fund.

But there is one basic question to which we do not seem to be giving enough thought. I refer to the effects, in the field of regional policy, of enlarging the Community to include three new Member States. I feel that the Commission would perform a very useful service by making an official assessment of the exact, quantified effects of the enlargement and here I am referring first and foremost to the effects on the regions of the present, Community of the Nine. Secondly, however, the Commission ought to make just as exact an assessment of the effects of enlargement on the weaker regions of Greece, Spain and Portugal. It is clear that the organization of the ERDF — its volume, its objectives and its methods — will be deeply affected by the enlargement. I have the feeling that we are not as much concerned about this as we should be. And yet the prospects I have just referred to are a formidable challenge. What total will the ERDF cover tomorrow? If we keep the bad system of quotas how will these quotas be established? Does the Commission really have the political will to do what is necessary to ensure that the new ERDF Regulation is examined here and adopted in sufficient time, in other words by January 1981 at the latest?

Mr President, I would like to conclude by dealing with one particular point which is a veritable scandal. We are celebrating — if that is the word — the eighth anniversary of the decision taken by the Commission on 26 April 1972 under Article 93 of the Treaty of Rome. It will be remembered that, under this exceptional decision, the Commission clearly invited the

Belgian government to change its system of regional aid. The system was criticized by the Commission as being too favourable to a rich area — Flanders — and unfavourable to a region in serious difficulties — Wallonia.

Since then, the Belgian government, under continuous pressure from the Flemish majority, has always refused to conform to the injunctions of the Commission and therefore to change the map of what are called regional development zones eligible for assistance. From time to time, the Commission has sent further protests to the Belgian authorities setting time limits on each occasion, the latest being 20 March. These, including the last, have not been complied with. I say that it is scandalous for a Member State which claims it is in favour of the unification of Europe to refuse to comply with a decision of the Commission in this way. Public opinion in Wallonia has less and less faith in the effectiveness and impartiality of the Belgian government in its distribution of aid among the regions. It must not be allowed to lose faith in the impartiality of the European Community, itself because, at the moment, the Community is the only recourse that Wallonia has in its continuing with the central government. This being so I shall end by saying that the Commission must show firmness but also independence with regard to governments and in this case the Belgian government. And since the Belgian government has not yet complied with the decision of 26 April 1972, well then I propose that the Commission should institute proceedings with the Court of Justice in Luxembourg.

President. — I call Mr Gabert.

Mr Gabert. — (*D*) Mr President, I too would like to emphasize the particular regional policy and transport policy significance of Mr Cecovini's question and also the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Gouthier, Mr Cariglia and others. I would however like to deal more specifically with the transport policy side of this question and explain that, as before, I am still of the opinion that the Commission needs to formulate an overall European transport policy strategy and that priorities should then be established on the basis of that strategy. These priorities will certainly need to be aligned with the Member States' regional policy requirements, but also with countries outside the Community where the volume of traffic will increase in the near future with Greece's accession to the Community. The question of the use of the ports of Trieste and Monfalcone is certainly important in this connection, but I feel you will agree that the transport infrastructures in the hinterland, behind the ports, will play just as great a role. After all, if the transport infrastructure in the hinterland fails to work then the ports will not be able to perform the function we expect of them. The accession of Greece will therefore bring with it problems in connection with traffic in the

Gabert

North-South direction, and vice-versa, and also in the East-West direction and vice-versa. Nor will the problems be confined to the Community countries. Austria has already been mentioned. I am glad that the Commission is conducting constructive talks with Austria on the Pirn motorway. As regards Yugoslavia I am also pleased to see that transport questions — including the Adriatic ports — are addressed in Article 8 of the treaty with that country. In addition it is clear to all of us that the sea route and the use of ports are both important. Just as important, however, is the transport of goods from the ports to the other countries and here it must be ensured that transport is firstly economic and frugal in its use of energy and secondly — and this I must stress — environmentally acceptable, particularly in the case of the transalpine routes. We cannot just destroy magnificent valleys and coat the alpine landscape with asphalt. The question refers to a direct road link between Munich and Trieste. A section of motorway from Undine to Carnia is mentioned and I would very much like to know where the connection would be: via Villach to the Tauern motorway or to the future Pirn motorway, which would not seem to me to be very sensible?

Austria is certainly badly burdened with transit traffic not just because of the fact that Greece is now joining the Community but also because of the heavy vehicles it accepts. Switzerland allows a maximum gross train weight of only 28 tones on its territory with the result that the heavier vehicles concentrate even more on little Austria. Austria allows 38 tones, although I hear that serious consideration is being given to reducing this figure of 38 tones for heavy vehicles. Or is the answer, for example, to be the Allemania motorway? I hope not because it would be unthinkable to destroy the magnificent valleys of the Tegernsee, Achental and Zillertal; it would also be pointless, because the governments of Federal Germany, Austria and Italy have all come out against this route.

I therefore feel that, apart from these questions of motorway construction, we must give first priority, for heavy freight, to rail transport. To my mind, from the standpoints of energy and environmental protection as well, the transport concept of the future has to be an efficient rail system. I think that it is necessary for all authorities responsible for transport policy to come out plainly, once and for all, in favour of this priority. Rail freight transport has to become more efficient and faster. Frontier-crossing formalities must become more efficient, i. e. more speedily dealt with. Surely we can hardly talk about European transport if goods sit waiting, often for weeks at a time, at borders within the Community. That is no way to run a railway. So we have to do something about it.

We need combined transport, piggyback transport, and that requires decisions from the Commission for good connections with priority to be given to rail transport for heavy freight.

Again, it is only if we really work for this that the necessary investment for the ports will make any sense. This is a point I would ask the Commission to reflect upon, taking into account, if I look at the motion for a resolution which includes Venice with the ports, the fact that in the case of the transalpine lines, concrete discussions are already under way on the boring of a tunnel under the Brenner. All of this needs to be considered together when studying the question.

President. — I call Mr O'Donnell.

Mr O'Donnell. — Mr President, I would like to join with the others who have spoken here in commending Mr Delmotte's excellent report. This report on the operation of the Regional Fund for 1978 focuses attention once again on the totally unsatisfactory and utterly ludicrous situation which obtains in relation to the Regional Fund and, indeed, in relation to the whole area of Community regional policy. As the Delmotte report points out, the European Parliament has frequently in the past criticized the way in which the regulations restrict the operations of the ERDF, especially in its opinions on annual reports on the fund for '75, '76 and '77. Indeed the Commission's own report for 1978 points out that the lessons which can be learned from that year differ very little from those of previous years. We find again that in respect of the year 1978 we have the same litany of problems, the absence of a coherent regional policy, the inadequacy of the fund, little respect shown for the vital and very important principle of additionality and no proper system of control. It must be a cause of great concern to the Members of this directly elected European Parliament that a quarter of a century after the establishment of the Community there is as yet no credible or identifiable Community regional policy. Indeed, as this latest report points out, there is no real regional policy geared to the achievement of economic and social convergence in the foreseeable future. And it also points out that what passes for the present Community regional policy has mere symbolic value. The stark reality of the situation facing us today is that regional disparities and imbalances continue to worsen with each year that passes. In plain language, the rich regions are getting richer, while the poor are getting poorer. This, I respectfully submit, Mr President, is a disgraceful, indefensible situation which reflects no credit on the institutions of the Community or on Member States' governments. It makes a mockery of both the letter and the spirit of the Treaty of Rome. Is it any wonder, then, that nowadays doubts are being expressed and questions are being asked by a growing number of people about the credibility of the fundamental principles and basic philosophy on which this Community is founded.

The greatest and most urgent challenge facing the Community today, and indeed this is very clearly

O'Donnell

emphasized in the Delmotte report, is the challenge of formulating a realistic and comprehensive Community regional development policy, supported by adequate financial and other resources. Such a Community policy must be implemented through fully integrated and properly coordinated regional programmes, programmes designed to meet the special needs of the different regions. There is just no other way that the problem of regional disparities can be tackled and there is no other road to the goal of ultimate economic and monetary union. The task of formulating and implementing a Community regional policy of this kind is a daunting one and it is one which can only be tackled by a new approach and a greater degree of commitment by the Community institutions, especially the Council, and the national governments. As long as the existing financial and budgetary structure of the Community continues, there is just no way that a comprehensive regional policy, so badly needed for Europe, can be implemented. A substantial increase in the financial resources of this Community is a *sine qua non* for the implementation of an acceptable and credible European regional policy.

I want to say that I totally reject the arguments that have so frequently been put forward of late to the effect that regional development policies should be implemented at the expense of the common agricultural policy. I want to say that, insofar as most of the disadvantaged regions of Europe are concerned, agriculture is a basic and fundamental part of the economy and that a common agricultural policy must be an integral part of any European regional policy. But a proper regional policy must cover all the sectors of the economy — agriculture, industry, fisheries, tourism, infrastructures and so forth, and must embrace all the resources of the region, physical as well as human. All these resources must be utilized to the optimum degree, and all the Community and national instruments must be properly coordinated and channelled into a dynamic European regional policy.

Finally, Mr President, it is only through a realistic European regional policy that we can achieve economic and monetary union for Europe. But by means of a credible European regional policy, we will also be creating a society where the principles of equity and justice will not only prevail, but will be seen to prevail.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Taylor.

Mr J. D. Taylor. — Mr President, it is very nice to follow a speaker from the south of Ireland with whom I can agree. I share very many of the views just expressed by Mr O'Donnell. It is regrettable that, in this major debate on regional policy, we have only 4 minutes for each of the 4 speakers in this group. I know that my colleague Mr Hutton from the south of

Scotland and Mrs Kellett-Bowman from the northwest of England wish to stress the local problems in their parts of the United Kingdom. It will therefore be on the affairs of Northern Ireland that I must concentrate my remarks in the few moments that are available to me.

I would, at the outset, like to congratulate Mr Delmotte on his report and also on the additional report which gave us background history of the development of European regional policy, I do believe that both of these documents should become compulsory reading in years to come, for students of the development of regional policy throughout the nine countries. We are, of course, not debating European regional policy as such, because there is no such thing. We are really debating today the European Regional Development Fund; a fund which is used to aid existing national regional programmes.

In my opinion regional development in Europe, up to now, has been a failure. This is the general consensus which is emerging from what other speakers in the House have said today. It has been a failure firstly because of lack of funds, as has been stressed already; secondly, because of the quota system which works against the areas which really need regional development; thirdly, because of the lack of an overall European policy, and finally, something which hurts us in Northern Ireland, the fact that additionality is used so that the money never reaches the areas that actually should be getting these funds from Europe. Of course all of this is proved by the point which Mr O'Donnell, from the south of Ireland, has just stressed, namely since the inception of the European Regional Fund, the poorer areas have got even poorer and the richer areas have become even more prosperous. The gap between poor and rich has increased rather than decreased during the period of operation of the European Regional Fund. So one of the first points I want to stress here in the House this morning is that the criteria for the allocation of European regional funds should be restricted to need and need alone and should not involve other factors such as quota allocations on a national basis.

If need is the basis for allocating regional funds then we in Northern Ireland certainly will qualify no matter how one defines the criteria. If the criteria is defined on the basis of peripheral areas, Northern Ireland is certainly a peripheral area; if it is unemployment, we have one of the highest unemployment rates in Europe — 11 % — so again we qualify; if it is emigration we have a high emigration rate; if it is declining industries then, certainly, in the city of Belfast, with the decline in the shipbuilding and textile industries, we qualify yet again. Finally, of course, if it is on the basis of being an agricultural community, once again, Northern Ireland qualifies. I know that Mr Giolitti, the Member of the Commission, who is here with us this morning, recognizes that Northern Ireland is one of the prime areas to warrant aid from regional aid.

J. D. Taylor

Now, unfortunately, as I said, it appears that none of this aid actually comes to Northern Ireland. We find that where the Commission decides to provide funds for certain projects, the British Government deducts the same amount from the sum it has allocated for those schemes. So the net inflow of funds to Northern Ireland is nil. This proves that the ERDF is not aiding areas that require regional aid. There is no evidence that areas such as Northern Ireland are becoming more prosperous. The gap is, in fact, widening.

Mr President, in the few moments left to me I would like to stress the need for further control of the way these funds are being spent in the various countries. The example of France cited in the report is alarming, and I am sure there are other examples in other countries. Secondly, I would like to see more publicity. In Northern Ireland and in the Republic of Ireland the projects receiving aid from the fund are getting good publicity. In Belfast today you can see signs at Aldergrove airport and on the M1-M2 link through the city referring to the Regional Fund. In other parts of Europe it does not seem to be happening. Finally, I would like to see consultation between the Commission and the regional authorities — not small local parish councils or similar types of councils in the Community but regional authorities. Unfortunately we have none in Northern Ireland at present, but hopefully before long we will have a regional authority which will speak with authority as a democratic body representing the people of Northern Ireland. At the moment, projects suggested to the Commission come from the United Kingdom Government. In Northern Ireland people are not consulted. It is not democratic in the least. Therefore I would like to place on record today some of the problems and some of the items we would like to receive attention.

I am glad to see Mr Burke, the Commissioner for Transport, here and I would say to him that we welcome his visit to Northern Ireland and we hope that the prime case considered will be the Scotland-Northern Ireland tunnel which would stimulate development not only throughout Northern Ireland but throughout the whole island of Ireland. Everyone in that island would benefit from such a tunnel. I would like to see the A75 Stranraer route improved. I would like to see the inter-rail link in Belfast improved so as to provide a continual rail link the whole way through Northern Ireland from Londonderry to Craigavon and down to Dublin.

Finally, Mr President, I would say this: for all these things to be considered the Commission needs more staff to develop properly a European regional policy and I support the need for more staff in that particular section of the Commission.

President. — I call Mrs Ewing.

Mrs Ewing. — First of all, I should like to say that I have lodged amendments to the Delmotte report, Nos 1, 2 and 3. They are all similar and perhaps it will not surprise anyone, neither the Commissioner, Mr Burke, nor Mr Delmotte, to know that I am seeking to add the Highlands and Islands of Scotland to the other listed areas. I think I must just move these amendments formally and go on to speak about the principles which have lead me to lodge these amendments.

My area, apart from Greenland, is really the periphery of the peripheries. I think it is known to you that among my responsibilities are about 80 inhabited islands and I am glad that Mr Burke is here because transport is perhaps the key to the survival of the population. The death of an island is something we in Scotland are very familiar with. Many islands used to have thriving populations and now have none. When any one of these islands dies, a culture dies, songs die and the hearts of people die. And it will happen again and again unless, in the words of the President of the Commission, Mr Jenkins, this Community shows a human face towards its peripheries. I think I agree with every speaker and with all the points that have been made. Like Mr Delmotte I think they all have their hearts in the right place, but I should like to suggest that here we do have the great problem of depopulation.

One of the reasons that the figures for my area are slightly out of focus, perhaps, is the oil industry. Our country has all this oil, but we do not seem to have many happy advantages. We seem to have the disadvantages of the risks of pollution to our tourist trade and the risks that other parts of the Community share. We have a temporary shifting of population with a lot of workers coming in, some from Europe, some from other parts of the world, which alters on paper our population figures, but it has almost nothing to do with the real problem of our periphery area where population is actually being lost and where islands are at risk.

I should just like to make one or two general points. I would echo all that has been said by Mr Harris, by the Welsh Socialist speaker, about additionality. I so agree with that. It was all exposed in a very interesting article — which I recommend to Mr Burke — in *The Scotsman* entitled the 'great Euro-fraud'. Now that is the way it has been represented and it is up to a point true about the additionality scandal in the United Kingdom. I could not agree more with all the speakers who have made the point about the direct approach by regional authorities. I should like to make the point about flexibility. 'Small is beautiful' where you are risking depopulation of remote places. Ten jobs could be vital to a whole area and yet sometimes we make rules about the number of jobs for the giving of aid. For example, 17 people manage to survive on an island in my constituency and therefore you can see right

Ewing

away that one male job might be vital to that particular island and so I would ask for a little flexibility in applying this type of rule.

On transport, I am so happy that Mr Burke is here and I would like to ask this Parliament to give Mr Burke a lovely big budget. I am sure he would like a much bigger budget, because, in a sense, transport is the key to depopulation. There is one island of Islay where, if they declared UDI tomorrow, with the amount of whisky on that island everyone there would be a millionaire. That island is a happy island because it has a winter population of 4 000, ten-years ago 2 000. It is the only success story of increasing population. Why? The answer is transport, because they have planes every day and a choice of boat twice a day. That is the secret of Islay and the development of its small industries. I would like to see road-equivalent tariff introduced as a principle of this Community. It has already been adopted by the Committee on Regional Policy in the past. Many people agree with it. Parliament has approved it in the past. Mr Corrie's report is on record before you. I should like to go further and ask you to look at the northern population of Norway. How can Norway double its northern population up to the Arctic in 50 years, when my area halved its population in 50 years? Again, the key is transport and the cost thereof. The Norwegian plan is worth a look. Equalized freights. Mr Berkhouwer spoke today about the postage. We would think it odd in Britain, if it cost a different price to post a letter from the island of Canna or Muckle Flugga in Shetland, compared with, say, London. We take that for granted: why not freights also? I would ask that these things be looked at.

I would ask that Scotland gets an institute of some kind. We are famous, I think rightly so, for our educational background. We export graduates, unfortunately for us too many. They are exported and never come back and are lost to our culture and our islands.

Unfortunately, perhaps, we do not export enough to Europe. Too many go elsewhere. I beg this Parliament to consider that institutes of all kind have been established in other parts of the Community. I ask for either an institute for economic analysis and research — after all we invented economics, perhaps a bad day's work on the part of Adam Smith — but nevertheless I ask for that or an institute of energy research in Dounreay.

If this Community is to wear a human face, Mr President, I would suggest that this Parliament passes my amendments, because we really are at the periphery of the periphery.

President. — I call Mr Blaney.

Mr Blaney. — Mr President, I have tabled an amendment No 4, which I merely move here. It is housing

and asks the Commission in the revision of the fund regulations to include provision for assistance for housing for those who cannot house themselves and I would beg the Members of this House to give this amendment their support.

A few words on the overall debate. I can only agree very briefly and quickly with so many speakers who talk about the growing disparities between areas and regions within the Community. I can also emphasize the belief that Parliament has too little control over the expenditure of regional funds. So far as policy is concerned, I think it is pretty well agreed without really criticizing anybody that policy as such on the ERDF just does not exist and I think this, to a large degree, is a reflection of the lack of appreciation, the lack of a realistic approach by the various national governments. And indeed, despite the contributions here today, I wonder, does this Parliament have a true appreciation of what it intends to do or would hope to do under the ERDF. There is a lack of coordination, there is no clear tie between that fund, the EAGGF, the Social Fund and all these other funds that might be put together to better use. I would suggest also that transport, as other speakers have already indicated, is from the point of view of the distant regions, the most important item that we must deal with. In talking of that I refer particularly to the western area of my own country parts of which have neither sea nor air transport nor adequate road systems. I can again find myself in agreement with Mr John Taylor when he talks about the project for a tunnel between Ireland and Scotland. Convergence is what we have been talking about. All I would say in conclusion, Mr President, is — convergence just does not seem to be on the horizon.

President. — I call Mr Petronio.

Mr Petronio. — (I) Mr President, we shall support the proposal which will subsequently be presented but which has already been fully argued by Mr Cecovini as regards the links between Trieste and Northern Europe by land and with the Eastern Mediterranean by sea, on the basis of the speed of this route, the energy savings it would undoubtedly bring and lastly its big potential contribution to the future of a city suffering from the ills that Mr Cecovini has, briefly but in tones of extreme seriousness, described.

The Adriatic was first exploited by the Republic of Venice several centuries ago when the latter transformed the little town into a major capital which transmitted the culture of the West to the whole Mediterranean, so much so that the Venetian dialect is still used in some Turkish and Greek towns and ports for routine loading and offloading operations. Later Trieste was discovered by the Empress Maria Teresa of Austria who made it her great storehouse, the leading port for *Mitteleuropa*. Later the city fell into decline, as

Petronio

we all know, in the terms that have been described. Today, thanks to this plan which can be discussed, postponed and no doubt perhaps even amended, the city of Trieste could be integrated in — instead of excluded from — the network of the big European port and transport infrastructures. We shall therefore support it as an alternative to the motorway it is proposed to build at a cost to the Community of 200 m u.a. which would go through Linz and Graz, thus bypassing Trieste, and connect Northern Europe directly with Greece and Turkey via Yugoslavia. In addition, with regard to these infrastructure problems, we would like to draw some other matters to the attention of the Commission. One of these, for example, is the fact that not only is there a plan for the much talked about canal from Milan via Cremona, Mantua and the Po to the Adriatic but that it is already at the implementation phase above all — waiting — the forthcoming opening of the Frejus and Gotthard tunnels which will bring thousands and thousands of big TIR trucks down to the plain of Padua in Italy which is not equipped to cope with this enormous mass of vehicles. This major waterway could therefore really connect the North — since the Frejus and Gotthard tunnels have already been bored — with the Adriatic sea, and since the port of Cremona has already been built and since there are 25 km of natural bed between Cremona and Milan, it could also be useful to the city of Trieste, both in relation to the well-known tanker degasification facilities and in that case the tanker barges we were talking about a little time ago, and inject new life into the Trieste shipyards which are capable of building special ships like the *castor*, the *Picard bathyscaphe*, etc. Much has been said about the Rhine-Rhone and Rhine-Danube links which would bypass Trieste. On the contrary, it seems to us advisable to support these two types of project to which might be added a third — that supported by the Swiss for a link between Locarno and the Po and the Adriatic via Lake Maggiore and the Ticino.

So there are projects of interest in many quarters. We hope that the Italian government, for example, or the Italian regions will make use of the available financial instruments — the Regional Fund, the Social Fund, the European Investment Bank and the Ortolì facility — to ensure that this ambitious and modern plan which would also include a new port in the zone between Ferrara and Rovigo directly connecting with the port of Trieste should not bypass this frontier zone in Europe in deference to some strange theory that favour should always be given to the regions that are the farthest away from our own Community.

President. — I call Mr Hume.

Mr Hume. — I would like to join with the rest of the speakers in this debate in congratulating Mr Delmotte for a very thorough and effective report, which is underlined by the fact that it was unanimously

adopted by the Committee on Regional Policy. Indeed all that most speakers in this debate have done and all that I am going to do is to repeat what Mr Delmotte has said in his report.

Every debate that has taken place in this Parliament on regional policy and regional development and every debate that has taken place in the Committee on Regional Policy has stressed the same point. When the European Community was founded, written into the preamble to the Treaties was the objective shared by the countries forming the Community to ensure the harmonious development of the Community by reducing the differences between the various regions and the backwardness of the less-favoured regions in particular. It is putting it mildly to say that there has been total failure to achieve this objective. In essence the differences in living standards between the richer and the poorer regions of Europe have increased rather than decreased, and there has been little effort to really tackle that problem. There is a total lack of commitment on the part of the Council of Ministers to dealing with this problem.

The points that have been made about the Regional Fund have been made by every speaker. The inadequacy of the fund is obvious to everyone, but so too is the hypocrisy of those national governments who complain about the high percentage of funds spent on agriculture when they themselves prevent any increase in the size of the Regional or Social Funds. There is a lack of coordination of the financial and policy instruments of the Commission and the Community itself. There is little point in the Commission on the one hand giving out grants under the Regional Fund to create jobs in priority areas, while on the other hand Commission policies in other areas are losing jobs for those same regions. It simply does not make sense. Then there is the problem, stressed again and again by most speakers, of additionality. There is little point in the Community providing funds to reduce national aids to the regions, thus ensuring that the whole purpose of the Regional Fund, which is to increase aid to priority regions and to regions in need, is not, in fact, achieved. There is the need to involve regional and local authorities and give them a direct role and a direct say in putting forward ideas and proposals for the development of their own regions.

However, these points have been stressed again and again. I would simply like to concentrate on two major points. The Commission has to recognize five priority regions for regional aid. They are Greenland, the French overseas departments, the Mezzogiorno, Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. If regional policy is to have a real effect in tackling the serious needs of those five regions — and the need is serious in those five regions, if one looks at the unemployment figures and the standard of living in those areas — then there ought to be for each of those priority regions a coordinated development programme. Where such a programme does not exist, the

Hume

Commission should see to it that it does exist and that it should be jointly funded by both the Commission and the national government.

Within that development programme attention should be given to two important sectors. One is the transport sector. We have already heard about the Commissioner's proposals on transport infrastructure from Mr Burke himself. They are to be welcomed. They are one of the most important developments in the Community in many years, and it should be the wish of this Parliament that they come to fruition. We should give them our full support. With regard to the second sector, it is noticeable that all of the priority regions are regions which depend heavily on agriculture and have a large number of small farmers. It no longer makes sense to promote policy which removes people and small farmers from the land and brings them into the towns, where all they are doing is swelling dole queues because there are no jobs to give them in urban areas. Therefore there is a great need now at regional level for rural development programmes in these priority regions, rural development programmes that will give priority to the development of rural towns, to the maintenance and development of small farms, to training programmes for small farmers, to an increase in food processing in those areas.

If we are to achieve any reduction in unemployment in the backward regions, then we have to take a very hard look at the sort of regional incentives that are being given at the moment. In places like Northern Ireland we find £26,000 per job being granted to multinational industry in return for a promise to provide jobs. It would seem to me that a £26,000 grant for an individual job could be used a lot more effectively if it was used to develop local resources and put into rural development programmes.

All the points I have made, Mr President have been made by every other speaker. Everyone has complained about the inadequacy of the Fund. Everyone has complained about the lack of a coordinated policy. Everyone has complained about the problem of additionality. Everyone has complained about the lack of real contact with local and regional authorities. In so doing, however, all we are doing is underlining the unanimity of this House about the inadequacy of regional policy, about the scandalous failure to reduce disparities in living standards between the richer and poorer areas of this Community. In saying that, the challenge is not to those of us who represent the poor areas of this Community; it is to those of you in this House who represent the richer areas, because you not only do it in this House, your parties do it in the governments of the Member States that are preventing the development of a regional policy and a Regional Fund. There is a great deal of lipservice paid to the concept of wishing to reduce disparities in living standards between the richer and poorer areas, but the political power to take effective action rests with the parties that are represented in this House. Effective action can

be taken if they want to take it. In the absence of such action the differences in living standards will continue to widen and the disillusionment in the poorer areas of this Community with the concept of a European Community will continue to grow.

President. — I call Mr Modiano.

Mr Modiano. — *(I)* Mr President, I am speaking on my own account and on behalf of my Group regarding the point made in Mr Cecovini's question and in order to stress and restate the importance and economic validity of the proposals it contains. Leaving aside purely parochial concern which would be completely out of place in a matter of such broad-ranging economic and infrastructural importance, it must be pointed out that the significance of building more rapid and functional road and rail links between Trieste and Central Europe is that it would be implementing an infrastructural programme in the service of the Community by virtue of which the Community ports of the Northern Adriatic could once again perform their natural world-economic function in the links with North Africa, the Eastern Mediterranean and the Middle and Far East.

Without referring to the Community Regional Policy and measures already taken with the help of the Regional Fund and non-quota actions, it is enough to remember that the measures suggested in Mr Cecovini's proposal are based on two fundamental and closely connected principles: the time-saving on routes between the Community and the areas I have referred to and the consequent saving in energy. It must therefore be clearly pointed out that the plan is not in open contrast to other and different programmes concerning other links between Central Europe, the Mediterranean, Greece — the next Member of the Community — and places beyond Suez. We have to bear in mind that the recent agreement between the Community and Yugoslavia provides for considerable appropriations, amounting to 200 m u.a., for infrastructural projects in that country. In addition, Yugoslavia is asking for a financial contribution by the Community to motorway infrastructures judged to be of Community interest, including — in particular — the motorway crossing Austria diagonally from Linz to Graz and then continuing in the direction of the Balkans along the trans-Yugoslavia route. This is why the proposal we are now discussing can and should be seen as nothing less than the guarantee of a certain infrastructural equilibrium which could otherwise be disturbed to the disadvantage of the Community ports of the Northern Adriatic. This balanced situation would thus allow the ports of Trieste, Monfalcone and Venice to perform their functions in genuinely competitive conditions.

The recent agreement between the EEC and Yugoslavia takes over the substance of the 1975 Treaty of

Modiano

Osimo between Italy and Yugoslavia and it also refers to a series of road and rail links connected with the planned joint Italian and Yugoslav industrial free zone. However it takes up only part of the infrastructural problems of the links between Trieste and Central Europe referred in Mr Cecovini's plan. In substance it deals with proposals that have already been considered and discussed with qualified political and economic authorities in the countries concerned. Some of them are already taking concrete shape thanks to the finance obtained, so far, at the national level only. It therefore seems logical to ask the Community to provide additional help and above all authoritative support for the urgent completion of the work requested, and to bring reasonable and proper pressure to bear on the countries concerned.

As a European, more than as a *Triestino* I ask all Members to approve what is suggested in the proposal.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Mr President, warm congratulations to Mr Delmotte! The Commission's fourth Annual Report on the European Regional Development Fund and the state of the regions presents a very sombre picture indeed in which the situation in regions heavily dependent on problem industry has got steadily worse.

There are some things in the Fourth Report which greatly puzzle me. I vividly remember Mr Yeats, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, drawing attention, in his opinion on the second Annual Report on the fund in 1976, to the inadequacy of detailed checks on industrial projects which had received fund aid. Has the position improved since then? Absolutely not! Indeed, it has got worse, and we are now more aware of the inadequacy of the checks than hitherto.

What fascinates me, however, is the table on page 48. Here we see that the number of industrial investment projects checked in the United Kingdom is higher than anywhere else and, as far as infrastructure projects are concerned is more than double that of any other country except Italy. Was this because the United Kingdom was particularly dishonest? By no means! The Court of Auditors was involved in four of the inspection visits—one each in Italy, Germany, France and the United Kingdom—and according to the report now before us, the United Kingdom was the only state about which the auditors did not complain. Why, therefore, spend their time investigating the good instead of the bad? In Germany, the completion reports often differed from actual figures given on page 50; in Italy, plant provided with the aid of fund money was apparently whipped off smartly to another factory; but far and away the most outrageous was the

conduct of France, which flatly refused to allow Commission officials to visit certain industrial projects. Small wonder that Mr Delmotte in his report should demand the suspension of fund aid to members which impede auditing work and that Mr Gouthier, in his opinion, agrees!

But auditing to make sure the money has been used for the intended purpose is not enough. It is essential to know that the expenditure is cost-effective, and here the Committee on Budgetary Control has a vital role to play, probing beneath the surface of mere accounting for money spent to make sure that the Community gets value for money, and I believe that the reputation of the Community will to a very large extent depend on the thoroughness with which that committee does its job in every realm of Community activity.

It is equally fascinating to note that the wealthiest Member State, Germany, is the quickest off the mark in demanding payment for completed projects, though apparently speed and accuracy did not go hand in hand, since their returns were challenged. But it really is essential that all Member States should submit their claims promptly, thus enabling the Commission to pay promptly and make the fund immediately effective.

Unfortunately, we have still not solved the problem of additionality, and Mr Delmotte is right to hammer this home again, as are other Members. If Member States insist on grabbing every penny that is given by the fund to industrial projects, they must not be surprised if industrialists dig in their heels and decline to apply for ERDF aid, thus causing Member States to lose their share.

Mr Delmotte is right in stressing the importance of the standard of infrastructure in promoting development in this energy-hungry world: this must include railways and canals and such projects as the Channel Tunnel, which will help with the steady and cheaper transport of goods from the more isolated parts of the United Kingdom.

I regard the role of local authorities, who alone really know the situation in their areas, as crucial. I would like to see them being allowed to apply direct for a certain proportion of the fund without having to go through national governments, but with a right of veto by Member States, to be exercised within one month only. Until this is achieved, I welcome the closer links which the Commission is forging with local authorities.

The endowment of the ERDF is and has always been totally inadequate, though this is the instrument which combined together the farthest regions of the Community and helped them to share in the prosperity of the golden triangle. It is essential greatly to increase the main fund and also the non-quota section, which has helped areas and sectors hit by the very policies which

we have put forward ourselves. They are therefore entitled to our utmost assistance. Until that help is generously given, we shall never be able to claim that we are truly a citizens' Europe.

President. — I call Mr Cariglia.

Mr Cariglia. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I approve Mr Delmotte's report and shall confine my comments to the problem raised by Mr Cecovini.

To prove that the Adriatic can and should be the trading outlet of Central Europe and the point of entry for the raw materials and products coming from Asia and East Africa does not, to my mind, require any effort of imagination.

The ports of Northern Europe, although they may be more efficient than those of Southern Europe and therefore preferable, are saturated. The Rhine-Danube canal, although it fits into a waterway transport network linking North and South Europe, cannot be conceived as an attempt — at least not on our part — to bypass the Adriatic sea route which is far more compatible with Community interests even allowing for the accession of Greece and the role of the federative Republic of Yugoslavia.

The enlargement of the Suez Canal, the increasing economic importance of the Indian sub-continent and the fact that the Chinese are striving for a place in world trade show how urgently necessary it is to fashion an overall transport strategy which, in its turn, will lead to largescale infrastructure projects that will radically revitalize the Adriatic ports, backed by new land routes — even if mainly by rail as requested by Mr Gabert — from Central Europe.

I was disappointed to hear Mr Burke say a moment ago that up to now no projects have been notified by the governments concerned. I wonder whether the blameworthy inertia of the Italian government might not be overcome by designing a project of Community interest for submission to the Council.

I say this precisely because I am convinced that the standpoint from which this problem has to be seen is not Italian, as might be thought, but largely European. I would remind you that the industrial area of Central Europe is approaching saturation and that, with the ecological and social problems caused by the intensive migration into Europe and particularly Central Europe, we should take a fresh look at the future of Southern Europe where the factors of space and manpower are combined to the best possible extent.

Perhaps I am going too far, but I do not think it would be too rash to plan in the near future for a single overall inter-regional authority with powers to formulate and manage an organic transport policy in Southern

Europe. In this way Europe could extricate itself, once and for all, from the rut of routine administration.

President. — I call Mr Travaglini.

Mr Travaglini. — (I) Mr President, the very limited time I am allocated allows me to make only a few points of a general nature on regional policy.

Community actions to restore regional equilibrium have up to now been absolutely inadequate in scale and content. In the past it has often been pointed out that, since regional policy is not explicitly named among the common policies provided for in the treaty, it was a long time — until the fund was instituted in 1975 — before suitable instruments and specific methodologies were introduced for a more incisive Community contribution to the process of regional reequilibrium.

I think the time has come — for one thing because of the increasing interest of Parliament in regional policy — to raise the question again in its right terms. The absence of regional policy from the common policies listed in Article 3 of the treaty, far from being a reason for delaying Community action, on the contrary prevents any confusion between instruments such as the common and other policies listed in the article and one of the fundamental reasons behind the institution of the Community itself. The Common Market itself — if you really think about the words '*by establishing*' that precede the words '*Common market*' in Article 2 of the treaty — and '*approximating the economic policies*' is clearly referred to as an instrument to '*promote a harmonious development of economic activities and a continuous and balanced expansion*' of the Community. Conversely '*to ensure their harmonious development by reducing the differences existing between the various regions and the backwardness of the less favoured regions*' is one of the few reasons for establishing the Community itself, one of the few clear objectives to be found in the opening words of the treaty, which are not a preamble — I would ask you to note — but an organic and basic part of the treaty itself.

It is all too clear that this objective could have been attained by making the best promotional use of all the general Community machinery for the areas in the weakest state — the gradual establishment of the Common Market, an effective and balanced agricultural policy and the implementation of all the other common policies should automatically have triggered off, according to the promoters of the Community, an accelerated process of development in the least-favoured areas. The benefits of these Community actions have in fact been felt but, in the end, the disparities have vastly increased. Nor has the institution of the fund and the first years of its application — falling moreover in the midst of the economic crisis — helped to resolve the problems. Far greater effective-

Travaglini

ness is necessary in Community action to produce concrete results in the process of restoring regional balance.

The fund is an essential, but absolutely inadequate, instrument. The non-quota section does, I agree, allow for a minimum of Community initiative in defining specific actions, but we need to guard against the danger of having to tackle short-term problems with the fund whose purpose, instead, should be to contribute to the solution of the structural problems that already exist in the less-favoured areas. It is not right and it would be dispersive — let us hope that this is not done — to use appropriations from the fund systematically to tackle the negative effects that common policies may have in these areas. Conversely, in defining more appropriate conditions and contents for our common policies we should take into account the need to contribute to a better balance between regions. And if that is not possible, the cost of dealing with negative effects must be met by the individual policies causing those effects and not by the Regional Fund.

What is needed is a new and certainly more effective concept of regional policy so that the resources and instruments of the Member States, regions and the Community itself may all be involved in regional development and adjustment schemes in an integrated approach to development requirements, problems and prospects. In other words we need to resurrect the territorial dimension of problems and action.

I shall soon finish. The Community should attack the problems of the less-favoured areas in full cooperation with the regions concerned and in real unity of effort and remedial action. For regional development and adjustment, the treaties place tasks on the Community that go far beyond help for the Member States, fragmented as they are, in any case, in a myriad of infrastructural projects. The Community should work out clear definitions of new methodologies, make concrete proposals for promoting these methodologies centred on integrated and strictly predefined operations, and make concrete proposals to bring about a coordinated and substantial increase in all the common policies as a new dimension of direct aid. Only in this way will it be possible to comply with the clear instruction in the treaty to *'reduce the differences existing between the various regions and the backwardness of the less-favoured regions'*.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Hutton.

Mr Hutton. — Mr President, I want to support all that Mr Delmotte says about the non-quota section of the Regional Fund. The non-quota section should be a marvellous demonstration of the vitality of the Community, of how it is living and evolving; but, to my

very great regret, the wrangling of the Member States has made it very much smaller than it should have been, and Mr Delmotte has properly exposed the trading that has gone on from the beginning. Of course it is still going on, for in my part of Scotland we even have a project, the revitalization of the Garnock Valley, where unemployment has now reached 20 % and which is crying out for all the help it can get, but we have not got approval for using the non-quota section. The section is not big and what it can do is not very extensive, but it is a sign of the care and concern which Europe can show for people out on the edge of the Community.

My main concern is the direction in which the Commission will point this non-quota section, especially as I hope it will increase in size and importance. I want to suggest to the Commissioner that the non-quota section should become the start of a Community rural fund. What will be the point if our industrial areas flower again and suck in people from the countryside who are fed up with having awful bus services, no trains, higher prices and lower services, just to add further pressures to the urban areas? These industrial areas need rehabilitation — in the centre of Scotland we have more than enough examples of that — but hand-in-hand with that we cannot allow our rural areas and our islands to wither and die. We have got to keep people on the land, for they not only produce food, but they keep the countryside. It therefore behoves this Community to do very much more than the CAP is doing. We want to give some point to keeping people in, and, I hope, attracting them into, the countryside; we have to encourage tourism and those industries which can be done well in the rural areas. There is the perfect example of the high-quality knitwear of the Scottish borders and of food processers who buy the produce of their areas. I have a man in my area, an area of 15 % unemployment, desperate to create 40 jobs, and he cannot get a grant from this Community to do it! I want to urge the Commissioner that, since we have a Regional Fund which is already giving considerable help to depressed industrial areas, the non-quota section should be the thin end of a wedge to begin tackling this difficult but absolutely vital work of stimulating what is our richest asset, our countryside and the people who live there.

President. — I call Mrs Cresson.

Mrs Cresson. — (F) Ladies and gentlemen, we Socialists are both committed Europeans and fully convinced of the need for a regional policy. As the rapporteur so rightly says, there are certainly obstacles to regional policy and whilst the attitude of all governments is not always consistent with the letter and spirit of the treaties, the French government has a particularly improper attitude towards European regional policy.

Cresson

Members like to complain in this Parliament of the cost of the agricultural policy, suggesting that the appropriations could be saved in order to develop other policies and regional policy in particular. Rest assured that even if the ERDF appropriations were multiplied by ten there will never be any European regional policy that includes France as long as the French government persists in its present practices.

What are these practices? To find out, I had to overcome much reluctance and many fears and refusals to speak on the part of European public servants patently worried about possible retaliation. In France, the liking for secrecy has been accentuating the country's traditional centralism to an excessive extent for several years. Moreover, this liking — this need — for secrecy extends to all fields including that of justice. I hope that an end will be made of this silence about how the French government interprets and uses Community regional policy. Make no mistake, we are not in favour of a supranational authority. Clearly, regional projects must be approved by the central authority as part of an overall regional development plan and then submitted to the responsible European bodies, but this is far from being the pattern of things in France. First of all, the French population knows nothing about regional policy for the simple reason that it is never told by the authorities of the allocation of ERDF funds in any particular case. This being so, how can its interest be awakened in the construction of Europe? In other countries, notice-boards at the worksites say if Europe is contributing. There is nothing like that in France where even the representatives of the *départements* and regions directly concerned do not know when ERDF funds are being used. What is worse, there is a factual reason for this: it is the French treasury that cashes the ERDF appropriations and it is the central authority that sprinkles these appropriations around in electorally valuable regions and has documentary evidence fabricated that has no relation with any concerted policy for regional development designed to eliminate disparities. I would add that the French government has asked its eight partners — successfully — for an increase in its distribution scale for ERDF appropriations on behalf of the overseas departments and territories whose difficult situation is familiar to all. We are still waiting for precise information about the use of these appropriations.

Who are being fooled? Everyone, the European institutions, the electors, the local and regional representatives who are sometimes astounded, when they come to Brussels, to find out that there are ERDF appropriations for their region about which they had not been told. As I said, we are not in favour at all of any weakening in the powers of national parliaments and authorities. What we want is compliance with the treaties and respect for the truth. This Parliament must get to grips with this problem of the application of regional policy. The subject is no new one for it was complained about by the previous Parliament, but no definite and courageous stance has been established. It

is time that the Commission presented proposals to bring the scandal to an end. It is time that we elected representatives were given precise instead of procrastinating answers to our written and oral questions. It is time that this pretence and the harm it does to the development of our regions, the functioning of our institutions, the future of European integration and respect for democracy stopped.

As a step in that direction, the Socialists ask for an increase in the non-quota section and at the same time a far stricter monitoring of the practices I have complained about, if necessary by scrutiny of documents and on-the-spot inspections. You may take it from me that everyone of us will personally ensure this is done in his or her region, informing the local elected representatives and demanding to see the books. You can rely on the Socialists to act both in the European Parliament and in the field.

(Applause on the Socialist Group benches)

President. — I call Mr Habsburg.

Mr Habsburg. — *(D)* Mr President, it is highly commendable that Mr Cecovini, the eminent mayor of Trieste, should have raised for discussion the question of the future of his city and the connection of the port with South Germany and Austria, particularly in these critical times. Above all, it is high time, bearing in mind the imminent accession of Greece to the Community, that provision were made for the best possible links between that country and the industrial heart of Western Europe. In addition, however, historic trade routes will, in this way, again be opened up between the Eastern Mediterranean and the German-speaking areas of Europe. These natural links were first damaged by the wave of nationalism after the first world war. That is when the decline of this major port began, but the division of Europe as the result of the Yalta Agreement and the occupation of the Danube area by the Soviet army was far more destructive. A real iron curtain came down interrupting normal trade flows very much to the disadvantage of the peoples concerned. The fact that we are talking today about re-opening traditional trade routes, in spite of the continued presence of forces hostile to the area in the heart of Europe, can be attributed to four main facts: the undaunted will to survive of the inhabitants of Trieste, the self-assertion of Greece as a bastion of freedom in the Eastern Mediterranean, Austria's ability to survive and successfully end its foreign occupation and since then to preserve its independence, and the hard work of the German people.

It is also because of these factors that we can now talk about a real step forward. What is proposed here for Trieste and its links with the East and the North West is European regional policy in the best sense of the term. It falls to us to endow our frontiers with a new

Habsburg

significance, using the means of modern communications. No-one today has any interest in interfering with existing frontiers but we all want to extend communications and remove artificial and unnatural obstacles. In this way we can correct the mistakes of past years without provoking any danger of a conflict. In this way Trieste can once again make its contribution to peace in Europe. This is where the higher interests of all Members of the Community lie, beyond their tangible and material interests.

On the other hand we have to make sure that this project does not get put on the shelf. There is no time to be lost, not least because of the energy savings to which Mr Cecovini has so rightly referred. But we must also be clear in our minds that the project in front of us is difficult and costly. This applies particularly to the Alpine crossings and therefore the part that goes through Austria. Here we have to remember that this is a small country with limited resources and that it is precisely there that every kilometre of track or road costs far more than further north or south. Since the interest of the Community is at stake it would therefore be only fair for it to shoulder part of the burden, because the advantages of this new Euro-economic dimension will benefit everyone and because, politically too, a major Community project will make a decisive contribution towards strengthening the Eastern flank of Europe as it now is.

It is therefore the duty of this Parliament to tell those responsible clearly that the freely elected representatives of the European people emphatically support the project and look forward to its being put into effect without loss of time. The stimulus to international trade and the contribution to economic stability are obvious, not least because Bavaria, the German California, would lie at one end of this new transalpine artery opening the door to new opportunities for all countries in the Alpine area and the Mediterranean.

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (F) I would like to take the opportunity of this debate to ask the Commission, on a personal basis, to report on the present state of the dispute it has been involved in since 26 April 1972 with successive Belgian governments on account of internal Belgian quarrels and the Belgian authorities' approach to the matter of regional aid.

Belgium's regional policy is based on the Act of 18 July 1959, confirmed by the Act of 14 July 1966. This basic legislation and the implementing royal decrees have been pointedly qualified by the Commission as a general aid system that does not specify exactly which sectors or regions are to benefit. On 26 April 1972, therefore, the Commission took out proceedings against this legislation for breach of the regulations on the grounds that its application distorted competition

between undertakings without, at the same time, supporting specific regions or sectors in difficulty. The point is that the terms of the Belgian legislation are so vague and its limits so broad that it could be used as a basis for helping prosperous sub-regions as much as, if not more than, the weak ones.

The Commission has often asked successive Belgian governments to study jointly with it the criteria and methods used for selecting development zones in Belgium. On many occasions in the old European Parliament and in the Belgian Parliament I have vainly tried, with questions, to bring a solution to the dispute closer. On 17 July 1979 again, in this elected Parliament, I asked the Commission in my written question No 257/79 to say how things stood. The Commission's reply was that *'the Belgian government unofficially put forward a new proposal for boundaries to the aid zones in October 1978. This proposal is now being studied by the Commission whose views will be communicated to the Belgian authorities in a few weeks' time*. My question today, Mr President, is simple, precise and brief: what is the position in this matter?

President. — I call Mr Giolitti

Mr Giolitti, member of the Commission. — (I) Mr President, I can answer the specific point raised by Mr Glinne immediately, reserving my reply on the report and the various speeches to the end of the debate.

The situation is exactly as Mr Glinne has described. I have to tell him that we are considering information of an unofficial nature communicated to the Commission services by the Belgian administration. To this unofficial information, the Commission services have replied giving the Commission's reactions and observations, these, too, being unofficial.

This exchange at - I would repeat - unofficial level is taking place between the departments responsible for competition questions, in the Belgian administration and the Commission, since it is in that light that the aid systems that exist or are planned for the regions in Belgium have to be considered. The Belgian government has been asked to communicate its official position, in other words an official proposal for the final settlement of these problems.

Thus the precise answer to the equally precise and brief question put by Mr Glinne is as follows: we are awaiting a reply to our request to the Belgian government to communicate to us a proposal in an official form. Pending that reply, we are prepared to continue these contacts at the unofficial and informal level which, obviously, may contribute to a better reciprocal understanding of problems and the solutions that may be proposed.

President. — I call Mr Bocklet.

Mr Bocklet. — (D) Mr President, the transalpine routes still constitute a crucial point of weakness in the European transport system. In spite of some progress in the development of these routes - the Brenner motorway is a particular example - there is still a lot of leeway to be made up. Because of this not only do millions of holiday-makers have to suffer throughout the year but regions of the European Community with a wealth of tradition, like Friuli, Giulia, Venezia and Bavaria, are impeded in their development. The hardest hit are the ports of Trieste, Monfalcone and also Venice. Only if there is a direct connection between Giulia, Venezia and Munich, will Trieste and Monfalcone be able to hope that the port facilities they already have will be used to full capacity. For this reason we support the request for the construction and extension of the Tauern motorway which would provide a high-speed link between Trieste and Munich and impart new economic stimuli to both areas. I would however like to add that — at least in our view — the improvement of the railway line over the Brenner is just as urgent because it takes the considerable traffic as long to cover this stretch today as it did in the era of the mail coach.

The problems relate more particularly to joint planning and financing and the removal of bureaucratic obstacles to transit traffic and to cooperation between Member States and associated countries. The planning instruments we have so far, the consultation procedure and the Committee on transport infrastructure are not enough; they must, at least, be made effective. To fund the development of the European transport networks roughly the same financing instruments are available at the moment as for regional policy. None of these instruments, however, has the specific role of providing support for transport infrastructure measures. Instead, what is necessary, particularly in view of the accession of Greece, is a basic strategy for the joint financing of transit routes in third countries, because we cannot leave these transit countries to shoulder, on their own, the enormous cost of developing and maintaining North-South links serving our own regional policy interests.

With your permission I would just refer again to a relatively minor problem compared with the financial question, namely that of frontier formalities which nevertheless cause extraordinary irritation day in day out. What use are wider roads if things break down at the frontier? It is precisely here, in the daily routine of border traffic, that we need more Community spirit. As an associated country, Austria should show more understanding in this matter too. The Commission ought to see whether appropriate undertakings could not be given in the framework of the Association relationship.

The art of European regional policy consists in welding the developed structures of the Community into a harmonious whole while recognizing their individual identities and, in so doing, removing existing disparities using the economic means available for cooperation. The Alpine area in particular has institutionalized cooperation in recent years beyond national and Community boundaries in the Arge Alp and the Arge Ost and has developed that cooperation as a model for regional policy. The Commission would be well advised to take off its blinkers and make use of the expertise of this body.

President — I call Mr von der Vring.

Mr von der Vring — (D) Mr President, what relative importance does regional economic policy really have in the Community? In 1979 it came to about 3 % of the total budget compared with over 70 % for agricultural subsidies. This disproportion ought to be our subject today. The facts are that the EEC has 7 million unemployed. Unregistered unemployment must surely make this up to a good 10 million and the enlargement of the Community will add a few more million. Poverty with full granaries. This is the reverse side of Europe. In times gone by every farmer had a simple rule for his economy. If workers were getting a good wage then the farmer was alright. Have the representatives of agriculture in this Parliament forgotten that principle? 3 % of our resources go to regional policy and with it we safeguard 70 000 jobs a year. A drop in the bucket, says the Delmotte report. If we maintain this status quo, the enlargement of the Community will require some 50 % more finance in other words 1 500 m EUA. But if we wanted to make a serious attack on unemployment in the Community, ten times this amount would be necessary, 15 000 m EUA. And yet the great aim of this Community is to reduce disparities between rich and poor regions. The facts prove the opposite. The situation is one of divergence, not convergence. The gap between rich and poor widens every year. In fact we have to admit that we have no successful convergence policy, matching our Community aims, to boast about. The Mezzogiorno is just as crippled as it was when the Community was founded. Is it not time that we admitted that something vital in our Community was not working? Is it not high time that we were thinking what radical changes we need to make in order, at last, to live up to the objectives of our Community?

15 000 m EUA! I agree there is not the slightest chance in the foreseeable future of mobilizing such a sum in the European budget for regional employment policy, but where is it written down that government investment aid has to be financed from the ordinary budget? After the second world war, when the Americans, with a considerable effort in the Marshall Plan, got the Central European economy going again with

von der Vring

great success and to their own advantage, they did not use budgetary resources but the traditional medium of industrial loan financing. If we converted the whole Regional Fund into a financing platform for a new European economic aid credit system, this would gather in enough resources to fund a European employment policy worthy of the name. True enough, conditions have changed since then, but one thing is still the same. There are many people looking for jobs in Europe who would love to buy many things they cannot now afford. What is more there are many industrial plants lying idle in Europe in which modern working conditions could be provided if there were only buyers for them. To bring the two together must be the paramount task of European economic policy. If Parliament has a role to play, then it is that. Instead of haggling about the height of the butter mountain or the British contribution, we should learn from the mistakes of the past and at last rouse ourselves to action with greater insight and skill than in 1949 so as to help Europe recover out of its own strength and to carry through an ambitious and courageous united programme for the poor areas of Europe.

President. — I call Mrs Gaiotti de Biase.

Mrs Gaiotti de Biase. — (I) The issue raised in Mr Cecovini's question is not solely, or mainly, of Italian interest. As has already been said, the South-Eastern flank of the Community is going to become increasingly important in that the accession of Greece and the binding Treaty of Association with Yugoslavia will make this area — once a frontier zone — an essential link and pivot in the Community's internal system. But it is mainly the commercial and political problems presented by the difficult relations with the Middle East together with the need for a European political initiative with regard to the Arab countries and the increasing two-way trade with Asia and Africa that tie up, here, with the strategy of economic and political growth aimed at establishing equilibrium in the area and materializing our hopes for peaceful developments in the Mediterranean.

In this context, action to achieve maximum operability of communication infrastructures represents a triple challenge calling for an overall response from a complex system. What is necessary now is to organize all the measures and necessary cooperation between the countries concerned and to promote Community action on a global basis, not just as the sum of competitive national initiatives but stimulating national planning by all the means available.

Against this background of overall political and commercial strategy which is not Italian but the Community's I would like to present three points for your consideration. The first concerns the pivotal nature of the Trieste area and the whole Friuli-Venezia Giulia region. This is a region, Mr President, that is naturally

defined as European in Italy because of the frontier culture that has always characterized it, because of the high rate and quality of emigration from it and because of its entrepreneurial vocation. I would like to remind you that this frontier region, where anything could have happened in the period immediately after the war and where European public opinion was spared the bloody events, strife and ethnic conflicts that occurred elsewhere — and could have occurred there as well — between Italians and Slovenians, this region should not be punished for the peace that it successfully maintained. The association with Yugoslavia today is another result of the capacity of Trieste and Friuli to work for day-to-day coexistence over the last thirty years along the difficult boundary that runs from Trieste to Gorizia.

Imagining that problems of communication raised by the association with Yugoslavia can be solved by bypassing and marginalizing this region, and punishing its resolute will to cooperate and overcome conflicts, is nothing short of absurd.

My second point is related to the first. This area has seen a recent but already powerful experiment in inter-regional cooperation in the form of a community that has adopted the name of the Alpeadria community involving nine regions in the bordering countries. This regional organization needs to be strengthened and its voice should be heard by the Community when defining a coordinated and comprehensive system of North-South and East-West communications in the area.

My third point relates to the nature of the comprehensive system that needs to be set up in this area with the cooperation of the countries concerned and the Community. Through this and other initiatives, the treaties recommend that we should try to eliminate existing disparities and prevent the creation of new ones. If we try to create a complete system of infrastructures, jointly between the Community and the countries concerned, for the Northern Adriatic, we must also make sure that no new marginal areas are once again formed within these regions. From this standpoint there are three areas to be considered — Belluno which should be able to find the way out of its isolation through the proposed Venice-Munich route, Carnia which, when the trans-Carnia motorway is finally built, will have its link function recognized and lastly Gorizia, a city split in two by the peace treaty but today bound up in intensive trade with neighbouring Yugoslavia for which a big frontier complex is now being built. If the full potential of this complex is to be developed it needs to be fitted into a network of communications of appropriate international importance. Possible action in the framework of the regulations that exist today and a general review of the Community's transport policy would need to take these requirements into account.

President. — I call Mr Delmotte.

Mr Delmotte, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, I can be very brief in view of the broad consensus that my report has met with and, for that reason, I would like to state my sincere gratitude to all Members who have spoken in today's debate. Raising one or other aspect of the report, they have added details, and made clear intentions and requirements that the responsible authorities cannot ignore.

With your permission, Mr President, I must express my regret, in passing, that at a certain level of appraisal and decision in this Parliament it should have been thought necessary to add Mr Cecovini's oral question with debate to our discussion. But let me reassure him. His initiative was highly commendable because we do know that there are problems about which no-one can remain unmoved. Nevertheless we have to be consistent. It was our wish that the Committee on Regional Policy and Transport should be split and policy with regard to ports, in particular, comes under the latter.

Mr President, I would like, at the close of this debate, to express our gratitude to this Commission, working in extremely arduous conditions and with not enough staff to do the work required for the scrutiny of projects and for the programmes of surveys to be carried out. I have already, in the Committee on Budgets, drawn the attention of those responsible to this matter.

Mr President, this report will have been useful only if we draw all its logical conclusions, including the determination — on the part of a Parliament born of democratic elections and therefore endowed with unquestionable authority — to concentrate our efforts in two directions. The first of these, Mr President, is the revision of the ERDF Regulation which, by 1 January 1981, will or should contain — as we have heard today — the essence of the objectives and measures requested by our Parliament in its various statements. These concern, in particular, the manifestly inadequate level of the fund's resources, the monitoring of the use of Community funds, the giving of information to the populations affected by what should be coherent programmes instead of vague projects, sometimes, not very often, meeting national, regional or local objectives and lastly, in the medium term, the firmer pressure to be applied to the Council to get it to define once and for all — because all of us can see clearly that there has not been any regional policy — the philosophy of a real Community regional policy. At the moment everyone has the feeling that the ERDF is just an instrument and a weak palliative in the absence of that policy.

Mr President, I would like once again to thank all those whose important contributions to this discussion have enabled all the Members and, I feel sure, the Commissioner to draw some useful lessons from this

broad debate on the Fourth Report on the ERDF in 1978.

President. — I call Mr Burke.

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission.— Mr President, since I have already spoken in the debate, and since I do not wish to take from the time which would be useful and necessary for my colleague, Mr Giolitti, I shall note the points made by the various speakers. I have noted them with interest; they all form part of the general debate on infrastructures which has been continuing since November and will be concluded where this section is concerned in the colloquium on 6 June in Brussels.

I would make three points: firstly, this question, in these north-south links, of choosing our priority. Yesterday, Mr Dalsass' question raised the matter of the Brenner Tunnel. I could also indicate other projects that might be included in our overall assessment. We have for example the St Gotthard Tunnel and the Splügen Tunnel and the improved links between Ulm and Milan. There are many others. It is therefore for the Committee on Infrastructures already set up by the Council to take on these matters and to discuss them.

The second point, I want to stress is the importance which the Commission attaches to the creation of a new financial instrument capable of meeting the needs of transport infrastructure. As I said yesterday in reply to the oral question, the Council is still examining this proposal and I hope that our amendments to it will also be received with attention. As a sub-point to this I would ask Parliament in its further budgetary discussion for the first time in the history of the Community to give to the transport infrastructure area some funds to make a start in this regard.

Finally and very briefly, I would make the following remarks on the resolution which is before the House. The first three points of the motion stress the need for an integrated approach to infrastructure development projects so that the necessary linkages can be made. Members of the House will find that this idea is very clearly taken up and set out in the Commission's memorandum on the Community's role in the development of transport infrastructure. On point 4 of the motion for a resolution I would point out that in the memorandum to which I have referred, the Commission stresses the complementary roles of existing financial instruments and our new proposed infrastructure financing instrument. I regret that have to be so brief, but it is out of deference to the House and to my colleague who wants a little time to answer the debate.

President. — I call Mr Giolitti.

Mr Giolitti, member of the Commission. — (I) Mr President, as I told you I shall now make an attempt at a tour de force and state the Commission's position in less than 20 minutes on the content of a 65-paragraph motion for a resolution and the points made in 28 speeches, some of which dealt with Mr Cecovini's question on which I will make one brief comment.

In order to keep within my time-limit I shall summarize the points that I feel that I have to make under four or five headings.

First of all I would like to express my sincere thanks to Mr Delmotte, the rapporteur, whose skill and spirit of collaboration with regard to the work that the Commission has undertaken and will continue to undertake in order to improve the effectiveness of Community regional policy I have already appreciated on various occasions in the past.

As the speakers have said, this report spells out all the problems experienced in the management of the Regional Fund during 1978, a year which already seems to be far away, for one thing because the regulation that then governed it has since been superseded. But I do not think that this is a reason for treating as academic the discussion we have had and which is now drawing to a close.

In any case, in policy matters, a review of the past helps in understanding the present and preparing the future and it is above all the future that I shall have in mind in the brief remarks that I shall now make, the future not only of the Regional Fund but, to use a pertinent comment by Mr Griffith, the future of regional policy as a whole, of which — as the rapporteur has rightly pointed out on several occasions — the Regional Fund is just one instrument and, I would dare to say, perhaps not even the main instrument, since the principal aspect of regional policy is the coordination of all the Community policies and the inclusion in all Community policies of an appraisal of their effects at the regional level, in other words what we call the *AIR* method — the appraisal of the regional impact of every Community policy.

The first point I want to make concern the reference that has often been made to the now imminent revision of the Fund Regulation which is scheduled to take place before the beginning of the new year.

The Commission certainly does not intend to evade its responsibilities but I would like to take this occasion to draw Parliament's attention to the somewhat difficult situation we find ourselves in this respect, which has been brought out in this debate.

You have discussed, and I am commenting on, what has happened with regard to the management of the

fund in 1978 — in other words the management of a fund governed by a regulation which has since been replaced by the regulation entering into force at the start of 1979 — with the object of revising the Fund Regulation.

Do we or do we not wish to take into account our experience with the application of the regulation that has been in force since February 1979 in view of the fact that it was only in February 1979 that the Council approved the Commission's proposals presented in June 1977?

I do not think we can revise the Fund Regulation without taking some account of the application — however brief it be — of the second regulation that we brought in, for one thing because this, second regulation included one major innovation whose effectiveness we must surely assess. I am referring to the non-quota section which, sad to say, has still not been implemented because the Council has not yet approved — and unfortunately, I have to say, is not yet making any attempt to approve — the first proposals presented by the Commission for the use of the non-quota section.

We would add, however, that we ought to assess — as several speakers have pointed out — the foreseeable effects, to the extent that we are capable of foreseeing them, of the enlargement of the Community to include Greece, which will accede to the Community on 1 January 1981.

This new regulation therefore, this revised Fund Regulation, would have to allow for the accession of Greece in all the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the Community's regional policy. But above all, we — namely the Commission and I personally — shall be fulfilling our obligation to present within the next few months (during the summer I think it will be) the first periodical report on the socio-economic situation in the Community's regions.

I feel that it is on the basis of this first report that we should assess the priorities to be set and the criteria to be adopted so that the revision of the Fund Regulation is carried out in relation to a concrete and real situation that we shall have been able to analyse and evaluate.

These are the points I wished to put before Parliament regarding the problem of the time available to us to carry out the revision of the Fund Regulation without haste and enabling us to reap the benefits of a joint assessment by the Community institutions, made more profound by the experience that we have had and culled at those important opportunities for overall review of which certainly the most significant will be the report to which I have referred.

The second point I wish to make is the importance of the regional development programmes. Mr Del-

Giolitti

motte's report speaks of the thousands of individual projects that the Commission's slender regional policy staff have to examine for eligibility for grants from the fund — with the consequent risk of fragmentation and lack of cohesion.

Only through the improvement of the programmes on the basis of the recommendations which the Commission sent to the Member States, and only on the basis of well co-ordinated development programmes, shall we be able to move forward according in a coherent manner.

This is why I feel encouraged by the comments that have been made during this debate along those lines. Mr President, it is on the basis of the programmes that we shall be able to resolve this difficult and nagging problem of complementarity which we have so far — and I wish to say this with all frankness — failed to solve. Neither can we be satisfied with the position in regard to the complementary and additional function that Community assistance should have in relation to national support in the field of regional policy.

It is on the basis of the programmes that we shall be able to overcome the difficulties that have so far prevented us — as we have to admit — from finding a satisfactory solution to this problem in order to avoid Community assistance in the regional policy field being reduced to a refund of money spent from the national budgets of the Member States and therefore performing a purely substitutional function, whereas, instead, it should be complementary and additional as demanded by all the speakers who have spoken. On this point, too, the Commission feels encouraged by the positions adopted in the course of this debate and indeed on many earlier occasions by the European Parliament.

This problem of complementarity and additionality is clearly linked with the problem of information and control. Members have referred to the unsatisfactory situation prevailing in certain countries from this standpoint. Here too I am counting on the support of Parliament so that this problem can be rapidly put right and overcome. The Commission will not fail to make every effort to improve this aspect as well.

I would like to make a very brief reference to a matter hardly touched upon during the course of the debate but which nevertheless, seems worth drawing to the attention of this Parliament. As you know, we have introduced the procedure of what are called accelerated payments into the regulation that entered into force early in 1979 after approval by the Council. This procedure has given good results. In 1979 we were able to make double the payments made in 1978, as can be seen from Mr Delmotte's report.

I would also like to touch very briefly on the problem of the relations between the regional and local bodies which, after all, have considerable importance.

Very recently, in the town of Campobasso, I had occasion, to attend a meeting of the Advisory Committee which the five organizations representing the regional and local bodies in the Community have set up. This seems to me to be a very important step forward. The existence of this single Advisory Committee, representing the five organizations, makes it possible for the Commission and also the Commissioner responsible for regional policy to establish relations at this important level of political and administrative responsibility, namely that of the regional and local authorities, more easily and therefore more continuously and frequently.

I would like to say one word about the amendments that have been tabled. I am in favour of Mrs Ewing's amendments because the identification or choice of the regions to benefit from contributions from the fund will not be the Commission's responsibility for as long as the basic regulation is unchanged. But it is the responsibility of the Member States — and therefore this cannot be offloaded onto the Commission — to add further regions to the list of those assisted by the fund.

As regards the amendment tabled by Mr Blaney regarding the financing of housing, I have to say that it is not as a social measure that this type of infrastructure can be financed by the Regional Fund as the amendment says but from the economic standpoint. We shall try, in the revision of the regulation, to extend eligibility for contributions from the fund to housing where it can be shown that housing for workers, for example, in areas where new industries are being set up will contribute to the economic development of the region. The objective of regional policy is not social assistance; its intention and purpose must be to further development objectives. Regional policy has to be a policy of development, not assistance.

Lastly, Mr President, allow me to take 30 seconds to give my opinion — because the problem also concerns my responsibilities — on the issue raised in Mr Cecovini's question that has been combined with the debate on the operation of the fund although the connection does not seem at all clear or evident, at least not to the naked eye, as Mr Burke has already observed.

Well, I feel that this connection can be found if one consider — as I am ready to consider — that the problems raised under this heading fall within the framework of a regional policy, if it is coordinated with a policy of territorial development as we propose to do but which certainly we have so far been unable to — for all the reasons that have been explained.

Transport infrastructure is certainly essential to counterbalance the disadvantages of peripherality from which frontier regions, in general, suffer and which could in particular affect the Friuli-Venezia Giulia region if the improvements are not made — particularly in the context of the Community's new relations

Giolitti

with Yugoslavia and its forthcoming enlargement to include Greece — which the questioner and other speakers on this point have described and requested on the basis of considerations which seem to me to have been summed up and brought home highly effectively in the last speech of Mrs Gaiotti.

I apologize for the no doubt numerous, omissions you will find — because of the limited time available to me — in this closing answer to the debate. On the other hand, this will certainly not be the last opportunity for the Commission to talk to you on these subjects. So questions to which I have not been able to give a full reply today will be properly answered on another occasion.

President. — To wind up this debate on the oral question I have received three motions for resolutions, with request for an early vote, pursuant to Rule 7(5) of the Rules of Procedure:

- from Mr Gouthier and others (Doc. 1-85/80),
- from Mr Cecovini, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group (Doc. 1-90/80),
- from Mr Modiano and others (Doc. 1-91/80).

I shall consult Parliament on these at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution contained in the Delmotte report will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.10 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

9. Votes

President. — The next item is the vote on the motions for resolutions on which the debate is closed.

We shall begin with the *Wawrzik report* (Doc. 1-734/79): *Food aid to Cambodia*.

This morning Mrs Macciocchi submitted an amendment to me which, with the rapporteur's agreement, she had hoped to table. I told her that, since the deadline for tabling amendments, 6 p.m. yesterday evening, had expired, this amendment could not be printed and distributed. However, in view of the importance of the

subject of the amendment, I wish to read aloud the first paragraph which seeks to replace paragraph 7 of the motion for a resolution by a new text:

'Has taken note of the Commission's proposals for a second instalment of emergency aid totalling 40 million EUA, and hopes that they will be approved as quickly as possible.'

I draw the Commission's attention to this text and asks it to give Parliament an undertaking to report to it on this matter as soon as possible. Since the Commission's statement on this subject will be recorded in the verbatim report of proceedings, this will meet the wish expressed by Mrs Macciocchi and the rapporteur.

I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson, member of the Commission. — (F) Madam President, during the debate that took up part of yesterday afternoon and continued this morning, Members were unanimous in wanting the responsibilities assumed by the Community for help to the Cambodians, whether in Kampuchea itself or as refugees in neighbouring countries, to be fully and properly discharged.

Now it so happens that, for reasons of climate and in the interests of urgency, we must act very quickly. We have budgetary difficulties with which you, Madam President, are more familiar than anyone else and which have forced us to make a distinction in our proposal between the decision on the principle and the budgetary application in the framework of the provisional twelfths.

If Parliament would be kind enough to state its agreement that the principle should be complied with as early as possible, the Commission will undertake to make detailed and precise proposals enabling a decision to be taken by the budgetary authorities as early as possible.

I am very grateful to you for being kind enough to read out the text proposed by Mrs Macciocchi — even though it cannot be treated as a formal proposal by Parliament — because in this way it will be minuted in the report of proceedings. The Commission undertakes to act as soon as possible along these lines.

President. — The second paragraph of this amendment, which I shall now read aloud, will be submitted to the enlarged Bureau at one of its next meetings:

'Asks Parliament, in accordance with its vote of 15 February 1980, to send a delegation to make an on-the-spot check on the distribution of this aid'.

I put the first two indents of the preamble to the vote.

The first two indents are adopted.

President

After the second indent I have Amendment No 2 by Mr Gremetz and others seeking to add the following two indents:

- having regard to the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Amendola and Mr Ansart on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group on the tragic situation of Vietnamese refugees (Doc. 1-224/79),
- having regard to the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Denis and Mr Ferrero on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group on EEC aid to Vietnam and Cambodia (Doc. 1-432/79).

What is the view of the rapporteur?

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) Madam President, I am against this amendment. The basis of the motion for a resolution comprises the two motions for a resolution from this House embodied in it. Here, however, an attempt is being made to revise a policy that has been decided on elsewhere in the House by means of this amendment.

President. — I put the amendment to the vote.

Amendment No 2 is rejected.

I put to the vote the third indent of the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 5.

The third indent and paragraphs 1 to 5 are adopted.

On paragraph 6 I have Amendment No 3 by Mr Gremetz and others, seeking to replace this paragraph by a new text:

- Calls for increased aid to be provided for the peoples of Cambodia, Vietnam and Laos, care being taken, in agreement and in cooperation with the governments concerned, to ensure that, despite all difficulties, the aid reaches the civilian population; this will require a special contribution by the Community to the repair of transport infrastructures and the development of road and waterway transport,
- therefore calls for the immediate restoration of increased food aid to Vietnam.

What is the view of the rapporteur?

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) Madam President, my comment on the first amendment also applies to this one. I am against it.

President. — I put the amendment to the vote.

Amendment No 3 is rejected.

I put paragraph 6 to the vote.

Paragraph 6 is adopted.

After paragraph 6 I have Amendment No 1 by Mr Purvis, seeking to add the following new paragraph:

- '6a In view of the critical conditions likely to arise in the next few weeks from a severely restricted and disrupted harvest in Kampuchea, calls on the Commission to ensure continuing and adequate supplies of food and medical aid through the existing voluntary organizations and to monitor their efficient distribution'.

What is the view of the rapporteur?

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour of the amendment.

President. — I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is adopted.

I put paragraphs 7 and 8 to the vote.

Paragraphs 7 and 8 are adopted.

Members can now give explanations of vote.

I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — (I) Madam President, I just want to say very briefly that I shall be voting in favour of this motion for a resolution but also to remind Parliament that this is the second or third time that we have concerned ourselves with the Cambodia problem and unfortunately I am afraid that we will probably be concerned with it for a long time to come. I also believe that the time has finally come to actually send our parliamentary delegation to Cambodia since this was voted on and decided by Parliament on 15 February. I do not know what the — probably bureaucratic — reasons are for the delay. I would not venture to think, Madam President, that it is an economic problem. It seems to me pretty ridiculous to put budgetary obstacles in the way of a delegation of this type. I also feel, and this is the problem that Mr Glinne raised in February, that the members of the delegation would have been quite prepared — I am sure — to meet, either personally or as a group, the costs of the journey.

I would also like to recall that there is a subject that we have not yet managed to tackle and that is the question of orphans and refugee children in the Thailand camps. This is a real tragedy. I understand, Madam President, that this morning you had more direct information and I hope that the delegation that is going to Cambodia will be able to bring us back information on this specific point so that we may initiate real action within the shortest possible time.

I am quite certain that there are families and others in all the European countries ready to take in these

Bonino

unfortunate children and I think that we have up to now set up too many bureaucratic obstacles and that we in Europe have not attached enough importance to the respect for human life and the duty to help those who are particularly in need.

President. — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

Mrs Macciocchi. — (*I*) I would first of all like to thank you, Madam President, for kindly reading the two amendments that were tabled after the time limit had already gone by. I would however like to add, with renewed thanks to you, that there are special conditions of which we should perhaps take more account, as in the specific case of this amendment that Mr Cheysson has been kind enough to take up asking that it be minuted in the report of proceedings. This amendment could not have been tabled until after the speech of the Commissioner which he gave at 7 p.m. yesterday. It was only after his speech and after he had explained to us the possibilities that existed for the Commission to provide a new type of aid in a second phase, that an amendment could be tabled. Otherwise we would have had to be gifted with a kind of inspired knowledge, a kind of European Thomism enabling us, before the Commission and other important speakers took the floor, to know what they would say and therefore what to put into an amendment. I say this merely to explain why the amendment was tabled after 6 p.m. — a problem that, in my view, could well arise for Parliament on other occasions.

As regards the second amendment that you were kind enough to read out and to put before the enlarged Bureau, I am particularly pleased at this decision (although I would have preferred a vote to have been taken) because this matter too was taken up again this morning by Mr Cheysson in his speech. In short, I repeat that I am extremely satisfied because the Commissioner has told us that, in his opinion, the sending of a delegation of this type could have favourable aspects. There is every probability that this will be so, all the more so — and here I again agree with him — if it can avoid the vicious circle of a political debate and directly tackle the task which, incidentally, we have clearly outlined, in other words an on-the-spot check on the conditions in which this aid is being distributed. Once again, I would say to all those who have spoken along these lines, and here I turn to Mr Haagerup who spoke on the subject, that we must set up this delegation, about which we first spoke in October last year, as quickly as possible, because I am convinced, like all of you, that in this problem, that we have been dealing with for months and months, a delegation within this Parliament will give life to the data and information that Mr Cheysson himself admits to be completely lacking, apart from that concerning the refugee camps in Thailand.

I share Mrs Bonino's feelings about the problem of the children and I think that next Tuesday in the Political Affairs Committee in the presence of Mr Hartling, High Commissioner for Refugees, we will be raising a question which arises, not purely as a matter of life and death, but as one of those capital moral choices concerning one of the most difficult and pressing aspects of future generations, namely the orphans of this dreadful tragedy which, not to mince words, could well be called genocide.

President. — Mrs Macciocchi, with regard to your first point, under the existing Rules of Procedure amendments cannot be distributed unless they have been translated. The Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions will have to consider whether this principle could not be waived.

On the question of sending a delegation to Cambodia to ascertain how the Cambodian people can best be helped, the Political Affairs Committee was to look into this, as you know. I will ask what conclusions it came to.

I call Mrs Baduel Glorioso.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — (*F*) Madam President, I voted in favour of Amendment No 1 tabled by Mr Purvis, because it seemed to me very appropriate to add a new paragraph after paragraph 6. I am sorry that our two amendments have been rejected, the first being of historical interest: the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Amendola and Mr Ansart on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group on the dramatic situation of refugees from Vietnam is an old motion, and it can be recalled without removing anything from the context, as is the case with the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Denis and Mr Ferrero on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group on EEC aid to Vietnam and Cambodia.

Even if paragraph 6 is worded in such a way as to satisfy us, our amendment No 3 could have been adopted. These two amendments do not seem to me to be so revolutionary.

We shall, however, vote in favour of the motion for a resolution, because aid to Cambodia is as necessary as aid to any people suffering under the conditions of war, wherever they may be.

President. — I call Mr Haagerup.

Mr Haagerup. — (*DK*) Madam President, as draftsman for the Political Affairs Committee I should like to repeat what I said yesterday, namely that the committee had, in response to the instruction to consider the dispatch of a delegation of this nature, recommended

Haagerup

that a decision be postponed until the UN High Commissioner for Refugees had been heard at the meeting with the Committee for Development and Cooperation and the Political Affairs Committee arranged for Tuesday. As I pointed out in the opinion I delivered on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, that does not mean the complete rejection of the proposal for a delegation, which will remain on the committee's agenda.

President. — The enlarged Bureau will take account of this.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole.

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — We come to the *Delmotte report (Doc. 1-789/79): Fourth Annual Report on the ERDF*.

I put the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 5 to the vote.

The preamble and paragraphs 1 to 5 are adopted.

After paragraph 5 I have Amendment No 1 by Mrs Ewing, seeking to add the following new paragraph:

'5a Nevertheless deplores the fact that the Highland Region and the Island Regions of Scotland have not been identified as priority regions by the criteria employed by the Commission despite the very obvious regional problems found therein and calls on the Commission to re-examine these criteria with due regard to the base-line socio-economic development found in these regions.'

What is the view of the rapporteur?

Mr Delmotte, rapporteur. — (F) I understand the intention, very laudable as it is, underlying the wording of this amendment by the honourable Member, Mrs Ewing, but I would urge her to withdraw it, because she must admit that we are not meant to be proposing specific regions in a resolution of this kind. It is not, Mrs Ewing, the Commission which proposes priority regions, but the Member States, and your thinking has undoubtedly taken the wrong course to some extent. This amendment is alien to the scope of the report.

President. — Mrs Ewing, are you maintaining your amendment?

Mrs Ewing. — Madam President, when I refer to the guidelines for Community regional policy, I do not see that anything there is against the proposition that my area should be excluded: the reason I gave was depopulation, and if Mr Delmotte does not recognize that that is a criterion then I can only say that, although I gave him credit for having a heart, I was perhaps mistaken, because the depopulation of an area with a culture and a language that is dying is very important to this whole Community. I know that the Community cares about peripheries, and I would just say that I think my amendment is totally relevant. Under all the pieces of paper that I have either from the Commission or from Parliament, and I refer to the resolution dated 21 April, ...

President. — Mrs Ewing, I simply wanted to know whether you were maintaining your amendment.

I put the amendment to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is rejected.

I put paragraphs 6 to 8 to the vote.

Paragraphs 6 to 8 are adopted.

After paragraph 8 I have Amendment No 2 by Mrs Ewing, seeking to add the following new paragraph:

'8a Nevertheless deplores the fact that the Highland Region and the Island Regions of Scotland have not been identified as priority regions by the criteria employed by the Commission despite the very obvious regional problems found therein and calls on the Commission to re-examine these criteria with due regard to the base-line socio-economic development found in these regions.'

What is the view of the rapporteur?

Mr Delmotte, rapporteur. — (F) What I said about Mrs Ewing's first amendment also applies to this one. I ask the House to reject it.

President. — I put the amendment to the vote.

Amendment No 2 is rejected.

I put paragraphs 9 to 18 to the vote.

Paragraph 9 to 18 are rejected.

After paragraph 18 I have Amendment No 4 by Mr Blaney, seeking to add the following new paragraph:

'18a Calls on the Commission, in making proposals to the Council for the upcoming revision of the Fund Regulation, to include provision for support from the Fund to national schemes to help make housing accessible to those unable to bear the rising cost of providing their own homes.'

President

What is the view of the rapporteur?

Mr Delmotte, rapporteur. — (F) In our Committee on Regional Planning and Regional Policy I have on several occasions in the past spoken in favour of the establishment in the policy of an infrastructure to permit the development of the less-favoured regions.

But, Madam President, I must point out that Mr Blaney's amendment, in referring to access to ownership and so on, is too specific in nature and does not therefore fit in with the general provisions contained in our report.

For Parliament's information, I would add that the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning is preparing a document on this very subject.

For the moment I would ask the House to reject Mr Blaney's amendment.

President. — I put the amendment to the vote. Amendment No 4 is rejected. I put paragraphs 19 to 21 to the vote. Paragraphs 19 to 21 are adopted. After paragraph 21 I have Amendment No 3 by Mrs Ewing, seeking to add the following new paragraph:

'21a. Nevertheless deplores the fact that the Highland Region and the Island Regions of Scotland have not been included in the Commission's list of priority regions despite the very obvious regional imbalances found in these areas, and calls on the Commission to re-assess the interpretation of the criteria which they have employed to define these priority regions, paying particular attention to 'structural under-employment' in regions of base-line socio-economic development (where traditional indicators such as unemployment figures, migration rates, etc. often fail to identify areas with chronic regional problems);

	Highland Region	Island Regions
Total Area (km ²)	25 389	5 303
Total		
Population (1977)	189 800	68 100
Population Density	7.5 pers/km ²	12.8 pers/km ²
Employees in employment	70 300 (37 %)	19 200 (28 %)
Percentage in:		
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	5.8	7.1
Engineering and allied industries	11.0	2.4
Other		
manufacturing	6.6	9.4
Construction	12.4	9.4
Mining, quarrying, gas, electricity and water	1.7	1.2
Service industries	62.4	60.9
UNEMPLOYED		
(%)	8.6	7.0

SOURCE: HMSO, CSO, Regional Statistics 1979

What is the view of the rapporteur?

Mr Delmotte, rapporteur. — (F) Madam President, we have here almost the same situation as with amendments Nos 1 and 2. Having put in her plea for the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, Mrs Ewing feels she must add a table giving detailed statistics. I believe, Madam President, that, given the form of this report, the object should not be to draw Parliament's attention to a specific aspect, of which everyone in this Chamber is aware. I see no reason why the resolution should contain detailed statistics, as this has never been customary in our Parliament.

I call on the House to reject this amendment.

President. — I put the amendment to the vote. Amendment No 3 is rejected. I put paragraphs 22 to 65 to the vote. Paragraphs 22 to 65 are adopted. Members can now give explanations of vote. I call Mr Fich.

Mr Fich. — (DK) Madam President, I should first like to say that I welcome this comprehensive and thorough report on the operation of the Regional Fund and the problems related thereto. However, politically I disagree with the report in two respects. The first is paragraph 13, which I find unacceptable. In this paragraph the Council's adoption of the unanimous voting procedure for specific projects is condemned, as showing little Community spirit. That is absolutely wrong. The whole idea of a Community is to reach unanimity, to demonstrate the willingness to act jointly. I do not believe that majority voting in the Council would help the Community spirit, and I therefore oppose the views expressed in paragraph 13.

Secondly, I cannot accept the report's opposition to national quotas. Only under that system is each country enabled to fix the objectives of its own regional policy. Community criteria would not always coincide with our peoples' wishes in respect of employment and economic activity. I do of course accept that a limited section of the fund is not based on quotas, but the individual countries' regional development plans funded through the national quotas must remain the backbone of the system. For these two reasons I shall vote against the Delmotte report.

President. — I call Mr Moreland.

Mr Moreland. — Madam President, I shall be supporting this resolution and I congratulate the rapporteur on a report which I think is sensible...

Mrs Ewing. — Don't forget the Highlands and Islands!

Mr Moreland. — ... and is critical where it should be critical. What I wanted to say is that we will in the future, however, look for more criticism of the regional policy, or indeed more analysis, particularly of areas where we squander money, ...

Mrs Ewing. — Squander?!

Mr Moreland. — ... because I think many of us are worried that we are not getting the results that we should be getting from regional policy and we are worried that it is sapping our enterprise rather than encouraging it. Therefore, while I support this resolution warmly, I believe that next year we should look at this very critically indeed.

Mrs Ewing. — What about the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, which you voted against?

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole. The resolution is adopted.

10. *Human rights in Chile*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-821/79) by Mr Van Miert, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on the violation of human rights and fundamental liberties in Chile.

I call Mr Van Miert.

Mr Van Miert, rapporteur. — (NL) Madam President, the question of the violation of human rights in Chile has already been discussed by the international community on repeated occasions. In every case it has been stated unequivocally that human rights have been violated repeatedly and seriously in that country since the coup of 11 September 1973. Not only the European Parliament but also many other international bodies have expressed concern over this question. Among them are the UN Human Rights Commission which has done a great deal of work on this question, and the Council of Europe, the Organization of American States, organizations like Amnesty International, international trade union organizations and the Catholic Church rather than its representatives in Chile itself. It is clear that very serious violations are still being perpetrated.

The European Parliament as a directly elected Parliament was therefore quite right at its first constituent sitting to request the Political Affairs Committee to look into this problem again and to draw up a report on the situation in Chile with specific reference to the protection of human rights.

Since the appearance of the report of 25 October 1978 by the UN ad hoc Working Group of Human Rights in Chile which it was felt allowed the prediction that there would be a slight improvement in the situation as regards respect for human rights, nothing has in fact changed. The latest report, likewise drawn up on behalf of the United Nations by Mr Dieye concludes that the tendency towards improvement did not come about. On the contrary. The state of siege that had been in force since September 1973 was admittedly lifted in March 1978, but it was replaced by a state of emergency which in practice has approximately the same implications. That, then, is the background against which the suppression of human rights has taken a firmer hold.

Under the state of emergency the exercise of a number of fundamental human rights is seriously restricted. Only a few days ago the Chilean Church authorities publicly emphasized this. For example, the freedom to associate freely and to hold meetings and the freedom of expression are still seriously restricted.

The Christian-Democratic President Eduardo Frey was not so long ago forcibly forbidden to speak. And on the International Day of the Woman, 8 March, mass arrests were again carried out. People are still being persecuted and intimidated and arbitrarily arrested and detained, even by bodies which have no right to do so. Use is still made of torture and other, more refined methods which are just as inhuman as torture.

Since the coup more than two thousand people have disappeared. Despite international pressure, the Chilean authorities have always failed to conduct serious investigations to clarify this particular situation. It is similarly an established fact that the military authorities do not even shrink from murder to silence the opposition. I would simply remind you of the horrible discovery of mass graves in Longuen, Yumbel and Santiago and of murders committed abroad such as that of Orlando Letelier in the United States.

In addition, the powers of the security services have obviously been considerably increased, and the Government has never been able to give a satisfactory explanation regarding the responsibility of its people for the disappearance of numerous political prisoners. The physical repression which undoubtedly exists and which the military rulers in Chile openly supported to some extent, certainly immediately after the coup, has gradually given way, partly due to the pressure of international opinion, to a more institutionalized form of repression by way of what are known as antiterrorist laws and other legislation governing, for example, associations and trade unions.

One problem that deserves our particular attention and causes us concern is the fate of the million or so Chileans who have had to leave the country. The inalienable right to live and work in one's own country

Van Miert

does not exist for more than 10 % of the Chilean population.

Despite the amnesty announced by the Government, the exiles, with a few exceptions, are still in practice unable to return to their country. It is essential that these people should be able to return to their country if they want to. The restrictive application of the theoretical right of return clearly shows that the Chilean authorities are not politically prepared to treat these exiles as full Chilean citizens again, with due regard for the fundamental rights of man.

What economic results the military junta has achieved have been at the expense of the Chilean population and the least affluent in particular. The Chilean citizens standard of living and purchasing power have declined substantially, and unemployment has assumed alarming proportions. Furthermore, there are other factors to be considered, for example in regard to education, to which less than half of what was spent for a number of years now goes, as a result of which the right to education has again become a right of the privileged few rather than of the whole population. Another example is health care, on which spending has also been drastically cut in recent years, with the result that it too has become something for the privileged and the well-to-do, to which the ordinary man in the street no longer has access. In short, what has been achieved, and this in very relative terms, at economic level has been at the cost of a great deal of misery for the average Chilean citizen.

The pressure of international opinion has so far been primarily concentrated, understandably, on executions, torture and other flagrant violations of human rights. It is obvious that this international pressure must not be allowed to abate and that particular vigilance is required. In this respect the European Community has, in my opinion, a very important role to play. The new resolution before the House should not therefore be regarded as a mere verbal statement, but as a step by which the directly elected Parliament makes it clear to the Chilean Government, and thus all governments which do not respect human rights that other measures will be taken if this urgent appeal does not produce any results.

Like the United Nations *ad hoc* Working Group, we feel that only if continuous and strong international pressure is brought to bear can the Chilean authorities be induced to show greater respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. The directly elected Parliament has a duty to devote itself to this cause. The European Community and its Member States must not let it rest at pious hopes: they should revise and suspend their economic and military relations with Chile. The United States recently took a number of steps in this direction. On 30 November 1979 the US Secretary of State decided, in view of the refusal by the Chilean authorities to condemn the members of the Chilean security services who were responsible for the murder

of the former Minister Orlando Letelier in Washington in 1976, severely to restrict military and economic relations with the Pinochet Government. The position adopted by the United States on the worsening of the situation as regards respect for human rights in Chile should prompt the Community countries to suspend any form of economic and military aid to the Pinochet Government until human rights and fundamental freedoms are respected and until the rule of law and democracy are properly restored. Against this background, it is therefore regrettable that the French Government should be supplying Chile with weapons and fighter planes and training Chilean pilots and that the British Government should have restored diplomatic relations with the Chilean authorities at the beginning of this year.

In this context it should be pointed out that Belgium has not only supported the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and taken steps together with the other Community countries in Santiago de Chile, but has also adopted two other measures worthy of note: a complete embargo on the supply of weapons to Chile and the refusal by the Foreign Minister to relax the *del credere* mechanism in favour of Chile, despite its foreign exchange surpluses. Unfortunately the Belgian Government has not adopted this attitude in other cases, for example towards Uruguay, where human rights are also very seriously violated. I personally find this disgraceful. It is now for the European Parliament and the other European institutions to demonstrate very clearly not only that it is deeply concerned at the continuing flagrant violation of human rights in Chile but above all that it is prepared to draw the logical conclusions, particularly by suspending all economic, financial and military assistance to the illegal Chilean regime.

To conclude, we are only too aware that Chile is not an isolated case. Unfortunately, human rights are violated in practically the whole of Latin America and elsewhere in the world in a flagrant and, in some case, even worse way than in Chile. It is the bounden duty of the European institutions continuously and consistently to make every effort to ensure that human rights are protected and respected everywhere in the world.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Van den Heuvel to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Van den Heuvel. — (NL) There is a danger, Madam President, of interest in the situation in Chile waning to some extent. After the extreme indignation which the coup by the military junta, under the leadership of Mr Pinochet, on 11 September 1973 aroused in almost every country of the world, we have, it sometimes seems, learned to live with what is unfortunately still happening there. Murders, disappearances, arrests

Van den Heuvel

in Chile are no longer front-page news. There are various reasons for this. Human rights have been violated so often and there are so many new cases as time passes that there is a danger of the injustice that has existed so long merging into the background.

Secondly, we tend to shut ourselves off from news about torture, persecution and oppression because we are emotionally unable to digest so much information. Partly as a result of this, some people are therefore only too willing to believe reports of a few slight improvements in the situation: Why do those people go on whining? It's getting a bit better after all. It is so nice to dwell on these so-called improvements.

How much better is the situation in Chile at the moment? The rapporteur has already talked about this: 1.2 million Chileans have been forced to leave their country, 250,000 of them recognized as political refugees. The state of siege which has been formally lifted by the junta has been replaced by a state of emergency, which has not in fact changed the situation in any way whatsoever. In April 1979 the junta announced what it called an anti-terrorist law under which suspicious persons must be reported. The accused must then prove his or her innocence. This anti-terrorist law also stipulates — this is another example — that any criticism of the Government is punishable by imprisonment of between 10 years and life.

Are things getting better in Chile? We need only ask the trade union leaders who were put on trial in September 1979 because they were not prepared to play the game in accordance with Mr Pinochet's rules, even though trade union activities are formally allowed as long as the requirements, which make any kind of trade union activity impossible, are satisfied. Are things getting better in Chile? We need only ask the prisoners; for after the dissolution of DINA, they are now being arrested by the same people, who have transferred from DINA to the new security service, the CNI, but whose methods, including intimidation and torture, have not changed.

Are things getting better in Chile? You must ask the refugees who want to return to their country for personal reasons, but cannot obtain an assurance from the Pinochet Government that they will be left unmolested even if they are willing to state explicitly that they will refrain from any political activity.

But not all the reports on the so-called improvements miss their target. Many people after all seek justification for their commercial interests, for example. They decide themselves that Chile is again a normal country with which normal trade is possible, that Chile is a country which can be supplied with weapons, that Chile is a country to which nuclear technology can be sold with a clear conscience. But, Madam President, the Van Miert report puts paid to this optimism. Chile is not a normal country. There is still oppression in

Chile. There is no freedom of expression at all. And that is why my group fully supports the resolution which Mr Van Miert has tabled on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, calling for the suspension of all military and economic aid. In this context the term 'aid' should be understood in its widest possible sense. Any assistance accorded in any form by the governments of our countries to the Chilean Government strengthens that Government and is an insult to the many thousands of its victims. It is a good thing, Madam President, that through this debate today on the report of the Political Affairs Committee Parliament should again be able to demonstrate its solidarity with all those who are so bitterly unaware that things are getting better in Chile. They have a right to our solidarity.

(Applause from the left)

President. — I call Mr Penders to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group).

Mr Penders. — (NL) Madam President, I should like to begin by paying a compliment to the rapporteur, Mr Van Miert. Apart from a number of comments I shall be making straightaway, I can sincerely say that I find his report on the whole really excellent. Furthermore, the rapporteur has also been cooperative, he has reported to the Political Affairs Committee in detail, a great deal of research has been done, and he agreed to make substantial amendments to the original text of his motion for a resolution. I feel he should be thanked for this.

The problem of Chile can be looked at from two angles: the restoration of democracy and respect for human rights. As regards the first angle, it must unfortunately be said that there is absolutely no prospect of democracy being restored. This is a cause of great distress for the Chilean Christian Democrats, who are now firmly reunited under the leadership of Eduardo Frey. As regards the second aspect, human rights, one thing must be said: Chile is not so bad at this moment, people are not now disappearing. Things are worse in Argentina, where death squads are still at work, for which the Government will accept no responsibility. And Uruguay is completely at the mercy of the military.

But there is one thing with which I cannot agree. In Chile human rights are continuously being violated. That is very serious for a number of reasons: firstly, because of Chile's one-time democratic tradition, and secondly, there is considerable insecurity in the country. People may not be imprisoned so soon, but they are sent into internal exile all the sooner. There is a judiciary in Chile, I agree, but it has no say in the activities of the military authorities. On 8 March of this year, the International Day of the Woman, many

Penders

people were arrested. Mr Michel, a member of my group, asked questions about this, and I am glad that you, Madam President, took action in this matter. The Minister of the Interior was dismissed after the failure of Mr Pinochet's state visit to the Philippines. This is a bad omen, because the Minister was regarded as a reasonably liberal man.

I now come to my few comments. The report would have gained in strength if various things had been added. It behoves a critic also to make a few positive comments. After all, the ALEANA Working Group, the UN Working Group, was in the end able to visit Chile. That is a positive aspect, even if it was a belated visit. Although it has admittedly not yet been possible for the Special Rapporteur to complete his work, it would have been better to refer to this positive aspect, the Working Group's visit. The former Dutch Foreign Minister, Mr Van der Stoel, expressly referred to this during a meeting of the UN Human Rights Commission in Geneva on 25 February. There is, strange though it may sound, reasonable freedom of the press in Chile. The newspaper '*Hoy*' can be very outspoken. President Carter and Cardinal Silva Henríquez, who is frequently quoted by the rapporteur, are to be thanked for this.

I must also say that the report is very weak in one respect, the section on the economic and social situation. Mr Van Miert has taken over almost all of this from the Cassese report. I do not find it a very strong section. Although many of the remarks made are correct, it should also have been realized that the poor social and economic situation was largely inherited from the Allende Government. Not only big business but also the Allende Government is to blame. Reorganization was necessary. Of course, any reorganization must have a social component, a subsidiary policy, subsidiary measures that must be taken. But it would have been to the credit of the rapporteur and Mr Cassese if they had mentioned the excellent work done by the Vicaria, which is supported by private organizations and has made such a fantastic contribution to the raising of morale among the poor sections of the population. This is recognized by the UN, it is recognized by the Council of Europe, Mr Van Miert might have recognized it too. Of course, what is needed is an integrated policy, and that is lacking in Chile. But it is not, in my opinion, a good thing to include a section verbatim in the report in this way.

Finally, Madam President, Mr Van Miert says in his motion for a resolution that oppression is increasing again. He says this in the fourth recital, and it is true. More arrests are being made, but this is because there is greater freedom of demonstration. If you look at the statistics, you will see that there is greater freedom to demonstrate, and that is why there are also more arrests. I do not approve these arrests, of course not. Mr Van Miert rightly does not do so either, but it would have been better to give a little more detail.

And then paragraph 5, which concerns economic and military aid. I am convinced that, despite everything that has been said here, the economic and military aid granted to Chile is in fact practically negligible. I looked into this matter in some detail. Do you know, Madam President, that of the nine Community countries the Netherlands is the only one not to grant the Chilean Government credit guarantees for its policy. All the other Community countries do. I would not call that aid, but normal economic dealings. Even the Belgian Government, formed by Mr Van Miert's party, grants the Chilean Government credit guarantees. I also feel that Mr Van Miert should have mentioned in this context a detailed contract his fellow party member Mr Simonnet signed for the supply to Uruguay of weapons valued at 22 million guilders. And this was done despite the opposition of the Christian-Democratic Minister Eyskens to this transaction. To be honest, I also feel that it would be better for Parliament's credibility if this paragraph was removed.

To conclude, my opinion of the report as a whole is still positive. I find it really outstanding. I hope that we shall soon be able to take positive action. I would be very pleased if the European countries went further in the future in a number of concrete respects, and I would refer in this context to one specific point, namely assisting political exiles to return to their country. I fully realize that it will not be possible to allow all political exiles to return, that is not usually on the cards, but — and Mr Van der Stoel can give numerous examples of this — unobtrusive activities can result in many political refugees, political exiles, returning to their own country. That would be a very good thing. Once again, my compliments to Mr Van Miert, and I hope that we can adopt a positive course as the debate continues.

(Applause)

President. — I call Lord Douro to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Lord Douro. — Madam President, this afternoon we are considering two reports on Latin American countries. I would like to start off by questioning whether Parliament is spending its time effectively when considering these matters. Our ability to influence events is minimal. Most countries in the world, unfortunately, have systems of government that are not democratic. This is the European Parliament and I would prefer to see us concentrating on human rights in Europe where I believe that our influence would be greater.

Having said, that, I would like, Madam President, to speak on both Chile and Nicaragua. I would like to congratulate Mr Antoniozzi on the report on Nicaragua. I think it is a very impartial and objective report and I think it is particularly good in view of the two

Lord Douro

motions for resolutions which stimulated it, one tabled by Socialists, one by French Communists. Both these resolutions were full of useless invective and I think it is particularly laudable, therefore, that Mr Antoniozzi produced the report that he did.

I wish I could say the same about Mr Van Miert's report on Chile. My own opinion is that it is biased, lacking in objectivity and, in certain respects, incompetent. Any remarks that I may make however, I must emphasize, do not in any way constitute an endorsement of the present government in Chile. We all want to see a return to democracy in Chile and we all condemn violations of human rights in Chile and elsewhere. However, I think we should put the matter in perspective. In 1973 the army intervened in Chile with considerable popular support, because the government of Chile had totally broken down. There was no food in the shops, there was considerable anarchy and, indeed, this House should not forget that under the government of Mr Allende torture, also, was perpetrated.

(Interruptions: Prove it!)

In fact there is a well documented case of a Member of Parliament... — I am ready to prove it and I am very pleased that I am having these sort of interjections from the other side — ... there is a well documented case of a Member of Parliament, during the time of Mr Allende, being tortured by the Allende government. I should be happy to produce proof, if Members opposite would like it.

Now it is most regrettable that, since 1973, there have been no democratic elections in Chile and that there is no apparent likelihood of them taking place in the immediate future. However, I think it very unfortunate that the report does not give more attention to the undoubted success of the economic policies of the government. There has been a tremendous step forward. There has been a reduction in inflation — one cannot deny that — and there has been real economic growth over many years. I would also like this House to consider why it is that there are 10 000 people in the Peruvian Embassy in Havana trying to get out of Cuba and that is not what is happening in Chile. There is surely a moral in the fact that people are trying to leave Cuba, but people are trying to return to Chile.

I know that my group very much wishes to see a return to democracy in Chile, but I regret that the motion for a resolution which we are being asked to consider this afternoon is so lacking in objectivity and I feel that the report which has been presented to us is not up to the standard which this House could expect.

(Applause from the right)

President. — I call Mrs Baduel Glorioso to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — *(I)* Madam President, Lord Douro is very young and there is still plenty of time for him to learn. I hope he will use this time to learn, whatever his interests, his attachment and his love for Portugal and for Chile, all of which I, as a free citizen and believer in individual and economic freedoms, respect.

Having said that, I must set the record straight by correcting some of the statements made in this House, coming as they do after two hundred and fifty days during which not a word has been said about Chile. I will say quite frankly that if there ever has been an attempt to create an alternative order in Latin America to the kind we see in Cuba then really that attempt was made by the Allende government, with its minority-respecting government of national unity which withheld arms from the people even when it knew that a civil war would perhaps have been better for its own supporters — who were being tortured and murdered in Santiago — and which did not opt for a Cuban-style revolution.

You, Lord Douro, believe that where Latin America is concerned the only choice available is between Castro's way and undemocratic regimes. I reject your argument because I believe that there is a democratic way and even President Frey believes it now, though he did not agree at the time; now even the whole of the Catholic Church believes it, though it did not unanimously support that view then; and most Americans believe it, though perhaps not ITT, nor perhaps the then Secretary of State Kissinger — who arrogantly boasted of having helped to bring down the government in Chile, saying: 'What else could we have done?' Arrogantly, he is making the United States pay for this arrogance.

Today, everyone without exception is opposed to the Pinochet regime. In the UN, on a General Assembly resolution there were 93 votes condemning the Pinochet regime — including the British Government of Mrs Thatcher — and only six countries, namely Chile itself, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay, Brazil and Lebanon, failed to support the resolution, proving that a certain solidarity exists, but not among the European nations.

Secondly, as regards the economic situation, it has been suggested that the Van Miert report is incorrect. I disagree! For me, it is too restrained. Had I been the rapporteur I should have had a great deal more to say. I should have said, for example, that in 1977 inflation in food prices reached 86 per cent. I should have said that, compared to 1972, the purchasing power of wages — perhaps it is my natural inclination to side with the workers — fell by 44 %.

You European Democrats would interpret these figures to suggest that the present situation in Chile was brought about by the actions of the previous govern-

Baduel Glorioso

ment. This is as much as to say that in Latin America there is no democratic alternative to Castro.

The Van Miert report is a moderate report, not a radical report. When it calls for the suspension of economic and military aid it is clear to what and to whom this refers: It does not call for the suspension of food aid, which is something on which even we agree. In fact, the reason why we are not calling for the suspension of food aid to Chile is because we know that large quantities of Community milk powder are still being distributed in Chile today. Even in the absence of any guarantees we are convinced that Europe cannot suspend food aid where it is going to help the needy. Here, the line is different, the moral choice is different and the political choice is different.

I therefore call upon this Parliament to vote unanimously in favour of the Van Miert report as a report which, two hundred and fifty days into this Parliament, at last presents a true picture of Chile.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Galland to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Galland. — *(F)* Madam President, the Liberal and Democratic Group will be supporting the motion for a resolution. While thanking Mr Van Miert for his important work I should like nevertheless to make just one observation. By trying to prove too much one can often do a disservice to the cause one is fighting for. We in the Liberal Group regard any attack on democracy as intolerable, but one needs to have the courage and perspicacity to analyze carefully the reasons for it in order to prevent a recurrence. When a government, however nobly motivated, is pursuing an economic policy that is leading the country to ruin, then there is every reason to fear that democracy will suffer a setback. This is precisely what happened under the government of President Allende, whose economic failure was legendary, as illustrated by an inflation rate of 1 000 % in the last year, and to try to suggest, as you have done, Mr Van Miert, in your explanatory statement, that there has been virtually no improvement in Chile's economy since 1973 is to deny the truth and weakens the credibility and objectivity of our Parliament. The Liberal Group wishes therefore to place on record its reservations on Chapter 4 of the explanatory statement, which concerns economic development in Chile. As this point is not taken up in the motion for a resolution we shall be voting in support of it because the Liberal Group wishes it to be known that it condemns any violation of human rights.

In point of fact, contrary to suggestions made in this House, we are determined to condemn unreservedly any attack on freedoms wherever in the world it may occur. We vigorously condemn the assassinations, the

disappearances, the detention and the intolerable and unjustifiable torture under the regime of General Pinochet. We are concerned at the rapid decline of freedoms and the disappearance of democracy in Chile — a country which, since the independence of Latin America over a century ago, has been an example of constitutional development and of a thriving democracy to the whole South American continent. But we have to ask ourselves what more can Parliament usefully do beyond voting for this motion for a resolution. We must aim to apply effective pressure on the Pinochet regime by rekindling hope in the Chilean people, by obtaining information about those that have disappeared, by enabling political exiles to return, by securing the release of detainees and many other specific improvements.

That is why we wonder about the possible effect a delegation from our Parliament might have, strengthened by the knowledge that it represents 250 million Europeans, if it were to visit Chile, Nicaragua and Argentina. Besides conveying our Parliament's condemnation, such a delegation could expect to achieve certain modest but tangible results, as did a delegation two years ago from the French Senate. The results that one might expect to achieve may appear insignificant in relation to the magnitude of the problem of loss of freedoms in these countries, but we shall surely achieve more that way than by sitting comfortably in our armchairs passing resolutions. And if anyone should condemn this kind of initiative on the grounds that such a delegation might be seen as a sightseeing trip or that such a journey would be too great an extravagance, then I am sure that Members could be found within every parliamentary group who would be willing, if necessary, to pay for such a trip out of their own pockets. To sum up, let us by all means condemn the Chilean regime, but let us also look for other ways in which our Parliament could bring more effective help to the people in those South American countries where the torch of liberty has been extinguished.

(Applause from the right)

President. — I call Mr Blaney to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Blaney. — Madam President, I rise to compliment the Political Affairs Committee its rapporteur and, indeed the Parliament as a whole on the litany of efforts they have made over the last seven years or so in condemnation of the situation obtaining in Chile — and, indeed, in other parts of the world such as Iran, Afghanistan and Czechoslovakia — and to say that when they use terms such as are to be found in this report I can only agree with them very heartily. The motion speaks of 'systematic intimidation...', arbitrary arrests, detention, deportation, torture and even murder' and further says that the Parliament 'reiterates its

Blaney

condemnation of any kind of cruel, inhuman or degrading punishment or treatment and all forms of torture'. All very laudable and, I am sure, something with which the vast majority of the Members of this House will once again agree, but I should be much more impressed by our chances of getting through to those whom we are trying to make change their ways if we were ourselves to clear up these very same demeaning, degrading and inhuman practices within the Community, more specifically in my country, particularly in the North-East of that country, which for years, but particularly in recent years, has suffered all of the things that are justly condemned here in this report. (*Protests*) I merely draw the attention of the House — and I thank Lord Duoro, who has already spoken before me, for drawing the attention of this House — to the manner in which we are so concerned about so many things that are so far away and we do not see nor do we condemn those cases which are under our own eyes — and we might talk to the people over there who are now interrupting, because they truly are the people who are responsible in my country for the denial of human rights in every form.

President. — I call Mrs Gaiotti de Biase.

Mrs Gaiotti de Biase. — (*I*) Madam President, the motion for a resolution on Chile that accompanies the Van Miert report is an opportunity for this Parliament to get the measure of the continuing strength of feeling of democratic public opinion. Evidence of this strength of feeling is also to be found in the many petitions on the subject that have been forwarded to Parliament, including the most recent one, No 10/79 by Mrs Danièle Josselin and 1 250 other officials of the Community, which is mentioned in the report.

As rapporteur on petitions for the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions — and pending discussion of the procedural questions relevant to the division of responsibility for petitions between the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and those committees that are from time to time entrusted with them — I should like to say that I find it personally very gratifying to note that all the points in the petition seem to have been embodied in the report by the Political Affairs Committee under discussion today. I take this as a positive response from the European Parliament. The strength of public opinion has made Chile a matter of conscience, typifying the contradictions, problems and risks that follow from any attack on democracy by the flagrant violation of human rights. This constitutes a challenge to which we must respond politically to the fullest extent of our responsibilities. But in doing so we are of course split between a growing feeling of impotence, a growing weariness with words, and the need nevertheless to do whatever we can by finding out about and by taking an unequivocal stand against any kind of direct or indirect support, toleration or sympathy on the part of anyone in the

Community for the atrocities documented in the report. Even a more detached and analytical approach than that of the Van Miert report would not in any case have helped to conceal the true horror of the situation in Chile.

There is no sense in going over the many things that have been said already, in particular by the spokesman for my group, Mr Penders, whose opinions I share. The very fact that such divergent political and social forces have joined together to condemn them is sufficient indication of the extreme seriousness of these events. We should like to express the hope, therefore, that the Nine working in political cooperation and this Parliament may at last take inspiration from such universal condemnation to search for a comprehensive political solution to the whole question of human rights and democracy around the world. We need to find a way of reversing the steady deterioration in political conditions. What we must not do in this situation is to indulge in mutual recriminations concerning violations of human rights or simply sit back and try to analyze why democracy has made so few advances in the world and why there is this escalation of violation by left and right-wing groups. In the meantime, the least we can do is individually to state our positions and thereby keep alive the hope of all humanity that one day we may live in a better world

President. — I call Mr Haferkamp.

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — (*D*) Madam President, the report before us has been complimented. We owe the rapporteur our thanks and acknowledgement. I feel the report might be taken as an example of how developments and facts relating to the violation of human rights can be described. The report is a detailed, a frightening summary of the facts.

We believe that this report and reports of this kind can prevent veils from being drawn over the violation of human rights, veils of forgetfulness and — the longer a situation of this kind continues — of apathy, and also veils of optimism and veils consisting in glossing things over, as has already been said here, along the lines of 'it's even worse somewhere else' or 'things will get better soon for sure'.

This report produces a resolution. That is important. It is important that we should state our opinion, but it is surely more important to establish what opportunities we have of doing something rather than simply stating something. Paragraph 3 and the succeeding paragraphs of the resolution essentially cover everything the Member States could do and, according to this resolution, should do in the fields of politics, diplomacy and bilateral economic relations. We can but hope that the appeal addressed here to the Member States is not only heard but also leads to action.

Haferkamp

What has the Community as such done in this specific case? Since 1973 we have taken numerous opportunities of adopting a clear stand against the violation of human rights in Chile. During these years we have received many leading figures who are living in exile. We also have numerous contacts with others who in one way or another do not agree with the dictatorial régime. In 1977 we moved the Commission's Latin American office from Santiago de Chile to Caracas. We have excluded Chile from the Community's aid programmes, for example those designed for non-associated developing countries, and the trade promotion programmes. Through international organizations, Caritas in particular, we have maintained food aid to this country and the people of this country. For this reason we still have an external office in Chile, which is dependent on the Caracás office. All the information we have indicates that the beneficiaries of what we are doing are in fact the people who suffer under the regime. We feel we should continue with this humanitarian aid.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Van Miert.

Mr Van Miert. — (NL) Madam President, there have been a number of inaccuracies, which I should like to correct. But firstly I should like to thank Mr Haferkamp for what he has just said. I believe that he has also provided an answer to the question which some speakers have raised as to the purpose of a debate of this kind so many years after the coup.

I should like to ask those who think such debates are superfluous, who feel it is not necessary for a European Parliament consisting of Members from democratic states, of democratically elected Members, to concern itself with anything like this — I feel that was the tenure of Lord Douro's speech — whether it was not necessary to support the democrats in Greece when a military régime was in power in that country. Was it not necessary to do the same with regard to Spain and Portugal? Was it not necessary several decades ago, when people here in Europe were suffering under a non-democratic régime, for them to be able to count on the support of democrats in other parts of the world? The answer is, therefore, that it is this Parliament's bounden duty to concern itself with such matters. It is far from superfluous to spend some time on them.

But I should like to refer to a number of misconceptions which have become apparent from various speeches, more specifically as regards Section IV of the report, that dealing with the social and economic situation. We told Parliament's services that the report was already more than voluminous enough and that the number of pages must be kept down. That is why I finally decided simply to repeat in Section IV the con-

clusions drawn in the Cassese report, which comprises more than 200 pages and was drawn up for the United Nations. I personally feel that these conclusions are still relevant today.

When mention is made of various economic results achieved by the present régime, the cost at which they have been achieved must not be forgotten. The ordinary Chilean man in the street has been the one to suffer. There is less education than there used to be, there is less employment, there is less health care. A policy is pursued to attract foreign investments. Lord Douro will know only too well what I am talking about, because he himself has a firm in Chile and for the sake of objectivity he might have stressed this a little more. Yes, a great deal has been done to attract foreign investments. An economic policy has been pursued to this end, but not an economic policy to benefit the Chilean people, simply a policy to benefit a privileged class. Those are also results that have been achieved. Those are also facts, and it is being objective to point it out. It has nothing to do with subjectivity. Lord Douro has spoken of an incompetent report. Does he mean by that the United Nations reports were incompetent, that the report of the Council of Europe was incompetent, that the many reports by Amnesty International are incompetent, that the resolution of the Organization of American States was incompetent, that all the other reports that have appeared, such as that of the Catholic Church in Chile, are incompetent?

Mr Penders has criticized me for not referring to the Vicaria. I assume that Mr Penders has read the whole report, and if he has done so, there must be a page missing from his copy, because a whole page is devoted to all the efforts the Vicaria has made to date. But I can only assume that this page is missing from his copy of the report, but that it is to be found in all the other copies before the Members of this Parliament.

Mr Penders also referred to the Belgian situation. I apologize to other Members for referring to this, but what he has said is incorrect. Firstly, Mr Simonnet is not a member of my party and secondly, the Minister of Economic Affairs, who does belong to my party, did oppose the supply of weapons to Uruguay. I just wanted to get that straight.

I will conclude by saying that I do indeed believe, as Mrs Baduel Glorioso has said, that this report is not in any way exaggerated, that it is a fair and sober statement of facts which conceal an enormous amount of human suffering, which evidently some Members of this Parliament are not even able to appreciate. And I find that regrettable, ladies and gentlemen. The report is based on objective information, which has also been verified by me personally. I have myself talked with the Cardinal of Chile, Silva Henríquez. He did not criticize a single point in this report. On the contrary, he was able to give it his entire approval. So I find it regrettable that doubts should be expressed about the

Van Miert

correctness of certain parts of this report in a very subjective and personal way in a democratic Parliament, where a totally democratic attitude is supposed to prevail.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

11. Situation in Nicaragua

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

I call Mr Antoniozzi.

Mr Antoniozzi, rapporteur. — (I) Madam President, the Political Affairs Committee has entrusted me with the task of reporting to Parliament on the situation in Nicaragua. I should like first of all to make a brief comment of a procedural nature. I believe Parliament must look for some way of dealing more rapidly with matters such as this. The origins of this debate date back to July 1979 with the tabling of two motions for a resolution, one by Mr Glinne and another by Mr Ansart and others. Following a series of referrals — from Parliament to the Political Affairs Committee, from the Political Affairs Committee to other committees for their opinion — we are now into April 1980. Of course, even in April 1980 it is still important for Parliament to say something about the situation in Nicaragua and call for some action to at least try to rescue this country from economic and social disaster. But, had we been able by means of a more streamlined procedure to discuss and conclude a debate such as this within a much shorter period of time, for example by the autumn of 1979, there is no question that the European Parliament would have been in a position to exercise much greater influence in such important matters and in such difficult and at times dramatic situations, and perhaps we should have been able to do what we had to do more efficiently and with the desired urgency.

Let us now turn to the situation in Nicaragua. As everyone knows, last summer saw the return of democracy to Nicaragua, undoubtedly as a result of internal and international pressures which brought about the fall of the dictator Somoza, who for twenty-five years had exercised control over the politics of that country through a dictatorship that had deprived it of all

democratic freedoms and plunged it into a state of social and economic chaos. The political situation, however, remains delicate. The junta which is in power clearly has right-wing tendencies, although there are attempts, which have been condemned all along even by the trade unions, by certain political groups, not always altogether democratically inspired, to alter the balance.

The Political Affairs Committee does not believe that aid should be linked to political criteria. All the same, a failure of the international community to come to the aid of Nicaragua in the enormous task of reconstruction could perhaps considerably hold up the establishment of the new regime and of democracy. The Political Affairs Committee therefore believes that a series of programmes designed to give aid and assistance, including equipment and supplies, would help this country to strengthen an as yet delicate and unstable political situation that is still only just beginning to adjust to the democratic system.

For this reason it is essential for the Community and the other developed countries to step in with substantial aid to this terribly devastated country, with aid that is primarily and strictly humanitarian.

I turn now to the economic and social situation in the country. Seventy per cent of the population is without employment or resources, the monetary system is in total disarray; the agricultural cycle is so dislocated that it will take quite some time before the first harvest can be gathered; food resources are nil; the capital, Managua, is in ruins. The Government of Nicaragua has drawn up a plan for reconstruction of the country which deals with three phases: immediate necessities, rehabilitation of basic systems, and reconstruction. The Government estimates that its bilateral aid requirements will amount to some 2 500 million dollars, besides which Nicaragua has an enormous debt burden, amounting to 1 500 million dollars, which is equal to the revenue from two years' exports and which will have to be renegotiated if the country is to derive any benefit from the economic and social measures. To this end the Government has made numerous direct approaches, not only to the Community, but also to countries in the other main developed regions of the world.

The European Community — and here I base my remarks on the information given by Commissioner Haferkamp at the meeting of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, in which he pointed out that the Commission had already taken certain measures to provide emergency medical supplies as early as July 1979 and that shortly afterwards help was made available in the form of seeds as well as aid to Nicaraguan refugees living in Costa Rica. At the end of August, a decision was taken to provide 3 million EUA in aid of various types.

Antoniozzi

This aid has already been dispatched. It includes 5 000 tonnes of cereals, 500 tonnes of skimmed milk powder, most of which has been purchased directly to save on transport delays, although some 70 tonnes was flown out from the Community. Of the total amount, about 2 million EUA is being made available for the purchase of beans from neighbouring countries like the Honduras, Costa Rica and Mexico, for sale on local markets in Nicaragua. Mr Haferkamp also stated that Commission experts are in Nicaragua to evaluate projects which are designed to help in the rebuilding of the country's economy, and that a further sum of two or three million EUA has been set aside for this purpose. The total aid from the Community now amounts to about 10 million dollars since the end of July. It is in the light of this political, social and economic situation that the Political Affairs Committee in its resolution justly welcomes the emergence of political democracy and hopes that the present democratic regime which is still finding its feet may be strengthened. Furthermore, the Political Affairs Committee, aware of Nicaragua's special economic and social requirements, draws attention to the need for more vigorous aid programmes than those that have been implemented so far. It therefore calls on the Member States of the Community, either as members of the Community or bilaterally, to do whatever is possible through a programme of contacts to improve conditions in Nicaragua. The committee also hopes that the Member States will observe strict neutrality towards Nicaragua and will invite their partners to take the same attitude and to encourage its observance by Nicaragua's neighbours as well, because there could be the temptation to use pressures, infiltration and various kinds of initiatives to effectively halt the growth of democracy and reverse whatever progress the country has made so far.

Having said that, the European Parliament, through the resolution of the Political Affairs Committee, calls for the rapid implementation of the aid programmes already agreed upon and calls on the Commission to keep it regularly informed on developments in Nicaragua. It also instructs its President to forward the resolution to the Council and Commission of the European Communities, as well as to the Foreign Ministers of the nine Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation, in order to fulfil the objectives that we have set forth.

In conclusion, I repeat what I said at the beginning: that we must seek procedures such as will enable us to respond more quickly. Otherwise it may take a year or so, and after a year or so it is exceedingly difficult, if not to express our good intentions, then to achieve anything positive and concrete.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR : MR VANDEWIELE*Vice-President*

President. — I call Mr Lomas to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Lomas. — Mr President, this report and motion for a resolution are fairly innocuous, and I am sure will be welcomed by most Members of this Parliament. I think, perhaps, the amendments tabled by Mrs Lizin, if they are acceptable to the rapporteur, may strengthen it a little.

There are two main points: the question of aid to Nicaragua and the question of a neutral political attitude by the Member States of the Community. I am sure we all welcome very much the democracy and freedom which now exist in that country following the fall of President Somoza. The Sandinist Government which now runs that country's affairs should have our full support and every encouragement and assistance in building a free democracy. Things have improved since the troubled days of the struggle to overthrow Somoza. The new government is now widely recognized as the legitimate government of the country, representing the aspirations of the people there. There is certainly more stability. There are many schemes now, ambitious schemes. The rapporteur referred to some of them. A mass literacy campaign has been introduced aimed at enabling, within the space of one year, 50 % of the largely illiterate population to read and write. So it is our duty to give every possible assistance to Nicaragua. Despite our economic problems, we in the West are relatively very rich countries. We really never do enough to assist countries in Latin America and the Third World generally. I appreciate the economic problems we have, but I do feel that we could give more assistance. This means not just aid. Certainly aid is important — medical aid, food aid —. But equally important is, for instance, better credit facilities to enable the people there to build up an industrial base.

While we do this we should make sure — and I come to the second point here — that there is no political interference in the way things develop in Nicaragua. I refer specifically to the United States. We all saw the destabilizing policies which applied in Chile when that country introduced democracy and progressive measures. I hope that we do not have that kind of interference, if the government of Nicaragua, which I suppose we could loosely describe as a left-of-centre government, starts to introduce measures which are not favourable to the United States. I hope we are not going to have any interference, either, by multinationals as we had in Chile. I would draw Parliament's attention to an interview which was held recently with Mr Henry Gayerling, who is president of the 'Council

Lomas

of the Americas', a very important group of businesses in America which deal with about 85 % of the trade with Latin America. When he was asked whether multinationals interfered politically in the development of other countries, he said this — and I think the words are significant — he said multinationals should not interfere politically with countries, whatever their politics might be, but he said what they do do is to go to their government and say — I quote — 'That is a son of a bitch there, what are we going to do about him? Are we keeping him in or out?' Well, I hope that Mr Gayerling does not think of the new government of Nicaragua as sons of bitches and we do not have any interference there by any country, whether it be the United States or any other.

Finally, Mr President, I would say that I welcome, of course, the assistance which has already been given by the Community to Nicaragua and Mr Haferkamp outlined some of the aid that has been given at a previous session of our Parliament. But it is never enough. Whatever aid we give to developing countries is really never sufficient and I appreciate that; but I do urge the Commission and Member States to do everything in their power to assist this young, progressive government of Nicaragua to make a success of running the country and the economy, so that the people there can for the first time ever build a democratic society, with a decent standard of living and hope for their future and the future of their children.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Chambeiron to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Chambeiron. — *(F)* Mr President, as our agenda calls for three successive debates (on Chile, Nicaragua, Czechoslovakia) in which I might have asked to speak, I have decided, with your approval and to avoid repeating myself, which would have tried the patience of the Members of this House, to speak on the second report, which is equidistant from the first and third, because I should like to make a few general remarks.

I have noticed that at the beginning of each part-session Parliament is called upon to debate human rights in the most varied of countries. In this regard I should like, on behalf of my French colleagues in the Communist and Allies Group, to recall our basic position.

We have repeatedly said that in our view it is not for this Parliament to set itself up as a kind of international judicial body responsible for laying down the law in third countries. It is neither within its power to do so, nor is it a role it should be playing.

But if it intends to continue on this course, it should go about things more seriously and leave nothing to chance, which would inevitably result in our devoting

all our time to these matters. I would add that the Community does not have a single instrument which would permit it to implement resolutions of this kind.

The impression I have gained while listening to various statements in this House is that the question of the violation of human rights has less to do in some Members' eyes with a desire to find practical solutions than with a desire to circumvent the provisions of the Treaties and so to strengthen the supranational powers of the Community or even to serve tactical interests and politicking, which we cannot accept.

This attitude also reflects, in some Members, a desire to line up with the position of the United States and thus runs counter to the repeated declarations on Europe's independence.

This being the case, insofar as the majority in Parliament forces us to debate these matters, we insist on explaining our position. Our conception of democratic life, and of political life in particular, leads us very naturally to include the question of human rights in our anxieties and our daily struggle. Our condemnation of violations of human rights and of all attacks on human freedoms is unequivocal. It is not determined by any partisan attitude or by any desire to be selective, as my friend Maxime Gremetz stressed yesterday: we do not make a choice among the victims, we are not party to any orchestrated campaign; yet we note that the criticisms made by the majority of Members here are made in a systematic manner, stamped with an inadmissible partiality with regard to the Socialist countries and the peoples who are trying to find their way in independence.

We condemn all attacks on human rights with the same vigour, in whatever country they may take place.

Our condemnation of the coup d'état against democracy and the people of Chile plotted by Pinochet with the help of the United States has been unequivocal. Our solidarity with the Chilean people knows no bounds. At this very moment, as, with 1 May approaching, Chilean workers and their trade union organizations are subject to a new wave of terror, we demand the immediate release of trade union leaders from prison and of the women incarcerated on 8 March, the International Day of the Woman.

Our solidarity is indivisible when it comes to human rights. Thus, we have condemned the administrative measures affecting Czechoslovakian citizens and expressed our opposition to any trial not held in public and not offering the accused all the guarantees to which he has a right.

But we cannot accept this false symmetry suggested by the agenda which was adopted yesterday. It is in Chile that people are murdered in the stadia, it is in Santiago that intellectuals are killed after being subjected to ter-

Chambeiron

rible tortures, it is in Chile that thousands of people have disappeared without trace.

If the urgency procedure were adopted for debates on violations on human rights throughout the world, we would have to be in constant session. But why has the spotlight of emotion been turned today on Chile and Czechoslovakia alone? Why not the West Bank, Ireland, Tunisia, where 13 executions may take place tomorrow, El Salvador — the list is endless.

Since we must get to the roots of this matter, we should not confine ourselves to the question of freedom of expression. There are other rights man can claim: the right to work, to health, to housing, in a word, the economic and social rights. But it seems as if these are the very rights that no one wants to discuss in this Chamber. Why keep out of our debates any mention of the daily infringements of human rights in the countries of the Community? We want to talk about them and give them priority. That is why we shall not rest until the proposal put forward by my friend Georges Marchais that an *ad hoc* committee on contraventions against human rights in the Community should be set up is removed from the drawer in which it appears to have been placed and debated by Parliament at an early date.

For the reasons of principle that I have mentioned we shall not be taking part in the vote on the Van Miert and Hänsch reports. On the other hand, as cooperation is involved, we shall take part in the vote on the report concerning the political situation in Nicaragua, to the extent that this cooperation relates to aid which the Community can give to a nation which has been sorely tested and is slowly finding its way back to a normal situation and a democratic way of life.

(Applause from the extreme left)

President. — I call Mr Haagerup to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Haagerup. — *(DK)* Mr President, in its relatively short life as a directly elected assembly, this Parliament has expressed its views on many reported violations of human rights and debated even more motions on such violations occurring all over the world. We have just been debating violations of human rights in Chile and we shall be going on to discuss violations in Czechoslovakia. At the moment we are discussing Nicaragua, where, as the rapporteur, Mr Antoniozzi, has just said, the situation has taken a more positive turn since last July when the European Parliament first debated events in that country.

Like the other two reports, on Chile and Czechoslovakia, the report on Nicaragua has been discussed at length in the Political Affairs Committee, competent

to deal with such matters. The report on Nicaragua, which it unanimously adopted, recommends increasing aid to that country, primarily on humanitarian grounds, and my group shares that view. We hope that assistance might also help Nicaragua to make progress towards greater stability and democracy, although assistance must not be made dependent on political criteria. My group endorses this point as well.

I should however like to make a more general comment, not specifically referring to Nicaragua, where, as we have seen, the situation has improved, on the way this Parliament debates and adopts resolutions on the many violations of human rights reported to it from throughout the world. My group will vote for this report, and for the reports on Chile and Czechoslovakia. Obviously we cannot be indifferent to violations of human rights, especially in countries outside the Community, many of which do not enjoy independent legal systems as we do to assess complaints and remedy wrongs where they have occurred. Nor can we show political bias in concerning ourselves only with violations of human rights reported from countries of particular political persuasions. The three countries referred to in these three reports have varying political systems. We must therefore concern ourselves with violations of human rights, and we must do so on the basis of the democratic principles uniting the vast majority in this House, and here I clearly disagree with the previous speaker.

However, at the risk of disagreement with several of my colleagues, I should like to emphasize that Parliament really must be selective in the cases it takes up, and its criterion should be whether there are reasonable grounds for believing that a resolution or debate on a matter in this House is at all likely to have any positive effect in each individual case.

The European Parliament is not the United Nations, nor a mini United Nations, and we are not a Court of Appeal for the unfortunately all too frequent violations of human rights we hear of, not to mention the many we do not hear of because they occur in countries successfully shutting themselves off from the outside world. But the time factor and practical reasons prevent us from investigating and giving our opinion on every single case.

Our voters within the Community would find it hard to understand why the European Parliament, with its crowded agenda, its overworked staff and, I might add, its busy Members, should concern itself with all these matters over which we have no influence. I myself have tabled a written proposal within the Committee on Budgets for a sub-committee to assess and classify the numerous cases referred to us. Others are considering how we can most effectively deal with those cases where we can influence matters. I would therefore like to conclude by appealing on behalf of my group to this House to bear in mind that the number of cases we can consider is limited, and ask for res-

Haagerup

traint in the referral of human rights violations to Parliament, for it has enough other external matters to keep it busy, not least the acute internal economic, social and political problems facing the Community itself.

President. — Mr Haagerup, the Bureau will consider what you have just said very carefully. Following on from Mr Antoniozzi's remarks, your observation, which is well founded, will be the subject of a special discussion in the Bureau. Thank you for your suggestion.

I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, with your permission the Commission will confine its statement to Nicaragua. Since the end of Somoza's dictatorship, which was, as all the resolutions say, implacable and destructive, this Parliament and the other Community institutions, the Commission in particular, have expressed their satisfaction at the return to a system involving greater freedom, and it was immediately decided to take steps. I should like to say to previous speakers that in this case the Commission took effective action and that it is therefore normal practice that we should be accounting to Parliament for this action, as all the resolutions invite us to do.

As you know, Mr President, the Commission took emergency action in the three weeks following the overthrow of the Somoza régime and the arrival of the Sandinista régime by providing food aid, some bought on the spot and some sent from Europe, as well as medical and technical aid. From late July 1979 until the end of 1979 the aid granted by the Community — I am not referring to that granted by the Member States — totalled 10 million dollars, more than half in food aid — of which, as I said, a large portion was purchased in the region so that it could be sent more quickly to those suffering hardship in Nicaragua — slightly less than one million dollars' worth of medicine and 3.6 million in technical aid to allow the re-establishment of food and other stocks.

Contacts with the new Nicaraguan authorities have also been stepped up. Since the end of July Mr Haferkamp has received the first official delegation from Nicaragua, and the President of the Commission was visited by the Minister for Commerce in the new government. Then, on 7 March 1980, came a visit by one of the five members of the junta which heads the Nicaraguan Government, Mr Ramirez, its Finance Minister and other leading figures in the country, who before visiting any of the European governments, were anxious to make contact with the Commission, on whose behalf I had the honour to receive them. They expressed their gratitude for the very rapid action taken by the Community and above all stressed the

political interpretation they gave to the fact that this Community, which had not had relations with their country in the past, has been able, very flexibly and very effectively, to act without delay and with the greatest impartiality, as recommended by one of the motions for resolutions, when the Sandinista régime was able to liberate Managua. They also emphasized the considerable difficulties suffered by a country which has been devastated by many years of dictatorship, which was in debt beyond all reason, whose economy and social structure had largely been destroyed, as Mr Antoniozzi's report very rightly underlines. I was able, Mr President, to inform the member of the Managua junta and his colleagues that the Community would continue its action in line with its sense of responsibility as approved by the Council and encouraged by this Parliament.

In 1980 we are therefore counting on providing food aid as we did in 1979. It will comprise supplies of maize, rice, powdered milk and products purchased locally, such as red beans, cotton seed, vegetable oils and food for children. The food aid thus provided will be worth 7 million dollars in 1980.

We are also determined to assist the Nicaraguan Government with some of its endeavours, several of which are very ambitious. Thus, as the rapporteur has pointed out, the Government has decided to launch a special campaign against illiteracy. We have been told that with the aid of UNESCO experts 200 000 literacy teachers are now at work teaching the basics in the first stage of this fight against illiteracy among a million people. This is a quite remarkable effort. It is being carried out with all the means that Nicaragua can mobilize, students, civil servants who give up their holidays. Instructors and teachers are also being recruited from neighbouring countries, El Salvador in particular. The Community is, of course, experiencing serious difficulty in releasing the resources required, in view of the present 'budgetary difficulties', to use a euphemism. Nonetheless, we have found a means of using aid to the non-associated developing countries to assist the Nicaraguan budget with certain development activities, thus enabling this budget to meet a large proportion of the cost of the campaign against illiteracy. Consequently, the aid which the Community will have granted to Nicaragua in 1980 — the food aid to which I have already referred and the contribution to this literacy campaign and so on — will amount to 13 million dollars.

So, Mr President, we have an activity which goes far beyond declarations of principle and which, more precisely, shows that it has been possible to translate into practice the declarations of principle called for by Parliament and accepted by our nine governments: we have shown the Community's solidarity with a people which has fought hard for its freedom. I am happy and proud to be able to report to Parliament in this way, and I should also like to thank it for the resolutions

Cheysson

which we hope it will adopt and which will give us encouragement in this area.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

12. *Human rights in Czechoslovakia*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-815/79) by Mr Hänsch, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on the respect for human rights in Czechoslovakia.

I call Mr Hänsch.

Mr Hänsch, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in the summer and autumn of last year we were shocked to hear of the arrest of ten citizens of Czechoslovakia, of the fact that some of them had been put on trial and of the verdicts handed down on them. There have since been further arrests and trials in Czechoslovakia. But here — and this not only since Afghanistan — silence seems to have again taken the place of outrage. Against this background it seems as if this Parliament is debating an event which has long since become normal practice. But normal practice is the worst enemy of any movement which advocates freedom. We are therefore adopting the right course by again drawing the attention of the public to those unjustly condemned in Czechoslovakia, by giving them an albeit modest, but clear sign of respect and hope. What do we have in mind? Firstly, we are today demonstrating with our report a moral attitude. Secondly, we are performing our parliamentary controlling function, and thirdly, we are describing what we consider right in foreign policy terms.

Our moral protest concerns 25 men and women today incarcerated in Czechoslovakian prisons for advocating respect for human and civil rights in their country, Czechoslovakia. Eleven other Czechoslovakians have been conditionally discharged, two others face trial, but are still free. These figures were established with the aid of Amnesty International, which I should like to thank very warmly at this juncture for its cooperation. It is possible that other people have been arrested or are being sought for political reasons. This report has been prompted by a number of resolutions which Parliament debated in the summer of last year. The ten people arrested at that time belong to a committee in defence of the unjustly persecuted. This is an association of citizens who have set themselves the goal, as they say, of observing cases in which people are prosecuted or held in prison for their convictions or who have fallen victim to Czechoslovakian policy and arbitrary justice. From April 1978 until October 1979 the committee made 118 statements on the conduct of

legal proceedings against the members of Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia and also on the trials of other citizens, including in particular workers and young people in provincial towns, details of whose trials would not otherwise have been made known. By publishing the names of the accused and the verdicts reached, the members of this committee attracted the interest of the public in Czechoslovakia. The trial against six of the ten people arrested took place in Prague in October of last year. The Court found the members of this committee guilty of — I quote — ‘subversion against the Republic’ on the grounds that they had published documents of Charter 77 and their own committee in Western countries. We should add that the arrest of these ten and the trials of six of them are but one link in a long chain of trials and arrests involving, among others, practising Catholics, both priests and laymen. But it must also be said that some of those arrested last year have again been freed, in some cases on probation. This all goes to show how the Czechoslovakian Government is trying to limit and suppress the consequences of the Conference on Security and Cooperation of Helsinki in its own country.

The reasons for the arrests, which have in fact been going on since early 1977, are many and varied, but they all follow the same pattern. Some Czechs were found to have a few typewritten lines from some Charter 77 document. Others were imprisoned because they had copied works of authors who are not allowed to publish or had taped music that did not comply with the party line. Yet others have been accused, some of them on several occasions, of hastily concocted criminal offences and arrested as a result. Others have been thrown into jail for sending works of Czech authors abroad, for being in possession of foreign literature or for drawing the attention of various bodies to the injustice in their country. But it should be pointed out that not all these incidents have been the direct responsibility of the Czech Government. Czech civil rights activists also admit that some of these incidents may well be due to the action of a state security apparatus which is progressively freeing itself of governmental control. And I should also like to add another point against the background of the debate we have just had: it must be said that the violation of human and civil rights in Czechoslovakia, however much we may criticize it, bears no comparison with what has been going on in recent years in Chile or with events in Nicaragua in the last few years.

What do the people and the civil rights activists in Czechoslovakia want? All those who have been affected by governmental measures in Czechoslovakia — and I, as the rapporteur, and, I hope, Parliament attach great importance to this — want to take the laws of their own country seriously and to use them. They do not preach subversion, they do not want simply to return to capitalism. All they want is that their own government should observe the seventh principle of the human rights and fundamental freedoms, of freedom of thought, conscience, religion and conviction.

Hänsch

tion, which Czechoslovakia along with 34 other countries undertook to observe in Helsinki. Czechoslovakia undertook — with your permission, Mr President, I quote — to promote and encourage the effective exercise of civil, political, economic, social, cultural and other rights and freedoms all of which derive from the inherent dignity of the human person and are essential for his free and full development.

The supporters of the Charter are not, then, calling on others to break the law in Czechoslovakia. On the contrary, they are calling on them to abide by the law. They want the Czechoslovakian Constitution, which after all guarantees freedom of opinion and of the press and the freedom to practice religion to be taken seriously and to be enforced. They want to see the international treaties and agreements like the UN Charter of Human Rights and the Final Act of Helsinki respected by the Czechoslovakian Government. What they do not have in common is a certain political concept. The civil rights movement in Czechoslovakia, or to be more precise Charter 77, includes Socialists and Trotskyists, Christians and Communists, former members of the party and outsiders. It includes intellectuals, students and workers.

Secondly, we take the controlling function of our Parliament seriously. Our aim is not, as a previous speaker in this debate has insinuated, to interfere in the affairs of another country. Our aim is to point out that Czechoslovakia is a contractual partner, and a contractual partner of the European Community at that, since the Council and Commission were involved in the Helsinki agreements. In Helsinki each of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation represented his own country as a signatory state of the Final Act in respect of all parts of the Final Act. The then President of the Council, Aldo Moro, also signed the agreements of what is known as Basket 2 of the Final Act on behalf of the Community as a whole.

In accordance with Article 140 of the EEC Treaty and other written agreements between the European institutions, the Council, Commission and Foreign Ministers must be accountable to Parliament, and we will be doing our duty as European parliamentarians only if we discuss the question of what the Council and Commission are doing to enforce what they drew up and signed in Helsinki.

The third point is that we must express our political will as the European Parliament. We want the policy of security and cooperation in Europe to go further. After all, this policy of security and cooperation not only serves the interests of the Soviet Union. It was never intended as a mere prize for good behaviour to be presented to the Soviet Union and has never worked as such. It was and is an instrument for the better maintenance of our economic and security interests, and it is wrong to believe that changes can only be forced on Eastern Europe with a policy of confrontation. Experience shows that the cold war by

no means makes change easier, and we are not doing either Professor Zakharov or those fighting for civil rights in Czechoslovakia a service by putting a stop to all opportunities for contacts and talks and not taking advantage of them. Talks, patient, persistent talks often help the individual, the person concerned, more than public declamations. The civil rights activists in Czechoslovakia form a movement which seeks not change, but respect for current laws and treaties. Those who understand this and take it seriously must ensure that there are international agreements which the civil rights movement can invoke. The forces in power in Czechoslovakia are being forced to change course. They are desperately trying, obviously without success, to prove that the civil rights activists are breaking laws — Mr President, I am coming to the end — because they are not indifferent to international reaction. We must realize that we are also talking about a regime of weakness. This is an explanation, not an apology. We, the directly elected Members of the European Parliament make our voices heard with this report to pay our respects to those who stand up for the maintenance of their rights as human beings and citizens of Czechoslovakia. It is our moral duty to do so.

As directly elected European parliamentarians we want to know what the Council of Ministers and the Commission and the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation are doing to ensure that agreements they have signed are taken seriously by all the parties to those agreements. This is our democratic right as a controlling body. As directly elected parliamentarians from nine European countries we also want to see the CSCE follow-up conference taking place in Madrid. The Political Affairs Committee is preparing itself for this with a large-scale public hearing. We want this confrontation to be a success, but it can only be a success if all the parties to the agreements observe what they decided in 1975. It is our political right to refer to this link publicly and at the proper time. Ladies and gentlemen, we owe the civil rights activists in Czechoslovakia not cheap advice, but reliable solidarity, not outrage but cautiously effective help. We owe them our confidence in the moral strength of a movement which represents a gleam of hope in a world that is again growing darker.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pelikan to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Pelikan. — *(I)* Mr President, I believe it is appropriate and consistent with its role that this Parliament should concern itself with violations of human rights. It has already looked at Chile and Nicaragua, and perhaps it is even more appropriate and necessary, even if a little painful that it should also look at human rights violations in a European country, namely

Pelikan

Czechoslovakia. This is a country steeped in European history and culture, a country that has made a significant contribution to European culture through thinkers like Comenius and Masaryk, through composers like Dvorak, Smetana and Janacek, and through writers like Kafka, Capek, Hasek and Seifert, to name but a few.

I believe that if we were to refuse to concern ourselves with violations in a European country we should have absolutely no right to call ourselves the *European* Parliament. May I say that I certainly agree with Mr Chambeiron when he says that we should give priority to the consideration of human rights problems within the European Community. Indeed we are already doing so in the Legal Affairs Committee and the Political Affairs Committee, and also in other committees. And, speaking as a Socialist, I hope we shall continue to do so.

Before continuing, may I on behalf of the Socialist Group congratulate the rapporteur, Mr Hänsch, on his excellent report and express our support for the motion for a resolution which we trust will be adopted unanimously during the present part-session. I must confess that I was rather taken aback when Mr Chambeiron intimated that the French Communists were proposing to abstain on the motion.

This is the third time that the European Parliament has been called upon to debate the issue of civil rights in Czechoslovakia: The first was in July of last year when a resolution was adopted regarding the trial in Czechoslovakia of the representatives of Charta 77. Unfortunately, the trial ended with five of the signatories being sentenced to 19½ years' imprisonment. But, even before the trial, hundreds of Czech citizens were arrested and given severe sentences simply for demanding respect for the Constitution, for the laws of the land and for the international agreements and conventions to which the Czechoslovak Government itself had put its signature.

Sadly, these arrests continue to this day, as borne out by the recent arrest of twenty-three people in Prague for attending a debate on Greek and Aristotelian philosophy. These political prisoners are being paid 20 per cent of the normal wage for the work they do, and with this they even have to pay the expenses of their enforced stay in prison!. It is not uncommon for those released from detention to have to continue to pay off the cost of their imprisonment for a further 10 or 20 years.

One of the best known Czech and European writers and winner of the European literature prize in Vienna, Vaclav Havel, was sentenced to 4½ years imprisonment at the trial in Prague. In his most recent letter to his wife from prison he wrote: "They have allowed me to tell you that I am working at the steelworks in Vitkovice, but I can say no more than that. Perhaps I can say just this: that I must not write about anything of

importance, which I could not do anyway, but I really cannot see how I am going to be able to stand this kind of life for the next five years." I must also tell you that this writer, whose plays have been staged in theatres all over Europe, has been forbidden to write or to make any kind of comment; he cannot have books and he is not allowed to study foreign languages.

The same things have been written by Jiri Dienstbier a television journalist, the engineer Petr Uhl, sentenced to five years in prison, Jaroslav Sabata, ex-member of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, who has now been in prison for eight years for the second time, and the television editor, Otká Bednárová, who was sentenced to 3 years' imprisonment and who despite being extremely ill has been refused parole. I should like to call upon the President of Parliament, Mrs Veil, to intercede personally to secure the release from prison of the courageous and seriously ill journalist, Otká Bednárová.

(Applause)

Unfortunately, Mr President, I have very little time left so I should just like to point out that arrests are only one aspect of repression. Hundreds of thousands of citizens have been removed from their jobs for political reasons and therefore cannot work and have no means of subsistence. It seems to me that what we have in Czechoslovakia — I do not want to get involved in an argument as to where there is more freedom and where there is less freedom — is a much greater trial, where the entire population is in fact being punished for its bid, back in 1968, to live in freedom and democracy, in a free socialist society.

Mr President, our Parliament can do little more than pass a resolution. I should like, nevertheless, to appeal to all Members to go to Prague, to go to Czechoslovakia, to visit the relatives of the political prisoners, to speak to those who are not allowed to speak out, and to let them know that they have not been forgotten and that they are not alone. This too will be a way of contributing to the cultural, political and moral unity of our European continent.

(Sustained applause)

President. — I call Mr Habsburg to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group).

Mr Habsburg. — *(D)* Mr President, my group endorses Mr Hänsch's report, even if it would have been happier to see it phrased in an even clearer language. I welcome Mr Pelikan's moving words and would merely like to add that religious freedom is restricted in Czechoslovakia in an inhuman manner, even if priests are being released from prison. I regret that

Habsburg

so much of our time has been devoted today to matters which do not directly concern us. As a result Europe, and Czechoslovakia is part of Europe, has been short-changed. We should at last realize that we have been elected for Europe, that we are responsible for Europe, for the whole of Europe, to which the peoples at present held in slavery by the Soviet Union belong just as we do.

(Applause)

President. — I call Lord Bethell to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Lord Bethell. — Mr President, I would like to join with others who have spoken in congratulating Mr Hänsch on his excellent report which was adopted unanimously by the Political Affairs Committee and which I sincerely hope will be adopted unanimously by this Assembly in plenary session. There were, I think, a number of points where Mr Hänsch could have expressed himself more vigorously and with greater clarity about the violations of human rights in Czechoslovakia. He has rightly pointed out that the number of people imprisoned is very small, a few dozen at most, but he might perhaps have concentrated a little more on the other means of repression against political dissenters in this European country.

It is no longer necessary, Mr President, to crush political opposition by the methods of crude political terror or torture. I admit, as Mr Hänsch pointed out, that Czechoslovakia is no Nicaragua; it is no vicious terrorist regime on a par with Amin's Uganda. It is not in the same situation as Indonesia where, it is often pointed out, there are more political prisoners than in the rest of the world put together. It comes far down the league table of numbers of political prisoners. But there are other ways of disposing of the people who dare to think differently from the government of that country. A few of these were outlined by Mr Pelikan in his extremely moving speech which rightly drew the admiration of the entire House. It is possible to crush a group of people by depriving them of their livelihood, by separating them from their friends, by dividing husband from wife, by putting pressure on children, by depriving them of University education, of higher education, by making their lives miserable economically, socially and culturally, and this is what is being done. People are not being tortured as they were in Hitler's Germany or in Stalin's Russia, but their souls and their spirits are being crushed in Czechoslovakia and this in a country only a couple of hundred kilometres from where we are sitting now, a European country which could, if circumstances were different, apply for membership of our Community and which would be welcomed into our Community, I feel sure, if only it were able to fulfil the basic criteria of membership, one of which is respect for human rights and the normal democratic forms of govern-

ment. I very much hope that the day will come in my lifetime when we will be able to welcome Czechoslovakia into our Community.

It is equally important, however, as Mr Hänsch pointed out, that we are bound by treaty obligations with Czechoslovakia. The Helsinki Agreement, signed by Mr Husak on his country's behalf, guarantees freedom of expression for all people in the 35 countries which signed it, and this agreement is clearly being violated by the government of Czechoslovakia. This is not a charade, the Helsinki Agreement. It is a specific agreement with certain paragraphs guaranteeing certain rights and giving certain privileges, many of which are extremely dear to the hearts of Communist countries such as Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. I feel very strongly that when this matter comes to be reviewed in Madrid this autumn, we must insist that the Helsinki Agreement either is to be observed in its entirety, all three baskets and all principles, or it is a dead letter and something which we need not bother about any more. You cannot have a semi-agreement. You cannot have an agreement of which one part is seen as very important, whether it is exchange of energy, the environment, medical research, scientific exchange, trade, all of them matters which the Soviet Union sees as vital to its progress, and yet cut out all the references to human rights which are dear to our hearts in this European Parliament.

Therefore, I ask this House please to approve Mr Hänsch's report unanimously. I single out particularly paragraph 6 of the report which instructs, our President, to communicate the document to the governments of the Member States of our Community and to report back to us on what action is taken. This is something which has not been done very often in the past, but I think it is an excellent example of what should be done. We should require the Member governments to tell us exactly what they have done as a result of the resolution if it is passed unanimously, which I very much hope it will be.

We should bear in mind, as Mr Pelikan very carefully and wisely pointed out, that it is the people of Czechoslovakia and countries like that who are paying the price for the fact that we live in freedom. Lines were drawn across Europe 30 years ago. Demarcation lines were drawn, and some people were condemned to live under foreign occupation. This has not changed as the decades have passed. It shows very little sign of changing, and I think we must feel very humble about the situation in which we find ourselves, able to enjoy the fruits of freedom while other European countries, only a few hundred kilometres from where we are, still live under foreign occupation and without normal basic human rights. This, I think, is the message that must go forth from this House to the people of Europe.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Irmer to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Irmer. — (D) Mr President, my group will be voting in favour of the motion for a resolution tabled by the Political Affairs Committee. We too would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Hänsch, for the work he has done.

It is true that this House is running the risk of creating an inflationary trend in resolutions on human rights throughout the world. We should certainly not debase this instrument. We must not devalue this Parliament's moral protest. But when it comes to violations of human rights in Czechoslovakia, we have a particular duty as the European Parliament. The rapporteur pointed out Czechoslovakia is itself a signatory of the Final Act of Helsinki. But there is another aspect to be considered. We call ourselves the European Parliament. Our Member States form the European Community. Let us not forget, however, that Europe is a larger entity than this Community. Let us not forget that Europe does not end at the River Elbe, or at the Bohemian Forest. Let us not forget that those other Europeans on the other side of these geographical lines do not, like us, live on the sunny side of the Continent, but still suffer bitterly from the consequences of the Second World War. We must show special solidarity with them.

I find one aspect particularly tragic. For only a very short period in its history has this country in the very heart of Europe enjoyed freedom. Throughout its history it has been oppressed by foreign peoples, Austrians, Germans, Russians. But today it is oppressed by its own people, who have come forward to obey the commands of a foreign power. What fear this régime must have of its own people if it persecutes freedom-loving citizens in this way. How inconsistent its conduct is with its own ideological aims. It is said that existence determines consciousness. Can critical voices then be so dangerous to the alleged Socialists' bliss? But obviously this bliss is simply nothing to write home about, and the people know this. Then critical voices do become dangerous, because they tell the truth.

I should now like to say a word or two to the French Communists. I am bitterly disappointed that even after the moving speech by Mr Pelikan, we have not had a French Communist ready to speak about Czechoslovakia, following the silence on Chile from that side. Is what is happening in Czechoslovakia the happiness that the French Communists are promising Europeans? Then we should be glad and grateful that they do not wield greater influence. I find it disgraceful the way the French Communists will at any given moment with inconsistent hypocrisy denounce the violation of human rights in the world. But when it is a question of discussing violations of human rights in a country where they consider the situation to be so satisfactory,

they are silent. We should take very careful note of this and express our disapproval.

(Applause)

Mr President, the Liberal and Democratic Group — and, I hope, the vast majority of this House — calls for the release of the civil rights activists in Czechoslovakia. At the very least we call for proper trials to which the world's public has access and an assurance of a proper defence. We too ask the House to vote in favour of the motion.

(Applause)

President. — Does anyone else wish to speak?

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote on Thursday, at 3 p.m.

The debate is closed.

13. *Directive on a right of residence for nationals of Member States in another Member State*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-40/80) by Mr Gonella, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on the

proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-324/79) for a directive on a right of residence for nationals of Member States in the territory of another Member State.

I call Mr Gonella.

Mr Gonella, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, I am deeply grateful to the Legal Affairs Committee for having entrusted me with presenting to Parliament a report on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on a right of residence for nationals of Member States in the territory of another Member State. This is a subject very different from those we have just been debating, which aroused indignation and protest at these attacks on freedom, to which indignation and protest I fully subscribe.

We cannot, however, confine ourselves to a purely general defence of human rights. What is important is to see what positive action the European Community can take through regulations and directives to encourage respect for human rights. This leads us on to another and certainly no less important issue, which concerns the development and improvement of the Community structure. We believe, in fact, that we have here a significant development, that this proposal provides the impetus for the transformation of the

Gonella

European Community from a common market in goods, which constitutes such a large part of our activity, to a real community of citizens, of men.

We all know, indeed it is a commonplace, being one of the basic principles of our social and European heritage, that freedom of movement within the Community and, therefore, by extension, the right to choose one's own place of residence, is a principle which has been enshrined in the Treaty establishing the European Community.

That much is now beyond dispute. What we are seeking now is to draw inferences from this principle. I need hardly remind you, but for the sake of good order I shall mention it anyway, that Article 3 (c) of the EEC Treaty accords freedom of movement to all citizens pursuing an activity and naturally that means an activity of an economic nature. We now wish to take a further step and herein lies the importance of these decisions: We wish to guarantee freedom of movement, the right to choose one's own place of residence independently of the pursuit of an economic activity. My report could well have ended at this point because this is where the difference lies, this is the radical innovation.

Title III of Part 2 of the Treaty deals with the free movement of two categories of persons. Specifically, Articles 48 to 51 cover the free movement of workers, defined as wage-earning, and Articles 52 to 58 cover self-employed persons. There is no point in my repeating here that which can be found in the written report concerning the numerous Community provisions that have lately facilitated the free movement and establishment of persons. We maintain — I believe without exaggeration, given the Legal Affairs Committee's unanimous verdict — that the proposal adds a new dimension to existing legislation in that the citizen is not considered here solely as an economic agent, a concept that we do not in any case accept. We believe that we will strengthen in this way the feeling of all citizens of belonging to a Community, not just a Community of things, as they might often feel from our agreements and our debates, but more — what is really fundamental — a Community of persons. It is a step towards the creation of a European citizenship, which, though it may be some time in coming, is certainly our end objective.

I should now like to give a very brief summary of the proposal. As I have said, its basic principle is that the right of residence should not be dependent on the pursuit of an economic activity as it is at present. The aim then is to remove all restrictions on citizens and on the members of their families, and at the same time to broaden the definition of 'members of the family'. The right of citizens to leave their own territory is thus recognized. Under the terms of this provision, they have the right to leave their own territory simply on production of an identity card or passport that must be valid for not less than five years — in order to minim-

ize the problems affecting any person having to move about — without an exit permit being required. This too is an innovation. At the same time as recognizing the right to leave, the right of entry without a permit is also recognized; an obvious relaxation, one might say a technicality and a formality, but underlying this formality there is undoubtedly a movement towards European Union. On a practical level, provision is made for the issue of a residence permit for a National of a Member State, which would not be dependent on the pursuit of an economic activity. Allowance is made for breaks in residence not exceeding twelve months, essentially for military service and on medical grounds. A list is given of the documents required concerned with proof of family relationship. It is made clear that these extended rights must cover all the territories of the Member States of the Community; that the residence permit must be issued free of charge — again with a view to facilitating the process of unification; that derogation from the directive is allowed only on grounds of public security and public health, and, finally, that the measures necessary to comply with the directive must be brought into force within 12 months and not put off indefinitely.

You might legitimately ask: What is the legal basis for all this? The proposal tries to demonstrate that the legal basis is Article 56 (2), in which reference is made to the coordination of provisions — a solution that has often been suggested. However, we reject this as a basis because we are not in any way dealing with a case of coordination. If anything, this could be a reference to Article 9. In our view, Article 235 provides the proper basis for this development in Community relations. This Article is of enormous interest and value, not solely from a philosophical and legal standpoint, but also because it leads the way to much more significant progress on a legislative level by affirming that if action by the Community should prove necessary to attain one of the objectives of the Community, appropriate measures can be taken even if the Treaty has not provided the necessary powers. One could therefore accept this provision with appropriate guarantees and safeguards, such as a unanimous decision of the Council after prior consultation of Parliament — as in this case.

Given that we need to refer to Article 235 rather than Article 56 (2), the Legal Affairs Committee has put forward an amendment, to the first indent seeking to replace this indent by the following recital: 'Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, and in particular Article 235, and having regard to Article 9 of this Directive, based on Article 56 (2)'. We have tried in Article 1 to define more clearly the meaning of family relationships, what is meant by 'residing in the territory' — does it mean residing in the territory or residing with? We have also attempted to clarify the concept of family relationships: who is a relative in the ascending line, in the descending line, and so on. The age of majority has been laid down as 18 to conform with most of the

Gonella

national legislations of the Member States. In Article 2 we have proposed the addition of the words 'irrespective of their nationality'. Here we based ourselves almost word for word on Directive 73/148/EEC.

Finally, we have included in Article 2 a provision annexed to the European Convention on Human Rights - which, as far as we are concerned, is beyond discussion - which has also been included in previous directives dealing with this matter. The last Article to which amendments have been proposed is Article 4, dealing with resources. Clearly there must be some degree of coordination between the social security provisions of certain Member States. In some of these, national assistance is granted automatically in cases of persons who are without their own means of subsistence. This provision does not prevent Member States from applying more liberal rules in respect of proof of resources. I should like to say, finally, that since a recommendation was called for we have added such a recommendation as a footnote to the document. It reads: 'The Council of the European Communities recommends that Member States give to stateless persons and persons having refugee status who were born in a non-member state and who are already resident in a state of the European Community the same treatment as that laid down by the rules on the right of residence, freedom of movement and right of establishment for nationals of Member States.'

I have to say that the Legal Affairs Committee gave their unanimous approval, apart from a few abstentions, to all of these amendments. For this reason I particularly commend our report to Parliament. Were it not for the fact that my time is up and that it is now late in the day I should have liked to have gone on to emphasize the fundamental significance of what we are discussing. Our electorate is asking us what progress we are making towards European Union. Well, although this represents only a small step, it is nevertheless a step towards a more structured European Union and towards a more meaningful recognition of human rights.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) I feel it would be a good thing for the Commission to make its position clear before the Members of Parliament speak so that they can react to what we say and we can then perhaps reply.

Mr Gonella has clearly and accurately underlined the importance of this directive. Parliament and the public often speak of the need to produce practical proof that the existence of the Community results in additional rights for its citizens. This is the aim of this proposal.

First, the legal basis: there are two ways of approaching the question of these rights. It can be said that there should be legal innovation and the establishment of new fundamental rights for the citizens as a result of the existence of the Community. This would be the beginning of the creation of a Europe of citizens, it would be the beginning of the establishment of a European political union. That is one of the questions we shall have to examine in the months to come.

But it can also be said that we are not going to await this major debate before giving the citizens additional rights as the law now stands. This is the choice which the Commission has made and which has been supported by the Legal Affairs Committee. I say this, because it limits our freedom of action in this field.

What we are concerned with is the effect of workers' freedom of establishment and freedom of movement and of the right of establishment of the employed and self-employed in the Community and rights extended to their families and dependents. It is therefore logical that the Legal Affairs Committee should choose to make a recommendation to the Council on problems connected with stateless persons, wherever they may come from. Parliament recommends to the Council that the Member States should voluntarily make provisions for these persons, which would not be connected with the legal basis provided by Article 235, within the context of workers' right of establishment and freedom of movement.

My second comment concerns the effectiveness of the action we want to take. And here the Commission faces a dilemma. This proposal aims at obtaining the Council's agreement (its unanimous agreement, since we are applying Article 235) on provisions over which it is clear the Member States have some reservations. That is why we stated in Article 4 of the Commission's initial proposal that the right of residence of the persons covered by the directive might be restricted by Member States in the sense that those wishing to settle in a Member State must have sufficient resources. Parliament's Legal Affairs Committee decided that this was not a good way of tackling the problem, because there was a risk that a distinction would be made between various categories of citizens, which must be avoided.

I should like to make it quite clear from the outset that I more than sympathize with Parliament's position on this: it is easier to say to people that there are no restrictions, and that obviates the danger that Member States will use this provision to deprive the existing right of residence of any meaning it has.

But I also know the attitude of the Member States. I would not say that they are looking for an excuse not to approve the right of residence, but they are showing us that we must use all our persuasive powers to get them to take this decision. Some Member States are afraid there would be major movements of population.

Davignon

I do not share this view. I do not feel that this rule on the right of residence will culminate in major population movements, because I believe that everyone for good reason feels better at home. On the other hand, the situation will be simplified.

I would ask the rapporteur to understand our position. In the case of students under 18 we agree with Parliament's position: it is easy not to create additional legal provisions for them, and we therefore agree to amend our proposal accordingly. On the other hand, where other people are concerned, we would like to keep the text as it is, with these two comments which we would pass on to the Council with the modified version of our directive, since we otherwise accept the other amendments, to which I will refer at the end of the debate so that our position is completely clear.

Firstly, we must define exactly what the notion of sufficient resources means, so that a mockery is not made of this provision in two ways: by allowing the Member States to assess at any given moment what measures should be taken and thus taking away with the left hand what they have given with the right or, on the other hand, fixing the level of resources required in such a way that two categories of citizens are in fact created in the Community, which would not be acceptable.

Otherwise, this would be a temporary provision applicable for an initial period of 5 years, after which we would know what movement of population had resulted from these rules. It seems to us that the Member States have no reason to feel concerned, as they do at present, and we would remove this measure after the 5-year period.

Why have we made this proposal? Because it seems to me important, for the Commission and for Parliament, that we should be open and bold in our proposals while ensuring they are effective, because if we propose something which cannot be put into practice, we may be pleasing ourselves, but not the citizens of Europe, to whom we are trying to give additional rights.

Those, then, are the comments I wanted to make at the beginning of this debate. I will speak again briefly, if I may, at the end of the debate on the amendments which have been tabled.

President. — I call Mr Janssen van Raay to speak on behalf of the European People's Party (C-D Group).

Mr Janssen van Raay. — (NL) Mr President, on behalf of my group I should like to say that we endorse the Gonella report. Mr Gonella won his spurs years ago in the movement for European citizenship, because that is what we are in fact talking about. We all regard this right of residence for citizens of the

European Community in each other's territory as a very important contribution to European citizenship, because it shows all the citizens of the Member States, all our fellow-citizens, that the European Community is not just an economic Community, that we are concerned with a new form within these nine, shortly ten, countries of the European Community. We wholeheartedly support this, just as we shall support any measure leading to this goal.

That is the first point. One of the most difficult aspects which the Legal Affairs Committee discussed and to which Mr Davignon has referred at some length, is the question of providing proof of sufficient resources. We can well understand the concern of the governments: they are afraid this freedom may be abused, particularly in view of the social security systems in the various countries of our Community. This concept is so general that two members of my group on the Legal Affairs Committee voted against the amendment seeking to remove the requirement of proof. In contrast, I would appeal on behalf of the vast majority of my group to the inventiveness of the Commission to find another way of preventing such abuse rather than evidence of resources.

Why, then, did the vast majority of my group decide not to support Mr Sieglerschmidt's amendment? There are two important reasons for this: firstly, if we intend to set up frontiers for each other's citizens, we do not want at the same time to introduce bureaucracy, and as far as we can see, this measure would inevitably result in that. The second major objection, one also raised by the Legal Affairs Committee, is that an element of arbitrariness might slip in here, because there can be no doubt that the aliens police in our various countries will be made responsible for interpreting these provisions and checking the validity of the evidence provided. Arbitrariness is a possibility, I would not say a certainty.

And at the very moment when we are seeking to open up the Europe of the Nine, soon to be the Europe of ten and even more Member States, for its citizens, we must oppose bureaucracy and the possibility of the police acting in an arbitrary manner. This resulted in our rejecting by a large majority the amendment tabled by Mr Sieglerschmidt, but I repeat, Mr Davignon, we well understand your concern. There is, of course, absolutely no point, because that would be throwing away the baby with the bath water, in our introducing a freedom, with every good intention, which becomes an impossibility because of large-scale abuse. We feel that other ways must be found, that the Commission must try to find out whether the Council would be willing to accept these provisions, in the light of the two factors I have just mentioned. If we had to choose between no right of residence and a right of residence subject to proof of sufficient resources, then we would, of course, agree to such proof. That goes without saying. We should not therefore see this matter in such clear-cut terms as I have put it. Hence my

van Raay

appeal, on behalf of my group, to the Commission to be as inventive as possible, in close consultation with the Council, to prevent the freedom of European citizens from being restricted by bureaucracy and arbitrary decisions.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Tyrrell to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Tyrrell. — Mr President, this proposal is an important landmark on the way to the creation of a genuine Community of peoples. Nothing could do more to make the Community a reality for its citizens than the right to move freely about it and reside where they choose within it. Such rights will emphasize that each citizen has a legitimate and personal interest in the prosperity, security and well-being of all other Member States. For this reason my group welcomes the purposes of the proposal and I personally support Mr Gonella's amendment for the redefining of the word 'family' to include all dependants. For the same reason I share the hope that the right of residence would be recognized, irrespective of proof of means of support.

However, the necessary conditions have first to be fulfilled. This Parliament in its law-making capacity must act responsibly having regard to what is practicable. And I ask my good friend Mr Janssen van Raay, whether in this respect he has not allowed his heart to overrule his head, because no alternative practicable steps have in fact emerged. We must not get carried away at this stage by impracticable, idealistic visions. Before requirement of proof of means of support can be made redundant, there must be considerable progress towards the convergence of social security structures. The Commission says in its proposal 'an examination of the laws of Member States has shown that in some of them persons who do not have their own means of subsistence are automatically granted social security'. This is an understatement. In at least one Member State, that is the United Kingdom, there is a legal duty on local authorities to provide accommodation, free of charge if necessary, for homeless persons and this imposes a very heavy financial burden on the inhabitants of the boroughs at the principal places of entry to the United Kingdom. It would be irresponsible of the United Kingdom or other states similarly placed to take on this burden for a limitless number of persons who have not the minimal means of support that the proposal requires. At the present time the requirement, as suggested by the Commission, is therefore, in my view, essential.

However, I welcomed Mr Davignon's suggestion that there should be a review after five years to see if it

could then be abolished. Moreover, the restriction should be as narrow as possible and I agree that different considerations apply to students. Many of us recall that in our student days we were able to live for limited periods at less than subsistence level through the hospitality of other students, not arranged in advance, and through unarranged casual work. Students should be encouraged to travel widely in the Community and they should be exempted. That exemption should apply to those over 18 as well as under 18. I do not know if the Commissioner was mistranslated when I heard it said that his suggestion referred to those students who were under 18.

I turn now to the recommendation relating to refugees, another wonderful idea, but impracticable. It would not help the refugees. Each country will say we will take, for example, 10 000 refugees from Vietnam, but if, on arrival in the European Community, all those 90 000 refugees were to be able to say they would all settle in Holland, then the Community would have to say that we cannot take as many as 90 000. So it would not help them. Furthermore, in the United Kingdom and maybe in other Member States as well, we have the problem of the definition of 'national'. The proposal refers to 'nationals'. Now, not all British nationals are nationals within the meaning of Community law. This is a grave injustice to about one million people who have full rights of citizenship within the United Kingdom but do not have rights of citizenship in the Community. It is a standing reproach to the Community and it is a problem which must be tackled and it must be overcome. But this directive is not the place to do it, because it would mean an amendment to the Treaty of Accession, where the word 'national' was defined in the way which I have described. It would be adding insult to injury to these one million people in the United Kingdom who have full civic rights in the United Kingdom, if we were to say to them, you may not have rights of residence throughout the Community, but refugees from South America and South Asia, and so on, may. So for these reasons and because we consider that the 1951 Convention on Refugees, to which all nine Member States are signatories, gives refugees adequate protection, we cannot support that recommendation.

For these reasons I move the three amendments standing in the name of my group and the additional amendment standing on my own behalf and, if those amendments are accepted — and they are acceptable, as I understand it, to the Commission — this report will have the support of the overwhelming majority of this House, excluding, I think, only the British Labour members, whose reactionary approach to this existing exciting directive is a matter of deep regret, although not, I fear, unexpected.

President. — I call Mr Berkhout to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Berkhouwer. — (NL) Mr President, the European Community has been in existence and operation since 1958, for 22 years in other words. And the wonderful thing is that all this time the citizens of one Member State have been regarded as foreigners in the other Member State. Is it really any wonder that it has taken more than 20 years for us to be foreigners in each other's countries and thus subject to the national provisions of legislation on aliens?

In the United Kingdom, so dear to my heart, we used to have to report to the immigration officer, as if we were immigrants. Happily that is now a thing of the past. I was once asked on arriving in England what the purpose of my visit was. My answer to those officials on British soil was always that I was working on having them pensioned off as quickly as possible. This situation has now fortunately changed, in that we no longer need to report to the immigration officer: we can enter the United Kingdom with the Community passport. So progress has been made in this respect.

I am glad that an Italian veteran has introduced us to this subject matter. He will know the history of ancient Rome as well as I do. He will recall that Emperor Caracalla, who was said to be mad, did do one thing which was certainly not mad. In the year 212 he declared all inhabitants of the then Roman Empire to be Roman citizens. And we, who have had our Community for 22 years, are still not European citizens of the European Community. I have long been pleading for Europe to be brought somewhat closer to the citizens. So what we are now doing here is very close to my heart.

With this directive we may now be on the right path, on the way to a Europe of the citizens. Last time we were discussing a European passport. This time we have talked about a European stamp. So there are really signs that we are bringing European citizens closer together. Of course, we must also have a Euro-time, a Euro-driving licence, and a Euro-coinage. People have no idea what countervailing duties at frontiers are for. They will not understand anything about the Community until they can travel throughout the Community using one kind of money, as can be done in the United States with the dollar and in Russia with the rouble. I always say the Americans have dollars, the Russians have roubles, and all we have are troubles. But there must come a time when we can use one kind of money throughout the Community rather than six or seven kinds.

I also have some difficulty as regards the legal basis. Why must Article 235 be brought up again? After all, Article 3 of the Treaty says that we want to bring the citizens closer together. Why cannot we refer to that? Article 235 is always being quoted, in and out of season, and Article 56 has little to do with this subject either, I find. And why is the directive again the chosen form? All nine States will again be embroidering away with their own legislation. Would it not have

been better to adopt a European regulation? That is the way it should be, and that's it. Binding on all citizens. Not through the national administrations with their bureaucratic nonsense again. Because we shall not be spared this. It is all very well to say that we must prevent bureaucracy, but we cannot avoid it in this way. And we shall, of course, again have to face the question of sufficient resources.

Article 1 says that the Member States will abolish the restrictions. Article 2 says that the Member States will grant the persons referred to in Article 1 the right to leave their territory. Just imagine that after spending some time in France or Britain I should not be able to leave. That makes you laugh. It is rather ridiculous. The Commission is proposing a directive which states that the Member State in which I have spent some time will grant me the right to leave again. Just imagine the French police saying, after I have spent three weeks in Paris: you must not leave Paris. I have every respect for the Commission, but this is preposterous. And then it says in Article 5 that citizens must show that they have sufficient resources. And it also says that the right of residence is dependent on the issue of a document, a resident's card for citizens of Member States. So I shall have to queue up again for a resident's card. But what is my position as long as I do not have it? What is the situation then? I arrive in Paris and say I want to stay there for three months. Here I am. Please let me in. But I do not yet have a card.

All I am trying to say, Mr President, is that legally this is all still rather shaky. The directive could be improved. The structure could be improved, but in any case I have set my heart on this matter.

I have just one more comment to make. You can enter my country with an identity card. So can the French. They have a *carte d'identité*. With that they can travel from Paris to Amsterdam. But I cannot go from my country to Germany without a passport. And for that passport I have to pay 50 guilders. Now I may be able to afford that from my salary as a Member of the European Parliament, but I recently attended a meeting of 1 500 German and Dutch children in the Eastern part of my country, and next year the Dutch children would like to go to Germany. But some of them come from families with two or three children, and they will have to pay 50 guilders per child if the children want to cross the frontier into Germany. Papers we need to enter the various Member States still vary considerably from one country to another, so I cannot go to Germany without a passport, while our French cousins have the right to go to the Western part of our country from Paris or Alsace with a simple *carte d'identité*, perhaps to get a personal glimpse of the pollution of the Rhine.

President. — I call Mr Gillot to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Gillot. — (F) Mr President, the Group of European Progressive Democrats is happy to see the Commission proposing a directive which is not confined to the free movement of workers but concerns all the citizens of the Member States of the Community.

This proposal is an appreciable step forward, no doubt about that. We agree with the rapporteur when he warns against discriminating between workers and others who are not carrying on an economic activity. We also feel that the right of residence should be extended to the family of a national of a Member State in the broad sense. But is it necessary, as the report proposes, to exclude the possibility of Member States making the right of residence subject to proof of sufficient resources? We would very much like to see this, but for the moment it seems scarcely possible, because in several Member States people without resources of their own automatically receive social benefits. Given this fact, it is not hard to imagine the influx of unemployed workers into certain countries if this proposal was maintained. The first essential is the harmonization of Member States' legislation on social assistance. But until that is done, the Commission's proposal seems to us the only acceptable one.

Similarly, valid though it may be, the generous idea put forward by the Legal Affairs Committee that stateless persons and refugees from third countries residing in a Community country should be accorded the same facilities as Community nationals seems to us too ambitious as the legislation and jurisprudence of the Member States now stand.

To summarize, if the rapporteur's proposals are accepted, there is a danger that the Member States will be induced to invoke public order, health and security as, preventing an excessive influx of foreigners and then the outcome would be exactly the opposite of what the rapporteur wants. For this reason my group will support the proposal for a directive submitted by the Commission.

President. — I call Mr Bøgh to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Bøgh. — (DK) Mr President, we smaller Member States have good reason to prick up our ears whenever a proposal is introduced on the basis of Article 235 of the Treaty of Rome, which essentially bypasses all other articles. This is true here too, in respect of this proposal to remove the Member States' right to documentary evidence that people coming from other Community countries, including refugees and stateless persons and their families, have means of subsistence before issuing them with residence permits.

The intention is ostensibly to remove the last obstacles to a humane and idealistic aliens policy, but, on closer examination, this reform may have the opposite effect. It would force us in Denmark to reduce the quality of our social services and to compromise our principles. In the nature of things the destitute will always gravitate towards those societies offering the highest social security payments.

Denmark, being a small country with limited resources, could not afford to support all the people who would be drawn there by its generous social security arrangements. The report recognizes this problem, stating that where appropriate other measures must therefore be taken to resolve any difficulties that might arise from the differences in the levels of national assistance to which those without means are entitled. The 'other measures' can of course only mean reducing the levels of assistance in the most advanced social systems.

As a result of the economic crisis, we in Denmark are in the middle of a political debate on the desirability of maintaining the high level of social services we have always aimed at. We want this debate and the resulting decisions to remain an internal Danish political matter. We must at all costs avoid a situation where pressure from without might be used as an argument by those political parties who are most keen to cut back our traditionally generous social policy. That is my first reason for opposing this proposal. My second is that the implementation of this proposal would erect a barrier between us in Denmark and our fellow Scandinavians. At the moment the situation is that immigration control for the whole Nordic area takes place at the Dano-German border. If this border ceases to operate as it did in the past, Norway and Sweden will be forced to set up their own checks on travellers arriving from Denmark.

We would thus, for the sake of an abstract concept, the 'European person', be forced to break our genuine historic and cultural connection with our fellow Scandinavian neighbours, and to undermine the social system we are proud of; that is why we reject this proposal.

President. — I call Mr Sieglerschmidt.

Mr Sieglerschmidt. — (D) Mr President, with my two minutes I should firstly like to thank the rapporteur and secondly to say that my group always sings with at least three voices and thus achieves speaking times which are completely unreasonable, thirdly to lend emphatic support to the amendments suggested by the Legal Affairs Committee and fourthly to call on the Commission, as Mr Janssen van Raay has done, to adopt a different course in this matter. We are not unaware of the difficulties, but there must be other ways, for example by giving Member States affected

Sieglerschmidt

by such phenomena the opportunity of defending themselves against excessive numbers of foreign nationals by some other means. Fifthly, I should like to say that I find the British amendment, which will be explained in a moment, particularly interesting because we have from the same source an amendment opposing the immigration policy of the present British Government. It is evidently supposed to be more difficult for Europeans.

Finally, I would call on the Commission to do everything possible when this directive is discussed to make the existing right of residence in the Member States sufficiently known and so enable Member States' authorities responsible for aliens and the Courts at lower levels to apply the provisions of Community law governing the freedom of movement.

Mr President, in saying this, I am referring not only to other countries but to my own as well. I will conclude by emphasizing once again that this is a first step on the path which will take us by means of a European passport — not simply this rather questionable form we are talking about now — from citizenship of our Member States to European citizenship.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Megahy.

Mr Megahy. — I will be brief, Mr President. As the Socialist Group did not find time to settle its position on this matter I have no doubt that the view put forward by Mr Sieglerschmidt is the one that would ultimately have prevailed. However had they listened to my oratory, perhaps they would have accepted my amendment. As it stands it expresses a different view from that put forward in this report and stresses that the political justification of this would be as a step towards European Union. It is argued in the documents before us that the first direct elections have created an opportunity of moving towards that goal. What I am suggesting in the amendment that I put forward is that the conditions in the Community at the moment are such as not to justify such a move towards what is called a Community of citizens. I feel that if such a community is to come about, it must, be based on a common bond, a feeling of citizenship amongst the members of the Community. If I look and if Mr Tyrrell looks at the United Kingdom at the present time, it is clear that there is a vast disenchantment with the EEC and no great desire and no great wish at this moment to move towards such a union. For these, and for the many other reasons which time does not allow me to explain, Mr President, we are suggesting that a certain period of time should elapse and that the propitious time to consider this move would be after the second direct elections when it will be possible to decide whether the EEC can continue in its present

form. If it can that may well be the time to contemplate a further move.

President. — I call Mr Ferri.

Mr Ferri, chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee. — (I) Mr President, I have asked to speak not only as the third speaker for the Socialist Group but also as chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee, which unanimously adopted, with one abstention, Mr Gonella's superbly drafted and presented report.

During the debate I have heard various speakers expressing anxiety and advocating prudence and caution. It has been said that this directive could have serious consequences. It has been suggested, for example, that the high level of social security benefits, in certain countries could be compromised by a hypothetical massive influx from other countries of people in financial difficulties or of the unemployed. And so people tend either to reject this directive outright, arguing that it is premature — I should like to know when would be the right time to introduce these provisions — or to revert to the original text proposed by the Commission which — if Commissioner Davignon will forgive me for saying so — would in effect be to rob this important directive of any real significance. We should be left simply with a token, a symbol, the importance of which I should be the last to deny. If we were to reinstate in Article 4 the power of each state to make right of residence dependent on evidence of sufficient resources we should be doing nothing to alter the present situation. In fact, Mr Davignon, we already have a situation where any citizen of a Member State can leave his own country — after all, under a democracy everyone is free to do so without a visa — and can easily obtain a residence permit provided he can show evidence of resources and can also show that he is not in financial difficulties.

So, what are we trying to do with this directive that is new? We are trying to establish as a right something that is already embodied in national legislations and is part of the democratic system of the individual Member States. By giving them the problem of ascertaining sufficient resources we are allowing them — Mr Jansen Van Raay put it very well in committee — to extend bureaucracy to such an extent as to effectively render any right of residence of citizens of the Member States meaningless, and to force on them such a tangle of red tape and police investigations as to create a situation worse than we have at present.

Mr President, I ask Parliament to be bold. The Legal Affairs Committee, by its very nature, cannot be suspected of indulging in dreams and fantasies. Many people here have said: 'You have done well, but you have been too idealistic, you see the world as other than it really is.' We believe that we have kept our feet firmly on the ground, that we have approached the

Ferri

matter as a committee which, as I say, does not go in for dreams and fantasies. By introducing these amendments to the Commission's proposal for a directive we have tried to give it real meaning and to comply with both the letter and the spirit of the Treaties by taking a modest but important step on the road to European Union, a first step in the creation of a true European citizenship. Mr Davignon, I appreciated your sincerity and your realism when you said to us: 'I have a great deal of sympathy for what you are doing, but I must tell you that, even if Parliament were to adopt the amended text proposed by the Legal Affairs Committee, the Commission would not be able to go along with you because we know that there is already among some of the Member States in the Council considerable resistance to our own cautious text. Who knows how many more would oppose it if we agreed to change it in line with the recommendations of the Legal Affairs Committee and Parliament'.

Mr Davignon, I believe that the Commission must show more fortitude on this issue, that it must exercise its political autonomy even before the Council. Let the Council, if it so chooses, take on its shoulders the responsibility of rejecting a directive based on a text amended by Parliament and adopted by the Commission. Then everyone will be politically responsible for their own actions. But let us not betray the people, let us not betray our own fellow citizens, let us not put ourselves in the position of having to tell them that we have issued a new directive on the right of residence, when a directive containing such limitations would in fact be a negation of that right.

In conclusion, I have to say that I do not believe that there is any likelihood of a mass migration from countries with lower living standards to other countries. We know very well that this will never happen, that such an idea flies in the face of economic and social reality. And so, to put this forward as a reason is simply an excuse on the part of a petty, narrow-minded bureaucracy, in the name of a fear that we have to overcome, to stand in the way of progress towards European Union. I appeal to you to give your support to the amended text of the Legal Affairs Committee, a text that the committee has itself endorsed.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Gonella.

Mr Gonella, *rapporteur*. — (I) Mr President, it really is very sad that such an important debate should have to be concluded during a single sitting and after such an essentially abstract discussion on a matter in which — as Mr Davignon rightly said — we have a tremendous responsibility.

However, I thank Mr Ferri for saying virtually what I wanted to say myself with such conviction and fer-

vour. Mr Davignon, we too are aware of the difficulties and possible effects of implementing this or that provision. In such a situation one needs more than just the courage of one's convictions, one must also have the will to accept the challenge that new problems present, along with all the attendant frustrations. There was once an Italian by the name of Caracalla — actually he was not an Italian but a Latin and therefore more courageous than the Italians — who conferred citizenship on all subjects of the Empire. No such boldness is called for in this case. All we are endeavouring to do is to draw up a set of provisions that in fact, we believe, would be compatible with the existing legislation in the other States, except for the few changes that will be necessary.

We are here to stimulate and guide progress in the legal domain along a path that will best serve the interests of the Community. There are two ways of obstructing progress: either by saying 'no', which achieves nothing, or by saying 'yes' with a few 'buts', which would in practice result in a set of bureaucratic provisions or in conditions that would make it better to have said 'no' in the first place. Neither option is acceptable to us. Much as we regret having to disagree with the arguments put forward by chairman of the committee, whose fair-mindedness we are bound to acknowledge, we shall take our courage in both hands and press for the text approved virtually unanimously by the committee.

I wish to thank everyone who has spoken in the debate for their kind remarks. I regret not having the time to go deeper into some of the issues raised. The road to any meaningful legislative unification of the European Community, if we have the will to pursue it, is bound to be strewn with obstacles.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, *Member of the Commission*. — (F) Mr President, I should very briefly like to make a number of comments of a technical nature before broaching the political problem raised by the chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee and by Mr Gonella. I am not known for my timidity, and I should therefore like to say a word or two on this subject.

The Commission accepts the amendments proposed by the Legal Affairs Committee subject to what I shall be saying presently about Article 4. The Commission does not, of course, share Mr Megahy's view. I do not understand the logic of suggesting what amounts to doing nothing for people to improve their opinion of the Community. The Commission cannot adopt that course.

Davignon

I was rather surprised to hear Mr Bøgh say that the implementation of the directive on the right of residence would affect the agreements between the Nordic countries. This is not true, Mr Bøgh. The directive has nothing to do with matters relating to identity documents required for freedom of movement. The situation at the German-Danish frontier will remain, after the implementation of this directive, exactly the same as before. I hope that Mr Bøgh will take note of what I have said and that there will be no spreading of information which conflicts with the legal basis of the text. As the rapporteur and Mr Ferri have so rightly said, the directive concerns the citizen's right of residence, which is completely different from the right to cross a frontier. You can oppose this directive, Mr Bøgh, but not on such grounds, which are irrelevant to the content of the directive.

I now come to Article 4. I admired the eloquence of Mr Ferri and Mr Gonella. All of us here have long been fighting to give rights to the citizens. I thank all Members who have supported this proposal. I fully share Mr Sieglerschmidt's sentiment, and we shall be making known what action we take in favour of the citizens. A suggestion I should like to make is that all our information offices might conduct an information campaign, in which the Commission and Parliament might join forces. You perhaps did not understand what I said, Mr Tyrrell, but we agree to the amendment concerning young people under 18 who are students. On the subject of subsistence rights Mr Ferri says with great eloquence that if any controls whatsoever are maintained, the citizens will be given a promise, while the situation will remain as it is, and that would be a sham. I would draw his attention to two remarks I have made. I said that it would no longer be a possibility but a right for the citizen. We are going to consider, as Mr Janssen van Raay and Mr Sieglerschmidt have invited us to do, ways of avoiding the difficulty raised by differences in social provisions. It would be a corruption of the system, Mr Ferri, if people living in border areas decided to settle on the other side of the frontier because the social system there was better. This might result in real difficulties at times of crisis. We must also see what is valid in the arguments of our opponents. It is a genuine risk because social benefits and the conditions attached to them are not the same everywhere.

I therefore realize that the objective of the present text may not be achieved because the phrase 'sufficient resources' can be interpreted in such a way that the right of residence is refused. We will try to improve the proposal so that it represents real, rather than simply symbolic progress. I feel it will be possible by taking the various national laws as a basis. Since we are talking about a right, Mr Gonella, Mr Ferri, and not a possibility, the citizen will be able to apply to the Courts. We are doing away with arbitrariness, and the citizen must therefore be able to invoke provisions which are clearly worded and better worded than those that already exist. We entirely agree on that. We

will be looking into this and trying to draft a text such that the national of a Community country has the same rights as the citizen of the host country. The Commission will try to find wording which reflects what the rapporteur wants. I hope you will sympathize and take account of the difficulty encountered in trying to prevent this difficulty being used to spoil the system. As Mr Berkhouwer has said, 22 years after the establishment of the Community we cannot content ourselves with symbols.

That, then, Mr President, was what I wanted to say, with the same conviction as Mr Gonella, Mr Ferri and the other speakers. I undertake, on behalf of the Commission, to ensure that the text we shall be putting to the Council cannot be used in a way other than intended. We well understand the wishes of the Legal Affairs Committee and of the vast majority of Parliament, who will be voting on this text tomorrow. But if we are to succeed, faith is essential. I also undertake to keep the Legal Affairs Committee up-to-date on the course of the debate with the Council, so that together we may be able to come to another political assessment tomorrow and decide if we must be more radical in one direction or more provisional in another to ensure progress is made. And, I can assure you, the Commission will not be making this assessment alone: it will be making it in agreement with the Council and Parliament. If it found that this right of residence was no more than a symbol and not a reality, the Commission — for this I also accept responsibility — would withdraw its proposal, because it does not want any pretence when the destiny of European citizens is at stake.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Bøgh for a personal comment.

Mr Bøgh. — *(DK)* Mr President, I can tell Mr Davignon that every week the Danish police arrest Turks at the border on their way to Sweden. This action is carried out by agreement with the Swedish authorities, because these people are without means. What he said is therefore incorrect.

President. — I call Mr Bonde on a point of order.

Mr Bonde. — *(DK)* Yes this is a point of order. I should like to defend my friend and colleague Jørgen Bøgh against the accusation that he is not telling the truth.

Is it not true, Mr Davignon, that, in the Commission's view the proposal, based on Article 235 means, among other things, that ...

President. — That is not a point of order. I cannot allow you to extend the debate.

I shall give Mr Davignon a chance to reply.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, I feel I should have a talk with Mr Bøgh in a moment because there has obviously been a misunderstanding or confusion over two types of document. I am in no way questioning Mr Bøgh's sincerity. I simply said that the Commission's proposal does nothing to change the present situation. I also said that even if the condition concerning sufficient resources was omitted, it would only allow a citizen of the Community to cross a frontier as long as he had the document required. It would not enable him to stay for longer than a certain period or to benefit from the various social laws.

I think it would be better for me to discuss this with Mr Bøgh. If he is not convinced, he can still say so when it comes to the voting on Thursday. I think I can persuade him, and his colleague, with the text to back me up. What they believe they see in the text — and I am not doubting their sincerity — does not correspond to the Commission's intentions.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

14. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received three motions for resolutions with a request for urgent procedure, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- from Mr Donnez and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on EEC/United States relations in the field of steel (Doc. 1-92/80),
- from Mr Van Minnen and other on the attempted suppression of the freedom of the media (Doc. 1-93/80),
- from Mr Prag and other on the hostages held at the American Embassy in Tehran (Doc. 1-98/80).

The reasons supporting the request for urgent procedure are contained in the documents themselves.

I shall consult Parliament on these requests at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

15. Agenda for next sitting

President. — The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Wednesday, 16 April 1980, with the following agenda:

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

- Decision on the various requests for urgent procedure
- Vote on requests for an early vote
- Joint debate on the Rey report on relations between Parliament and the Commission, the Scott-Hopkins resolution on the report of the Committee of Wise Men on the European Institutions and the Blumenfeld report on Greece's accession to the Community
- Ruffolo report on the European Monetary System

5.30 to 7 p.m.:

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

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 7.10 p.m.)

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 16 APRIL 1980

Contents

1. Approval of minutes	117		
2. Documents received	117		
3. Decision on urgency:	117		
<i>Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Glinne (S); Mr Bail- lot; Mr Bangemann (L); Mr Blumenfeld (EPP); Mr Gillot (EPD); Lady Elles (ED); Mr Fanti (COM); Mr Capanna; Mr De Goede; Mr Glinne; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Glinne; Mr Fanti; Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Donnez; Mr Martin; Mr Herman (EPP); Mrs Lizin (S); Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Vergeer</i>		117	
4. Welcome	124		
<i>Mr Colombo, President-in-Office of the Council</i>		124	
5. Decision on requests for an early vote	124		
<i>Mr Cecovini</i>		125	
6. Urgent procedure	125		
7. Relations between the European Parliament and the Commission — Report on the Euro- pean institutions by the Committee of Three — Greece's accession to the European Community - Joint debate on the reports drawn up by Mr Rey (Doc. 1-71/80) and Mr Blumenfeld (Doc. 1-49/80) on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee and the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-33/80) tabled by Mr Scott-Hopkins and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group	125		
<i>Point of order: Mr Patterson</i>		125	
<i>Mr Rey, rapporteur (Doc. 1-71/80)</i>		125	
<i>Mr Scott-Hopkins, author of the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-33/80)</i>		127	
8. Order of business	129		
9. Deadline for tabling amendments and motions for resolutions on Iran	129		
10. Relations between the European Parliament and the Commission — Report on the Euro- pean institutions by the Committee of Three — Greece's accession to the European Community (continuation)	129		
<i>Mr Blumenfeld, rapporteur (Doc. 1-49/80)</i>		129	
			<i>Mr Colombo, President-in-Office of the Council; Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission; Mr Megahy; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Nothomb (EPP); Lady Elles (ED)</i>
			131
		11. Statement by the Council on the situation in Iran	143
		<i>Mr Colombo, President-in-Office of the Council</i>	143
		12. Relations between the European Parliament and the Commission — Report on the Euro- pean institutions by the Committee of Three — Greece's accession to the European Community (continuation)	144
		<i>Mr De Pasquale (COM); Mr Haagerup (L); Mr de la Malène (EPD); Mrs Hammerich (I); Mr De Goede; Mr Hänsch; Mr Blumenfeld; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Baillet; Mr Druon; Mr Paisley; Mrs Castle; Mr Antoniazzi; Mr Møller; Mr Romualdi; Mr Fich; Mr Pfennig; Mr Tuckman; Mrs Focke; Mr Penders; Mr Prout; Mr Ferri, Chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee; Mr Battersby; Mr De Goede</i>	
			145
		13. Order of business	165
		14. European monetary system — Report (Doc. 1-63/80) drawn up by Mr Ruffolo on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs	165
		<i>Mr Ruffolo, rapporteur</i>	165
		<i>Mr Colombo, President-in-Office of the Council</i>	167
		15. Question Time (conclusion)	168
		Questions to the Council: Question No 55, by Mr Rogers: Conscien- tious objectors: <i>Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council; Mr Rogers; Mr Zamberletti; Mrs Weber; Mr Zamberletti; Mrs Clwyd; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Galland; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Galland; Mr Zamberletti;</i>	
			168
		Question No 56, by Mr Linde: Right of indi- viduals to appeal to the Commission of Human Rights:	

Mr Zamberletti; Mr Linde; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Schwartzberg; Mr Zamberletti	169	Mr Zamberletti; Mr Bettiza; Mr Zamberletti; Mrs Bonino; Mr Zamberletti	175
Question No 58, by Mr Fergusson: Rational use of national budgets:		Questions to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation:	
Mr Zamberletti; Mr Fergusson	170	Question No 73, by Mr Rogers: The death penalty:	
Question No 59, by Mr Tyrell: Financial regulations in the field of transport infrastruc- ture:		Mr Zamberletti; President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers; Mr Rogers; Mr Zamber- letti	176
Mr Zamberletti; Mr Tyrell; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Patterson; Mr Zamberletti	170	Question No 74, by Mrs Ewing: Political refugees from Chile and Argentina:	
Question No 60, by Mr O'Connell: Council delays on consumer directives:		Mr Zamberletti; Mrs Ewing; Mr Zamber- letti; Mrs Lizin; Mr Zamberletti	176
Mr Zamberletti	171	Question No 75, by Mr Fergusson; Afghani- stan:	
Question No 61, by Mr Collins: Product liability:		Mr Zamberletti; Mr Fergusson; Mr Zamber- letti	177
Mr Zamberletti; Mr Collins; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Battersby; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Marshall; Mr Zamberletti; Mr O'Connell; Mr Zamber- letti; Mr Sherlock; Mr Zamberletti; Mr O'Connell; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Zamberletti	171	Question No 77, by Mr Schwartzberg: Relations between the European Community and Israel:	
Question No 62, by Mr Muntingh: Support to common projects for hydrocarbon explora- tion:		Mr Zamberletti; Mr Schwartzberg; Mr Zamberletti	178
Mr Zamberletti; Mr Muntingh; Mr Zamber- letti; Mrs Lizin; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Schmid; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Colla; Mr Zamberletti; Mrs Krouwel-Vlam; Mr Zamberletti	173	16. Urgent procedure	179
Question No 63, by Mr Bettiza: Develop- ment of relations between the European Community and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia:		17. Membership of Parliament	179
		18. Membership of committees	179
		19. Agenda for next sitting	180
		Annex	181

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

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

President. — The sitting is open.

1. Approval of minutes

President. — The minutes of proceedings of yester-
day's sitting have been distributed.

Since there are no comments, the minutes of proceed-
ings are approved.

2. Documents received

President. — I have received from the Council sev-
eral requests for an opinion. Details will be found in
the minutes of proceedings.

3. Decision on urgency

President. — The first item is the decision on the
urgency of various motions for resolutions.

We shall begin with the motions for resolutions on the
situation in Iran. In addition to the two motions which
I announced yesterday had been tabled, I have been
notified of several others on the same subject. In view
of this, I propose that Parliament vote on whether a

President

debate on the situation in Iran should be placed on the agenda under urgent procedure pursuant to Rule 14.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins — Madam President, on behalf of my group I beg to move that this should be treated as an urgent matter and that it should come onto our agenda. I do not think anybody here can doubt the case for urgent debate, bearing in mind that the Council of Foreign Ministers will be meeting on Monday to discuss these matters, following the request from the President of the United States that the European Community should support this country's action in trying to get the release of the hostages from the US Embassy in Tehran. Therefore I put it to the House and to you, Madam President, that there is a definite need to have this matter discussed, so that not only our constituents in Europe but also the world will know what action this House believes should be taken to demonstrate our support for the United States in the very difficult and dangerous situation developing in the Middle East. One does not want to exaggerate its importance, but I think it is without doubt one of the most serious situations which has arisen since 1945.

What day we debate it, Madam President, is up to the House to decide. As you know, I hoped as a matter of courtesy it would be today, but I believe that will not be possible. Nevertheless, the sooner we can debate this the better.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Madam President, we do not think there is any call for urgency on this matter where procedure and content are inextricably linked. There is no call for urgency because in the middle of last November the House adopted a resolution which outlined in very specific terms our condemnation of the authorities in Iran.

On 15 November the House adopted another resolution, the first having been tabled by our fellow Socialist, Mr Schwartzberg, by Mrs Weiss, condemning the conduct of the Iranian authorities who were guilty of flagrantly violating human rights as universally defined.

The task today is to assess exactly what means can be used to get the hostages freed. But we see from the third version of the document which has been tabled that there is no rejection of force and that the breaking off of diplomatic relations between the Nine and Iran is seen as a possibility. There are other measures which are not put forward and which we could discuss if there were in fact to be a debate. As for the Socialist

Group, Madam President, we do not feel that the content of the document under consideration really merits urgent procedure.

President. — I call Mr Baillot.

Mr Baillot. — *(F)* Madam President, on behalf of the French Members of the Communist and Allies Group let me say that we are against urgent procedure. We are well aware of what is happening in Iran. We have had an opportunity in the past to say what we think and we are quite ready to do so again if need be, but this has nothing to do with what the real point is today. What we have to consider here is whether this Assembly, the European Parliament, is going to let itself be dictated to by a Jimmy Carter who is campaigning for reelection to the presidency and who is ready to exploit anything for the sake of that campaign. In a recent interview with four European television companies, Carter asked the nine countries of the European Community for a prompt show of support for America and for sanctions against Iran. Writing on the situation in Iran, a French evening newspaper commented on Monday that the US President was forcefully reaffirming American leadership and that at the risk of offending many people in Europe he was showing no sympathy for those who offered only halfhearted support. We do not want anything to do with American leadership and we refuse to kowtow to Carter and his vote-catching ploys. That is why we are going to vote against urgent procedure.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* Madam President, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group I want to urge that the motions tabled on this subject be dealt with as a matter of urgency. The Socialist Group's argument is unconvincing. I agree, we have already had resolutions on this matter, but things have changed since then. As for what the Communist spokesman just said, it reinforces our intention to press for urgency. Why? The reason is not because we are ready to kowtow to the US President or the Iranian Government, or to anyone else for that matter. The predominant reason is that the European Community must make its own opinion be heard on this difficult situation and at the same time achieve a dual aim: firstly, to free at long last the hapless victims of this assault on international law and human rights, and secondly, to defuse a situation which as a result of the action by the Iranian militants has become a threat to peace both in this area and in the whole world. This is what it is all about. If there is a call for the severing of diplomatic relations in the text referred to by Mr Glinne, that is by no means a last resort. My group tried again last night to phrase things differently, and the question of urgency should not be made to depend on what is in one motion or

Bangemann

another. There are several motions on the table. It was only at seven o'clock last night, when we were all meeting, that we heard that the Socialist and Communists Groups would have no objection to urgency, provided urgent procedure were adopted for all the motions so that they could be debated on Friday. I fail to understand why there has been such a rapid change of mind. How can you draw up an agenda when a large group, the biggest group in the House, does a complete about-turn between seven o'clock and half past seven?

(Applause)

This is a form of conduct which the House can well do without.

To sum up, we have no intention of kowtowing to anyone. But we also see no reason why the Foreign Ministers of the Community should reach decisions — as we hope they will — on this matter in the coming weeks without some indication of what this Parliament thinks. This is what it is all about, no more and no less!

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Blumenfeld.

Mr Blumenfeld. — *(D)* Speaking on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, let me say, Madam President, that I second the last speaker, Mr Bangemann, and that we find it incomprehensible that the Socialist Group should go back on what its chairman said at the meeting with you last night, i. e. that they were in favour of having this crucial issue discussed by the European Parliament, whereas now they are saying there is no case for urgency and they seem to want to postpone the whole matter until the Greek calends.

In view of the Council meeting which is scheduled for 21 April next, we believe that the opinion of this freely elected European Parliament on this imperative and politically charged issue should be made known to the President-in-Office at this time, at a time which you could say marks a turning point in this fraught situation. The Group of the European People's Party was in favour of doing this today, but if there are obstacles connected with procedure or the agenda in the way, Friday will have to do.

At their meeting in Lisbon the Foreign Ministers adopted a position on Iran. We welcomed that. We now want to inform them of where we stand and therefore, Madam President, we are in favour of urgency. We fail to comprehend the lack of political awareness exhibited by the Socialist Group in this Parliament.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Gillot.

Mr Gillot. — *(F)* Madam President, we naturally support the request for urgent procedure which has been tabled. It seems quite straightforward to us. Consequently, there is nothing I want to say on this point, but on the manner of dealing with it.

There are certain topics which by virtue of their significance and seriousness need a number of conditions to be fulfilled in order to be debated. This is of course true in the case of Iran. The point is that we have been told that we shall be called on to discuss the matter on Friday morning. I know that people will say that Friday is a day like any other and in theory this is true, but in practice there are seldom many Members in the Chamber on Friday mornings. I do not think it would be proper for the House to discuss such a serious subject with the Chamber more than half empty. Respect for this Parliament, for its credibility and for the seriousness of the subject in hand is at stake here.

I strongly protest against deferring this vital debate for procedural reasons to Friday morning. I urge the House to discuss this matter today, or tomorrow at the very latest.

(Applause)

President. — I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — Madam President, on behalf of my group: it is clear that we support the urgency of this motion, having been its originators. Of course we have understood that it was difficult to hold this debate today and we have conceded that it should be held on Friday. However, I am absolutely amazed at the reaction of the Socialist Group. Every day that these hostages are held contrary to the rules of international law and all diplomatic convention, the urgency of this matter for every democratic assembly of the world increases and will continue to do so until these hostages are released. When one considers that the Socialist Group has been granted urgent procedure to discuss the results of the assassination of an archbishop — however good and holy a man he was, he is, alas, already dead — and yet they cannot take part or consider urgent procedure for a debate concerning the lives and the safety of people who are being held hostage, one is filled with incredulity that such a party can reason in such a way and dare again to speak of upholding human rights. It is intolerable.

(Applause)

Elles

Secondly, Madam President, if this Parliament is to have any authority at all, surely it is its duty and obligation to advise the Foreign Ministers before they meet on Monday as to what line and what policy they should take.

(Applause)

If we are being accused of following the line of America without consultation, it will not be our fault but the fault of those people over there who refuse to debate the issue before our Foreign Ministers meet on Monday. I therefore support the urgency of this motion.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Fanti.

Mr Fanti. — *(I)* Madam President, since the matter has been brought up, I should like to remind the House of what was discussed at yesterday's meeting of the group chairmen.

We in the Communist Group have absolutely nothing against this debate and we reserve the right, when the time comes, to give our opinion on the problems which will be raised and considered on Friday. What we do object to — and it seems that Mr Glinne does as well — is that the work of Parliament is being turned upside down, along with the agenda which we adopted at Monday's sitting.

We feel there is also a justification for voting against urgency, since we cannot give our support to the reasons put forward by the authors of these motions for the simple reason that Parliament has already on several occasions made its views known, and I do not see how we can add anything to what we said as recently as a month ago.

As I said, we shall be ready to discuss the matter on Friday but in the meantime we are against urgent procedure for these motions.

President. — I call Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna. — *(I)* The Iranian problem obviously needs to be considered without delay, Madam President, but these motions have been tabled in far too much of a rush. With us here is Mr Colombo, the newly appointed Foreign Minister in the Italian Government and, by virtue of this post, the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation. The logical thing to do would be for the House to hear a statement by Mr Colombo, who could report on the recent Lisbon summit as well. This is what we need. I think there has been far too much of a rush to table requests for urgency which have

been mainly prompted by the desire to ensure this Parliament's unreserved support for the extremist stance of the President of the United States.

In my view, we have to ask Mr Colombo to give us a detailed rundown of the positions of the nine governments of the Member States of the Community. When we have heard this, Parliament can discuss the matter quite independently — without being dictated to by the nine governments — and decide on its response to the conflict between Iran and the US. Otherwise, we are just making a show about the fate of the 49 hostages, who — I agree — are being held illegally in the embassy in Tehran. The point is that when there was a request for urgency on the subject of 400 Indians held in isolation by the US Government in the very heart of America, the request was turned down. The political manipulation and warmongering designs are obvious in these motions which go as far as to call for what the governments of the Nine have not even yet dared to do: the severing of diplomatic relations with Iran.

President. — I call Mr De Goede.

Mr De Goede. — *(NL)* Madam President, the question at the moment does not concern the substance of these motions which have been tabled but rather whether the topic of Iran should again be discussed as a matter of urgency. My reply is affirmative. It is true that I share Mr Glinne's reluctance on this matter, in connection with last November's resolution, but I have this to say to him and to Mr Fanti and to the others: five months have passed since then. In the meantime the hopes of those involved have blossomed and withered. In the meantime that stubborn old cleric in Iran — who obviously thinks that his own convictions are more important than world peace and human and civil rights — has been making further pronouncements. The question here is not whether we should busy ourselves with what the American President has asked. The opportunity will arise on Friday if urgency is adopted.

When I consider how many subjects of much less significance are given urgent treatment by the House, I fail to see why we should not deal with this vital issue, especially as the opinion of the European Parliament might be useful for the Foreign Ministers who have a meeting scheduled for next week. We should not miss this opportunity to express our views on this urgent and sordid affair. I shall be voting in favour of urgency.

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Madam President, we are talking about different texts. On this morning's agenda we have a motion for a resolution by Mr Fergusson, Mr

Glinne

Blumenfeld, Mr Berkhouwer and Mr Rey. The text refers to the suspension of diplomatic relations with Tehran, which is obviously a step of some magnitude. On the other hand, in Document 1-78/80 there is no mention of any political step of this kind . . .

President. — Mr Glinne, the matter under discussion at the moment is whether in fact we should have a debate on Iran. We are not concerned about this or that motion for a resolution since, as I said earlier, the debate will cover all the motions which have been tabled.

Does this meet with your approval, Mr Glinne?

Mr Glinne. — (*F*) I am sorry, Madam President. I was not paying attention. If we are going to have a debate on all the motions, including the one put forward by our group, we have no more objections.

President. — The matter is settled, Mr Glinne, provided your motion is tabled in good time.

I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

I call Mr Blumenfeld.

Mr Blumenfeld. — (*D*) Madam President, I am speaking on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, the European Democratic Group and the Liberal and Democratic Group. In view of the decision which has just been taken on urgent procedure and since the President of the Council is in agreement, I propose that we make a start with the debate on Iran this afternoon. It is now necessary.

(*Applause*)

Now that the majority of the Socialist Group has acknowledged the urgency of this whole affair, I think that we ought to inform the President-in-Office of Parliament's position on this matter. I also think that Parliament ought to hear what the President-in-Office has to say about the situation. I propose that we start the debate this afternoon.

(*Applause*)

President. — Speaking time for this afternoon's debate has already been allocated. I am wondering if the urgent debate you want will have to be slotted into the speaking time which is scheduled.

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (*F*) Madam President, the group chairmen decided yesterday morning that all the urgent debates based on Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure would be placed on the agenda for Friday. Furthermore, the same group chairmen decided yesterday afternoon that if there was to be a debate on Iran it would be on Friday.

I fully appreciate that when the President of the Council makes his statement shortly on the general political situation of the Community and its position in the world, he may indicate what stance the Council is going to adopt on this affair of the hostages in Tehran. However, if you want the groups to give their views in a proper fashion, can we have a debate with a set of documents including all the motions for resolutions from all the groups in the House who want to take the trouble of tabling such texts?

We cannot agree to a debate this afternoon on motions for resolutions when our group will not have tabled its text until tomorrow morning. I ask the other groups to play fair and to do the gentlemanly thing which is required in situations like this. Let us hear what the President of the Council has to say this afternoon, but let us keep the debate for Friday morning when we shall have all the motions to go on.

President. — I call Mr Fanti.

Mr Fanti. — (*I*) I, too, have something to say, Madam President, about this preposterous request we have heard from Mr Blumenfeld. Yesterday, as Mr Glinne has just pointed out, an agreement was reached by the group chairmen. This agreement has to be respected. If it is not going to be respected, I request that the sitting be suspended and that we have a new meeting of the group chairmen, together with the President of the House.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti.

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti. — (*I*) Madam President, I think we ought to change the agenda along these lines. Firstly, we shall discuss the Ruffolo report in accordance with the present agenda. Secondly, we shall ask the President of the Council to make a statement on Iran, as it would be a good idea to take advantage of his presence in the Chamber today. Thirdly, if possible, we shall have the debate. If this turns out to be impossible, we shall defer it in line with the Bureau's decision. These are the proposals which I put forward on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party.

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, my colleagues will remember that it was yesterday that I asked, particularly in the meeting of group chairmen, — I am sure that Mr Glinne will remember this — that we should have this debate on Iran today. I even offered to give up the time which was to be given to the debate on the motion for a resolution concerning the institutions. I was supported by colleagues in the EPP and the Liberal and Democratic Group. Mr Glinne will remember that.

You will recall, Madam President, that he then said on behalf of his group that if we pursued this course there would be a complete disruption of the House's affairs by his group, whereupon I replied that if his group was going to behave in that way, then 'with the greatest reluctance' — he will remember that these were my very words — I would not pursue my demand, because I do not believe that this House should be brought into disrepute. I do not believe that this issue of Iran and the hostages held there is of such slight importance that it should be messed around by *amour propre*, which is what, in point of fact, this is all about. We all of us know that it is while the President-in-Office of the Council is here that we should be debating this matter. We all know this, Madam President. It is merely a question of finding the time and the means to do so.

We all of us want it. Most of the honourable Members in the Socialist Group, most of them, would want to have this debate in the presence of the President-in-Office of the Council. Certainly my group, the Liberal Group and the EPP wish this to take place, and that is the majority of this House, Madam President. In the light of what has happened in the past, I ask you to put it to the House that we should have this debate this afternoon, starting at 3 p.m. and running for an hour and a half.

(Applause)

President. — We shall interrupt the proceedings in order to convene a meeting of the group chairmen.

The sitting will be suspended for a few minutes.

(The sitting was suspended at 9.35 a.m. and resumed at 10.25 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is resumed.

I call Mr Blumenfeld.

Mr. Blumenfeld. — (D) Madam President, I wish to withdraw my earlier request to have the debate this afternoon. This will make it possible to reach an alternative solution.

President. — I take note of your statement, Mr Blumenfeld. Parliament will be informed in about an hour of when we can have the debate on Iran.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-92/80) tabled by Mr Donnez and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group: EEC-US relations in the steel sector.*

I call Mr Donnez.

Mr Donnez. — (F) Madam President, by stressing the urgency of this matter, I think we can show that in the Liberal and Democratic Group we do not take our orders from President Carter.

There has been a wave of protectionist moves by US steel concerns, and especially by Union Steel which has just initiated anti-dumping proceedings against a number of European steel producers. Seven European countries are involved. This could stop European steel products from reaching the American market, which would naturally be an immediate and daunting setback for steel production in the Community.

The legal motivation of these anti-dumping proceedings was the recent decision of the US Government to suspend the trigger prices which fixed the prices of steel imported into the United States at adequate levels. The immediate result of this suspension of the trigger price system may be unbridled competition from third world countries which will undercut European prices. They will make it extremely difficult for us to find outlets for our steel on the American market.

I gather that there are some groups, and particularly our colleagues from the United Kingdom, who do not feel there is any call for urgency. I am quite willing to accept an amendment seeking to refer the matter to the relevant committee, so that it can draw up a thorough report and give its opinion on the matter. The immediate problem, however, is still the threat to 10-15 000 jobs in the steel industry. I say 'immediate' because in my view it is up to the Commission to take every step to ensure that the American authorities reintroduce the trigger price system as soon as possible, in order to protect the steel industry in Europe. The need for urgency seems obvious to me, and I trust that the House will share the same view.

President. — I call Mr Martin.

Mr Martin. — (F) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, there is an urgent need for a debate on the steel industry. This Parliament really must make up its

Martin

mind to consider the genuine fears of the workers in this sector which is such an important part of our economies. It is absolutely vital for these workers and for the steel industry in France and other countries of the Community that we draw up plans for pruning the steel industry.

There are people in this Parliament who try to hoodwink us, and the workers, into believing that the Community is really standing up for the steel industries in the various countries of the Community and that it is against American protectionism. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is talk of trade wars, and dumping, of protectionism and competitiveness. There can be no denying these things exist. You only have to think of all the obstacles that the capitalist nations put up at their frontiers to realize this.

The essential point in all this is quite different, however, and much more down to earth. The fact is that 60 000 steel workers lost their jobs between 1975 and 1978 and another 110 000 will be getting their cards before 1981. In France 45 000 workers will have lost their jobs between 1978 and 1980. Plants are being shut down everywhere.

You do not have to look very far to find those who are behind this catastrophe. It is the European Commission and the governments of the Nine who are pushing through these restructuring plans. What you are trying to protect these days is not our steel industry, because you are wrecking it by laying off workers and dismantling the plants. What you are trying to safeguard is this competitiveness, as you call it, based on closures and unemployment so that a restricted number of foundry owners can benefit.

We cannot accept this because there is another way of going about things. We have to do away with these austerity policies which are curbing economic growth and having a demoralizing impact on workers' wages. We have to boost popular spending and investment on public and social facilities in particular. We have to put a tax on capital and profits and give an adequate boost to the incomes of the workers. This is the only way we are going to create the right climate for increased steel production, in France as elsewhere.

We are not going to play along with you as long as there is a need to develop our steel industry. We have to produce more and expand and diversify the range of products instead of axing some of them, because there are lots of markets which need to be filled. We shall be voting in favour of urgency. The time has come when we really must oppose the Davignon plan.

President. — I call Mr Herman.

Mr Herman. — (*F*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, this is obviously a very important issue and

we are worried about the social implications. However, we intend to vote against urgency on this tough problem and we have three reasons for doing so.

Firstly, what the Commission is being asked to do has already been done. According to information which may be confirmed at any moment, the Commission has already lodged a formal protest.

Secondly, the Commission is asked to make every effort to ensure that the consensus is respected. However, the Commission has already made a public statement to the effect that this was foremost among its concerns and it has already initiated a procedure in conjunction with the United States in order to work out an agreement and avoid protectionist measures.

Thirdly — and this is a point mentioned by Mr Donnez earlier — in two or three months' time we shall find ourselves in the position of having to support the Commission on proposals which will be put before us, and I think it would be better at that time if we had some kind of proposal which had been drawn up in committee, a committee which will have had the opportunity tackling this tricky subject.

For these reasons, Madam President, I beg the House to reject urgency on this matter.

President. — I call Mrs Lizin.

Mrs Lizin. — (*F*) Madam President, with the aim of getting something done the Socialist Group will vote in favour of urgency for this motion for a resolution. We do not want to go into the ins and outs of the matter but simply tackle the essential issue which in our view is urgent.

The point is that for a large part of the European steel industry — the industry in Wallonia, for example — this matter deserves to be discussed without delay. In the last few days there has been a change in one important factor in this case between Union Steel and the European Commission, and that is the attitude of the other American steel manufacturers.

The Socialist Group will therefore support this request for urgent procedure.

President. — I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

Sir Fred Catherwood. — I agree, Madam President, that this is a very urgent matter. But it is extremely difficult to see what can be decided in an urgent debate this week. I think we should accept the extreme urgency of the matter and I suggest that this resolution be referred at once to the competent committees.

President. — I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

The motion for a resolution will be placed on the agenda of Friday's sitting.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-93/80) by Mr Van Minnen and others: Attempted suppression of freedom of the media.*

I call Mr Van Minnen.

Mr Van Minnen. — (NL) Madam President, we have tabled this motion for a resolution as a result of the television film 'Death of a Princess', which has already been shown by some TV companies and which may or may not be broadcast by others. We may even be able to lift the debate above the party considerations which have bedevilled proceedings so far this morning. We are not concerned about having a lengthy and time-consuming debate; we just want a short, sharp statement. And we are not concerned either about assessing the quality of this television film. If it were bad, no viewer would have cause to be shocked, and if it were good, this would be an equally unconvincing argument.

What is at stake in this matter is the fundamental freedom of our media. Here, in the European Parliament, we are duty bound to express an opinion on this. The question is whether we are willing to allow censorship and pressure on our media. What is at stake and at risk here is an essential element of freedom of expression. What is needed here, before any of the television companies knuckle under, is a clear signal from us. I hope that the majority of us will agree that the independence of our media is too important to tolerate interference from outside in what we decide to broadcast. I hope that the House will vote in favour of urgency.

President. — I call Mr Vergeer.

Mr Vergeer. — (NL) Madam President, on behalf of our group I want to begin by saying — and I was almost tempted to say 'naturally' — that any pressure brought to bear on the media, whether radio or television, and likely to hinder their freedom will be opposed by us. However, Madam President, in the first part of the motion there is mention of political interference and I must confess that I do not find this at all clear, because this can also mean political interference by national government, and in my opinion

this is to say the least rather premature and dubious. I agree that this is an important matter but I also think it has to be properly looked into by the appropriate Committee. This means that the majority of my group is not in favour of urgency.

President. — I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

Since the result of the show of hands is doubtful, we shall take a fresh vote by sitting and standing.

The request is rejected. The motion for a resolution is therefore referred to the appropriate committee.

4. Welcome

President. — In welcoming to the House Mr Colombo, President-in-Office of the Council, I wish to say how hard he worked for the idea of Europe when he was President of this Parliament.

I am sure his presence here in his new role will serve to strengthen collaboration between our two institutions for the benefit of the people of Europe.

On behalf of Parliament and myself, Mr President, I once again convey to you my most sincere good wishes.

(Applause)

I call Mr Colombo.

Mr Colombo, President-in-Office of the Council. — (I) Madam President, I am deeply moved by the welcome you have uttered on behalf of those whom I am sorry to say I can no longer call colleagues but who until a short time again were my very dear friends and colleagues. I thank you for good wishes and for your expression of appreciation and faith in me.

I want to assure the House that although I have a new role, which normally puts me on the other side of the fence from Parliament, I shall never forget the struggles we have had together and the convictions which we have shared and which have spurred us forward during the weeks and months and years of working together.

(Applause)

5. Decisions on requests for an early vote

President. — The next item is the decision on the requests for an early vote on the *motions for resolutions*

President

(Docs. 1-85/80, 1-90/80 and 1-91/80): *Involving the northern Adriatic in the European unification process.*

I propose that Parliament take a single vote on these three requests.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

I call Mr Cecovini.

Mr Cecovini. — (I) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, as for the projects themselves there are Community and regional reasons for requesting an early vote on this and the other motions on the Adriatic waterway.

I say there are Community reasons because the overloading of the Austrian road system along the north-west-southeast axis is not a problem which is going to come along tomorrow but which is already with us. The question by Mr Dalsass has made it clear that something has to be done about the Brenner Pass and a lot of people are aware that six-mile queues of trucks are not uncommon at the Tarvisio-Coccau Pass, which is at the moment the only way from Austria into Italy and down to Trieste. Rail traffic, too, is extremely slow. The regional reasons are immediately obvious if you remember that Trieste, which was formerly the third-ranking port in the Mediterranean and served Austria, Bavaria and central Europe in general, is now on the verge of economic collapse. The dock workers are on strike to protest about the lack of structural reform and the workers in the shipyards are protesting about the lack of progress on the dry dock facilities which have been in limbo for ten years. Unemployed workers have been marching through the streets in protest against living on benefits for five years. Families have been camping in the city's main square because they have nowhere to live.

The city depends to a great extent on state handouts and a small jeans factory which is now threatened by the new trans-Yugoslavia highway. The proposed project would solve everything.

If we really want to put a stop to the economic deterioration of the region and its ports before it is too late, we really must do something right now, because it will take a long time to complete this project, and a long time to plan it as well.

President. — I put to the vote the request for an early vote.

The requests are adopted. The motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

6. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received from Mr Jaquet and others a motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-100/80), with a request for an urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the events in Tunisia.

The reasons supporting this request for urgent debate are contained in the document itself.

I shall consult Parliament on this request at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

7. Relations between the European Parliament and the Commission — Report on the European institutions by the Committee of Three — Greece's accession to the European Community

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

- report (Doc. 1-71/80), drawn up by Mr Rey on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on relations between the European Parliament and the Commission with a view to the forthcoming appointment of a new Commission;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-33/80), tabled by Mr Scott-Hopkins and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the report on the European institutions by the Committee of Three;
- report (Doc. 1-49/80), drawn up by Mr Blumenfeld on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on the institutional aspects of Greek accession to the European Community.

I call Mr Patterson on a point of order.

Mr Patterson. — Madam President, I think it would help us all if before we start this debate you were to make your announcement as to when the debate on Iran will take place.

President. — Mr Patterson, I said earlier that Parliament would be informed in about an hour of the time of the debate. There is still one point I have to know before this can be done.

I call Mr Rey.

Mr Rey, rapporteur. — (F) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the report which I have the privilege to present to you on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee is the first in a series which will be brought before Parliament during the part-sessions to come.

As early as September, just after we were elected, the Political Affairs Committee decided to put before you a number of views concerning the working of the

Rey

European authorities and institutions. We were encouraged in this path not only as a result of the new authority conferred on Parliament by its election, but by the decision taken as early as December 1974, at the highest level, in Paris during a meeting presided over by the President of the French Republic, Mr Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, together with the eight other heads of government, a decision in which it was stated that once the European Parliament was elected by universal suffrage, it would be fitting to increase its powers, in particular in the field of legislation.

As a result of our own studies, of a number of steps taken by Parliament which are listed in our report and of the appointment of a subcommittee presided over by Mr Charles-Ferdinand Nothomb, we were led to submit a certain number of motions for resolutions. And if it is the one relating to the Commission which is at the top of the list, this is not because it is more important than the others but because it is more urgent. We feel that the proposals which will be put to you concerning the relationship between Parliament and the Council of Ministers on the one hand and the European Council on the other are more worthy of consideration. But given that the new Commission will be appointed this year, and that perhaps the new President will be designated before the summer holidays, we felt that this matter was especially urgent.

In all our studies, two considerations were uppermost in our minds: the first was that as things stand at the moment the Treaties must not be touched. The Treaties will be revised one day. This revision was already undertaken once before during my time as President of the Commission between 1967 and 1970: this work was interrupted and will one day have to be restarted. But knowing how slow the constitutional procedures for revision are, we thought it was wiser at the outset and this year in particular to remain within the framework of the existing Treaties.

The second consideration which I placed at the top of my report, with the agreement of the Political Affairs Committee — and I should like to stress this point in the presence of the President of the Council — is that we can see nothing to be gained by our institutions quarrelling amongst themselves. In particular, we have no intention of gaining the support of one institution in order to combat another. It is our experience — and as you can imagine, mine goes back many years — that when the institutions quarrel, the Community makes no headway and that when, on the contrary, they are in agreement, then the Community makes marked progress.

Be this as it may, in the few minutes allotted to me, I should like to go over the main points of our proposals. First of all, we feel that the political role of the Commission should be firmly stressed at the outset. The Members of the Commission are neither experts nor top civil servants, they are politicians, and this an outcome of the fact that, quite apart from any other

consideration, they are answerable to this Parliament, which is not the case for civil servants or experts. Thus they are political, and we feel that it is essential for them to remain so.

Secondly, there is the problem of the number of Members of the Commission. You will recall the report by the Spierenburg group, approved by the report by the Three Wise Men, which proposed a reduction in this number, in particular by suggesting that there be one member per Member State. This proposal will be reiterated in the amendments which you will have to consider in a moment, and as a result I will not go over it in detail. It is however my duty to tell Parliament, that, as rapporteur, I personally supported this reduction in the number of Members in the future Commission, but that neither the Subcommittee on Institutional Problems nor the Political Affairs Committee followed my lead. We will come back to this later.

Thirdly, we feel that it is high time we had a woman Commissioner. Our Commission has existed for almost thirty years in various forms and up to now not one woman has been appointed as a member, either of the High Authority, or of the Brussels Commissions, or of the single Commission. We think this is not a good idea, that the time has come for this to change — we can discuss later what form should be given to the motion for a resolution — and that this reform must not be delayed any longer.

The Spierenburg report suggested that in future a vice-president should be given special responsibility for coordination. Coordination within the Commission between the various directorates-general, Commissioners and countries is an extremely important matter, and we feel that in these circumstances it would be worthwhile to try out the proposal which is put to us of having a vice-president with special responsibility for these tasks and responsible for assisting the future President of the Commission in this capacity.

Our resolution also speaks of the management tasks performed by the Commission. We did not think that it was our place to draw up an inventory of the problem areas in which this function could be improved, and we feel that it is up to the Commission itself to do this. This view is expressed in the explanatory statement with my report and might do well to be expressed in some pieces of legislation. Some amendments on this subject are also proposed which I would ask you to accept.

My penultimate point concerns cooperation between the Commission and Parliament. The Political Affairs Committee has expressed the wish that in future, whenever the Commission has a proposal to put to us, it will enter into contact with Parliament at the preliminary draft stage. I think it is necessary to make clear — the text of my report does not state this but it goes without saying — that when we say 'before Parlia-

Rey

ment', we do not mean a debate during a public sitting. It is clear that we would be putting the Commission in great difficulty should it be forced to give an opinion at a public sitting on a project which had not yet taken on its final form. It would also place Parliament itself in a difficult position. Of course, this procedure is already applied to some extent within our parliamentary committees, but it could be extended and the Commission, before drafting and publishing a proposal, could contact the competent parliamentary committees.

My final point, and perhaps the most important one, is that we feel that the time has come to endow the new Commission with a clearer responsibility to Parliament by requesting that it be subject to a vote. We on the Political Affairs Committee rejected proposals which were aimed at having the Parliament itself lay down the policies of the future Commission. We also rejected those amendments which suggested that Parliament should discuss who the future Commissioners were to be. Whatever one may think of this, it is obvious that it would be going beyond the Treaties and we wished to remain within that framework. But since our Parliament may dismiss the Commission by a motion of censure, it seems worthwhile to us — of course using the same voting procedure as that laid down in Article 144 of the Treaty of Rome and in the other Treaties, of Rome and Paris — that the designated President enter into contact with the Political Affairs Committee so that a general debate may take place on his interim policy, since his colleagues will not yet have been appointed, and possibly in order to discuss who these might be and even to name names. Once the Commission is appointed, we should like to have a general debate with it, at the end of which a vote would be taken ratifying and expressing confidence in the appointment of the Commission. We consider that these proposals fall within the framework of the Treaties and as a result we adopted them with conviction.

Madam President, I am now reaching the end of my speech but I would like just to stress one thing which I feel is very striking. In thirty years, our Parliament has never dismissed the High Authority, nor the Brussels Commissions, nor the single Commission. This is a very striking fact and I do not think that we can say for many of our Member States that over a period of thirty years their Parliaments have constantly expressed confidence in the governing executive. I think we can see in this striking fact a tribute to the past and hope for the future.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, it is now more than 18 months since the President of France, as

we have already heard, first proposed that the European Council should entrust the Three Wise Men with the task of exploring on our behalf the problems presented not only by enlargement but also by the direct election of this Parliament. The direct election was an event which, in the words of President Giscard d'Estaing, would give a '*nouvel élan*' to the Community. Now, six months ago the report of the Three Wise Men was submitted to the European Council. It contained many proposals of great importance to the future of our Community and of our Parliament and the decisions on these proposals are expected in June. I am of course aware that the report was only forwarded to Parliament for information. Nevertheless I believe that we should be failing in our duty if we did not make known our views on the report before the European Council takes its decision. Equally, I believe that the Foreign Ministers, who are currently studying the report at the request of the European Council, would be failing in their duty if they did not take into account the views of Parliament on these important matters. We shall be listening with the closest attention to the contributions to be made, I hope, at the end of this debate by the President-in-Office of the Council.

May I take this opportunity, Madam President, following your example, of welcoming the Foreign Minister, Mr Colombo, with whom I have worked over many years. I am delighted to see him here and I thank him for his courtesy in coming.

(Applause)

It is my privilege as the first speaker, to pay tribute also to the authors of the report, Mr Marjolin, Mr Biesheuvel and Mr Edmund Dell. They really have produced a most lucid, comprehensive, and perceptive report on the difficulties which face our Community today. Their analysis of what is right and what is wrong with the workings of our institutions seem to me extremely well-balanced and their conclusions, with one or two exceptions, are convincing even if, not always new. But as they, themselves, said in a passage which I am sure will ring true to many of us with experience of institutional problems, the problem is often not to find good new ideas, but to ensure that good old ones are actually put into practice. We believe, that the Community's institutions can respond to the new stresses and strains and challenges of the 1980s; we must respond to them, for, if we do not, the whole of the Community will suffer. We must re-examine and, where necessary, reform our institutions and that is something which cannot be undertaken lightly.

You know, I have yet to be convinced that we in this Parliament have made so very much progress towards solving our own difficulties as far as the efficient dispatch of our business is concerned and I have always believed that the case for increasing our powers can only be founded on the judicious use of our existing ones. We have got a long way to go. I think today's

Scott-Hopkins

example has demonstrated the problems which exist for us. We have two tasks to do in this Parliament, one is to debate those issues which are of world importance and the other is to process and deal with in detail the draft proposals from the Commission which are submitted to us through the Council. At this moment we are having difficulty in keeping up with both of these tasks. I do not know how many draft directives are piling up to be dealt with through our various committee procedures. We also have difficulty finding the time to debate those matters of international importance. Until we have got things working more smoothly I think it would be injudicious to say that we want to increase our existing powers.

What we suggested in our evidence was an extension to the existing conciliation procedure, which would enable Parliament to follow an item of draft legislation right through to the Council's final decision. I do not see why this should not be extended beyond the budgetary field, where we are the joint budgetary authority with the Council. I would hope that the conciliation procedure could be extended to the fields of energy, of agriculture and of industry. There is a great area of further activity which this House and the Community should cover. When there is a dispute between us and the Council let us have a form of conciliation procedure where we can sit down together and try to work out the best possible solution. We suggested also that, in the case of prolonged deadlock in the Council over a particular issue, the problem could occasionally be solved by a vote in this House. We can certainly support the practical improvement of the conciliation procedure which has been proposed in Annex III.

I do believe that the Council itself has got to find a better way of coming to its decisions and coming to those decisions more quickly than at present. I shall not be so discourteous as to ask the President-in-Office how many proposals from the Commission are still awaiting a decision by the Council. I know there are a great many. The decision-making process within the Council is not standing up to the existing pressures and I shudder to think what will happen after enlargement. I am not going to suggest now whether the Luxembourg compromise should be re-examined. It is up to the Council to come forward with its own proposals on these matters.

We want Parliament's powers to keep in step with those of other institutions. And we want to keep them in line with the Community's increasing authority in world affairs. Accordingly we are suspicious of all those procedures by which decisions are taken on the Community's future in secret, without recourse to Parliament. And we are suspicious of the proliferation of the advisory committees to the Council, which have a tendency to impede or even obstruct the proper functioning of the Council and the Council-Commission relationship. I suspect that this Commission also has doubts about this latter development. We insist, whatever the Treaty may say, that when adjustments

consequent upon further enlargement are made to the system of weighted votes set out in Article 148 of the Treaty, the Parliament should and must be consulted.

With such considerations in mind we have restricted the scope of the motion before the House. It concerns almost solely those proposals in the report which directly affect Parliament. These are matters upon which Parliament can legitimately expect its views to have the most weight with the European Council. The House will be aware that the Political Affairs Committee has set up a subcommittee on institutional matters, very ably chaired by Mr Nothomb, and it is preparing a series of detailed institutional studies including that presented by Mr Rey in that splendid speech he has just made. We cannot debate the whole of the report of the Wise Men, but I hope very much in the course of the debate that the President will set out his views on the heart of the matter, that is, the 30 pages that relate to the worsening problem of the Council of Ministers.

Perhaps it may seem overcritical, but I should like to turn to some of those matters which are not touched on in the report. One of them is not covered by Mr Rey and there is another one which seems of great importance to me as the Community seeks to regain some of the impetus which it has lost in recent years — that is the question of political cooperation. I am convinced that during the next decade the Community must play a political role appropriate to its economic strength. It must be in a position to take the initiative, not merely to react, as unhappily often happens now. It must be the means of harnessing the prestige, experience and authority of Member States for the world and it must enable Europe to become a much more effective partner in the defence of the West. Surely we are proud of our cultural heritage, the quality of our life; are they not worth defending? I say to our friends in all the other countries of the Community and particularly in France, do not let our internal difficulties overwhelm us, let us get them in the right perspective. Of course, the issues of lamb and fish and contributions to the budget are of great importance. But let us look a little beyond that, because they pale into insignificance before the great dangers which confront us now which we can not afford to ignore and which we must resolve as a Community. No doubt the Wise Men ignored political cooperation because their mandate required them to produce proposals on the basis of compliance with the treaties. This was an unnecessary restriction in my view, and unfortunate.

In conclusion, Madam President, let me say that I hope this Parliament will support my group's resolution and so help to stiffen the resolve of the European Council when it comes to take its decisions on this report in June. It would be very saddening proof of the Community's inability to adapt to changing circumstances if the European Council were to allow this report of the Three Wise Men to go the same way as the report drawn up by our colleague, Mr Tindemans, three years ago. Indeed, the usefulness of the Euro-

Scott-Hopkins

pean Council itself would be called into question if it failed, for whatever reason, to implement some of these wise men's very sensible recommendations. We cannot stand still — that would be fatal for this Community. We have to make progress together, we, the Commission and the Council. If we start fighting amongst ourselves too much, we shall do great damage to the idea of the Community and that is the last thing that most of us in this House want to see happen.

(Applause)

8. Order of Business

President. — The President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Colombo, has agreed to make a statement at three o'clock this afternoon on the situation in Iran.

Pursuant to Rule 14 (3) of the Rules of Procedure, and after consultation with the group chairmen who all expressed agreement, it has been decided that the debate on Iran, in respect of which urgent procedure was adopted earlier today, will now be held between 3 p.m. and 5 p.m. tomorrow, 17 April 1980. Speaking time will be allocated after I have consulted the group chairmen.

The votes on the motions for resolutions on Iran will be held tomorrow at 6 p.m., which has been set as the voting time for the sitting.

9. Deadline for tabling amendments and motions for resolutions on Iran

President. — The deadline for tabling amendments and motions for resolutions on the situation in Iran is 12 noon tomorrow, 17 April 1980.

10. Relations between the European Parliament and the Commission — Report on the European institutions by the Committee of Three — Greece's accession to the European Community (continuation)

President. — I call Mr Blumenfeld.

Mr Blumenfeld, rapporteur. — (D) Madam President, if we succeed this afternoon or in the course of this part-session in adopting the two reports presented by Mr Jean Rey and by myself on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, the European Parliament will have taken a very important, very significant step towards making use of all the powers bestowed on it

by the Treaty of Rome, and at the same time we shall have given notice of our political determination to extend and give the fullest possible interpretation to our powers. If I may say so right at the outset, then, I hope that my report on Greek accession, which — let there be no mistake about it — is important in its own right, will also give us the chance to clear up the basic question of the right of Parliament and its directly elected Members to have a say in all the matters which directly affect this House.

Like Mr Scott-Hopkins, who spoke just now, I am very pleased to welcome the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Emilio Colombo, especially as he was for many years chairman of the Political Affairs Committee, on behalf of which I am speaking now. Indeed, it was under his chairmanship that we discussed this report and finally adopted it by a large majority. I hope therefore that Mr Colombo will, from his new position, be able to give this matter the same support as he did while he was still chairman of the Political Affairs Committee.

Madam President, the first point in the motion for a resolution now before this House says quite tersely but categorically that the European Parliament 'ratifies the Treaty of 29 May 1979 on the accession of Greece to the European Community'. The thinking behind this assertion on the part of the Political Affairs Committee, which may seem rather bold to some governments — although it is not up to us to reassure our governments but rather to give them a prod every now and again — was more of a political than of a legal nature. According to Article 237 of the EEC Treaty, an agreement on accession to the Community by an applicant State must be submitted for ratification by all the Contracting States in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements. It therefore follows that the national Parliaments of the Member States of the Community and the Parliament of the applicant State are officially charged with the task of Parliamentary ratification.

By adopting paragraph 1 of our motion for a resolution — as I hope it will — this House will be taking a first, important step towards filling the gap left by the Treaty as regards ratification by the European Parliament. First of all, then, it expresses the political desire of this House to be involved in the ratification of future accession treaties, and it should of course be borne in mind that Greek accession will probably be followed by that of Spain, Portugal and possibly also Turkey in the years to come. It is therefore very important for us to create a precedent in the case of Greece, so that there is political — if not formal — acceptance of the right of the European Parliament to play its appropriate part along with the national parliaments in such an important matter as the ratification of a treaty on the accession of new Member States, especially as the directly elected European Parliament now represents 110 million people throughout the Community.

Blumenfeld

Paragraph 1 of our motion for a resolution also constitutes a statement of intent on the part of the European Parliament. This debate gives the whole House the chance to welcome Greek membership of the Community, as no ratification debate has taken place on the basis of consultation of Parliament by the other institutions. Following the signing of the Accession Treaty of 28 May 1979 and ratification by the national parliaments of the nine Member States and the Greek Parliament, this debate and the motion for a resolution tabled by the Political Affairs Committee now give this House too the chance to approve the treaty. I must point out, though, that if Parliament had been consulted on the conditions of the Accession Treaty prior to its being signed, we would undoubtedly have made a number of proposals and suggestions, not only on the content of the treaty, but also on its effects on the European Parliament itself. I should also like to say, Mr President, that we would undoubtedly have had something to say about the tricky matter of relations between Turkey and Greece and would also have pointed out, for instance, that the Community had given Turkey an explicit assurance as recently as 5 February 1980 that relations between Turkey and the Community and the rights enshrined in the Treaty of Ankara would in no way be affected by other states — including Greece — joining the Community.

As regards the role of the European Parliament in negotiating and ratifying treaties of accession, I should like to point out that the Political Affairs Committee has asked me, in my capacity as rapporteur, to present another report on this subject in the near future — provided that the House approves this motion for a resolution — analysing the role of the European Parliament in negotiating and ratifying treaties of accession and other agreements between the Community and third countries from the legal and political points of view. This supplementary report will be a detailed document and will, for instance, include proposals on ways of improving application of the Luns-Westerterp Procedure.

Like the majority of the members of the Political Affairs Committee, I believe that the Greek members of the European Parliament should be elected before accession on 1 January 1981. In fact, the election is scheduled for some time in 1981, and there is nothing we can do about this, as the timing is stipulated in the Treaty of Accession. But it should have been perfectly possible for the Community and the Greek negotiators to make provision for the election of the Greek Members of the Parliament to be held before the end of this year. If such arrangements had been made, we would not now be in a situation where — until the elections are held in Greece — the European Parliament will include both directly elected and nominated Members. Article 23 of Title 1 of the Act of Accession states that, in the time before the actual election, 'the 24 representatives of the Assembly of the people of Greece shall be appointed by the Hellenic Parliament within itself

in accordance with the future procedure laid down by the Hellenic Republic'.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, along with a large majority of the members of the Political Affairs Committee, I see a danger for the development of Parliament in this matter. We cannot agree to this Parliament containing in the future a mixture of elected and nominated Members. Such a situation is not in the interests of our new Greek colleagues, nor is it acceptable to us. The Greek Members must therefore be elected as quickly as possible, and we make this point in one of the clauses of the motion for a resolution.

Although Article 237 of the EEC Treaty lays down the conditions for admission of a new Member State by way of an agreement between the Member States and the applicant State, we all realize of course that, in practice, the Council gives the Commission a mandate to conduct negotiations, the Commission negotiates membership conditions for the applicant State according to the provisions of this mandate, and the European Parliament has so far never been involved in the process. We want to see a change in this situation.

If, despite the absence of any such provisions in Article 237 of the Treaty, the Council can issue a mandate and the Commission can fulfil it, why, I wonder, can the European Parliament not proceed in a similar fashion and play its appropriate parliamentary role in the preparatory negotiations and the ratification of the resulting treaty? This House should therefore — and my forthcoming report would contain suggestions along these lines — submit proposals as to how it could play its rightful role in future negotiations on accession to the Community. I should also like to stress the fact that Parliament has not even been consulted by the relevant institutions on the question of what repercussions Greek accession will have on Parliament's own status — and what I mean by that is the mixture of directly elected and nominated Members — and has never been asked for its opinion on the repercussions of Greek membership on the size of the European Parliament, including the question of Parliament's working conditions — with particular reference to the language problem — resulting from any further enlargement of the Community.

Finally, I should like to point out that paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution refers to the kind of questions I intend to go into in my report on the general problems arising in connection with the role of the European Parliament in the negotiation and ratification of all kinds of treaties or agreement between the Community and third countries.

I would ask the House to follow the example of its Political Affairs Committee and vote for the ratifica-

Blumenfeld

tion of the Treaty of Accession of Greece to the European Community by the European Parliament, and also for the other points in the motion for a resolution.

(*Applause*)

IN THE CHAIR: MR JAQUET

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Colombo.

Mr Colombo, President-In-Office of the Council. —

(*I*) Mr President, as I have remarked before, to speak in this House as President-In-Office of the Council of Ministers, an institution which has often been and often is at odds with Parliament, is a particularly delicate matter for me, because the circumspection with which the Council of Ministers is obliged to speak may seem to you to be out of keeping with the ideas and attitudes expressed in this House during the cut and thrust of Parliamentary debates. But the Members are well aware of my convictions and also know that I should not have taken on the responsibilities of Foreign Minister of my country if I did not feel able to help to achieve from this position — albeit with that gradualness which is an inevitable consequence of the difficult task of searching for a consensus amongst the Member States represented in the Council — the same aims, and the same ideals for which we have all fought in these years of commitment to the European ideal.

(*Applause*)

I wish to assure the Members of this House that in the exercise of my functions I shall be guided by the conviction, brought to maturity here and elsewhere, that the Community institutions can only progress if they are sustained and nourished by a respectful and constructive relationship with an assembly — your assembly, our assembly — in which the voices of the peoples of Europe are interpreted and given expression by persons such as yourselves, whose deep convictions and whose devotion to the European cause are well known.

By a happy coincidence, the question of the development, the progress and the efficiency of the European institutions has been raised here today in an important debate occasioned by a decision on the part of the Political Affairs Committee which until a few days ago I had the honour of chairing. The report prepared by Mr Rey, who is well-known to all of us for his extensive knowledge of the European Institutions and the way they work, and the motion for a resolution by Mr Scott-Hopkins, as also one or two points contained in

Mr Luster's motion for a resolution, provide the basis for an initial discussion which is without any doubt extremely topical. What is more, the motion for a resolution by Mr Blumenfeld — as I shall point out later — also brings us back to the examination of institutional matters. The topicality of all these matters derives from a series of considerations which I should like to remind you of now.

The first of these has to do with the discussions taking place at this moment with a view to the enlargement of the Community: we shall deal with Greece presently; at the same time negotiations with Portugal and Spain are also going ahead. We are all well aware that extending in this way the geographical, economic and political area covered by the Community could easily bring us back to the narrow concepts of a mere customs union and free trade area, unless the much more ambitious policy of integration is sustained and supported by institutions capable of adaptation and ready to take the lead in creating a new Europe.

The second consideration that gives topicality to this discussion is the fact that, last year, one of the Community institutions, namely this Parliament, modified both its composition and the source of its mandate; of course, this may, and probably will, raise problems as regards the Treaties, problems of relations between the institutions which have not so far been foreseen, or which have not been implemented if they have been foreseen, as happened for example, in the case of the budget procedure.

Mr Scott-Hopkins drew our attention in particular to the continuing checks which must be made on the outcome of parliamentary debates and on the follow-up which they get at meetings of the Council of Ministers. It seems to me that this is one of the topics on which we must concentrate our attention. Thus in my opinion the Scott-Hopkins proposal to widen the consultation procedure to include other aspects of relations between Parliament and the Council deserves particular attention.

The third consideration that makes this discussion topical is the realization that a certain process of ossification may have set in in the lives of the institutions, a process of giving in to the temptations of routine, a certain falling off from the usually smooth functioning of the institutions, which may all have helped to wear away some of the initial bloom and undermine their efficiency.

All these factors were taken into account at the European Council of 1974 when, in view of the ambitious aim of achieving European Union by 1980, it commissioned the Tindemans report, to which subsequent events have unfortunately not been able to provide an efficient follow-up, and when, in December 1976, it asked the Three Wise Men to prepare the report which is now being examined in detail, with the aim of gradually implementing it. I think that the Commis-

Colombo

sion was moved by the same spirit when it asked Mr Spierenburg to prepare his report, in order to help it to reflect a little on its own organization, on the efficacy of its decision-taking machinery, and on the problems of its internal coordination and of its relations with the other institutions.

I want to assure Parliament that a thorough examination of these topics is proceeding on two levels: the first is an examination by the Council of Foreign Ministers. The European Council in Dublin instructed the Council of Foreign Ministers to carry out a detailed study, and a start was made on this during two informal meetings held on 8 February in Varese and on 17 March in Brussels.

The main thing to have emerged from the work which has so far been carried out on this topic is the great interest which all the Member States have in the Three Wise Men's report, which is considered a useful source of ideas and suggestions relating to the institutional organization of the Community. There is also a willingness to continue examining these topics in detail in order to be able to submit opinions and proposals to the European Council in Venice on 12-13 June of this year.

However, one or two topics mentioned in the report of the Three Wise Men and given particular attention in the Rey report should — as is expected — be considered at the forthcoming European Council at the end of this month.

For this reason, the discussion which is taking place at this moment at the other level, at the parliamentary level, is very useful and comes at a particularly opportune moment, so that the decisions taken by the European Council — and I hope they will be taken and will be able to be adopted — may take due account of Parliament's opinions, the discussion which has taken place here and the resolutions which will be adopted here.

I shall personally take pains to see that attention is also given to Parliament's request that it should play some part in the process of appointing the members of the new Commission and approving the new Commission's programme.

(Applause)

However, I can, as of now, assure you that we are concerned to help to protect the central role which the Treaties allocate to the Commission, with the political implications that that involves, so as to ensure that the Commission functions properly and with maximum efficacy.

As for relations between the Council and Parliament, which are dealt with at some length in the motion for a resolution by Mr Scott-Hopkins and which are also the subject of reflections and suggestions in the report

of the Three Wise Men, I can confirm to you now that the Italian Presidency is committed to doing all it can to develop and improve relations between our institutions.

In this connection, I am convinced that, whilst respecting the responsibilities which the Treaties allocate to each institution and respecting the present equilibrium between the institutions, we can seek ways of working, closer contacts, new procedures — one of which Mr Scott-Hopkins mentions, i.e. broadening the system of consultation — and, above all, political attitudes, which will help us to extract the maximum possible benefit from present possibilities and will pave the way for a genuinely fruitful dialogue between Council and Parliament.

In this respect, I would remind you that the Italian Presidency has already set up one or two procedures designed to ensure that the Council pays more attention to the opinions expressed by Parliament, and I have no doubt that the Council is prepared to continue in this direction in a spirit of open and genuine collaboration.

The Italian Presidency has also been particularly scrupulous about continuing the tradition of collaboration between Council and Parliament during meetings of the Parliament's committees.

In the context of this close relationship between the institutions, which has gained strength since the election of the Parliament by universal suffrage, I think that I am in a position to say with a clear conscience that all the suggestions put forward by the European Parliament will be interpreted by the Council of Ministers as a concrete contribution to the progress of the Community and to the gradual achievement of European Union.

(Applause)

No one will have failed to observe that Mr Blumensfeld's report on the institutional aspects of the accession of Greece to the European Community is of great political interest, while at the same time it raises one or two problems of a legal nature.

From the legal point of view, it is well known that the accession of a European country to the Community is governed by Article 237 of the Treaty. According to this Article, the candidate state sends its request for membership to the Council, which, after having asked the Commission for its opinion, takes a unanimous decision. I should say that this is the first stage of the process of accession, a stage which, in the case of Greece, was completed when the Council of Ministers accepted the request submitted to it by the Greek Government.

Once this request has been accepted, according to the provisions of the Treaty, 'the conditions of admission

Colombo

and the adjustments to this Treaty necessitated thereby shall be the subject of an agreement between the Member State and the applicant states. This agreement shall be submitted for ratification by all the contracting states in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements'.

It is obvious that when Mr Blumenfeld's report expresses the hope that Parliament will be consulted on requests for accession to the Community by other European countries, and that it will be involved in the process of ratification of the Treaties and that, in a more general sense, improvements will be made to the functioning of the Luns-Westerterp procedure regarding negotiations and ratifications of other treaties and agreements, the report is looking at these things — in the present legal context of the Community — from a point of view which is essentially political, that is to say, from the point of view of the need to ensure that the European Parliament is involved more and more directly in the most important aspects of Community life.

A resolution by the European Parliament ratifying the Treaty by which Greece accedes to the European Community consequently constitutes in such a legal context, and in parallel with the legal process provided for in the Treaties in the case of the accession of a European state to the Community, and in the case of the respective ratification by all the contracting parties — this resolution, I repeat, constitutes a quintessentially political act. It is an act which gives Parliament's sanction to the accession of Greece to membership of the Community, the importance of which must be obvious to everyone and which is particularly significant to the people and the government of Greece.

Whether or not we shall in future be able to ensure that similar expressions of Parliament's will are to become a formal part of the legal process of ratification depends upon the future development — which in my opinion is desirable — of Community legislation by way of amendments to the Treaties.

As for future aspects of Parliament's position *vis-à-vis* requests for membership of the Community and, in particular, as regards Parliament's right to be consulted on negotiations concerning membership of the Community, it seems to me perfectly legitimate for the Parliament to wish to be kept informed of how the accession procedure is progressing, just as it seems legitimate to me that it should express its opinion, if it so wishes, on any requests for membership.

This is what happened in the case of Greece. The Commission and the Council kept Parliament amply informed throughout the duration of the negotiations, and Parliament itself adopted on 14 March 1979 a resolution relating to the request for membership of the Community by Greece in which, amongst other things, it expressed its satisfaction at the prospect of

seeing this country become the tenth full member of the Community on 1 January 1981.

That being said, certain aspects of the accession procedure more closely affecting the European Parliament — for instance the number of Members which the new Member State may send to the Parliament and the manner in which they should be elected — are without any doubt aspects which, though formally governed by agreements between the states that negotiated the accession, ought — and here I think I should emphasize that I am speaking in a purely personal capacity — to have some form of *quid pro quo* in the shape of consultation of the European Parliament. In this respect I am glad that the rapporteur, in his presentation of the motion for a resolution, pointed out that the figure of 24 Greek Members of the European Parliament would nevertheless be approved by Parliament.

As for the desirability of having the period during which the delegated Members of Parliament will represent Greece in this House reduced to the minimum, and seeing that direct elections take place in Greece during the first few months of 1981, the Council will act as an intermediary and will convey to the Greek Government Parliament's concern in this matter.

In the last point dealt with in the Pfennig motion for a resolution — regarding possible improvements to be made to the Luns-Westerterp procedure whilst fully respecting the institutional practices established by the Treaties — I think that the Council is quite prepared to examine any concrete suggestions transmitted to it by the European Parliament.

I can assure Mr Blumenfeld of the close attention which will be given to the proposals that the Political Affairs Committee intends to prepare on the basis of the final conclusions of the report and the motion for a resolution by Mr Blumenfeld.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Jenkins.

Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission. — Mr President, let me begin, if I may, by adding my words of welcome to Mr Colombo in his new capacity amongst us as President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers. Since he and I first came into close contact over 12 years ago, when we were Finance Ministers of our respective countries, our lives have been intertwined in a quite remarkable way, and I have had the honour of serving with him as co-President — he in two capacities, I in one — throughout a great part of the last 3½ years. It is a pleasure to have him as a co-President of a major Community institution once again.

Jenkins

I warmly welcome the decision of this House to devote some time — not, perhaps, quite as much time as we envisaged at one stage, but some time — to a debate on the wide range of institutional questions raised both by the report of the Three Wise Men and by the report of the Spierenburg Review Body which was established by the Commission and which reported to it last autumn.

I think that a debate on our institutions at this time is, perhaps, particularly opportune. First, it is being held very shortly before a European Council which may well itself wish to begin its own discussion of the report of the Three Wise Men. Both the resolution tabled by the European Democrats — and I listened to Mr Scott-Hopkins with great interest — and the resolution from the Political Affairs Committee introduced by Mr Rey, with his commanding knowledge of the workings of the Commission, raise questions of major importance for consideration by the European Council.

Second, this debate comes at a time when the Commission itself is nearly at the end of its own examination of the Spierenburg report. We have already taken a number of decisions and remain determined to give effect to a substantial programme of internal reform following Spierenburg during the life-time of this present Commission. It would, I think, be appropriate in this debate for me to say something about the conclusions that we have reached on the means of improving the internal efficiency and operation of the Commission.

Third, and perhaps most important, this Parliamentary discussion today comes at a time when there is a special need to reassert the basic framework of the Community as enshrined in the Treaties. The whole carefully-balanced edifice of powers and responsibilities on which the Community is based depends upon respect for its rules and the full-hearted support for its institutions. It is a point that I have made in this House before. I do so again today, because respect for the Treaties implies above all a respect for the integrity of our common institutions established under the Treaties. They are the very essence of our Community.

Before I turn to a number of the more detailed points raised in the three resolutions before the House, I would like, if I may, to make two preliminary remarks. First, the Commission welcomes the clear statement by the European Parliament of the need to ensure that, within the institutional balance, the Commission can and does continue to exercise its political powers of initiative in full independence. That is indeed our prime responsibility. In the Commission's view, any watering-down or weakening of its right of initiative to make proposals could only act to the detriment of the Community decision-making process itself. The right of initiative is the central part of the Commission's political mandate. It cannot be shared and it

must be exercised to the full in the interests of the Community as a whole. This we intend to do.

Second, the institutional framework of the Treaties must be seen as a whole. Essentially, this framework is based on inter-dependence, a creative partnership between independent bodies, each respecting the other and each with its own defined responsibility. Each institution relies for its daily functioning on the contributions of others. It is a shared process. Thus, it follows that for each institution a prerequisite of efficiency is the pursuit of good and balanced relations with the other institutions within the Community framework. The Commission attaches the highest priorities to the continuing development of the good relations which it hopes, and indeed believes, have been rapidly built up since direct elections with the Parliament. We will continue to take all necessary steps to ensure that, when preparing proposals for the Council, the opinions of Parliament that may have been expressed on the subjects concerned are carefully and regularly considered.

Against this general background, it would, perhaps, be helpful to the House if I were to look in a little more detail at the principal issues raised in the three resolutions under discussion. I concentrate in the main on the Rey resolution put forward on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee and I do that because, unlike the other two resolutions, the Rey resolution concentrates on the Commission and its role. I will, however, with your permission, Mr President, take up one or two points on the resolutions introduced by Mr Scott-Hopkins and by Mr Blumenfeld.

I start with the future size and composition of the Commission. Here, as I have made clear to the House on a previous occasion, our experience, as a Commission, does not lead us to think that the Commission should necessarily be smaller than the present one. We believe it has been possible to function effectively as a college with 13 Members. We are, however, much less clear that the Commission would gain from being significantly larger. Further thought needs to be given before it is agreed that the Commission should grow automatically to 17 Members — perhaps even more. In particular, there needs to be fuller consideration of the weighty analysis presented by the Spierenburg team about the number of portfolios that the present and prospective work-load of the Commission could reasonably bear. It may be that a suitable time for such reflection could be after the entry of Greece, which will increase the Commission to 14 — which is not a significant or qualitative change from 13 — but before enlargement to include Spain and Portugal. In 1981, I am also sure that it would be right for the new Commission of 14 Members to include one or more women. That is certainly the Commission's view. It is also mine. I would not like to concentrate on any par-

Jenkins

particular figure; I merely say that there should be women Members of the Commission...

(Interruption : 'Why not 13?')

... I think that might be a little unbalanced the other way, but you might say that it was redressing the period of several decades.

(Interruption)

Well, we are against discrimination, as you know, we are all against that! But, if I may remind the House, before the present Commission was established, or indeed, when it was being established, I worked hard within the powers I had at my disposal to try to secure the appointment of a woman Commissioner and it was to my real regret that that did not prove possible in 1977. I hope very much that it will be the case in 1981.

The resolution also rightly draws attention to the need to improve the system of coordination within the Commission. This was a main concern of the Spierenburg team which we appointed in 1978. We have already acted on a number of the recommendations in that report. First, we have embarked on a major re-organization of the departmental structure of the Commission which has as its objective a reduction of the number of basic administrative units by 50. Second, we have adopted a number of proposals for improving internal coordination, for strengthening policy planning and the monitoring of priorities and for reinforcing our internal budgetary procedures. Third, we have decided upon new procedures in line with Spierenburg to ensure that the overall staff resources of the Commission are deployed in the most economic and effective manner possible. Fourth, we have started on detailed consultation with the staff on a wide range of proposals designed to give effect to the Spierenburg recommendations on staff policy, including recruitment, training, mobility and career development. My friend and colleague, Vice-President Ortoli, has with a small group of Commissioners devoted a great part of the time over the past few months to pursuing these objects and has made considerable and rapid progress. I am very grateful for the work which he and the others have done.

The Commission has also considered the concept of a Commissioner with special responsibilities for certain internal administrative functions, including coordination. This is certainly an idea which we hope the next Commission will consider seriously. We are not, however — and I should be frank with the House, as I have been with the members of the Spierenburg team — convinced at this stage that the range of duties identified by the Spierenburg report for such a Commissioner is necessarily exactly the right one nor that such a Commissioner need necessarily be Vice-President or Deputy President of the Commission. What we regard as essential at this stage is that the machinery and procedures of internal coordination are

strengthened and improved. And the action we have already taken has that major objective in mind.

I turn next to the ideas expressed both in the European Democratic Group's resolution and in the Rey resolution about the role of this House in the process of appointment to the new Commission and in the establishment of its policy programme. Here let me say straight away that I have considerable sympathy for the views which have been expressed. I start from the position which I made clear to the House in my programme speech for this year in February. It will be essential, in my view, if the next Commission is to fulfil its functions, that it should be in a position to feel that it has been accepted by those who represent the people of the Community. However, it is difficult to see precisely how the Parliament could be consulted about the Commission's policy before the new Commission takes office, certainly how it could be consulted in a formal sense. The Commission is a college — that is very much of its nature and essence — and policy can only be agreed on the basis of discussion between all the Members of the college. I cannot, of course, speak for a new President, but I would see merit myself in an arrangement such as is suggested, whereby the Political Affairs Committee might have the opportunity for a general exchange of views with the President-designate. Such a procedure would necessarily have to be informal, and clearly the new President would not be in a position to commit his future colleagues, the college as a whole, until it had come together and deliberated on policy matters.

The first task of a new Commission will be to consider its policy priorities and to draw up a programme for submission to and discussion by this House. A new Commission, like its predecessors, will present its policy programme to the Parliament at the earliest opportunity after taking office. That is the moment for a public debate. Indeed, I would myself find it difficult to envisage the content or purpose of a public debate in advance of a presentation by the new President on behalf of the college of its policies to this House. At that stage, however, it would be both natural and desirable that the Parliament should express its view on the Commission's first programme. There is no reason why it should not do so then or, indeed, on subsequent annual programmes by any means it thinks right, including a vote, if that is the wish of the House.

The resolution of the Political Affairs Committee also raises an important point about the Commission as the executive organ of the Community and the role of committees. Here I think it is right to draw a distinction between powers delegated to the Commission under Article 155 of the Treaties and the Commission's duty to implement the budget under Article 205. As to the former, I would wish to reaffirm the Commission's acceptance of the existing procedures as regards management and rule-making committees generally. The legality of these procedures has been confirmed by the Court, which has ruled that Article

Jenkins

155 enables the Council to determine any detailed rules to which the Commission is subject in exercising the powers conferred on it; that these committee procedures form part of these detailed rules; and that the committees themselves, as they do not have the power to take a decision in place of the Commission or Council, do not lead to a distortion of the balance between the institutions.

As to committee procedures to assist the Commission in its task of implementing the budget, the Commission has made clear its views to this House on this issue on a number of occasions. The Commission takes the view that the aim should be to ensure that the role of any committees created to assist the Commission in the implementation of the budget should be purely advisory. This should be the aim, and it is one which the Commission, conscious of its duties under Article 205 of the Treaty, takes seriously. I must, however, remind the House that the Council is not in agreement and, as regards proposals now pending before it, is tending towards a position which would confer on it greater power than it has under the Regional Fund committee model. The Commission considers that in the case of proposals involving third countries, as all those pending before the Council at present do, the involvement of the Council in the committees is appropriate, but the Commission is not, in any event, willing to accept formulae which go beyond that of the Regional Fund model. I must stress to the House that the Commission feels that this question should be solved politically rather than by resort to the Court. Parliament has asked for conciliation in relation to one of the pending cases. The Commission supports this and looks to the Council to respond in a manner which will enable a constructive inter-institutional dialogue to take place.

Finally, I turn to a number of different aspects of the procedures for consultation between Parliament and the Commission which are raised in all three resolutions. In general, let me say again that the Commission's commitment and firm resolve is to make sure that, when preparing its proposals for the Council, opinions which have been expressed in Parliament on the subject in question are carefully and regularly considered. We remain sympathetic and ready to do all that we can to promote the aim of increased consultation. At the same time, however, the Commission considers that the institutional balance between the Parliament, the Commission and the Council should be fully respected. That implies that nothing should be done which could lead to a weakening of the Commission's role under the Treaties as the independent initiator of Community legislation. In the Commission's view, a consultation procedure which had as its aim an agreement on the broad lines of proposals before they were decided upon and submitted to the Council would in practice distort and upset the balance between the institutions. We are not therefore in favour of an inter-institutional arrangement setting up new consultation procedures. Rather, we believe that, maybe, the

best way to proceed is through informal discussion in Parliamentary committees and, where appropriate, by the use of discussion documents which can form the basis of debate in Parliament before formal proposals are made by the Commission.

Both the Scott-Hopkins and the Blumenfeld resolutions raise the question of extending the existing consultation procedures with Parliament on the Community's international agreements. The role of Parliament in these matters has evolved over a number of years under the Luns-Westerterp procedures. It is arguable that these procedures have yet to be used to the full and the Commission, for its part, would certainly be ready to consider with all concerned how they might be improved. The further development of these procedures would, however, need to involve the Council as well and would naturally have to take place within a framework which fully respects the role of each institution under the Treaties.

Against this background, we could start by studying the feasibility of extending to further types of agreement existing procedures for briefing and consulting Parliament. We might also examine in turn what improvements might be made to the present arrangements for involving Parliament at various stages of the negotiations.

Thus, in the preparatory phase, thanks to the Luns-Westerterp procedures, Parliament is already free to hold a public debate before the initiation of negotiations for association on trade agreements. Given the confidential nature of negotiations, it is difficult to envisage a full-scale debate on the draft negotiating directives themselves. On the other hand, I see no reason why the appropriate Parliamentary committees should not be fully informed as to the general political and economic factors on which negotiating directives will be based. The Commission would be ready to supply documentation on these general factors on an *ad hoc* basis. During negotiations, the Commission already briefs Parliamentary committees on the progress of negotiations. The Commission would be ready to discuss Parliament's wishes as regards the exact scope and form of these briefings, it being understood that contacts must remain informal and confidential. I believe that if we were to set to work along these lines, we should be able to attain the objective of this resolution of enabling Parliament to play a fuller role in negotiations with third countries.

The Blumenfeld report also raises the issue of Parliament's involvement in procedures for the accession of new Member States. To begin with, on this point we should recognize that there is a fundamental difference between the negotiation of accession agreements and the negotiation of Community agreements. Although the Council provides administrative support to the Conference of negotiation on accession and though the Commission may be given specific assignments within the framework of that negotiation,

Jenkins

legally both negotiation and conclusion are matters for the Member States.

This being said, my own view — and I clearly cannot here commit the views of Member States — is that Parliament could, here too, play its role at the first stage of negotiations. On the basis of material provided by the Commission, it could, for example, discuss the problems arising and suggest appropriate solutions. I recall that this was indeed the case when the previous Parliament discussed Greek enlargement on the basis of a report by Mr Amadei.

In the course of negotiations, it might also be possible to envisage procedures within an appropriate framework for keeping Parliament informed on progress. Equally, I see no objection in principle to the suggestion that at the end of negotiations Parliament might sum up its own opinion in much the same way as the Commission does under the provisions of Article 237. Indeed, there is nothing to prevent Parliament at that stage from organizing the equivalent of a 'ratification' debate in parallel with those taking place at national level in the parliaments of Member States. Clearly, the outcome of such a debate would have no binding effect, but it could certainly be an important influence on the stand adopted by national parliaments.

I have sought, Mr President, to set out the views of the Commission on the numerous points of substance which are raised in these three important resolutions. If there are any points, as there may well be, which I have not been able to cover in the course of my remarks, I will listen to the debate and, if necessary, endeavour to take them up at the end of the debate if there is then any time left. This is a debate, as I said at the beginning, of major importance, since the continuing strength and vitality of our Community institutions will more than anything else determine whether we can move forward to tackle the deep-seated economic and social problems that face us. These resolutions demonstrate the determination of this House to uphold and strengthen the institutions of the Community. I hope I have demonstrated that the Commission shares that determination, that it shares a great part of the approach of this House. I welcome this debate and look forward to hearing the views of the honourable Members.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Megahy, who tabled a question on this subject for Question Time.

Mr Megahy. — Mr President, this is a rather unusual position for me to be in, speaking at this stage of the debate, before the political heavyweights from the groups come in. Indeed, it takes away one of the points of complaint that I was going to make about this Parliament — that those of us who are humble

backbenchers in the large political groups never get an opportunity of actually saying anything worthwhile. However, by one of those quirks of the rules, because I had a question for the Council of Ministers this afternoon on this topic, I am therefore allowed some kind of precedence in this debate.

I would make it clear that I am not speaking on behalf of a political group, although I am quite certain that the views I put forward and many of the views in amendments of which I am a part-author will be subscribed to by British Members of the Socialist Group, but I am in no sense their official spokesman on this. In a sense I speak as one of those few individuals in this House who is totally opposed to increasing the powers of this Parliament. I could say that I feel somewhat like a total abstainer in a brewery. Nevertheless, I think it is right that this point of view should be expressed.

I was interested in what Mr Scott-Hopkins said about the working of this Parliament. Certainly some Members, like myself, came to this Parliament in a very sceptical but nonetheless constructive frame of mind and not to wreck the proceedings. However, when I witnessed the kind of thing that went on this morning, for example, with Members standing around in the bar and the lobby waiting to see if a debate could be launched on an issue of some importance to the Community, then I, at least, felt that there was no need for anyone to play a wrecking role in this Parliament. The bulk of the Members seem to do that very successfully themselves. Indeed if I were being quite Machiavellian about this question and concerned about not increasing the role of the Parliament, I think that after seeing the way in which it has behaved on a number of occasions, I would simply say, 'Good, let Parliament do what it wants, because if it continues to behave in the way that it has done over the past several months, then I think all its claims to credibility as a serious political institution will go by the board'.

Now, looking at the questions that are raised here, one of the things that interests me is the way in which the Three Wise Men's recommendation about the size of the Commission seems to have been abandoned in the various reports put forward. I find this quite surprising. It relates, after all, to the efficient working of the Commission, and we had a very interesting statement on what was said to be the efficient working of the Commission in the papers this week. We had someone who is described, I think, as a fairly colourful gentleman in the Commission, a man called Sir Roy Denman, who made a statement to the effect that the people who work for the Commission would be free to get drunk all day or to indulge in all sorts of immorality. He did not say, of course, whether they chose to exercise that freedom or not, and I noticed that Mr Jenkins, in defending the right of Sir Roy Denman to make this statement, did not make any comment on the substance of the matter. I hope that the investigations being carried out into the working of the Com-

Megahy

mission will bring out whether or not there is any truth in what, I think, is the general implication here, that there is a lack of control over the working of the Commission and its workload and that people are free to do whatever they want. One can, of course, well understand the concern of the staff about the phraseology used. In any case it seems to me that the whole argument about the number of Commissioners is related to the effective working of that institution. Frankly I find it difficult enough now to find out which DG deals with what. If one is going to have something like 17 Commissioners, all in charge of different DG's, then God help us! We will never find our way through the system.

I wish now to refer briefly to the main substance of the complaints that we have, and that is the deliberate intention of Members to try to extend the powers of the Parliament. This is something to which we in the British Labour Party are totally opposed. I feel that extension of the powers of Parliament does not always come about through change in the Treaties. People have emphasized that they are not trying to change the Treaties. You can in fact change the relationship between institutions by changing conventions and working habits. I am totally opposed to anything that smacks of introducing formal procedures by which we approve the Commission and the proposals of the Commission, because these I see as a way of trying to extend the powers of this Parliament. If we want democratic control we should be arguing in our own countries for some more democratic control in the national parliaments over the affairs of the Council of Ministers. What would be wrong with opening up the Council of Ministers and letting us see what they are talking about. I am all in favour of some freedom in that respect.

The amendments to which I have subscribed indicate those areas of both reports to which I take objection and I shall be voting against all attempts to increase the powers of this Parliament.

(Applause from the left)

President. — I call Mrs van den Heuvel to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs van den Heuvel. — (NL) Mr President, perhaps I may be permitted to use — or, as some may think, abuse — this opportunity to bring up a point of order. I fail to see why someone who has tabled an oral question should get priority in this debate, and the fact that the Member concerned belongs to my own group is neither here nor there. I sincerely hope that we have not set a precedent in this case . . .

President. — On the contrary, this is normal procedure.

Mrs van den Heuvel. — (NL) . . . Very well, I shall move on to the matter in hand. First of all I should like to make a brief comment on Mr Scott-Hopkins's motion for a resolution. The Socialist Group objects very strongly to what we believe to be the over-hasty treatment of the report of the Three Wise Men in Mr Scott-Hopkins's motion for a resolution. Insufficient time has been spent on the essential preparatory work. We believe this to be such an important subject that there is, in our opinion, no point in debating the matter before the report has been studied in detail by the relevant committee. We appreciate that Mr Scott-Hopkins had perfectly respectable motives for tabling his motion for a resolution, but we also believe that, in this case, he has missed the mark. Quite frankly, we are surprised that a member of the Political Affairs Committee should have asked so unexpectedly for this matter to be debated in plenary session rather than urging the committee of which he is a member to prepare the matter thoroughly. We do not believe that this method of going about things serves the interests of the matter at hand, and we thus intend to have no part in discussing this here today. Of course, we shall be perfectly willing to play our part in the preparation and discussion of this subject in the Political Affairs Committee.

Mr Blumenfeld's motion on Greek accession very largely meets with the approval of a majority of my group, and the same goes for what Mr Blumenfeld had to say here today. I therefore propose to spend no more of my limited speaking time on this point, and instead I shall move on to deal with the Rey report.

The great majority of my group very much welcomed Mr Rey's report, and we think our compliments are due to Mr Rey for the work he has put into it. We wholeheartedly support the political tenor of the report, which is that the Commission and the European Parliament are political allies in the struggle to improve the political and democratic aspects of the Community institutions.

As Members of the first directly elected European Parliament, we are intent on making Parliament more influential and we have, on several occasions, appealed to the Commission to play its part in this process. We support the attitude taken by the Three Wise Men to the effect that, without the Commission the Community would never have come into being, and that without the Commission the Community could not function properly. But *noblesse oblige!* we cannot help thinking that the Commission is insufficiently conscious of the obligations this involves. A Commission which at every step — or even before taking a step — looks round anxiously to see whether it can rely on the Council's support is, in our opinion, setting its sights too low. Let me say, again that Parliament and the Commission need each other, not to make common cause against the Council — which is represented here today by Mr Colombo, whom I have already had occasion this morning to congratulate on his appointment.

Van den Heuvel

ment and to whose speech I listened with great interest and respect — not, as I said, to make common cause against the Council but because the Commission and Parliament are the Community institutions *par excellence* and thus need each other's support more than the other institutions.

A majority of my group support the proposals contained in the Rey report for improving cooperation between the Commission and the European Parliament. We believe that it is essential for a directly elected European Parliament which takes itself and the Commission seriously to be able to influence the appointment of a new Commission and that Commission's policy programme and that a debate should be held in Parliament once the Members of the Commission have been officially appointed. We welcome the support given in the Political Affairs Committee's motion for a resolution for an arrangement between the Commission and Parliament whereby Parliament is to be consulted by the Commission on all preliminary draft decisions, with texts not being submitted to the Council until agreement has been reached with Parliament. This procedure would do justice to the special relationship which should exist between the Commission and the European Parliament, a procedure which the present President of the Commission declared himself in favour of earlier and which — if I have understood him correctly — he is not opposed to in principle today.

Praise aside, there are a few minor criticisms I should like to make on the report submitted by Mr Rey on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee. We are disappointed at what the committee had to say in its motion for a resolution about women Members of the Commission. After the election campaign conducted by our parties, in which we consistently tried to explain to our women voters in particular what great things they could expect of the Community over the coming years, the wording contained in the motion for a resolution leaves a lot to be desired. Alright, we know all the arguments; they have all become a little hackneyed over the years, but recent experience in discussions has clearly shown us that they still command respect. Women must not be elected or appointed simply because they are women. Women must enjoy full equality with men and any kind of 'positive discrimination' is contrary to this principle of equality. We know all the arguments. They have all been trotted out time and time again for decades with the result that there has been no reduction in discrimination against women. On the contrary, it is frustrating to have to study report after report on the still prevalent inequality of men and women. Even the most ardent feminist would agree that the positive discrimination in favour of women — in other words the deliberate choice of a woman from male and female candidates of equal quality — is basically contrary to the principle of equality which we are trying to defend.

But what is the use of fine principles if in practice they only serve to perpetuate inequality. What is the value of vague formulations which governments — which will shortly be selecting their candidates — can misuse as an excuse for perpetuating male dominance?

We had a foretaste of this in the Political Affairs Committee when one of the members suggested that adequate representation of women could also mean that no women at all would be appointed to the new Commission. The fact is that women are at a disadvantage in our society and we are not going to alter that by formulations which are susceptible to all manner of interpretations. Let us be realistic about this. If we fail to spell out what we want and say exactly what is the minimum number of women we expect to see in the Commission from 1 January 1981, there is every probability of us finishing up with an exclusively male Commission for the next four years, whereupon another President of the Commission will come along and say that he too is very much in favour of women Members of the Commission, but that he regrettably failed to get any appointed last time. There is perhaps one other possible outcome. It is not inconceivable that the next Commission may contain one token female Member. That, though, would be contrary to the electoral pledges we gave. On behalf of my group, then, I should like to appeal to all the Members of this House to support my amendment calling for at least — and I would stress the phrase 'at least' — three women to be appointed to the new Commission. *Noblesse oblige!* And that applies equally to the Members of this House.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Nothomb to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group).

Mr Nothomb. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, anything which can contribute directly to our collective ability to take decisions is fundamental for Europe and for the strife-torn world we live in. In this context, we are glad to take part in this first debate on institutional matters and at the same time pleased to see that it concerns a specific and down to earth subject.

I should like to recall that the Political Affairs Committee, which is the competent body in this matter, adopted a wise and cautious procedural approach to these problems, by designating a small number of its members to form a Subcommittee on Institutional Problems. This Committee decided in its first year of operation to resist two potentially dangerous temptations. The first of these would have been to try to revolutionize the European world and draw an idealistic but somewhat unrealistic picture of what it should be.

Nothomb

The other temptation would have been to try to catalogue in a single all encompassing report all the things which should be done in Europe.

For our first year, our approach has been more than anything a realistic one. Our first consideration was to remain strictly within the boundaries of the present Treaties which govern our relationship with each other, and at the same time we were concerned with examining objectively the whole series of relationships which exist between the institutions, taking as a basis the obvious innovation that our Parliament was elected by universal suffrage almost a year ago now and that even if the legal positions have not altered, the political facts are different. We decided as a result to draw up a number of reports, the first two of which are those by Mr Rey and Mr Blumenfeld. These reports, which will be closely interrelated, should be submitted before the end of the year. Their subject matter is the relations between Parliament and the Commission and the very nature of the Commission's power — this is the theme of Mr Rey's report —, and the relations between Parliament and the Council of Ministers in its changing composition — a Council which is at present presided over by Mr Colombo, whose presence is welcomed by all those on the Political Affairs Committee — and between Parliament and the European Council, which, even if it is not provided for by the Treaty, is a reality. The European Council acting in political cooperation is also a new factor and is destined to play a major part. Three reports will be drawn up on these three subjects, by Mr Hänsch, Mr Antoniozzi and Lady Elles respectively.

There will also be other reports, one of which will concern the new view we hold of the European Parliament's right to initiate policy. There will be a second Blumenfeld report, which will take a more general look at the procedure to be followed for any negotiation on accession to the Community. Two other reports will also be drawn up: one will deal with the Economic and Social Committee, the Court of Justice and the Court of Auditors; the other, which is just as important since we wish to be realistic, will examine the relationship between the European Parliament and the national parliaments, since many matters are still dealt with jointly and the Council of Ministers continues to be answerable to the national parliaments.

I wanted to re-establish this general background in order to give full significance to the reports by Mr Rey and Mr Blumenfeld. I will not go into the motion for a resolution submitted by Mr Scott-Hopkins and his group, which in my opinion is today pointless. As you know, we decided not to study the report by the Committee of Three as such, but rather to take the situation of the European Parliament as a point of departure for examination of institutional problems. Even though our aims are close to some of those expressed by the signatories to the motion submitted by Mr Scott-Hopkins and others, together we have chosen to

go about it a different way. We wish to look into the various subject headings, using our political experience and all the data now available, i. e. previous European Parliament reports, previous reports drawn up by the European Council, the Spierenburg report and the report by the Committee of Three. I thus agree with Mrs Van den Heuvel that there is no call to discuss the Scott-Hopkins motion for a resolution today. I should like it to be examined, since it raises interesting and important points, in the context of the general work of the Political Affairs Committee and of the Subcommittee on Institutional Problems. I should have however like to raise one small objection to this motion, which requests the European Council to consult the European Parliament on the relations which exist between Parliament and the other institutions. This amounts to asking someone else consult us on the relations which people have with us! Of course, it is quite right that we should discuss the problem of our relations with the European Council. As it happens, this will be the theme of Mr Antoniozzi's report.

I am now coming to the main point of this discussion, which is obviously the Rey report. Why is it the main point? Because the Commission is central to our institutional mechanism. By submitting this report quickly, we wish to reaffirm both the central and the political role of the Commission and at the same time our concern to see this role clearly defined here and now, because the President of the Commission will be designated in June and the whole Commission in the autumn. Before all this happens we must make extremely clear what we feel to be a suitable relationship between the European Parliament and the Commission and what we feel to be the Commission's role in the general European context. I would like to add that obviously I agree wholeheartedly with what Mr Jenkins said, that the strengthening of Europe cannot be achieved by strengthening one body in opposition to the others, but by strengthening each of these bodies and improving the relations between them. It is clear that we must not try to build up one institution against the others; on the contrary, strengthening the Commission means strengthening Parliament which is in close contact with it, and also means simplifying the task of the Council of Ministers. I was especially pleased to note the spirit in which the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Colombo, spoke of the problems of relations between the Council of Ministers, Parliament and the Commission, since he showed a deeply realistic and constructive attitude. Our institutions must not oppose each other, they must cooperate and strengthen each other.

In addition to strengthening the Commission, the guiding spirit of the motion for a resolution contained in the Rey report is the Commission's role and its internal efficiency. We have declared our support for keeping the present composition of the Commission, not because we do not agree with decreasing the number of Members of the Commission in order to increase efficiency, but because a realistic political at-

Nothomb

titude demands a better weighted representation for large countries within the Commission. It is also necessary to ensure a political balance so that the Commission can carry out its role.

If we wish to make sure that there are women Commissioners, this should be possible both through the small countries, which will only have one member of the Commission, and through the large countries, for which this will perhaps be simpler to achieve. We do not need to state our complete approval of the paragraph requesting that at least some members of the Commission be women. It is our considered opinion that in this case a past error must be corrected. The old arguments that ability should be the only criterion and that things should be left to look after themselves are out of date. If we want to be realistic and have women actually in the Commission by the end of this year, we must make minimum female representation compulsory. As a result we are entirely in agreement with this motion.

We also wanted to strengthen the President of the Commission's role, and we feel that we are doing this when we ask him to designate from amongst the Commission someone to aid him in his task of coordination just as we feel that it is strengthening his role by asking him to give prior notice of the Members of the Commission and to conduct a confidential dialogue with the Political Affairs Committee of the European Parliament. This exchange of views on the role the European Parliament would like to see the Commission play and on its membership and nature would of course have to be confidential because it would be weakening the stature of the President of the Commission were he to come before Parliament as a whole and make a declaration on his own, without the support of the other Commissioners and before consulting national governments.

We would also have liked to find a satisfactory way of making his position more stable than it is at the moment, since he is elected for two years only. It has always been possible for him to be re-elected, but this possibility has never been exploited. In point of fact, it was difficult to find any legal basis for this in the Treaties as they are now, which are formal on this point.

It is essential however that once formed, the Commission should come before Parliament for a general debate on its programme and its policy, to be followed by a vote ratifying the Commission's appointment and expressing confidence in it.

In order to have an increased political role, the Commission obviously needs to be sure that its general aims are shared by a majority of this Parliament. Parliament should also be able, without exercising its ability to dismiss the Commission, which is a negative attitude, to express its support for the Commission outright since the Commission cannot work, nor exist, without this support.

In this way, from the outset, relations based on dialogue will be established between the Commission and the Parliament, not merely in the formal relations which are prescribed in the Treaty and have become normal usage, but also in the informal, unofficial and everyday relations. The President of the Commission reminded us of some the helpful procedures which already exist for this and which are mentioned in paragraph 9 of the motion for a resolution contained in Mr Rey's report.

I now come to the report by Mr Blumenfeld, which deals with an urgent and important motion. At least eight of the nine national parliaments have ratified Greece's accession. It is inconceivable that our Parliament should not also express its opinion on this point more formally and more legally because this Treaty changes the composition of our Parliament. We are quite justified also in stressing that it falls within our competence to lay down the method to be used in enlarging our Parliament and how we would like the Greek Members to be elected as soon as possible by universal suffrage — a point it is unnecessary to repeat — and also how we will organize our work as a result of this accession. Since this means that a considerable change in the character of our Community will be brought about by Greece's accession, the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Blumenfeld and approved by the Political Affairs Committee propose that we ratify Greece's accession to the Community. This does not mean that we doubt the fundamental legal right of each of the national parliaments to ratify this accession and to have the last word on this subject, but it is absolutely essential that we too, as a body, ratify this accession, that is to say that we should give our political assent to Greece which will then by its entry strengthen our Community. In conclusion, I would like to congratulate Mr Rey, who has brought with him to the Political Affairs Committee and the subcommittee all the experience of a former President of the Brussels Commission, and whose realistic attitude has enabled us to make the definite steps forward which were necessary. I also congratulate Mr Blumenfeld for his report which he drew up in a short time on an important matter, thereby opening up the way to a broader discussion on Parliament's participation in ratifying and negotiating treaties of accession. These two reports are two fundamental steps forward. We shall submit them to a realistic and positive examination by the end of the year, while taking into account the new factors concerning the European Parliament. The European Peoples' Party will contribute wholeheartedly to this endeavour.

(Applause from the right)

President. — I call Lady Elles to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Lady Elles. — Mr President, I would have thought that everybody would have agreed that, to preserve

Lady Elles

the dynamism of the European Community, as evidenced by direct elections to the European Parliament in 1979 and the accession of Greece, urgent assessment of the inter-relationship of the institutions of the Community is required. While, of course, I accept totally that this matter will be discussed in greater depth in the sub-committee so ably chaired by Mr Nothomb on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee — and I very much welcome of course future cooperation in that committee on this matter — it is nevertheless urgent to debate this matter now. After all, the question of the Three Wise Men will be considered by the European Council in June, and surely it is in our interests that our voices should at least be heard giving preliminary views on what we think of the proposals of the Three Wise Men, particularly in relation to our own institution. I have no regrets whatsoever at having tabled; with Mr Scott-Hopkins and other members of our group, a request for a debate on this matter now. I believe that we have had proof of the need and urgency of this debate in the extremely welcome and constructive replies that we have had both from the President-in-Office of the Council and the President of the Commission. I have not noticed in their replies any expression of regret that this matter has been debated urgently now, and I very much welcome this fact.

It is, however, symptomatic of the illogicality of the Community as a living organism that the very body, the European Council, which proposed an assessment and recommendations on the institutions within the parameters of the Treaty of Rome and which was opposed to amending that Treaty, is itself, the one institutional body which is not even mentioned in the Treaty and which was not even envisaged in 1957. But that does not in any way take away from its efficacy as a necessary institution within our Community set-up.

However, I shall now confine myself to a few comments on the report and motion for a resolution presented by Mr Rey. The speed and clarity with which he has presented this document is indeed remarkable for this body of ours which is not noted for either of these two qualities. I think we can be proud that we have this report before us today. I would certainly add my compliments and the compliments of my group to those which have already been expressed.

There are three points on which I would like to concentrate, very briefly. First of all, there is the way in which procedures should be developed between the Parliament and the Commission. There is one point which, I think, needs elaborating, and that is the question of amendments to draft proposals made by the Commission. When amendments from this Parliament are accepted by the Commission, we welcome it, but when sometimes, as inevitably happens, they are rejected, the rejection should be justified and the matter returned to this Parliament for rediscussion before the proposal is forwarded to the Council for a final decision on policy. This would indeed closely follow

the procedures of our own Houses of Parliament, where we have first the committee stage and then a report stage before the bill passes into legislation. This particular procedure would I believe be welcome and beneficial for better relations between our two institutions.

We very much welcome the remark made by the President-in-Office concerning the recognition of our democratic legitimacy in that resolutions on political matters coming from Parliament will be seriously considered instead of simply note being taken of their contents. This will mean that action will at least be considered. However, I think it is fair to say that, if we wish our resolutions to be taken notice of, we should ourselves be reforming our own voting procedure. I think it is intolerable in a body of this kind that we can vote and yet nobody at the end of the day knows how anybody has voted or how many votes were cast for or against a particular motion. It can go through by one vote, as a matter of extreme urgency, but nobody will know what the majority was on that resolution. So I do think that if we are going to demand better relationships with the other institutions, we should begin by putting our own House in order, and the sooner the better.

The second point I want to mention is the question of the composition of the Commission. I, and I believe the majority of my group, would not be in favour of reducing the number to an arbitrary ten. I think that the Spierenberg arguments are understandable. But I believe that, in politics, there are things which go beyond reason, and I do not think that ten, as an arbitrary number, is any better than thirteen. It will not make the collegiality of the Commission any more effective than thirteen. After all, in our own British cabinet there are over twenty members, and the principle of collegiality is still respected. I do not think you need fewer people in order to reach agreement, though sometimes of course it does help. However, I think also that the larger Member States will demand more than one representative. We only have to look at the absurdity of China and the Seychelles, having each one vote in the United Nations and the weight that these two votes have in determining universal decisions. I think the same kind of reasoning should apply, at any rate for the time being, to the manner in which the Community is set up. And I would like to emphasize that the economic and political weight of smaller Member States is already vastly increased by being members of a Community. It is no reflection on their size or their economic status on their financial contribution nor would it be any derogation of their standing *vis-à-vis* the other member States. Again, you have only to look at the number of portfolios to see that if you have a president and a vice-president there are only eight Commissioners left to deal with all the very many portfolios which have to be handled. One can therefore will understand some of the comments made by Sir Roy Denman.

Lady Elles

With regard to women, which is of course another aspect of representation within the Commission, I was somewhat surprised to see the new wording in the Rey report which says that it is essential for women to be adequately represented on the Commission as from 1 January 1981. As a lawyer I would demand that the meaning of the word 'adequate' be based on proportional representation, which would mean 52 %. I think that that would be difficult to have this accepted by most Member States and certainly by any Member of the present Commission. So, I would say that I support very much what Mrs Van den Heuvel has said with regard to women being represented in the Commission, although I do not support the wording of her amendment. I think that if we already have a woman member of the European Council, and a woman President of this Parliament, both of whom have been elected by very large numbers of people, representing very large sections of the electorate, it is surely not beyond the wit of man — and I repeat the word 'man' — to nominate a woman to the new Commission. Of course, we do have the power of censure, so perhaps the men, when they are making their appointments, will bear that in mind when the Commission comes before the Parliament after it has been appointed early in 1981. I know I shall have support from my group in not hesitating to censure the Commission if there is not a woman on the Commission next year.

Thirdly, there is the question of the appointment of the Commission. My colleague Sir Fred Catherwood will be dealing briefly with the ways in which this can be done in a practical manner without upsetting the present constitution of the Community. Nevertheless, we very much welcome the suggestion of the President of the Commission that the President designate should come before the Political Affairs Committee for an exchange of views on future policies. Of course we accept that it is not possible for a Commission to put forward policies until it is in office; this is perfectly clear and I personally, of course, accept that.

In conclusion, Mr President, I think that what may have appeared as a rather dry and irrelevant subject is in fact one of the most vital to have been discussed by this House. If our efforts on behalf of the 260 million citizens of Europe are to be effective, we must concern ourselves with our own procedures and machinery and our relations with the other institutions. Let us be quite certain that nobody else will do that for us. We must therefore take it upon our shoulders to be quite certain that the future of this Parliament is one that we shall be proud of and not, as some Members like to apply, something which will remain static. This is a living organism, the Community is a dynamic institution and we shall support that dynamism with all the measures at our disposal.

(Applause from the right)

President. — The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 1 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR KATZER

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

11. *Statement by the Council on the situation in Iran*

President. — The next item is the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Colombo, on the situation in Iran.

I call Mr Colombo.

Mr Colombo, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(I)* Mr President, the situation which arose in Tehran on 4 November last with the occupation of the United States embassy and the taking hostage of the American staff by Iranian students can only be described as an inadmissible violation of international law. The immediate consultations among the Nine had two main results — the statements made by the bodies responsible for political cooperation, i.e. the ministerial meeting of 20 November 1979 and the European Council of 29-30 November 1979, and the joint representations made to the Iranian authorities in Tehran by the ambassadors of the Member States.

The aim of the Nine was from the start to help bring about a peaceful solution to the crisis in relations between Iran and the United States, by encouraging any developments which seemed likely to contribute to that end.

The call for the hostages to be released as soon as possible was linked by the countries of the European Community with two essential elements which together make up our established policy. Firstly, there is our unqualified respect for the Iranian people and their commitment to the creation of a society in keeping with the values of their own historical, cultural and religious heritage. Secondly, it is our sincere belief that Iran must assume the role and the greater responsibilities which fall to it, in order to ensure the stability and security of the whole Gulf area.

Faced with an extremely delicate situation, the Nine have had a duty to base their action on the approach adopted by the United States Government with a view

Colombo

to obtaining the rapid release of the hostages. Right from the start, this approach was twofold. On the one hand, the American Government followed the normal international procedures by appealing to the International Court of Justice in the Hague, which on 15 December 1979 ordered the Iranian Government to release the hostages immediately. It submitted the problem to the Security Council of the United Nations, which adopted Resolutions 457 and 461 on 7 and 31 December 1979 respectively. It cooperated with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, whose good offices culminated in the sending of an international commission of lawyers to Tehran. On the other hand, the United States Government brought a coordinated series of direct pressures to bear on Iran, and asked allied and friendly governments to restrict their trade and financial relations with Iran.

Within the last few days the Iranian Government has decided not to take what had been regarded as the first step towards solving the serious crisis brought about by the taking of the American hostages — i.e. to bring them under government control.

It is indeed disturbing that even after such a lapse of time it has been impossible for the rule of law, and more importantly reason, to prevail.

The Nine regard the continued detention of the American hostages in Tehran as totally unacceptable. They are in full sympathy with the people of the United States, to whose dignified patience in the face of such a blatant offence against the American nation they pay tribute.

Our solidarity is all the more incumbent and deeply felt because this situation involves the human suffering of the hostages and their families, with which we all sympathize. The persistence of this state of affairs strikes at long-standing traditions of the international community and makes it impossible to use its normal channels of communication. Such practices are unacceptable, all the more so because in this day and age they tend to be imitated elsewhere.

The countries of the European Community feel deeply that a revolution which aims at achieving liberation and independence should not discredit itself by such blatant violations of law, and that justice can be demanded only by those who act in accordance with justice.

The failure to hand over the hostages to the Iranian Government has led the United States to announce sanctions against Iran, with a view to persuading the Iranian Government to abandon its unacceptable position and release the hostages. The American Government immediately communicated its decisions through diplomatic channels to the governments of many allied and friendly countries, including all those of the European Community, stressing the American people's

expectation that those countries would also take appropriate action to bring about the release of the hostages.

Following immediate consultations among the Foreign Ministers of the Nine, held in Lisbon on the sidelines of the meeting of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, the ambassadors of the Community countries in Tehran immediately approached the President of the Islamic Republic of Iran to call for the release of the hostages and obtain information and assurances on the likely date and circumstances of their release.

The ambassadors of the Nine in Tehran have now recalled for consultations, so that they may inform their governments of the Iranian reply to the Nine's request.

It must be stressed that the action of the Nine implies no disrespect for the difficult struggle of the Iranian people to express their nationhood. It also reflects a prudent concern not to introduce further destabilizing elements into such a delicate situation, and a concern to safeguard legitimate national and personal interests. But above all, it reflects our full solidarity with the people and government of the United States.

On the basis of the replies obtained by our ambassadors from the Iranian President — and on which they are now reporting to their governments — the Nine are already discussing the matter in the appropriate Community bodies.

The results of these detailed analyses and assessments will thus be available for the forthcoming meetings of the nine Foreign Ministers. There will be the meeting of the Council of Ministers at the beginning of next week in Luxembourg, and other meetings will follow soon afterwards.

At all events, we are fully determined to help to ensure, by adopting a joint position in the appropriate multilateral and bilateral international consultations, that the safety and release of the unjustly held hostages is guaranteed by all means available under international law. I shall now use the authority conferred by this rostrum to make, on behalf of the Nine, a friendly but firm appeal to the Iranian leaders to make this possible.

(Applause)

12. Relations between the European Parliament and the Commission — Report on the European institutions by the Committee of Three — Greece's accession to the European Community (continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on the Rey and Blumenfeld reports (Docs.

President

1-71/80 and 1-49/80) and the Scott-Hopkins motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-33/80).

I call Mr De Pasquale to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr De Pasquale. — (*I*) Mr President, we Italian members of the Communist and Allies Group are in favour of the Rey resolution, because we regard it as confirmation of Parliament's political will to achieve further progress, gradually but decisively, in the integration and democratization of the European Community.

In these first months of intense and feverish activity, activity which is open to criticism in many other respects, Parliament has nevertheless managed to make its desires perfectly plain by actions that have had a wide and very positive echo throughout Europe. I need only remind you of the rejection of the budget and Parliament's subsequent refusal to betray its ideals by giving support to a dangerous and demagogical race for ever higher agricultural prices. These questions are still open, and it will not be easy to settle them without abiding by the guidelines incorporated in our decisions. In this way we can see the beginnings of a fundamental unity in Parliament's actions, which are directed to the aim of promoting a new and more democratic balance of Community powers. If this unity — to which the Italian members of the Communist and Allies Group have made a by no means minor contribution — is confirmed and consolidated in the future, the European Parliament, which is already the direct expression of the popular will of the peoples of Europe, will increase its prestige so as to become — as it is right that it should become — an organ of effective political guidance, the most authoritative source of momentum for measures that fall within the Community ambit.

Now we are faced with another event of fundamental importance: the appointment of the new Commission. In the political climate which has resulted from direct elections it is unthinkable that the Parliament should be excluded from the process of appointing the members of the new Commission. Apart from anything else, it cannot be denied, especially if we look at present trends in Community law, that in the context of the code of practice that regulates relationships between the institutions, Parliament already has the right and the duty to play a part in the appointment of the Commission and to determine broad outlines of its political programme. Parliament carries out the role of an inspector with regard to the actions of the Commission; it expresses an opinion on the initiatives which the Commission takes; on the basis of Article 143 it examines and subsequently approves or disapproves the Annual Report on Community activity which the Commission is obliged to submit to it; and, above all, on the basis of Article 144, a vote of censure on Parliament's part can compel the members of the Commis-

sion to resign. In the institutional structure set up by the Treaties, therefore, Parliament and Commission are closely bound up with each other: the functions of each institution are conditioned by those of the other. Such an intimate connection between the two Community organs could be inconceivable if it did not implicitly presuppose Parliament's co-responsibility in selecting and appointing the new Commission and in determining its political programme. These, in brief, are the reasons why we approve the proposals contained in the Rey resolution, to which the Italian members of the Communist and Allies Group have already given significant support during the meetings of the Political Affairs Committee. Other reasons could be adduced, but there is no need. The important thing is that we should succeed — in fact and in the well-measured and prudent wording provided for by the resolution — in obtaining a significant participation by Parliament in the appointment of the Commission, so that we may then launch on a new basis forms and procedures based on closer collaboration right from the formative stage of initiatives and legislation.

This is not a purely academic discussion of one of the numerous, though very valuable omnibus reports. On the contrary, we are about to take concrete political action on one precise topic: the Commission. This topic requires an immediate reply, something very different from the circumlocutions — which were as elegant as they were vague and imprecise — given to us in this House by Mr Colombo. Our opposite numbers in other words the governments of the Member States, taken individually or taken collectively as members of the Council of Ministers, should become aware of this. We wish to warn them against any temptation to repeat the serious mistake of under estimating us, an error which they fell into on the occasion of the Budget and the serious consequences of which can still be felt. In this matter, as in the matter of the budget, Parliament has the opportunity of reacting effectively if it should be once again be faced with an unmotivated and disparaging refusal. This is the weapon of censure, which Parliament has never used, as Mr Rey reminded us and which, I am certain, it has no intention of using lightly. But we must take account of the fact that the problem of the new Parliament's role in the institutional context is of such a scope as to justify using every means at Parliament's disposal.

Mr President, we — and you are all aware of this — are not advocates of perpetual conflict between the Community institutions, since we are already quite well aware that such behaviour leads to paralysis; on the contrary, we desire and are pursuing harmony, understanding, the agreement needed to make progress. Nevertheless, we are not prepared to retreat in the face of the predictable and predicted bitterness of the fight for the democratic transformation of the Community and its institutions, a fight which is not just ours alone, but in which we wish to be, and shall be, in the front line.

(Applause from the left)

President. — I call Mr Haagerup to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Haagerup. — (DK) Mr President, the Political Affairs Committee devoted considerable time to discussing the reports submitted by Mr Jean Rey and Mr Blumenfeld. There was good reason for this and considerable preparatory work was done. I am thinking, for example, of the Spierenburg report of September and the Report by the Committee of Three of October. These reports have come in for a good deal of both praise and criticism and there is no point in repeating them here. The important thing is that we have had a chance to make use of the material contained in the reports submitted, particularly that drawn up by a sub-committee of the Political Affairs Committee, with my highly respected colleague Mr Jean Rey, as rapporteur.

We are fortunate to have been able to draw on Mr Rey's wide knowledge and experience and to take advantage of the fact that he is a quite unique authority on this matter of the relations between the institutions, particularly between the Commission and this Parliament. There is no one else in this Parliament as well qualified to talk on this matter as Mr Rey and, as Lady Elles rightly pointed out, it is not least due to Mr Rey's own personal effort that Parliament has been able to receive a report such as this in so short a time. It is also important that we should do something about the proposals and views contained in the two reports of last year which mentioned a few moments ago. If we consider the way in which the Tindemans report was dealt with, we are justified in deploring the fact that the many proposals and ideas it contained were not discussed and evaluated in greater depth, one of the unfortunate results of which was that certain myths grew up around the Tindemans report, to the effect that Mr Tindemans' proposals were much far-reaching and radical than was in fact the case.

I can therefore endorse, on behalf of my Group, what Mr Scott-Hopkins had to say on this point, and say that, broadly speaking, I go along with many of the thought-provoking views he has put forward. The reason why I do not intend to go into the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Scott-Hopkins and others in greater detail is that we expect to be able to return to it in the Political Affairs Committee, and, at a later date, in this House, since, in our view, it calls for thorough discussion and consideration in the Political Affairs Committee. For this reason, we cannot vote in favour of the motion for a resolution, since we do not intend to adopt a position on it until it has been discussed in the Committee. I should like to say that my Group is in favour of the procedure chosen by the Political Affairs Committee and the sub-committee under Mr Nothomb, whereby the Report by the Committee of Three and the problems arising from it are to be discussed section by section.

My Group goes along with the main points contained in the report of the institutional aspects of the accession of Greece drawn up by Mr Blumenfeld and will be able to vote in favour of the attached motion for a resolution tabled. It is only common sense that Parliament should also be involved in the decision-making process regarding the accession to the Community of new countries within the context of the relevant Treaty. I listened with great interest to what the President of the Commission, Mr Jenkins, had to say on this point.

As regards the Rey Report, I should like to stress that the Liberal Group fully agrees that the Commission has a political role to play. The majority of my Group support the idea that the number of members of the Commission should remain unchanged in accordance with the Treaty. Opinions differ within my Group regarding the proposal contained in the Spierenburg Report to the effect that the number of Commission members should be reduced, but the majority take the view that the amount of work for the Commissioners to do justifies maintaining the present number of Commissioners and increasing this number when the Community is enlarged.

Thus, it could well be argued that there was a need for more than one Commissioner to deal with, for example, the Commission's relations with non-member countries in general, apart from the Lomé countries.

As regards the inclusion of one or more women members of the Commission, or, as Mr Nothomb, so elegantly put it, 'feminization' of the Commission, we regard this as a perfectly natural thing. However, since there have so far been no women Commissioners, it might be a good idea to stress the desirability of the Commission including a number of women members. If we talk about 'women being adequately represented' this could, as Lady Elles pointed out with her usual precision, be open to interpretation.

When we speak about the idea of the Commission including women members as perfectly natural, this should be seen particularly in the light of the fact that no other political group in this Parliament has such a large proportion of women members as the Liberal Group.

The proposals contained in the Rey Report are, of course, in no way intended as criticisms of the Commission, and it was clear from what Mr Jenkins said that he fully understands this. The intention is rather to strengthen the Commission, but at the same time to strengthen Parliament and the close cooperation between our two institutions, as a natural follow-up to the first direct elections to the European Parliament.

This should not be taken as an attack on the Council since what we must strive for is a healthy balance between the institutions. As Mr Rey pointed out when

Haagerup

presenting his report, improved cooperation and a greater degree of agreement between the institutions can only be in the interest of the Community. I was pleased to note in this connection the points made by the new President of the Council of Ministers, our former colleague, Mr Colombo, in this House this morning. I should like to say that I am confident that it will be possible to conduct a fruitful cooperation with the President of the Council whom I came to know and respect very much during the time I worked with him in his previous capacity of chairman of the Political Affairs Committee.

It is no less important to stress that the proposals tabled were drawn up on the basis of the relevant Treaty. They do not call for any amendment of the Treaties since we do not go beyond the Treaty in these proposals, the aim of which is to use the Treaty to increase the role and influence of this Parliament. There is no question of us wishing to dictate to the Commission and its President the policy it should pursue. It is, however, quite legitimate that Parliament should be able, by means of a debate and a vote, to express viewpoints and exert an influence. It is a good sign that the President of the Commission, Mr Jenkins, has just said that he understands the view that early contacts between the Political Affairs Committee and the President-designate can be useful.

There will no doubt be voices raised in indignation during this debate at the idea of giving Parliament greater powers. We have already heard one such voice. Let me point out, therefore, that I myself and my Group regard it as important that we should proceed in this matter at this time on the basis of the Treaty and attempt to increase the role and influence of the democratically elected Parliament with a view to creating a more healthy balance between the institutions of the Community. We will receive further proposals and reports to work on in the future and I should like to say in conclusion that the report under discussion here today and the points which have already been made by the President of the Council and the President of the Commission are a good start.

(Applause)

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, ladies and gentlemen, I shall restrict my short speech to only two of the documents involved in this joint debate: Mr Rey's report and the motion for a resolution by the Conservative group.

In the case of the first text — the report by the Political Affairs Committee — I must say that my group is in unanimous and total disagreement with the essential

points of Mr Rey's text. We disagree both with the title, which bears no relation whatsoever to the content of the text, and with the procedure being followed. We think firstly that it is somewhat ridiculous, to seek to alter the institutional balance by adopting a unilateral approach which only affects part of the institutions, and secondly that this text is fundamentally bad because it turns its back on the pragmatic attitude adopted so rightly both by the Three Wise Men and by the Spierenburg report. I say this because both the general spirit of the report and its details imply profound alterations which would drastically and seriously affect the institutional balance contained in the Treaty.

So we disagree with the general outline and the spirit behind these reforms and we also disagree with the precise details. We disagree with the proposal — even if this is not in direct contradiction with the letter of the Treaty, it does contradict the spirit of it — to arrange for the Commission to be appointed by two jointly responsible authorities, this means that not only the national governments but Parliament too would be called upon, as it is on budgetary matters, to designate the Members of the Commission. Naturally, there is no provision for this in the Treaty, it is naturally not in the spirit of the Treaty, and it definitely goes against the letter of that Treaty to try to modify the method for appointing the Commission.

We also feel that it is going against the spirit of the Treaty to suggest setting up a joint authority to formulate proposals since this task is clearly allotted by the Treaty to the Commission. It is not our Parliament's task to grant the Commission permission to submit proposals. It is explicitly laid down in the Treaty that it is the Commission which makes proposals, forwards them to the Council and that the Council then sends them on to us for our opinion. Suggesting that there should be a joint authority to draw up proposals, means on the one hand hampering the Commission's work and on the other hand clearly violating the spirit and the letter of the Treaty.

This means that we cannot agree to Mr Rey's proposals either with regard to their tenor or with regard to the actual details. These modifications should not be thought of as minor. In fact, they would mean a fundamental change which would unilaterally alter the institutional balance laid down by the Treaty with nothing given in return. In any case, we are certain that these proposals will get nowhere at all, even if they are approved by a majority of this House.

As for the second text, the one submitted by the European Democratic Group, I can say that here, on the other hand, we are on the same wavelength as them and that we could have agreed to this without too much difficulty. This is because it follows the line — in our opinion a wise and pragmatic one — set out in the report by the Three Wise Men, which was backed up by the Spierenburg report. We have not subscribed to

Haagerup

the motion for a resolution submitted by Mr Scott-Hopkins in its entirety because we want to be more specific. We are prepared to stand behind the motion put forward by our neighbours, but at the same time we wanted to express clearly our own ideas and in order to do this we have tabled an overall amendment which we would like Parliament to vote on. Should our amendment not be adopted, should like at least a large part of the motion submitted by Mr Scott-Hopkins to be passed.

In our amendment we are trying, not to alter the Treaties without saying so as the sub-committee and the Political Affairs Committee do in their motion, but to compensate, within the framework and in the spirit of the Treaties, for any distortions the institutions might suffer as a result of various developments.

In particular, we should like the European Council to keep to its proper role, which is one giving impetus at the highest level and we should also like it to remain at this level because if it descends to minor details it might well get bogged down in them.

On the other hand, we should like the Council of Ministers to become fully effective and operational again, by refusing to fragment itself into a multitude of specialized Councils in which it can only lose its strength and unity.

As far as the Commission is concerned, we want it to regain its collegiate character, as laid down in the Treaty. We want it to regain its power to propose legislation and we don't want to see it bogged down in some sort of authority sharing arrangement with Parliament. We are even prepared to delegate additional responsibilities to it. Should new common policies be worked out together in one field or another, we would be prepared to give the Commission the means to implement them, but we do not want to see it getting bogged down in a ridiculous and petty bureaucratic attitude. There are thousands of examples of this. For example, while Parliament is considering the vital problem of peace and war in Iran, we are asked to give our opinion on a Directive produced by the Commission relating to — wait for it — the medical examination of personnel engaged in poultry meat production. This is the type of Commission activity we are consulted on!

We want Parliament to regain its real functions, we want the Council to delegate powers to it when there are common policies, but we want it to remain at the top and also provide impetus, to coordinate and control work at national level, but not to be weighed down by a vast and meddlesome bureaucracy which only serves to duplicate the ones we are only too familiar with in our own countries.

These are a few general principles restoring of the overall institutional balance which we wanted to put forward in our motion. I shall say no more now, but

hope that the amendment we have tabled will receive some support. Should it not, we are prepared to give support to the motion tabled by the European Democratic Group with the exception of paragraph 7 a.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Hammerich to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defense of Independent Groups and Members.

Mrs Hammerich. — *(DK)* Mr President, it seems that this Assembly needs to be regularly reminded of the fact that it is not a proper Parliament. A proper Parliament is one which can, for example, adopt laws and appoint a government. This is not the case here, however, where the power of the Parliament to take decisions only affects small parts of the budget and the right to dismiss the Commission.

The two reports before us today express great frustration at the fact that the powers of the European Parliament are so limited. We in the People's Movement against Danish membership of the European Community do not share this frustration. It is normal democratic practice that the duties and powers of a popularly elected assembly are first of all clearly specified and that the members are elected subsequently. This is the only satisfactory sequence. First the powers are specified and afterwards the members are elected. However, here in the European Community we have witnessed a curious new departure in parliamentary matters, i. e. an assembly is directly elected first of all and it is hoped that afterwards the assembly will arrogate more power to itself. This is a peculiar and somewhat disconcerting sequence and this is what is starting here. The Political Affairs Committee will be submitting eight reports in the near future, all of which propose an increase in Parliament's powers, and it is the first two of these reports we are discussing today.

It is the aim of the Rey Report to promote a move towards the European Parliament appointing the Commission, which thus would come to be a type of government. It is the aim of the Blumenfeld Report to give the European Parliament decision-making powers when new members are to accede to the Community. It is symptomatic that the proposals of this kind now coming through Parliament are very unobtrusive and practical in character. They deal with small, limited fields and do not require direct amendments to the Treaties since amendments to the Treaties attract a great deal of attention and require the approval of the individual national Parliaments and, in some cases, a referendum, and the Community does not enjoy the same degree of popularity in all the Member States.

These pragmatic reports work on a principle which is commonly known as 'salami tactics'. The Community

Hammerich

arrogates power to itself little by little. One slice after another is chopped off the sovereignty of the individual Member States and it is this surreptitious aspect of the process which we object to. If this assembly is trying to become a real Parliament with the right to appoint a government and adopt real laws, we cannot regard this as a democratic step forward, and this is the point we wish to make. Power cannot be taken from thin air, it must be taken from somebody else — in this case the government and parliaments of the individual countries. And if our Folketing loses authority, we reserve the right to call this a retrograde step from the point of view of democracy. After all, we are a small country with only 15 seats out of the total 410 in the European Parliament.

Without wishing to be pompous I might nevertheless remind you once that we in Denmark have for centuries been progressing steadily towards democracy, and we think it would be rash to break off this development, to let go of the reins and let important decisions regarding our society be made abroad.

I should like to comment briefly on the two reports. The Blumenfeld report on the accession of Greece deals with the great disappointment and frustration experienced by this Parliament at not being involved in the decision-making process regarding the accession of the new Member States. The report's total lack of logic is only by the way, but it is nevertheless very amusing and curious that paragraph 1 should state that the European Parliament ratifies the Treaty on the Accession of Greece, after which, in paragraph 3, it claims the right to participate in ratification. In other words, the Parliament first of all insists that it has a right which it subsequently claims it should be given. This is a strange kind of logic. The main thing, however is that, according to Article 237 of the Treaty, it is the Member States which negotiate with applicant States and it is the Member States which ratify. This is where the European Parliament wishes to be involved. However, this would demand amendments to the Treaty, even if this is not stated in so many words. It was said in the Political Affairs Committee that amendments to the Treaty were not necessary but that there was simply a need to fill a gap between two articles, i.e. Article 237 and Article 238. This filling of gaps without amending the Treaties would be an interesting parliamentary innovation, a real Euro-idea.

The Rey report regarding the relations between Parliament and the Commission claims, among other things, the right to hold a vote of confidence to ratify the appointment of a new Commission. The general trend of these minor proposals is that the European Parliament should appoint a sort of government and hence virtually become a real Parliament. The motion for a resolution tabled by the British Conservatives regarding the report of the Committee. Three are in the same vein. Naturally, we intend to oppose these three proposals and any future proposals aimed at increasing the powers of the European Parliament at the expense

of our *Folketing* and of democratic control in our country. A very large majority of the people of Denmark will be opposed to democratic steps backward of this kind. Naturally we support the sensible amendments to these two reports tabled by members of the British Labour Party.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr De Goede.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is encouraging that a consensus is emerging in this House on the matter now under discussion. I myself have tried to make a preliminary contribution to this process by getting the matter discussed in the Bureau, and I hope that my efforts helped to bring about the speedy discussion of the matter by our Political Affairs Committee and its rapporteur, Mr Rey.

My party in the Netherlands, D'66, shares the concern felt about the inadequate functioning of the Community. The reports produced by Mr Spierenburg and the Three Wise Men give us an excellent analysis of the problems. Four major problems stand out: firstly, shortcomings in the application of the Treaties; secondly, stagnation in the integration and extension of Community powers; thirdly, the failure to take effective steps to combat the economic crisis in the Community; and fourthly, a lack of efficiency within the Commission and the Council for lack of general guidelines and clear priorities. It is true that both reports make constructive proposals, but we believe them to be inadequate. No doubt this was partly to do with the limited terms of reference and the haste with which the reports had to be prepared. My party's programme on Europe goes somewhat further, in particular as regards the importance and influence of the European Parliament, including the matter of extending Parliament's powers. To be brief though, I shall have to restrict my remarks to the two reports.

First of all, let me express my appreciation of the quality of these two documents. They are well thought out and correctly present the essential facts. The proposals are well and truly in a Community spirit and serve to strengthen the supranational character of the Community, which is something we fully endorse. The interests of the smaller Member States have also been taken fully into account. The proposals are pragmatic in character, and this again is something we approve of. As regards the various sections of the reports, I have the following comments.

A lot of attention has rightly been devoted to the European Council, which should, in our opinion, mainly concern itself with giving fresh impetus to the unification process, to which informal procedures seem best suited. We welcome a clear set of priorities

De Goede

for Community action, but feel for some thought should be given to the risk of tension between the informal procedures and the idea that the European Council should draw up this list of priorities. Would that not, we wonder, be something more fitting for the Council of Ministers? We go along with the Three Wise Men in advocating more political clout for the Commission, which must be able to play a very important part in drawing up the list of priorities. We also subscribe to the suggestion made by Mr Scott-Hopkins in his motion for a resolution to have the President-in-Office of the European Council appear before the European Parliament.

As regards the Council of Ministers, we believe that the practical proposals for improving the work of the Council made by the Committee should be implemented as quickly as possible. We endorse the Committee's proposals on strengthening the functions of the Committee of Permanent Representatives and the Commission with regard to Council decisions. We too want to see no changes made to the length of the Presidency of the Council. The adoption of majority decisions must be encouraged as much as possible, and it seems to us that valuable suggestions have been made on this subject.

As regards the work of the Commission, D '66 regrets the fact that neither the Spierenburg Report nor the Report of the Three Wise Men proposes to involve the European Parliament in appointing the President of the Commission, which is something we believe to be highly desirable. Nor is paragraph 7 of Mr Scott-Hopkins' motion for a resolution very clear on this point. Fortunately, this criticism does not apply to the Rey Report. However, in contrast to the Rey Report, we support the idea of limiting the number of Members of the Commission and we should like to ask what the report means by women being adequately represented on the Commission? The position of the President of the Commission needs strengthening. He must be able to approve the appointment of the other Members of the Commission if there is to be any hope of forming a homogeneous college. We are opposed to the idea of a Vice-President responsible for day-to-day coordination.

Mr President, ever since the first week this House met, we have repeatedly advocated and supported the idea that following its appointing and subsequently every year the Commission should draw up a political programme to be debated at a special session of the European Parliament. This would serve to stress the responsibility the Commission has *vis-à-vis* Parliament and the support of a majority of the European Parliament for the Commission's proposed policies could strengthen the Commission in its dealings with the Council. The Rey Report rightly says that the European Parliament's right of censure implies that it should be consulted on Commission policy and should approve that policy before the Commission actually takes office. I wholeheartedly support the Spierenburg

Report's proposals on making the Commission's services more efficient and improving recruitment procedures, career development and mobility of officials.

Finally, the remarks made by the Committee on the European Parliament itself are of a different nature to those referring to the Commission and the Council. They are more cautious and more vague. This must, I suppose, have something to do with the fact that the Commission and the Council have set their sights too low in doing their duty to the Community, whereas Parliament's problem is precisely that it does not have enough powers. We certainly take the view that Parliament's powers are inadequate. However, the Committee's terms of reference do not allow it to submit any proposals for amending the Treaty. It maintains relations between the Council, Parliament and the Commission must be three-cornered, with Parliament forging close and direct links with both the Council and the Commission. That is something we would go along with. We want as far as possible to extend the scope of the existing consultation procedures. At any rate, they should cover all those decisions which affect the Community's basic legislation, such as amendments to the Treaty and decisions which form the basis of the policies to be pursued by the Community in various fields. We realize that within the terms of the existing Treaty there is only very limited scope for effectively strengthening the position of the European Parliament. The Committee's proposals also underline the fact that Parliament is largely dependent on the willingness of the Commission and the Council to give us a more important role to play. It must be said, though — and this is reinforced by our status as a directly elected European Parliament since the middle of last year — that there are many, as yet untried, means of making Parliament's presence felt. This debate may contribute to this process.

President. — I call Mr Hänsch.

Mr Hänsch. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to say that, along with many of my colleagues, I agree with a lot of what Mr Rey and Mr Blumenfeld had to say in their respective reports, both of which reflect the same basic philosophy. I was also pleased to hear both Mr Colombo and Mr Jenkins espouse the same philosophy in their speeches this morning. The point is, ladies and gentlemen, that both reports remain within the terms of the Treaties; both are intent on exhausting all the possibilities offered by the Treaties. Both of them use the Treaties as a lever to strengthen the influence of the European Parliament — and I deliberately use the word 'influence' and not 'rights'. Let me repeat that for this reason, we can give our full support to the two reports, both of which follow the line I believe to be of decisive importance: anything not explicitly ruled out by the Treaties must be fair game for this House.

Hänsch

The right we have, ladies and gentlemen, to pass a vote of no confidence in the Commission indirectly gives us the right to express our confidence in them. If we do not express a lack of confidence in the Commission, we are effectively giving them a vote of confidence. What is there, then, to prevent us from taking a vote to make that public?

For the same reason, we would be opposed to making the President of the Commission alone the subject of a vote of confidence. The important thing must be to use the Treaty to make our views known on the nomination of the Commission. At any rate, this is what I regard as the central point of the Rey Report: we shall have to force the governments to enter into consultation with the European Parliament before the new Commission is appointed, otherwise they will risk being defeated.

Mr de la Malène and Mrs Hammerich spoke about using this as a means of extending our influence and our rights. It is perfectly natural, ladies and gentlemen, for a directly-elected Parliament to be constantly concerned about strengthening its influence in general and in particular its influence on the membership of the institution we shall be working with for many years to come, namely, the Commission of the European Communities.

(Applause)

The point is not to amend the Treaties, but to establish new conventions within the terms of the Treaties, and this, incidentally, also goes for the Blumenfeld report on ratification of the Treaty for the accession of Greece. I know — indeed, we all know — that there is nothing legally binding in this, but I think we must make it established practice that the European Parliament should be called upon to express a final opinion on the accession of new Member States to the Community. The point is not — as some people are insinuating — to divest the national parliaments of some of their rights. They will still have to ratify new treaties. The point is that the European Parliament should ratify such treaties in addition to the national parliaments.

I must admit that, if we had been involved in the ratification procedure at an earlier stage, the Socialist Group would have made no bones about the fact that there are certain aspects of Greek accession which give us cause for concern or which we are not entirely in favour of. For instance, there is the question of how conscientious objectors are dealt with in Greece and the status of trade unions in that country. However, this does not mean we cannot give our clear support to the Blumenfeld report and thus welcome and ratify the accession of Greece to the European Community.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, there is the question of the number of Members the Commission should have. There are many arguments here both for and against

reducing the number of Commissioners. Let me just mention one argument. If we seek to reduce the size of the Commission, this Parliament will be running the risk not only of getting into conflict with the governments on this question, but of getting beaten. I am not necessarily against conflicts with the national governments, but I think we must take care to select those areas in which we are prepared to suffer a defeat. And in my view the question of the number of Commissioners is not worth any such conflict; I therefore believe that we should stick to the present composition of the Commission.

In conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to comment on the motion for a resolution tabled by the European Democratic Group. In my opinion, both the timing and the subject of this motion are wrong. The Political Affairs Committee is already dealing with the questions brought up in this motion for a resolution. I believe that it is not right for a parliament to either approve or reject reports like the Spierenburg report or the report of the Three Wise Men. Reports are intended to be used as a part of the work in progress. That is the line we should take, rather than voting on specific points in the two reports. I therefore think we must reject the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Scott-Hopkins and his Group.

Ladies and gentlemen, the European Parliament has a chance to prove, with the Rey and Blumenfeld reports that we are working towards the goal most of us advocated to the electorate last year — to strengthen the influence of this Parliament so as to make it worthwhile that the people of Europe cast their votes every five years.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Blumenfeld.

Mr Blumenfeld. — *(D)* Mr President, in my opinion and the opinion of my group, today's debate is a good thing inasmuch as it brings out the contrasting views held by certain violent opponents of European unification, and may force some of us to state our own views more clearly, as Mr Hänsch did just now. I think a bit of friction in questions like this is a good thing; I am thinking here, for instance, of the views put forward by Mrs Hammerich or some of those advanced by Mr de la Malène. Let me concentrate, though, on what Mrs Hammerich had to say. She is within her rights to express her opinion, but it is the opinion of a dwindling minority in Europe, and we accordingly simply take note of what she had to say.

Mr President, I should like, on behalf of my group, to comment briefly on Mr Rey's report and then to move on to comment briefly on Mr Scott-Hopkins' speech and his motion for a resolution on the report of the Three Wise Men.

Blumenfeld

Paragraph 9 of Mr Rey's motion for a resolution demands that as soon as the Commission has been appointed it should conclude with Parliament an inter-institutional agreement to be used as a basis for laying down procedures for increasingly close cooperation. We gather from what Mr Jenkins said on behalf of the Commission that while he is prepared to discuss these questions with Parliament most thoroughly in committee before Parliament reaches a final decision and submits a resolution to the Council, he is opposed to upsetting the balance between the institutions — if I understood him correctly — by accepting point 9 of Mr Rey's motion for a resolution. I take his point, but I should like to ask Mr Jenkins to confirm that he is prepared to resume the hitherto not very formalized consultations in committee between the Commission and the European Parliament on important Commission proposals with a view to reinforcing the work of The Commission, so that we can achieve a form of cooperation which — although not institutionalized — is at least more clearly formalized. Let me say quite clearly that a large majority of this House is not — and cannot be — satisfied with the current state of affairs. All too often, we have been told after the event of initiatives, developments and political activities on the part of the Commission which have therefore taken place in a parliamentary and democratic vacuum, because the national parliaments and governments have also had no opportunity to state their opinions. I would be grateful for Mr Jenkins' comments on this point at the end of the debate.

I should also like to make it clear that as regards extending or strengthening the rights of the European Parliament, which we have always advocated in the past and shall continue to work for, once agreement has been reached on cooperation in the institutional sphere between the Political Affairs Committee and the Committee on External Economic Relations we shall continue in our efforts, with the proper institutional procedures to see that the Committee on External Economic Relations takes responsibility for those matters — for instance, the conclusion of treaties — where the European Parliament has a right to be heard and consulted. It is only at the present stage — now that I have heard with pleasure and gratitude that a majority of this House is in favour of strengthening the rights of the European Parliament in this respect — that it is up to the Political Affairs Committee to provide a framework to be fleshed out subsequently in close cooperation with the members of the Committee on External Economic Relations.

I should like to conclude with two brief comments on the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Scott-Hopkins and his group. I agree with my colleague Mr Nothomb, Mr Hänsch and other members that it is really too early to be talking about this subject today, or rather that this motion is wide of the mark. The Political Affairs Committee is currently discussing all the questions mentioned in Mr Scott-Hopkins' motion for a resolution. Unfortunately, both the Spierenburg

report and the report of the Three Wise Men are concerned almost exclusively with a historical view of the Commission and the Council. Indeed, there are many aspects of the history of these two institutions which are worthy of criticism, but we are more concerned about looking ahead, and precious little mention has been made of the European Parliament. As a result, this report is not exactly helpful as far as we are concerned.

However, if any points are worth discussing — and need to be discussed — in this House, they are the following two. The report of the Three Wise Men has nowhere near managed to bring out the real dimension of the European Council *vis-à-vis* all the other institutions. The European Council is not mentioned at all in the Treaties of Rome, but has become a dominant institution, and yet it has so far largely failed to do the job entrusted to it. This European Council, which managed to take no real decisions, which fails to give any real impetus, is supposed — and this would be a job for a summit meeting of the European Heads of State and Government — to put the Commission in a position to take much more vigorous and energetic action not just on its own but in collaboration of course with the European Parliament. This would be a democratic task for the European Council and I hope that the gentlemen heading our governments will give a little thought to how they should proceed in the future.

Finally, let me turn to the question which is discussed in the Rey report and of course also in the report of the Three Wise Men, and which a number of speakers have already mentioned, namely, the number of Members to be appointed to the new Commission. I think it must be realized here — and this is an argument which has not been put so far — that, if we want the Commission to become even more of a purely administrative bureaucracy, then we should indeed fix the number of Commissioners at ten or eleven, which would make the Commission nothing more than an auxiliary body. On the other hand, if the Commission is to assume a political role, the number of members must increase in accordance with the current formula. We therefore believe that, as far as this point is concerned, Mr Rey's motion for a resolution advances a good and realistic proposal. We are against any reduction in the number of Commissioners. We should like to ask for Mr Scott-Hopkins' motion for a resolution to be referred back to the Political Affairs Committee along with the amendments. That is where such resolutions rightly belong.

(Applause)

President. — I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

Sir Fred Catherwood. — Mr President, as chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations I

Catherwood

thank Mr Blumenfeld for the cooperation on the Luns-Westerterp procedures. I am quite sure that the Committee on External Economic Relations and the Political Affairs Committee have got to work together on this. I also thank Mr Jenkins for his most helpful initiative in offering to consult us formally before the Commission starts trade negotiations and informally afterwards — that is a great step forward and it meets paragraph 7b of the resolution tabled by the European Democratic Group.

Now I want to speak about paragraph 7a where our resolution insists that the European Parliament is consulted on the appointment of the President of the Commission and on the appointment of the other Commissioners. The section in the report of the Committee of Three on the appalling problems of running the council of Ministers makes clear the need for a Commission that is technically and politically strong. The report says that the burden of business of the Council has become unmanageable, that the Presidency is undisciplined and incoherent, that the Foreign Ministers cannot control the low-level technocratic working groups where junior national officials block progress, that Foreign Ministers fly in for only part of sessions, never knowing who they are going to find on the other side to negotiate with, and that no one can coordinate the agriculture and finance Councils. Like everyone else we welcome Mr Colombo whom we trust as a former President and recently an elected Member, but he is the fourth President in ten months and he will be in office for another ten weeks. Now for all these reasons we really have got to make sure that there is some functioning body and that we have in the newly appointed Commission a technically competent Commission which works with the full political support of our directly elected Parliament. Now, Mr Blumenfeld and Mr Hänsch have said all these things are underway, so what is the hurry. The hurry is that there is to be a new Commission, the first to be appointed after the direct elections, and the way in which that Commission is appointed and the way in which we are consulted will set the standard for the future. What is done now will be done for the future, what is not done now will never be done again. So we have either got to do it now or not at all. Now, while welcoming the President-in-Office's support in principle for Parliamentary endorsement of the new Commission, we believe that this endorsement must not be a formality. I would like to point out that the American President submits each member of his administration for scrutiny by the Senate and, if Member Governments similarly submitted Commissioners to Parliament's scrutiny, I am quite sure that Commissioners of the highest calibre would be produced and that continued strong political support for the Commission would be ensured. Now, we no doubt have the fullest confidence in the selection of proposed Commissioners by our own national governments, but it does no harm to have double support in the very hard times ahead about which Mr Jenkins has so rightly warned us. The Commissioners and Parliament will need all of each

other's goodwill, so let us start off with a very full consultation procedure. Finally, the Treaty recognizes Parliament's powers in giving it the right to remove by qualified majority a Commission in which it has no confidence, so proposals on procedure which would give us confidence in a new Commission are squarely in accord with the letter and the spirit of the Treaty.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Baillot.

Mr Baillot. — (F) Mr President, in this debate on the European institutions I should like to give the point of view of the French members of the Communist and Allies Group.

First of all I should like to point out that all these motions are put forward with a view to the enlargement of the Community and that this is held to be an accomplished fact even before the national parliaments have had time to take a decision on the entry of Spain and Portugal.

As Mr Nothomb made clear during the debate, the proposals which are put to us are the first part of a whole set of institutional reforms all tending towards reinforcing political integration. Firstly, these proposals are aimed at strengthening the role and the powers of the European Parliament.

The Rey report is clear on this point. So, for example, Parliament ought to be able to choose the members of the Commission. When Parliament claims the right to have the Commission present its programme to Parliament before it is implemented, and to follow this with a vote ratifying the programme, then the report is proposing nothing more or less than the adoption of the procedure used by a national Parliament to ratify its Government.

As for Parliament's field of competence, this would be greatly extended since it would be entitled to debate subjects which are not covered by the Treaty. Basically, this means a return to the contents of the *communiqué* issued after the European Summit Conference of December 1974, at which France's representatives were Mr Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and Mr Jacques Chirac, who asked for the European Parliament to be more closely involved in the legislative process of the Communities.

Secondly, the proposals we are debating today aim at strengthening the role and powers of the Commission, which some people equate with a real executive body which is answerable to no one except Parliament. Purportedly "in order to remove the Commission's technocratic image" as the Spierenburg report calls it, these proposals ask that its political powers be strengthened so that it can embody to an ever increasing extent

Baillet

'the interests of Europe before the interests of the Member States'. From this basic political standpoint, since progress must be made towards integration, the proposals aim at a large increase in the Commission's management powers, since the Three Wise Men consider that it is the 'natural executive organ of the Community'. However, facts show that the Commission has already played this role and has taken decisions in particular on economic and social matters which have done great harm to workers in our countries.

Since I am on the subject of the situation in which workers find themselves, allow me to say something on one aspect of these proposals which we feel to be very serious. This is when the regulations of the European Civil Service are undermined by a whole series of measures relating to outside recruitment, greater staff mobility, and the reduction of guarantees to staff, so that they will be more directly subject to the political decisions taken by the Commission. As I was saying, the proposals aim at strengthening the powers of Parliament and of the Commission — this is especially true for the Rey report — and the prerogatives of other European organizations, the European Council and the Council of Ministers, are also extended to the same end, namely greater political integration. Thus Three Wise Men speak of objectively ascertained European interests for the Council of Ministers, and for the European Council they speak of a consensus in an area where the Treaty does not give any precise details, with the aim of introducing more common policies. They propose a wider application of Article 235 of the Treaty and also a reinforcement of coordination between Member States on subjects which are not covered by the Treaties. In addition to political cooperation, we can quote amongst others, health, education, telecommunications, the European passport, the European judicial area and, as we saw last September, problems of defence which were approached via arms manufacture. During this session, a motion by Mr d'Ormesson and others under cover of discussing energy and raw material supplies for our countries has tried to revive the policy of military integration which Georges Marchais opposed last September.

In order to continue towards extension of the scope of the powers of European organizations, these proposals strike directly at the rule of unanimity and suggest putting in its place the method of voting by a qualified majority. Basically, what is being proposed to us is a new step forward in an extremely important area, that of strict observance of the national sovereignty of each Member State in the Community, a step which was first mooted at the Paris Summit of December 1974. The Three Wise Men take as their pretext the problems which will arise from the enlargement of the Community in order to gain acceptance of what they suggest is the need for a vote by a qualified majority, which would mean jeopardizing the sovereignty of individual States.

I would like in conclusion to make two points. All the proposals submitted to us officially today were already contained in their general lines in the Tindemans report which the Council had purportedly shelved after it was submitted by the supporters of supranationality who go tirelessly about their wicked task. Although they were foiled by the opposition they met with in France especially, they now think that they have found the necessary excuse for pursuing their aims in the accession of three new countries.

One year ago, during the campaign for the election of this Parliament, all the French candidates asserted that they would fight against any widening of the Parliament's powers and of those of the European organizations and that they would conform strictly to the provisions of the Treaty of Rome. We shall see when voting takes place just how they have kept their promise. As for ourselves, we will continue to resist any supranational ideas and any increase in the powers of this Parliament. This is why we reject the two reports and the motion before us.

President. — I call Mr Druon.

Mr Druon. — (*F*) Mr President, I only intended to speak on the draft Blumenfeld report on the institutional aspects of Greece's accession to the European Community.

The motion for a resolution before us provides a very interesting example of what I would venture to call the disease from which all international parliamentary institutions suffer. Without going as far as to call it paranoia, we can detect in this motion a tendency to illusions about the future, a propensity to consider as achieved things which are only wished for or, as our British friends would call it, a piece of 'wishful thinking', which in my opinion calls for a brief examination of the basis, or rather the alleged basis, of the resolution, namely a diplomatic act which is now being carried out and which is almost completed.

I am well placed to talk about it. It was in fact I who was privileged to be the rapporteur in the French National Assembly for the bill concerning Greece's accession to the Communities, a bill which was passed by both houses of the French Parliament so rapidly that France was able to be the first signatory to the legal instruments ratifying the Treaty. So it is impossible to attribute to what I say any reticence about Greece's joining the European Community, since I have long supported its entry and am pleased about it in every way, both for Greece and for Europe.

No, we are dealing with a different problem altogether — this Parliament's powers. The first paragraph of the motion for a resolution proposes that the European Parliament should ratify the Treaty of Accession concerning Greece. The rapporteur himself described this

Druon

motion as rash, which I feel is an understatement. I see from the document that the rapporteur is basing his proposal on a previous motion for a resolution No 1-346/79, which expressed the desire that this Parliament be involved in the procedures for ratifying treaties. I have only one question to put. Since this motion for a resolution was submitted, have the governments of the Nine met to examine this question, have they amended the various Community treaties, specifically the Treaty of Rome, have they put this amendment to the National Parliaments, and did the governments ratify these amendments? Ladies and gentlemen, if this had been the case I think we would know about it. So, to state that Parliament should ratify treaties is to display a frivolous attitude towards the law which will not help in getting this Parliament taken seriously.

I would have nothing more to say, were the second paragraph of this proposal not even more of an aberration. The second paragraph insists that the Greek Government should as soon as possible hold direct elections of its representatives, according to the explanatory statement this means during 1980. Well, the Treaty of Accession stipulates that this election shall take place during 1981. So, ladies and gentlemen, what we would be doing is to ask the Greek Republic to infringe immediately, even before it comes into force, the Treaty which will link it to the Communities. Where is the common sense in all this, and can it enhance the dignity of this house?

The reason given is that for a few months, perhaps a year, there will be on these benches directly elected Members, that is to say ourselves, and nominated Members, i.e. our Greek colleagues. But just who are these nominated Members and who nominates them? They are members of the Greek Parliament nominated by the Greek Government and as such they are elected. I think I can say that it is somewhat insulting not just for the Greek Members but for all the Members of the European Parliament who sat in this House up until last July, to consider indirectly elected Members as some sort of inferior representatives. Greek representation during the first year in which they will be sitting is one of the transitional measures of the Treaty of Accession. It is our duty to obey that Treaty, so let us be polite about it.

These are the reasons, ladies and gentlemen, why I take it upon myself to ask you not to adopt this motion for a resolution, not just on behalf of my Group, but for reasons of sound logic and good manners.

President. — I call Mr Paisley.

Mr Paisley. — Mr President, during the Euro-elections in the United Kingdom many statements were made about the increased powers which an elected European Assembly could and would take to itself. It

was painted as a body that would strike an effective blow at the bureaucracy of the Commission and proceed to bring democracy into the workings of the Community. Those of us in that election who pointed out the falsehood of those claims are now fully vindicated. This elected body has no more powers than the previous assemblies which were nominated. Indeed this Assembly, on the accession of Greece, will be partly elected and partly nominated until the next Euro-elections. In fact, under the Treaties the power of this Assembly cannot be changed without changing those treaties. However, as has been pointed out today by one of the United Kingdom Members, who had an oral question down on this issue, there could be a move to change the habits of this Institution in order to seize further powers.

I stand opposed to any increase in the powers of this House which would further undermine or erode the sovereignty of the national governments. This is not really a Parliament. It is an assembly. It neither initiates laws nor legislates them. The Commission under the Treaties, whether we like it or not, is not a cabinet of this Assembly. The President of the Commission spelt this out clearly today. He said that its right of initiative cannot be shared. The Commission had independence and intended to retain it. This Assembly will be consulted and its opinions considered, but not necessarily acted upon. How then can this Assembly have a say in the Commission's appointment? The Commissioners are nominated by the national governments, and those sovereign bodies would rightly resent any such interference.

It has been said today that we should encourage harmony in order to produce progress — harmony between the Council, the Commission and the Assembly. Could I say, in bringing to a conclusion my speech today, that disunity will be encouraged within this Assembly when it is used to launch unfounded attacks on a Member State of the Community. Such an attack was made yesterday by Mr Neil Blaney, a representative of the Irish Republic. He made the wild, fanatical and lying accusation that the Government of the United Kingdom in Northern Ireland is responsible — and I quote from page 112 of the report of yesterday's debates — 'for the denial of human rights in every form'.

I would remind this House that the provisional Irish Republican Army was spawned with Mr Blaney's help in the Irish Republic, and that that terrorist organization has been responsible for many hundreds of the most brutal murders in my country. I would ask this House to read Mr Blaney's own speech in the Dail concerning his support when the Provisional IRA was formed. During the last few days the IRA has murdered many of my constituents, yet if these murderers get safely into Mr Blaney's country they will find safe sanctuary. Moreover, there is one fact which destroys Mr Blaney's contention about the persecution of the Roman Catholic minority in Northern Ireland. When

Paisley

this part of Ireland left the United Kingdom, the Protestant population was around ten per cent. Now it is only over two per cent, whereas the Roman Catholic minority in Northern Ireland has actually increased since the division of the country . . .

President. — Mr Paisley, please keep to the subject on which you asked to speak.

Mr Paisley. — The people of Northern Ireland, under attack from the IRA, deeply resent these slanders by Mr Blaney which cannot lead to a better working of this Assembly.

President. — I call Mrs Castle.

Mrs Castle. — Mr President, in some of this debate today there has been a good deal of wishful thinking. Surely what happened this morning in this House is the best comment we could have on the three reports we are discussing this afternoon, because after the shambles over our own agenda, which wasted 1½ hours of valuable time, can anybody in this Parliament seriously deny that what we are suffering from is an inability to make an effective and organized use of the powers we have got?

The reason, of course is, that we are trying to do too much. We are drowning in a sea of paper, of undigested detail and half-read reports. What is more, that is true of the whole Community, as the very excellent report of the Three Wise Men points out. It is true of the Commission itself, of whom the Three Wise Men's report says there are too many Commissioners looking for activities to justify their existence. The report spells it out clearly. The increase in the number of Commissioners since the enlargement of the Commission in 1967 has — and I quote the report — 'made it impossible to give equally meaningful portfolios to them all'. Hence the passion of the Commissioners to find subjects for harmonization which are not a contribution to a meaningful European unity but merely an irritant to the citizens of the Member States, like the absurd attempt to harmonize the emission of noise from lawn-mowers and other comparable absurdities. I hope the Commission has taken to heart the report's rebukes about its harmonization activities, its stress on the need for the Commission to rationalize the flow of its proposals in this field and cut it down to what is really essential.

But, you know, this won't happen if the Commission is going to go on and enlarge itself with every enlargement of the Community. There will be more boys in jobs for which there is no really effective work, and the report of the Three Wise Men is emphatic on this. Again I quote: 'To continue to extend Commission membership on the present basis after enlargement could be fatal for the organization's coherence and

efficiency'. Serious words, and I am astonished that Mr Scott-Hopkins' motion makes no mention of this. I am deeply disappointed that Mr Rey's report wants to stick to the present rules, which would mean that with enlargement the size of the Commission would go up and up. I was disappointed by Mr Jenkins' comments on this. I did not think he gave us a strong enough lead towards the rationalization of the Commission, which is clearly overdue, and that is why Mr Megahy and I have an amendment to delete paragraph 2 on this matter in the motion for a resolution from the Rey report. I welcome even more positive amendments on this matter by Socialist colleagues, and I hope the House will vote for them.

But there are other lessons we should learn from this sensible report of the Three Wise Men. It certainly rejects any attempt to extend the Parliament's powers. Its whole message is that we should first make more efficient use of the institutions we have got before we try to extend them into a more ambitious role. As for this Parliament, it has got to prove itself in its present form before striking more grandiose attitudes. That is why Mr Megahy and I have tabled an amendment to delete paragraph 7 of the Scott-Hopkins motion, because however muzzily that paragraph is worded, using words like 'endorsement' instead of ratification of the appointment of the President of the Commission, it is in fact trying to enlarge the legal powers of the Parliament, and to that I remain obdurately opposed.

Indeed, I find this attempt highly ironical at a time when there is no guarantee at all that the Parliament is going to have the guts to stand by the boldest use it has yet made of its present powers — the rejection last November of the budget which violated all the expressed aims of the Community to move towards greater equality of economic development. Let us pass that test first before we start demanding an even more influential role!

I say this in conclusion, Mr President: those of us who are pressing these amendments and opposing these extensions of powers, we are the real friends, you know, of the European Parliament. We claim that the Parliament and the Community are trying to do too much, to interfere too much, that — in the words of the Three Wise Men — 'a disproportionate effort in terms of energy, time and money is needed to produce a rather modest output'.

We commend to this House the advice of the Three Wise Men. Stop being too ambitious! Stop trying to get the Community to do jobs which are not for the Community to do! Remember — and I conclude with this quotation from the Three Very Wise Men — 'An excess of ambition, particularly when it begins and ends with mere words, breeds confusion, frustration and finally indifference'.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Antoniazzi.

Mr Antoniazzi. — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have listened very attentively to this debate on the Rey report on relations between the European Parliament and the Commission of the Communities with a view to the forthcoming appointment of a new Commission.

Having listened very carefully to the various speeches, let me make one very brief initial remark.

It seems to me that people have taken the opportunity of this debate to raise a lot of points — indeed perhaps too many. Perhaps it was the English conservatives who set the ball rolling when they opened the discussion on the report of the Three Wise Men. At any rate, one or two other members have referred at length to this report during the debate. I think this is a mistake, because I believe that the report of the Three Wise Men is such an important, such a highly-qualified, such a wide-ranging document on which we could stop and reflect that I think that it would be an appropriate topic for a separate debate in Parliament once it has been discussed in the Political Affairs Committee, which is the body which should in the first instance be concerned by this report, and subsequently in the other committees consulted for their opinion. If we don't do that, we run the risk of making desultory remarks here and there on this report by the Three Wise Men without giving to this extremely important topic the time and space that it merits and without going into the detailed examination of it which I believe to be absolutely necessary and indeed indispensable. This is the reason why, in the Political Affairs Committee, I was opposed to the Scott-Hopkins initiative, since I felt, along with others, that we should discuss this topic on another occasion in order not to mix the two debates up.

It also seems to me that the Political Affairs Committee, under the presidency of Mr Colombo, was quite right to set up a subcommittee for institutional problems, and having on its agenda a series of topics concerning particular aspects of the report of the Three Wise Men — aspects which, if they are each dealt with one after the other in particular detail, could provide a broad framework for comments on the report itself, so that there could subsequently be an overall examination of all the material in the report, which is extremely important and fundamental for the well-being of our Assembly and for the activity and even the prospects of the European Community.

I hope that, after these brief introductory remarks, I may be allowed to say how much I welcomed this debate, which in my opinion is the first debate which is in genuine sympathy with our institutional duties deriving from the European elections. Let me therefore say that I was surprised to hear several prominent Members of this House expressing negative views and

criticisms on the idea of broadening the sphere and the scope of our activities, of our responsibilities and so on. Let us go back just for a moment to the very beginning: I wonder whether these people have read and still remember the preamble to the Treaties establishing the European Community, i.e. the European Coal and Steel Community Treaty, the EEC Treaty and the Euratom Treaty. In three very brief passages this preamble says: 'Convinced that the contribution which an organized and vital Europe' — and 'organized Europe' means much more than the restrictive interpretations some people try to put upon it — and 'Recognizing that Europe can be built' — and 'can be built' does not just mean setting up a customs union or a bit of agricultural policy — 'only through practical achievements which will first of all create real solidarity' — and here the 'real solidarity' is harmonization, a stage of the initial economic initiatives which must then be followed by the stage of political development. It goes on: 'Resolved to substitute for age-old rivalries the merging of their essential interests' — and here we are talking about much broader matters than just economic interests — 'by establishing an economic Community, to create the basis for a broader and deeper Community among peoples long divided'. This preamble was signed by the political representatives of those who have spoken out here against any extension of the Community's responsibilities. Here are a few more quotations from the preamble of the document setting up the European Economic Community: 'Determined to lay the foundations of an ever-closer union among the peoples of Europe' — and 'ever-closer union' has the political meaning which we understand. And, finally, there is the preamble to the Euratom Treaty which I shall not bother to read now.

Well then, ladies and gentlemen, there were political prospects for us from the very first moment we launched the economic initiatives. But then there is an important political fact: let us not forget how we came to be here last year. We arrived here as a result of an election in which 180 million European citizens were called upon to vote, obviously in order to give this institution the political strength which it required to make progress on the matters which were referred to in these preambles. This is why I welcome this debate, a debate which is perhaps the first that Parliament has held that has a full bearing on an important function which Parliament should be exercising on the basis of the mandate it received from the voters.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I believe that in recent months we have wasted too much time on discussing road signs, dangerous colorants; or the problems of marine pollution; and even when we have discussed or when we were discussing more important topics — such as world hunger, the situations in places such as Chile, Afghanistan, Iran, Cambodia, or the problems of the Moscow Olympics — these topics,

Antoniozzi

while they must be given due attention, must not make us forget the important task that we must fulfil and the mandate that we received when we were elected, that is to say the mandate to strengthen this European Economic Community politically.

This is why it gives me so much pleasure to welcome Mr Colombo, the Italian Foreign Minister and President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers, because the fact that he holds the office of President of the Council of Ministers may be of great importance. At bottom, the dialectic role which he spoke about in his speech this morning will certainly be further developed during the coming months, but we must recognize that both the Commission and the Parliament have a dialectic role to play *vis-à-vis* the Council which should result in diminishing the power of the Council and increasing the rightful powers of the Commission as the executive and those of the Parliament, so as to achieve the objectives which we have set ourselves. I am certain that Mr Colombo will make the right interpretation of his function in the right way, also because every time that he has been a minister — not just now but also 20 years ago, when he was a minister with important portfolios — he has always felt the importance of this European prospect of which he has been such a persuasive advocate as to be elected President of the European Parliament.

Ladies and gentlemen, in this House we have spoken of the Spierenburg report and the report of the Three Wise Men. I have already spoken about the Three Wise Men; so I can turn now to the Spierenburg report. I should have preferred this report to have put greater emphasis on the political aspects, and to have kept consideration of the technico-administrative aspects within their proper dimension, whereas it seems to me that they have been somewhat exaggerated. I am in agreement with the Rey report amongst other things because it was fully discussed in committee, and I really think that it reflects the thinking of the overwhelming majority of the Political Affairs Committee. I have one reservation, a marginal criticism of paragraph 4 dealing with the need for a woman Member of the Commission. I am not against a woman's being a Member of the Commission, but in my opinion there is no need to insist that the new Commission should include at least one woman; putting things in an extreme form, someone could have proposed an amendment to the effect that 'It is considered essential that at least one man should be a Member of the Commission'. I should have excluded paragraph No 4; I would have said something general, without mentioning either men or women, something that would have ensured that a woman was a Member of the new Commission, something with which I am certainly in agreement as more than just a passing fad.

I think the Political Affairs Committee, drawing comfort from Parliament's vote on this resolution, should continue its examination of the problems of the European Council, the problem of the Council of Minis-

ters, the problem of relations between Parliament and the national parliaments — in a word, of all the institutional matters which in my opinion represent the fundamental aspect of our responsibilities and our future activities.

While it is of course very important to speak about the physical enlargement of the Community — and I am in agreement with what Mr Blumenfeld said — the most important enlargement for us, and of which the physical enlargement may be an aspect which will influence any further developments, is the enlargement of the legal and political aspects and those of the future of Europe.

Ladies and gentlemen, we in this House have sometimes expressed majority opinions with regard to this or that resolution, we have perhaps even expressed a majority opinion when we elected the President of the Assembly; but do you really believe that these are the majorities that matter for our future? The majorities that matter are those which are arrived at sincerely on subjects which concern the best road to political union.

In other words, I think that today, at long last, this initiative is in harmony with the political strength of this new Parliament, since it deals with a subject inspired by political vision which we must bring more and more into our debates in order to live up to our duties as representatives of 180 million voters.

(Applause)

Mr Møller. — (DK) Mr President, I wholeheartedly go along with the previous speaker in welcoming this debate. It is nice for us in the European Parliament to get an occasional chance to discuss matters which concern Europe. Perhaps our thoughts sometimes range further afield to problems which are not directly European in nature, but today at least we are having a European Day:

However, although, as I said, I am pleased that this debate is being held, I am nevertheless disturbed at the account of the development of the parliamentary system presented by my compatriot, Mrs Else Hammerich, a few moments ago. She said that first of all a decision is taken as to what powers a parliament should have, and the parliament is then elected. However, anyone who knows a little about history, e.g. Danish history, will know, and I hope Mrs Hammerich will confirm this, that it was the parliament which its members created which ultimately led to the parliamentary system as we know it. The same was true in the case of the mother of European Parliaments, i.e. the English Parliament. It was a long and slow process by which England developed its parliamentary system and it was only when a German-speaking king came to the throne, who could not lead the debates in the Privy Council that the parliamentary system came into

Møller

being, i. e. that it was the Prime Minister came to preside over the British Cabinet and the British Government.

This was just a passing remark to Mrs Hammerich, whom, as she is aware, I otherwise greatly respect. As regards women, who have been the subject of much discussion here today, and I have had an opportunity to make a remark on this to Mrs Hammerich, I am also very much in favour of the idea of women being included in the Commission. However, I am not in favour of fixing a definite number. If we did that, there would have to be a fixed number for men too, since there should be at least one man in the Commission. There must also be equality the other way round, if I may put it that way.

For the rest, I can naturally support the proposal, tabled not by the British Conservative Group but by the European Democratic Group, including the Danish Conservatives who form part of this group. However, I should like to say that the Commission is subject to Parliamentary control, it is only natural that the same Parliament should have the opportunity to pronounce on the composition and formation of this Commission. It would be absurd if we could only dismiss Commissioners but not be involved in appointing them, i.e. if Parliament were not actively involved, but could only advise.

Finally, therefore, I should like to say that Parliament should first put its own house in order and here the Committee of Three and the reports before us today will not help us. As Mrs Castle said — and it is rare that I agree with her — the way this Parliament works is just too bad. We have nothing to brag about. We have nothing to congratulate ourselves on. After the first short year of this Parliament's existence, all we can do is feel ashamed at the way in which we have carried out our work. We could not reach agreement on a budget. We did not manage to adopt agricultural prices. We did not succeed in doing anything about the most important powers we have. For this reason, I agree with the view that if something is to grow big it must be allowed to grow slowly. If it grows too quickly, it can get growing pains and become deformed. I should therefore like to point out in conclusion that we must above all give some thought to our own problems and that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure should press on with its work on drawing up an up-to-date set of rules which correspond to the needs of this Parliament of 410 members and not of a Parliament of 198 members.

President. — I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my only purpose in speaking is to confirm the agreement I have already expressed in the Political Affairs Committee with the motion for a resolution put down by Mr Rey.

There is no doubt that this constitutes a step forward along the lines studied and called for by the Three Wise Men and by others — among them Mr Bertrand, Mr Tindemans, Mr Spierenburg — who were entrusted before them or together with them with the task of examining ways and means of modernizing the Community institutions, with a view to providing greater space, greater incisiveness to Parliament's participation in decision-making and management of Community policy in every sector. All of this, however, has been done in increasingly full agreement with the Commission, whose role has been and is essential, and without which — as was rightly pointed out by the Three Wise Men — there would never have been a Community, and the Community would not have been and would not be capable of functioning. The work and the decisions of the Commission, however, cannot become fully operative if everything does not proceed in harmony with Parliament. Mr de la Malène and others believe that all this could threaten the letter and spirit of the Treaty, which makes no provisions for relations or initiatives between Commission and Parliament — only between Commission and Council, and between the Council and Parliament, which is asked to express an opinion on the decisions to be taken. I do not believe that these criticisms, even if we accept that they are formally valid, are also valid in substance. Even in interpreting the Treaty with regard to the relations between the various Community institutions, we must take account of the fact that the election of the Parliament by direct universal suffrage must have a certain influence, in the sense that the Parliament must make its importance felt more and more decisively. If this were not so, we should have to ask ourselves why we bothered to have these elections. If we had wanted to preserve the status quo there was no need to bother 180 million European voters who — if we were to act otherwise — would certainly consider they had been betrayed in their rights and disappointed in their hopes.

I shall give my opinion on the particular points in the Rey report when we come to discuss the amendments. As for the Blumenfeld report on the question of Greek membership, we too, whilst we welcome Greek accession and shall vote in favour of it, we regret that Parliament was not more specifically involved in the negotiations. This would have made it possible for us to prepare ourselves better to face and to overcome, in the name of the political community, the serious practical and, in particular, economic difficulties which the accession today of Greece — as also the accession of Spain, Portugal and perhaps even Turkey tomorrow — will undoubtedly cause.

IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Fich.

Mr Fich. — (DK) Mr President, I should like to begin by putting a question on behalf of Mrs Gredal, who is unfortunately unable to be present, and myself to the Commission in connection with the Blumenfeld Report. Mr Jenkins is unfortunately not present, but I expect someone will pass the question on to him. I know this question has been put before, but I think it is apposite at this time and that this is possibly the last chance to get a clear answer to it. The question quite simply is whether the ratification of Greek membership means that the Greek Government will in future be able to veto the accession of Turkey, with which the Community has had Association Agreements for many years? I should now like to continue with the main points I wanted to make which concern the Rey Report.

Clarity of the kind exhibited by the Rey Report is something we have rarely experienced. This report expresses brilliantly what presumably the majority in the Assembly hope the European Parliament will eventually develop into. Briefly, what is wanted is that this advisory and supervisory assembly should develop into a legislative Parliament similar to the national parliaments as we know them in Western Europe. It will come as no surprise that the Danish Social Democrats are against this. We are strong adherents of international cooperation, but in our view this cooperation should involve commitments entered into voluntarily and should not be an instrument for the repression of national wishes for independent development. In his report, Mr Rey proposes, as a step towards greater powers for the European Parliament, that the Assembly should be actively involved in appointing the Commission, through the expression of its confidence or lack of confidence in the Commission. I seriously wonder whether this is at all in accordance with the Treaties, since they quite clearly state that the Assembly can dismiss the Commission but — and I stress this most emphatically — on the basis of the work which the Commission has done. As far as I know, the Commission has not done any work at the time it is appointed. There is, therefore, no legal basis for the Assembly to give a vote of no confidence in the Commission at the time of its appointment.

Obviously, what people have in mind is to introduce the parliamentary system at European level and thereby make themselves into a Parliament and, just as important, make the Commission a government. Naturally, therefore, the Commission is also likely to be in favour of this procedure. Since I decidedly wish to see the Commission as an administrative body with limited political influence, I must oppose the Rey Report. In conclusion, I should like to say that the only positive thing I find in the Report is the wish that the Commission should include a number of women members. I must therefore urge you to reject the Rey Report, and I also urge the Council of Ministers to reject it if it should turn out that the Report is in fact adopted by this assembly. We must maintain the exist-

ing procedures and the existing distribution of powers among the institutions. If this assembly persists in its craving for power, the Council of Ministers must put it firmly in its place.

President. — I call Mr Pfennig.

Mr Pfennig. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to comment briefly on the Blumenfeld report on Greek accession, which is concerned with a matter of great importance to this Parliament. When — acting on behalf of my group, the Group of the European People's Party (CD-Group) — I tabled the motion for a resolution calling for the European Parliament to be involved in the ratification of the Treaty of Accession of Greece, we fully realized that our demand might meet with formal objections, not only in connection with Greek accession, but also as regards subsequent accession treaties. According to Article 237 of the EEC Treaty, ratification by the national parliaments is quite sufficient. If the European Parliament claims the right to ratify such treaties as well, we are effectively expecting our national parliaments to relinquish some of their powers. After all, our demand can only mean that future accession treaties will incorporate a clause stipulating that the treaty can only become effective once it has been ratified by the parliament of the country seeking accession, the national parliaments of the other Member States and the European Parliament. This presupposes that the Community is one of the contracting parties, which is the only way a decision taken by one of its institutions — the European Parliament, — can be effective as regards the implementation of a treaty of accession under international law.

So we are asking for a great deal, and we have a right to do so, because we, as a directly elected Parliament, are directly affected by the advent of new Members to this House from any new Member State, and because we must bear in mind the financial repercussions of accession and must decide whether or not to approve the expenditure. We should therefore make our justified demand in unequivocal terms to our national parliaments in good time before the next accession negotiations and in future ensure that our work is coordinated with that of the national parliaments. The German Bundestag was, for instance, recently presented — on the occasion of the ratification of the Greek Treaty of Accession — with a resolution which was welcomed by all the parties represented in the Bundestag and according to which the European Parliament should in future be involved in the process of ratifying treaties of accession. I am told that the same kind of thing is currently happening in the Dutch Parliament. This, I think, is a highly welcome development. I can only urge all the Members of this House to see to it that a similar resolution is brought before all the Member States' parliaments to ensure that the necessary pressure is brought to bear on the govern-

Pfennig

ments from our side. I think we can then expect our wishes to be fulfilled.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Tuckman.

Mr Tuckman. — Mr President, the Committee of Three noted that there was a loss of vitality, and I think this is true. We are in a situation where Europe is in a very delicate balance between all power going to the States and some power going to the centre to give it more clout. Now what we see in Europe is that we are unable at this stage to cope well with loss of growth, inflation, unemployment and technical change. Above all we see that there is an enormous desire for stability. I think that what the Committee of Three asked for, which echoes what Spierenburg said, was that the President of the Commission should become a more powerful and more visible figure. I think he should be entitled to collect his team around him, in agreement with the national governments, of course. In that connection I think that Mr Roy Jenkins has done very well. He has pushed through a number of initiatives, particularly the EMS, and he has got to the top table together with the Heads of Government together with, not equal to. However, I now sense a substantial loss of vitality there as well and I could well imagine that a new face might be sensible for the next appointment. Of those that I have met here, Viscount Davignon, the Belgian, and Mr Gundelach, the Dane, seem to have the sort of visibility I have in mind. I was also very impressed with the introduction of the new budget procedures by Christopher Tugendhat.

Now, Mr President, you will see from that that I am in favour of a great deal of what has been put into this Committee of Three report, but there is also a lot with which I don't agree. In particular I refer here to the manner in which they want to go and change procedures in favour of the staff at the Berlaymont. I should incidentally declare an interest here. I am a member of a management consultancy called Hay. Now what I find is that there is a blind groping for new and better procedures without a proper study of these matters. What I have seen in the Berlaymont so far is that there are some people enormously overloaded, there are others who are sitting there with nothing to do. I don't think it is a matter one just has to lie down under, I think it is something which could be remedied.

Now, behind another idea of the Committee of Three, namely, the extra career step which I think is a bad idea, there lies this thing I have already stressed, the enormous desire for stability. The extra career step is apparently thought of as the sort of notion which underlies the idea of *Besitzstand* in German, whereby anything you have once achieved is yours forever, regardless of whether your new contribution or your new job demands it. I think that this kind of ossifica-

tion is very well at times of growth, when we get on better, when we have more to distribute. However, I think that at times when we are beginning to have to face recession, unemployment and the like, this is an entirely unacceptable notion.

We are already, as I understand it, paying our employees at the Berlaymont, and probably here as well, at the sort of level at which you would pay an expatriate you sent to an undesirable and dangerous if not hostile country. I think that the underlying idea of feather-bedding people is mistaken. There are many matters in which the Anglo-Saxons limp behind the Continental Europeans, but not, I think, in this matter of keeping your feet on the ground, of a sense of realism, of a sense that things cannot always be made pleasant for people. I think on that there is a realism of the kind we now see emerging in East Asia with which we find we cannot compete on equal terms. I therefore suggest that that part of the report be rejected. The other parts seem to me very good indeed.

President. — I call Mrs Focke.

Mrs Focke. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, good institutions are certainly not a remedy for all ills, but they are an essential prerequisite for efficiency and decisive action, and I believe that, in this case, Jean Monnet's view of the European Community with its special institutions has stood the test of time. On the other hand, things do change; even without any treaty amendment institutions can change, become worn and deteriorate. Likewise, their relations with each other tend to shift, and one must always be on one's guard to ensure that they retain their ability to function effectively in terms of their relations with each other. The Spierenburg report and the report of the Three Wise Men are signals for what is going on, and this year we have particular reason to take a fresh look at our institutions, concentrating our attention on the Commission, because we are now approaching the end of one Commission's period of office and nearing the time for the appointment of a new one, and all this in the light of the forthcoming enlargement of the Community. I am therefore very glad that Jean Rey has produced a report and a motion for a resolution on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee in good time. What he has to say is, in my opinion, remarkably cool and objective, concentrating on the essential points and steering a course well within the terms of the treaties.

Time is pressing, and so I shall concentrate on a few points in telegram style. First of all, going along more or less with what has been said here so far today, let me pick out the absolutely logical and consistent fact that if we have a right under the Treaty to pass a vote of no confidence in the Commission and dismiss it *in toto*, we must surely be able to support and express our confidence in a new Commission at the start of its per-

Focke

iod of office. I welcome everything that is said on this point in paragraphs 3, 7 and 8 of the motion for a resolution, and I hope that by the beginning of 1981, we shall be able to do just that, although it will only be possible if prior — not over-formalized — consultations, tentative talks and discussions are held, albeit not in plenary session. The proposals are good ones. I think, though, that I have discovered a gap in this system, and I have taken the liberty to table an amendment to fill it.

Secondly, I should like to underline what other speakers had to say about strengthening the Commission's executive functions. Here again, though, I have felt obliged to propose a change in wording to Mr Rey's motion for a resolution to make it express rather better the point that Mr Rey makes in his explanatory statement.

Thirdly, I believe that the Commission's function as an initiator is of vital importance, and I should like here to make a somewhat critical comment on paragraph 9 of the motion for a resolution, which calls for Parliament to be consulted in advance on every proposal. In this case, I can understand Barbara Castle's fear that we may be overreaching ourselves. At any rate, I should like to stress the fact that this should not result in anything being held up or delayed. On the contrary, our concern must be to ensure that the work is done better than it has been in the past.

Fourthly and finally, there is of course no magic number to be applied to membership of the Commission, but I would underline everything that has been said by those Members who feel that a rather smaller number of Commissioners — and unfortunately this can mean only the principle of one Commissioner per Member State — is probably better in terms of the collegial cooperation, coherence and transparency of the Commission's work and its internal division of responsibilities. I do not believe that Mr Hänsch's arguments really get to the core of the matter, nor do I believe that this system will necessarily make the Commission's work more nationally biased than hitherto. Goodness knows, the representatives of the Netherlands, Belgium and other small Member States have proved this.

I think it is up to us to ensure that our debate today and the decision we take tomorrow will support the Commission on the eve of its reappointment. By so doing, we shall be making a contribution towards the better functioning of the Community, which is what our voters want. By so doing, we shall strengthen our own influence and — not least — improve the effectiveness of the Council. Everything points to the need to follow this course, and I hope there will be as large a majority as possible.

President. — I call Mr Penders.

Mr Penders. — (NL) I must begin by complimenting our rapporteur, Mr Rey who, as we all know, will be leaving us in a few months' time. It is indicative of his commitment to Europe that, in the short time he has been a Member of the European Parliament, he has seen his way to produce this report for us. My sincere thanks, and those of my Group, are due to him. I should also like to offer a word praise to Mr Nothomb, the deputy chairman of the Political Affairs Committee's subcommittee and institutional problems, who has done a lot to ensure that the new European Parliament gets down to discussing this sort of institutional issue as quickly as possible. If only these two Belgian Members could put in so much constructive work in their own country as they have in the European Parliament!

Mr President, I think we shall have to have a number of debates in this House on institutional matters, including of course the question of extending the powers of the European Parliament. However, it is quite right that we should begin with the Commission, and this for three reasons. Firstly, a new Commission will be taking office on 1 January 1981, which makes this a highly appropriate moment for us to try to exert some influence. Secondly, there is a strong institutional link between the Commission and the European Parliament, and it is only reasonable for us to build on this link. In other words, the European Parliament has got a grip on the Commission. Thirdly and finally, Mr Spierenburg's report is an outstanding piece of work which, as far as the section concerning the Commission is concerned, has practically been taken over lock, stock and barrel by the Three Wise Men in their report. Of course, at some stage we shall also have to discuss at length new links between this House and the European Council, but I think it is very right and proper for us to be starting with the Commission.

Perhaps I can make a few comments on the motion for a resolution. I agree with paragraph 2 which fixes the number of Members of the Commission at 13, soon to be increased to 17. Personally, I very much preferred what the Spierenburg report had to say on this point, but my Group decided otherwise. I must say, though that the other side had some sound arguments. I should like in any case to point out the provisional nature of this decision. I believe that, in the years to come, we shall have to discuss the question of the number of Commissioners again.

Paragraph 8, dealing with the appointment of the new Commission, is, in my opinion, extremely important. We have the right to dismiss the Commission — as Mrs Focke said earlier — and I think it is therefore logical for us also to have a right to sanction the appointment of a new Commission. That, I think, is a very important matter. This is something we can tackle ourselves without any interference from the Council, the Commission or the European Council. The European Parliament can simply say that we are going to make this a convention. Of course, I hope the other

Penders

Community institutions will agree to this but even if they do not, it matters very little: as I said, we can see to the matter ourselves.

The same does not go, in my opinion, for paragraph 9, which I take to be an extremely important point as well, perhaps the most important aspect of the whole report. The thinking behind this paragraph cropped up in a recent speech by Mr Vredeling, i.e. that the Commission should not submit any preliminary draft decisions to the Council before having first of all reached agreement with the European Parliament. I believe this to be an extremely important point, and here of course we need the support of the Commission. I should therefore much appreciate it if the Commission would give an explicit answer to this request of ours.

Finally, Mr President, the political bureau of the EPP, under the chairmanship of Mr Tindemans, the author of a famous report on institutional matters met on 4 March 1980 and drew up a number of guidelines for the selection of the new Commission. I should like to pick out one point which I wholeheartedly support, and that is that the new Commission should, broadly speaking, reflect the political composition of the European Parliament. This is by no means the case at the moment. I think it a matter of fundamental importance for the new Commission which will be taking office on 1 January 1981 to reflect, generally speaking, the political composition of the European Parliament.

President. — I call Mr Prout.

Mr Prout. — Mr President, under the Treaty of Rome the Commission has two fundamental responsibilities. First, to initiate legislation, and, second, to see that it is properly implemented by the Member States. These two responsibilities are intimately linked. To the extent that the second is not properly fulfilled, the first is of no account. Legislation of whatever type is of no value unless it is properly enforced.

Now, since legislation and enforcement are inseparable, I regard the lack of any serious discussion of the enforcement question to be the most serious defect in the report of the Three Wise Men. Precisely half a page is devoted to the Court of Justice, whose role in this matter of enforcement is absolutely essential. In contrast, about 50 pages are devoted to the Council. Not much wisdom there I fear! The achievement of a genuine community of nations depends upon the effectiveness of the Commission and, if necessary, the Court in ensuring that nations states apply uniformly the new laws. There is no lack of determination on behalf of the Court, but I would like to see far more decisiveness on the part of the Commission in identifying breaches and in bringing disciplinary action under Article 169 of the Treaty. Without such an activist approach the harmonization programme is rendered entirely meaningless.

Of course, there is one further treacherous stage in the process of enforcement. It depends in the last resort on the goodwill of Member States. Ultimately the key to responsible government is respect for the rule of law. There is no doubt whatsoever of the European Court's determination to uphold the principles of the Treaty of Rome. Whether Member States will be prepared to meet their obligations to enforce the decisions of the Court only time will tell, but if they are not, we shall never have a European Community.

My other central criticism of the report is its failure to recognize the implications of Parliament's right to dismiss the Commission. Save in budgetary matters it is the Commission, not Parliament, which has the legal powers under the Treaty to discipline the Council and the Member States. But the right to censure in turn makes the Commission in the last resort politically responsible to Parliament. It is by this indirect route via the Commission that Parliament will achieve real influence over the Council of Ministers. The President of the Commission has the legal powers, but the Commission is also responsible for the exercise of these legal powers to us! The point is, I believe, fundamental to everything we do in this House in the future and it is not a question of increasing our powers. We have the powers already. All we have to do is to enforce them.

I would like, finally, to make a related point about the evolution of our institutional system. Institutions never stand still. They evolve sometimes for better, sometimes for worse. The Commission used to enjoy a substantial degree of political independence, because it was responsible for initiating legislation under strict Treaty obligations to implement particular transitional programmes according to a particular timetable. Now it is trying to make headway in controversial political areas, governed by Treaty provisions of extreme generality, disciplined by no timetable. As a result it seems to me that the Commission has lost all real power of initiative and the solutions we reach are not generally European but those that reflect the lowest common denominator acceptable to the representatives of the nine member governments.

I venture to suggest, with respect, that the Commission will never again regain its old initiative until, at every step, it comes to the Parliament to seek its full support for the measures it proposes. The political responsibility of the Commission, therefore, is a matter of self-interest, just as much as a matter of the rule of law.

President. — I call Mr Ferri.

— (I) Mr President, I wish to express some reservations on Mr Rey's report.

Ferri

The first of these reservations has to do with the fact that the Legal Affairs Committee — of which I have the honour to be chairman — was not called upon to give its opinion on this matter, despite the fact that it had expressly submitted a request to this end to the President. I do not wish to bring into this discussion what might appear to be a demarcation dispute between committees; the problem will arise again in the future with the eight other reports which the Political Affairs Committee has been authorized to prepare and on some of which the Legal Affairs Committee certainly has at least the right to express an opinion.

I want to say, however, that there are some points in the Rey report which do not convince me — although I am fully in agreement with the spirit behind the Rey report and the report of the Three Wise Men — on the need for Parliament and the Commission to strengthen their relation and their roles and, above all, for the Commission to return completely to its autonomous political role — reversing a tendency which has become apparent in recent years with the result that the Commission has, as it were, kow-towed to the Council. Now whilst — I repeat — I am in agreement with the spirit of the report and on the need to put a stop to the system of management committees, which usurp the Commission tasks, I must express some reservations with regard to the consultation procedure which certainly will have to be looked at in some detail by the Legal Affairs Committee. I believe that each one of us must carry out his role and that Parliament must demand that the Commission should behave in accordance with the spirit of Article 149 of the Treaty, that is to say, that it should generally amend its own proposals to the Council in the sense indicated by Parliament.

My other reservation concerns, as regards points 3 and 8, what in a sense could be called the novelty of this report — the concept that Parliament must give the Commission a vote which is actually defined as a vote of ratification or a vote of confidence. It has been said — and the last person to say this was my colleague from the group to which I belong, Mrs Focke — that the legal basis of this power derives from Article 144 using a form of reasoning which, in my opinion, is extremely simplistic.

It is said: if Parliament has the power to express a vote of censure — and as far as I can remember it is not true that the censure motion must be voted on according to a special procedure and with a special kind of majority — it must also have the power to express a vote of ratification or a vote of confidence. I do not believe that Parliament can arrogate to itself this power, and if it could, it would have neither political nor legal effect. I am certain not one of those who fear an increase in the powers of this Parliament, in that I believe in continuing the job of creating a united Europe, and in this sense I too am fighting for a continuing growth in the role of Parliament. Nevertheless I believe that this is not the right way of going about it.

I am in some doubts and confusion with regard to what would happen if Parliament, on the occasion of an initial vote on the Commission, were to go so far as to oppose a decision which had not been taken by another institution. In that case we should have a conflict, not between institutions, but with the Member States, because the Commission is appointed by the governments of the Member States.

So I say: let us keep a check on the actions of the Commission, let us demand of the Commission that it should abide by the policy guidelines laid down by Parliament, let us have recourse — in those cases where conditions require it — to Article 144, but let us not arrogate to ourselves an additional responsibility which is not within our remit.

The origin of this report is the report of the Three Wise Men. Mr Rey has every right to be considered and there is no doubt that he is considered, with regard to Europe — a fourth wise man. If I had had the time which I did not have — because this debate has been guillotined — to submit an amendment, all I should have done would have been to ask for the deletion in point 3 of the motion for a resolution, of the words 'ratifying' and 'confidence'.

Therefore I appeal to the wisdom of Mr Rey and ask him to have the kindness to accede if possible, to this change.

President. — I call Mr Battersby.

Mr Battersby. — As Mr Jenkins has pointed out, this Parliament is determined to uphold and strengthen the institutions and to be seen so to do. It was very heartening to hear Mr Jenkins' words of support for our determination and to hear that inter-institutional consultation in the future will become the rule and not the rare exception.

I think, too, it is important that our Greek friends' understand the real reasoning behind Mr Blumenfeld's report, which is to emphasize our determination. We have an internal problem of long standing with the other institutions. This is the lack of due respect by these institutions for the Parliament and for the Parliament's powers. We welcome the entry of Greece into the Community and we welcome the fact that Greece, which is the birthplace of our democratic civilization, a nation which has maintained its European spirit and culture and its national identity for over 2 000 years, a modern, dynamic nation, is shortly to become a partner in our great enterprise. We also welcome the fact that Greek colleagues will shortly be joining us in this Chamber. This accession of Greece is an historical event of considerable importance in the evolution of our Community and one which must be treated with due respect and dignity. The Treaty of Accession must be approved by this Parliament as a matter of principle,

Battersby

and this principle must also be upheld when Spain and Portugal join. Ratification by this House is also a matter of urgency. I therefore call on the Council to place the relevant instruments before this Parliament with the minimum possible delay, in order to enable formal approval to take place. This will enable us to give the Treaty its true political and historical dignity and significance. I would also suggest, Mr President, that it would be appropriate when this ratification takes place for the President of Greece to be invited as a guest of honour to be present at this great historical occasion, a great occasion both for Greece and for our Community.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote during the next voting time.

I call Mr De Goede on a point of order.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Mr President, I am surprised that you have concluded this extremely important debate we have had today without the Council and the Commission replying to the points raised by the various speakers and still remaining unanswered.

How are you going to solve this problem? We can now go on to discuss the Ruffolo report, and perhaps to Question Time as well, but I should like both the Council and the Commission to reply — even if it is only for a quarter of an hour — to the points raised in this debate and which did not figure in this morning's statements by the Council and the Commission. That is my point of order.

I feel that the quality of our debates is lowered if all we do here is make statements and there is no real discussion. I would therefore ask you to invite the Council and the Commission to reply to the points raised by the various speakers in the debate this afternoon.

President. — I appreciate your problem, Mr De Goede, but all I can do is point out that neither the Council nor the Commission has asked me to call their representatives again. I therefore had no choice but to conclude the debate.

13. Order of business

President. — I propose that the beginning of Question Time be postponed for about quarter of an hour to enable the Council to give its views on the Ruffolo report. Mr Ruffolo will of course have to present his report first.

Question Time will consequently last until a quarter past seven.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

14. European Monetary System

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-63/80), drawn up by Mr Ruffolo on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the European Monetary System as an aspect of the international monetary system.

I call Mr Ruffolo.

Mr Ruffolo, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, in the very short time which is unfortunately all that is available for this debate, it is clearly impossible for me to go into complex problems and assessments, which have in any case already been dealt with in the motion for a resolution and its explanatory statement. I shall therefore confine myself to summarizing what, in my view, are a few essential conclusions.

The trial phase of the European Monetary System mechanism has undoubtedly been successful. The forecasts that the system would disintegrate have been proved wrong. Exchange rate fluctuations have decreased from 5.2 % to 1.9 %, creating a climate of greater certainty.

However, in the last few months the basic limitation of the system has emerged — the failure to put the exchange rate agreement in the context of a consistent Community policy, in two crucial respects — internal difficulties and the external fragility of the system. Within the system, discipline has not been as strict, and Community solidarity not as strong, as it should have been.

This conclusion is reinforced by three observations. Firstly, the fact that there have been two successive exchange rate adjustments without activation of the credit mechanisms for monetary support — intended to avoid too frequent exchange rate changes — leads one to fear that the system will be excessively flexible. Moreover, the operation of the alarm and regulation mechanisms has been disorted, since the Member States have given priority to national objectives as a frame of reference for their exchange rate policy, rather than to the Community objectives represented by the divergence indicator.

Finally — and this is the Achilles' heel, the fatal weakness of the EMS — the solid basis which should be provided, according to the original Bremen plan, by the gradual convergence of the economic policies and structures of the member countries, is lacking. Since

Ruffolo

the system came into operation, no real effort has been made to reduce the serious imbalances between the poorer and richer areas of the Community, nor to achieve real coordination of the economic policies of the Member States. On the contrary, Mr President, the Community has never appeared so divided, its internal quarrels so acrimonious and its level of solidarity so low.

Externally, the crucial point is the absence of a common policy towards the dollar and the consequent risk that the vicissitudes of the dollar may cause tensions within the system which will in the long run become unbearable, because of the varying importance of the American currency in the trade structures of the individual European countries.

In the absence of a common policy, there is therefore a risk that the task of determining the desired rate of exchange will be left to the country with the strongest currency, with the result that the countries with weaker currencies risk either being unable to keep up or suffering the inflationary consequences of a policy of divergence.

These problems appear all the more threatening today in view of the worsening of the oil crisis and the serious new political divergences which have emerged within the Community. In these circumstances it is likely to be anything but easy to start the second phase of the EMS.

Three problems with obvious political implications have to be tackled. The first concerns the strengthening of the economic basis of the system. In this respect — as I have already said — the outlook is rather gloomy. To appreciate this, it is enough to remember the long list of Community failures in the field of convergence of economic structures and policies — from the agricultural policy to the Community budget, from the energy and industrial policies to the regional policy. Without structural policies designed to reduce imbalances, and without a convergence of the national economic policies with a view to achieving growth targets and respecting commitments to achieve stability, no monetary discipline can last long.

The second problem concerns the development of the system and its mechanisms in the second phase. First and foremost, there are the technical problems of correcting the mechanics of the system, but I cannot dwell on these. The basic question is the creation of the European Monetary Fund and the necessary integration within it of the three instruments of the EMS — the exchange rate agreement, the credit mechanism and the ECU.

In particular, the exchange rate agreements must be made more rigid and the three credit mechanisms strengthened and incorporated in the management of the Fund. The ECU should no longer be a pale shadow, a mere accounting unit, but a real reserve and

trading currency. To that end, it would have to be permanent, fully acceptable and directly linked with the credit mechanisms.

In short, all this requires the creation of a real Monetary Fund instead of the present one, which is simply a means of registering monetary transactions — a Fund which should gradually acquire the functions of a central monetary authority. Obviously this raises difficult legal and constitutional problems, and it may also disturb those who are haunted by the spectre of supranationality.

The truth is that a failure to take cautious but decisive steps towards the creation of a real European monetary authority means condoning the worst form of supranationality — that hidden supranationality based not on responsible Community institutions but on relationships of brute force.

The third set of problems concerns the contribution which an outward looking European Monetary System can make to a new international monetary order. In the present situation of disorder in the international monetary system it is still difficult to see any immediate and agreed alternative to the instability entailed by the dollar standard.

The existence of a strong European Monetary System could be a factor for progress towards a new multipolar balance. However, this presupposes that the ECU would be a real currency which could be used for international reserve purposes, that the European Monetary Fund would have a solid institutional and functional reality, that the EMS be extended to include sterling, whose external position creates imbalances in the regulation mechanisms of the system and makes the future of its exchange rate uncertain.

The future of the European Monetary System, and above all the transition to the second phase envisaged by the agreement, therefore involve not only technical problems but basic political problems.

No decisive progress seems to have been made on the technical side, and the political obstacles have so far not been touched. One is therefore somewhat surprised at the nonchalance with which the last European Council in Dublin — perhaps to include a word of comfort in what was otherwise such a depressing message — was able calmly to confirm the commitment to implement the definitive phase of the EMS in March 1981. It is now more than probable that the lack of technical and political preparation, as well as the electoral preoccupations of some governments, will lead the Council to renege on this commitment. Grand designs would therefore be followed once more by embarrassing disavowals, and in this case it would be a serious matter.

In the last few days we have read in the press about a new grand design for the reorganization of the inter-

Ruffolo

national monetary system — nothing less — which will supposedly be revealed in Venice next June. Mr President, no one doubts for a moment that the international monetary system needs to be reorganized. But we think that the most responsible and practical way of doing this is not to build new and improbable castles in the air while avoiding the difficult problems which confront us, but to implement Community commitments by turning the EMS, the Fund and the ECU into established facts.

It is therefore more than ever desirable that the Council and the Commission make their intentions in the matter known to Parliament. Currency is too serious a matter to be left to the bankers! This, Mr President, is the essential aim of the motion for a resolution which I have the honour to present on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Colombo.

Mr Colombo, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(I)* Mr President, we still regard the creation of the European Monetary System and the direct election of Parliament by universal suffrage as the two important achievements of 1979.

The development of the EMS has been followed continuously and with interest by the Council since it came into operation.

The Ruffolo report provides us with an opportunity to record, on the basis of this first year's experience, that the system has functioned properly and made significant contribution to the stability of exchange rates within the Community. This has been possible thanks to increased cooperation among the appropriate authorities.

As envisaged by the European Council Resolution of 5 December 1978, the Council re-examined some aspects of the system on 17 September 1979 at the end of the first six months of its operation. On that occasion, after hearing the opinions of the Commission, the Monetary Committee and the Committee of the Governors of the Central Banks, the Council did not think it necessary to change the operating rules decided upon in December 1978.

In the past year it has been necessary to make two adjustments to the central exchange rates of the currencies participating in the system, in order to relieve the strains which had developed on the exchange markets. These adjustments proved to be useful and opportune, for they re-established more orderly operating conditions on the markets. They also contributed to the stability of the currencies outside the system.

The Council never loses sight of the need for the EMS to develop in the context of a stable and balanced international monetary system.

For this reason, the Council intends to make an active contribution to the discussion of these problems and the assessment of the proposals by the International Monetary Fund and the Interim Committee. The February and September 1979 meetings of the Council were partly devoted to consideration of these problems and of the Community position. The forthcoming meeting of the Council on 21 April will also devote attention to this matter.

Mr Ruffolo is undoubtedly right when he says that one of the weaknesses of the system is the lack of a common policy towards the dollar, although such a policy should have been one of the objectives of the European Monetary System from its inception.

It is well known that the EMS must move on from its present initial phase to a definitive phase. The latter as envisaged by the conclusions of the European Council held in Bremen on 6 and 7 July 1978 and confirmed by the European Council held in Brussels on 5 December 1978, will involve the creation of the European Monetary Fund and the unqualified use of the ECU as a mechanism for reserve and regulatory purposes. The definitive system must be based on suitable legislative instruments to be adopted both at Community and at national levels. Pursuant to this commitment by the European Council, the Council asked the Commission, the Monetary Committee and the Committee of the Governors of the Central Banks to carry out the studies required for the proposal to create the European Monetary Fund. A preliminary report by these Committees was submitted to the Council in December 1979, and a second report was submitted in March of this year.

However, our thoughts on the EMS must not be confined to the technical aspects of its operation. In particular, we must assess the contribution that it can make to solving the basic problems now confronting us, which were rightly mentioned in the report of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and in Mr Ruffolo's speech just now.

The relative stability of currencies which we were able to ensure in the past year was not accompanied by a convergence of inflation rates. Internally, the inflation rate in the Community increased on average from 6.9 % at the end of 1978 to 9 % at the end of 1979, and the divergence between the minimum and maximum inflation rates recorded in the Member States further increased.

As was rightly pointed out in the report by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, not enough progress was made on the measures which, along with the developments in the monetary field, were supposed to give a real stimulus to economic

Colombo

convergence in order to ensure greater stability and thus a balanced development of the Community as a whole, particularly through a special commitment to strengthening the economic potential of the poorer countries. This is an especially important aspect, which Parliament has repeatedly raised, and on which there must be a new stimulus to Community action.

At the end of November, the European Council meeting in Dublin, confirmed its intention to set up the European Monetary Fund according to the original timetable, and to this end it asked the Commission to submit to it at its next meeting a report reviewing the progress made in this sector and pointing out the difficulties encountered.

The Commission has now drawn up the report asked for by the European Council held in Dublin, dwelling particularly on the problems relating to the credit mechanisms, the internal and international roles of the ECU and the institutional powers to be conferred on the European Monetary Fund. This report is on the agenda for the next meeting of the European Council. Let us hope that there will be both opportunity and time to examine it, even though the European Council is involved in the important matter of convergence policy and in the related matter of agricultural prices and the budget.

This debate, which I must say seems somewhat compressed to me, since it is limited to the rapporteur's presentation, a Council statement and a Commission statement, will undoubtedly be useful in providing information and assessments as a basis for future decisions.

I notice that Mr Ruffolo is somewhat sceptical about the future development of the European Monetary System, and that his scepticism seems to be shared by others. We must not be discouraged by such scepticism. We must instead try to overcome the difficulties, however great, and to achieve the aims we have set ourselves.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is suspended until tomorrow morning.

15. *Question Time* (conclusion)

President. — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. 1-72/80).

We shall deal first with the questions addressed to the Council of the European Communities.

At the request of its author, Question No 54 (H-416/79) is postponed until the May part-session.

I call Question No 55, by Mr Rogers (H-66/80, formerly O-143/79):

Is the Council aware that the position of conscientious objectors to military service in the Member States of the European Community is by no means uniformly fair and not always in accordance with the standards adopted by Amnesty International, which are partly based on resolutions adopted by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe? Will the Council take a united and positive stand on this subject?

Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(I)* This question is interesting, but the answer which the Council must give is that it is not for it to state its position on this issue, which, as is known, falls within the province of the Governments of the Member States.

Mr Rogers. — I am pleased that the Minister feels that the question is interesting. Is the Council aware — if not, I should like to make it aware in my supplementary — that in Greece, which is seeking accession to the Community, the military and the Orthodox Church are opposed to any recognition of conscientious objection, that conscientious objectors are still sentenced to 4 or more years of imprisonment, where they are habitually beaten, abused and refused medical treatment, and also that the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in 1977 invited member countries that do not allow the right of conscientious objection to legislate to provide for such a right?

Mr Zamberletti. — *(I)* I take due note of the points made by the honourable Member, but, as I said before, this problem could be brought up elsewhere in institutions responsible for such matters. There can be no doubt, however, that this question lies outside the competencies provided for by the Treaties.

Mr Weber. — *(D)* Would it perhaps be possible to ask the Council what view it takes of the situation in France, where the period of alternative service for conscientious objectors is twice as long as the corresponding period of military service and where, for example, it is not possible for persons to be active politically or in trade unions during the period of alternative service? Do you not think that the Council should intervene if persons doing alternative service cannot even speak publicly on political questions without consulting the minister in advance, whereas clearly one of the most basic rights in a free country is the right to be politically active? I ask you really seriously to comment on this question.

Mr Zamberletti. — *(I)* I am sorry, but I must repeat that this question although very interesting, is one which concerns the Member States, and it is therefore to the Member States that questions regarding a solu-

Zamberletti

tion to these problems, which do not come within the competency of the Community, should be addressed.

Miss Clwyd. — Would not the Council agree that reform and revision are called for on three main counts and appropriate provisions could be incorporated into a charter of civil rights proposed by the European Parliament and adopted by the European Community institutions as a whole, firstly, encouraging basic minimum standards in dealing with the rights of conscientious objectors, secondly, improving facilities for considering cases of a political conscientious objector and, thirdly, increasing the choice of the forms of alternative service offered in countries where conscription exists, without restrictions?

Mr Zamberletti. — (*I*) I should like to say in a personal capacity that I can sympathize with the views put forward on this matter, but I must say, in my capacity as President-in-Office of the Council, that this subject is not covered by the Treaties and that the Treaties form the basis of our action. It is to the Treaties that we must refer when trying to solve problems within the Community. Sometimes the Treaties are a headache to us, but at other times they are a delight, since it is the Treaties which permit us to pursue the various policies thanks to which we are achieving results within the Community.

Mr Galland. — (*F*) I should first of all like to congratulate the representative of the Council for the extremely circumspect manner in which he has answered questions regarding a problem which, strictly speaking, does not fall within the competency of this Parliament. Secondly, I should like to ask him another question of a more general nature on this problem. Does he not find it a very surprising suggestion that a charter should be drawn up on the basis of standards laid down by an organization, regardless of the nature of this organization? Does he not find this totally astonishing and unacceptable?

President. — I do not think there is any point in asking the President-in-Office to reply.

Mrs van den Heuvel. — (*NL*) I should like to ask the President-in-Office what view the Council takes in this connection — and in this way both our questions can easily be answered jointly — regarding the suggestion made in the Commission memorandum to the effect that the Community as such should accede to the European Convention on Human Rights, which would mean that the question of the individual right of appeal of the people of Europe would be settled automatically.

Mr Zamberletti. — (*I*) This problem is one of those currently under consideration in the Council.

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

Mr Galland. — (*F*) Mr President, I must point out that I thoroughly deplore your previous remark. It is not one of the tasks of a President to say that he assumes that the representative of the Council need not reply to a question put by a Member. I strongly deplore your action!

(Applause from certain quarters)

President. — Mr Galland, if you took it this way, it is because I expressed myself badly. This is simply a misunderstanding. I thought I had understood that the President-in-Office did not wish to reply.

Mr Zamberletti. — (*I*) I should like to say, in connection with what the honourable Member has just said, that the Council obviously takes due note of the points made and leaves the responsibility for them to the questioner himself.

President. — I call question No 56, by Mr Linde (H-68/80, formerly H-145/79):

Will the Council accept the proposals of Amnesty International and other organizations that individuals in all Member States of the European Community should have the right to appeal to the Commission of Human Rights under the European Convention on this subject?

Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council. — (*I*) As already indicated in its reply to Written Question No 704/79 put by Mr Schwartzberg, the Council is of the opinion that it is for the Member States of the Community alone, as Contracting Parties to the Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, to decide whether and for how long they should subscribe to the declaration provided for in Article 25 of that Convention.

Mr Linde. — (*G*) Does the President-in-Office join me in regretting the fact that citizens in different parts of our Community enjoy different constitutional rights and, if so, can he tell us what action the current Presidency intends to take in this respect?

Mr Zamberletti. — (*I*) The Council has no cause for complaint about the protection of human rights within the Community. As regards the individual right of appeal, which is covered by Article 25 of the Convention on Human Rights, I should like to remind you that this is guaranteed by virtue of the ratification of

Zamberletti

the Convention by the Member States. Basically, therefore, this is a question of relations between the Member States and the Convention, and not between the Community and the Convention. It seems to me that the rights of the citizens of Europe are adequately protected without the Community being involved with the Convention.

Mr Schwartzberg. — (F) Although it is true to say, at the legal level, that the ratification of an international convention in its entirety is a matter for the individual Member States, is it not nevertheless possible for the Council not to decide, certainly, on behalf of the Member States, but to make suggestions and proposals with a view to ever increasing convergence between the Member States of the Community?

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) I take due note of the point made by the honourable Member, but would point out that the Council reflects the wishes of its Members and, for this reason, all I can do is pass your remark on to the Council taking account, however, of the fact that there is already a very clear and definite bilateral relationship between the Member States and the Convention on Human Rights.

President. — Question No 57 will not be called since the same subject was covered in the previous debate.

I call Question No 58, by Mr Fergusson (H-27/80):

Which major spending ministries in the Member States of the Community does the Council consider most appropriate for study and rationalization with a view to achieving greater savings and efficiency as a whole in the Community?

Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council. — (I) Pursuant to the Decision on the attainment of a high degree of convergence of the economic policies on the Member States, the Council lays down every year the economic policy guidelines to be pursued by the Member States in the course of the following year. These guidelines cover, among other things, the budgetary policies to be implemented by each Member State. The aim of this exercise is to ensure that national policies are consistent with one another and are in line with the Community's general economic policy objectives.

Translating these guidelines into practical measures is a matter for the governments of the Member States. It is therefore up to them, and not the Council, to determine which ministries might be appropriate for study and rationalization with a view to achieving budgetary savings and greater efficiency in public spending.

Mr Fergusson. — That answer, goes no way at all towards providing an answer to the question I asked.

It merely sidestepped it, deflected it and ignored it. I hardly know how to ask a supplementary to an answer of that kind, but I can only say that my understanding is that in most Member States the departments of, for example, defence and of education are pre-eminently the departments which answer the description given in my original question and I very much hoped . . .

President. — Mr Ferguson, now that you are answering your own questions the Council refuses to do so.

(Loud laughter)

Mr Fergusson. — I suppose I must sit down and reword the question another time, because I did not get an answer and how can I ask a supplementary to a non-answer?

(Loud laughter and applause)

President. — I call Question No 59, by Mr Tyrrell (H-530/79):

What are the reasons for delay in making the financial regulation on transport infrastructure referred to in a letter from the Council to the Parliament dated 22 July 1976, and when is it anticipated such a regulation will be made?

Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council. — (I) Mr President, on 5 July 1976 the Commission submitted a comprehensive communication on Community action in the field of transport infrastructure, covering a number of aspects. The proposal for a Decision instituting a consultation procedure and setting up a Committee in the field of transport infrastructure, which the Commission amended on 3 October 1977 in response to the European Parliament's Opinion, was adopted by the Council on 20 February 1978. As regards the proposal for a Regulation on financial support for projects of Community interest in the field of transport infrastructure, the Council stressed at its meeting on 23 November 1978 the importance which it attached to rapid progress on the matter. It invited the Commission to submit a report on the bottlenecks in transport infrastructures and on the various possible modes of finance, and to collaborate with the Committee on Infrastructures in evolving criteria for evaluating projects of Community interest.

The Commission has recently announced that it will be submitting a report on the first two questions very shortly.

In order to take account both of the considerable development in transport between the Community and non-member countries and of Greece's forthcoming accession to the Community, the Commission submitted to the Council on 4 March 1980 a further amend-

Zamberletti

ment to its proposal for a Regulation dated 5 July 1976, with the aim of extending the scope of the proposed system of financial support to transport infrastructures in non-member countries. In a letter dated 19 March 1980, the Council asked the European Parliament for an Opinion on this amended proposal. The Council is therefore awaiting both the Commission report and the Opinion that the European Parliament may deliver.

Mr Tyrrell. — Will the new President-in-Office agree that it is utterly deplorable that there should have been a delay of three years, a delay which he is now attributing, as regards the last few weeks, to an amended proposal, and would he also agree that the action of this House in December in its budget amendment to vote a sum for this regulation is now likely to be stultified if the Council and the Commission between them cannot rapidly bring this long outstanding matter to fruition?

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) The Presidency is fully aware of the need referred to by the honourable Member for the Community institutions to work within their precise competencies at every institutional level, and of the usefulness of a little more speed in this matter.

I shall pass on this call for swifter action, since I realize that the problems underlying this question are important. We trust that the Commission proposal will move in the desired direction as quickly as possible.

Mr Patterson. — I notice that the President-in-Office did not answer the first part of Mr Tyrrell's question concerning the reasons for the delay between 1976 and 1978, and I would like to know that first. Secondly, is the President-in-Office not aware that there are a number of projects, of which the Channel tunnel is one, decisions on which are impending and that decision on this regulation is therefore even more vital? If this House and the Commission do their work speedily, can we therefore have an assurance that the Council will act equally speedily?

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) On 31 January 1980, at the beginning of this Presidency, Mr Preti explained very clearly to the Committee on Transport all the reasons for the delays which this House deplores. He also said that the Council was determined to do all it could to overcome the remaining difficulties with a view to establishing a specific working programme as swiftly as possible. As regards the Presidency, it will do what it can to see to it that this commitment made to the Committee on Transport in January of this year is put into practice as soon as possible.

President. — I call Question No 60, by Mr O'Connell (H-1/80):

At the public hearings of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, the Commissioner with responsibility for consumer affairs referred to the lack of 'the necessary drive, the required conviction and the political will' of the Council with regard to the outstanding legislation under the preliminary consumer action programme.

Would the Council give Parliament a time-table for the implementation of the outstanding measures, including door-to-door sales, misleading advertising, product liability and consumer credit?

Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council.

— (I) As regards progress on the various consumer proposals currently being examined by the Council's bodies, I can inform the honourable Member that the Presidency made a special effort recently to speed up the process of examining these proposals. The Presidency hopes, therefore, that the Council will be able, in the course of the next few months, to finalize its position on the proposal for a Directive on door-to-door sales and the proposal for a Decision to set up a Community information system on accidents involving products.

The Council began a detailed study of the proposals for Directives on misleading advertising and product liability several months ago. However, given the broad legal and economic issues raised by these proposals, the honourable Member will appreciate that at this stage in the finalization of the Directives the Council cannot specify any time-table for implementation of the anticipated measures.

The Council intends to begin examination of the proposal on consumer credit as soon as the European Parliament has delivered its Opinion.

President. — I call Question No 61, by Mr Collins (H-5/80):

In view of the large number of representations being made across Europe by companies and organizations which will be affected by the proposal on product liability, will the Council say what progress has been made on this matter and within what time-scale they expect results of their deliberations to be made known?

Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council.

— (I) The Council is having the amended proposal for a Directive on product liability submitted to it by the Commission on 1 October 1979 examined by its dependent bodies.

Work began in January 1980. It is not possible at this juncture to give any estimate as to the length of proceedings within the Council.

Mr Collins. — I must say that the reply which I have just received is quite astonishing. We are told that this

Collins

is to be examined by independent bodies. I would remind the Council that the first draft of this directive dates from 1974 and was sent to the Council in April 1979 after a great deal of discussion here, in the Commission and elsewhere. Now we are told that it is to be examined by independent bodies. Are the Council saying that during the time between April 1979 and December 1979 no work at all was done on this directive, and will they say which independent bodies are being referred to, how these independent bodies differ, and whether they intend to be rather more speedy than the Irish Presidency was in discussing this?

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) Mr President, I think there has been a misunderstanding as I did not say that the proposal was to be examined by independent bodies. The proposal is being examined by the Council, and I should therefore like to clear up this misunderstanding, since otherwise the Council's reply would appear a little odd. I said that the proposal was being studied by the Council, was submitted to the Council on 1 October 1979, and that work began in January 1980. When I said that it was not possible at this stage to give any estimate as to the length of proceedings within the Council, I was referring to the examination of the Commission proposal not by an independent body but by the Council.

Mr Battersby. — I for one welcome the Council's obviously cautious and careful approach to this highly complex matter. There are so many grey areas in it, such as when movable becomes immovable, when liability begins, when and where it ends, especially in such areas as building and construction materials, that I think caution is necessary. For example, does the Council agree that the complexity of defining product liability in cases of involvement by default in accidents — for example, at work — is too complex and should not really be legislated for by us? The final question: has the Council costed the financial burden excessively stringent legislation in this area would place on the consumer, owing to the extra insurance and litigation which would be caused by such legislation?

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) The fact that this is a highly delicate and complex matter, as the honourable Member has reminded us, is all the more reason for the Council to devote great care and attention to this matter. I cannot at this stage predict what the Council's approach will be, in view of the fact that work on this extremely complex problem began only in January of this year. I might however remind you, as an example, of the great number of opinions which have been issued on this important problem by interested bodies such as the European Consumer Office, the Union of Industries of the European Community, the Commission of Agriculture and Food Industries, the European Centre of Public Enterprises and various others. I mention these bodies merely to give you an idea of the enormous and complex range of opinions which has

been sent to the Council for consideration in its final assessment of the problem.

We realize that these opinions often differ substantially and, for this reason, we are faced with a very complex problem. Nevertheless — I repeat — the Council intends to continue along the lines which the European Parliament had a part in suggesting to it.

Mr Marshall. — Would the President-in-Office not agree that the answers to various questions this afternoon indicate that the Council's decision-making is a rather sorry story of non-progress, and can we have an assurance from him that on this matter and other matters he is going to see that the making of decisions is speeded up somewhat and is not a record of sorry, sad delays?

(Laughter)

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) I can assure the honourable Member that the Council is far from being a source of major delays. Perhaps if Members recall the attention the Council pays to the numerous problems to which we are finding positive solutions, they would be impressed by the speed and dedication with which the Council works. Unfortunately the questions put clearly concern problems where the decision-making process should be speeded up. This is why, from a point of view which might be understandable, but which is not ideal, the fact that the examination of these problems is taking a longer time may give the impression that these are the only matters before the Council.

Mr President, I should like to say that as regards this matter it has rightly been said that it is a complex and delicate problem. I myself have reminded you that this is a delicate and complex matter which involves, let us make no bones about it, not only major interests in the European production sector but also the interests of consumers. There are therefore many points which must be examined with all the attention and seriousness which the problem demands. I must point out, therefore, that the Council started work on this matter only on 1 January of this year. If we were talking about 1 January 1979, we could probably justifiably speak of a delay. But I should like to remind the honourable Member of one thing. Parliament took two and a half years to issue its opinion on this question. To say that the Council is dragging its feet after two or three months of work strikes me, therefore, as a little premature at this stage.

Mr O'Connell. — Is the President-in-Office aware of the fact that this was sent to the Council in September 1976, and is he also aware of the fact that the big obstacle to the Council passing it is the insurance problem? I have been assured, as has the Commission,

O'Connell

that the insurance costs would be negligible, that they would certainly not be what the Council fears. In these circumstances, would he see to it that the thing is properly dealt with, and in time?

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) The opinion of Parliament — and as you know the Council can examine the proposal on the basis of the opinion of Parliament — did not permit the Council to start work on the examination of this problem until 1 October 1979.

I should like to remind the honourable Member that the two and a half years' delay — which also hindered the Council in working on this matter — are further evidence of the complexity of this problem.

Mr Sherlock. — I am pleased to notice that since I raised my hand my principal point has at least been mentioned by the President-in-Office, and that is that among the multiplicity of bodies offering opinions, perhaps the opinion in this Parliament was the most important one of all. I wanted to seek his reassurance that the opinion of this body would be foremost in the mind of the Council when further deliberating on this particular subject, especially that component of it which is usually referred to as 'absolute liability'.

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) The Presidency places great importance on the opinion of Parliament, and it was on the basis of this opinion that the Council was able — and this is not intended as a criticism of Parliament, merely as an explanation of the Council's working methods — to start examining this proposal in January.

Mr O'Connell. — Is the President-in-Office aware of the massive dissatisfaction amongst consumer organizations over the snail-like pace of Community consumer policy? Would he not agree and accept that the Council is the Community institution which has acted as a barrier to progress in this field?

And with the Second Consumer Action Programme presently being discussed in committee, is it not time that the Council demonstrated some measure of commitment to Europe's 260 million consumers by setting a deadline for the implementation of outstanding measures and agreeing to the holding of separate Council meetings on consumer affairs, to ensure that future consumer measures are not treated with the . . .

President. — Mr O'Connell, this is already the sixth short supplementary question you are putting in one.

Mr O'Connell. — . . . Unfortunately, the answers are not very good, and in view of that I wanted to mention the fact that the product liability proposal was

sent to the Council in September 1976, and that it does not necessarily follow that the Council must await Parliament's opinion before examining a directive. Also the door-to-door sales proposal went to the Council in January 1977, and the one on misleading advertising in March 1978.

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) I am aware of the importance of the matter and of the honourable Member's request that it should be dealt with as a matter of urgency. However, I must point out that the Council is faced with a whole range of difficulties of very different kinds. In the case of the principal directives concerning consumers, door-to-door sales, misleading advertising and product liability, the problems are largely of a legal nature, particularly problems of civil law, but also — I must point out — of an economic and political nature.

In spite of these difficulties, I can assure the honourable Member that the dependent bodies of the Council have recently adopted a number of procedures involving, in particular, putting the examination of the proposals regarding door-to-door sales, the information system on accidents in the home and correspondence courses directly in the hands of the advisors to the permanent representatives, so that they can present the main problems arising from these proposals to COREPER during the coming weeks. In view, therefore, of the multifarious difficulties we are coming up against and in view of the fact that we are awaiting the opinion of Parliament on one of these questions, the Presidency is doing all it can under the circumstances.

Mr Newton-Dunn. — Would not the President-in-Office agree that the last questioner's comparison of the Council's progress in this field to a snail is insulting to snails? Many of us are very fond of snails and they should not be insulted in this way.

(Laughter)

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) This is obviously a matter for the honourable Member to decide for himself. As I said before, the subjects on which questions are put are frequently those on which rapid progress has not been made. It would be very interesting, however, to take a good look at what does in fact get done, though this obviously never comes up in questions, as there is no need for us to announce it formally when we can agree to work fast on a subject.

President. — I call Question No 62, by Mr Muntingh (H-7/80):

In view of the many resolutions adopted by the European Parliament calling for measures to enable the Community to reduce its dependence on imported oil, will the Council state the reasons why it has been unable to adopt the

President

Commission's proposal on 29 November 1974 for a Regulation concerning support to common projects for hydrocarbon exploration?

Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council.

— (I) Despite all its efforts, the Council has not yet been able to reach agreement on the proposal for a Regulation concerning support for common projects for hydrocarbon exploration which was forwarded by the Commission on 27 October 1977 and amended on 7 August 1978 since — we must be quite frank with you here — no general agreement has as yet been reached on the very principle of Community aid in the field of hydrocarbon exploration. However, given the pressing need for a decision on the hydrocarbon exploration project in Greenland, the Council, at its meeting on 24 May 1979, adopted the Regulation granting Community support for this project up to a maximum amount of 3.45 million EUA, in the form of subsidies repayable if the results obtained are exploited commercially.

Mr Muntingh. — (NL) Since I am not particularly satisfied with this answer, I should like to ask the President-in-Office of the Council whether or not he thinks that since the oil-producing countries have, for various reasons, cut back their production recently, and since there are still several problems involved in nuclear energy, it is high time that a solution be found to the general difficulties mentioned by the President-in-Office. I should also like to ask the President what further proposals he needs for this Proposal, which has already been amended by the Commission twice, to be brought up in the Council and discussed in such a way that a decision will finally be reached on this matter, so that it will be possible to provide aid not only for the odd project such as Greenland but for other important projects too.

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) As will be clear from the Council's reply, the Nine have not yet adopted any policy on this matter, since there are differences of opinion which are not due to delays or indolence.

We must, however, admit that the differences on this matter are substantial, and I think it is impossible not to share the concern of the honourable Member.

In view of the importance of our objectives in a sector such as energy, in which Community involvement should be based principally on the results it is likely to achieve, and in view of the concern expressed at the most recent meeting of the Heads of State and Government in Dublin, I think all the Presidency can undertake to do is to make every effort to bring about a convergence of positions which are still very far apart, while obviously taking due account of the opinions of the representatives of the Member States of the Community in the Council.

Mrs Lizin. — (F) Can the President-in-Office of the Council confirm that, during his period of Presidency this will be one of Italy's priorities, as I think his final phrase implied?

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) To include energy policy among our priorities would at this time amount to stating an obvious long-term approach, since it seems to me that the concern of everyone in Europe should be to increase efforts in this field.

The Italian Presidency repeats, therefore, its firm undertaking to work in this direction. As I have already stressed, there are differences, and we are doing all we can to overcome them. I can certainly not cherish any illusions in view of the gap still separating some Member States as regards agreement on this matter.

Mr Schmid. — (D) Can the President-in-Office give us some more details on these differences of opinion, since we had already worked out for ourselves that the Council's inability to reach a decision so far resulted from differences of opinion.

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) The differences concern the usefulness or otherwise of Community aid, and hence the question of whether we should proceed at Community level or dispense with such a long-term approach.

Mr Colla. — (NL) If I have understood correctly, the President-in-Office told us that no regulation had as yet been introduced because there were fundamental differences of opinion between the Member States.

My question is brief. Does the Council realize that in this way it is completely disregarding the fact that the budgetary authority include both the Council and Parliament?

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) In cases such as the one before us, when opinions differ within the Council regarding its aims, it does all it can in an attempt to achieve a convergence of views and to reach agreement even if, in cases where it is not a question of details but of fundamentally different approaches, the search for an agreement undoubtedly entails patient work involving reflection and the building up of a common resolve. I do not think one can talk in this case of delays, but rather of a serious commitment which means that things are certainly progressing slowly, but the development of Community policy is frequently a slow affair, the important thing being that we manage to achieve positive joint results.

Mrs Krouwel-Vlam. — (NL) Can the President-in-Office tell us which countries are causing these difficulties?

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) As the honourable Member is perfectly aware, information regarding the positions of the various delegations of the Council is not made public, as this practice leads to good results in Community action.

President. — I call Question No 63, by Mr Bettiza (H-13/80):

What does the Council consider to be the main priorities of the new cooperation between the EEC and Yugoslavia? In particular, does the Council consider that this agreement will make it possible to reduce the Yugoslav trade deficit and that the financial and technical cooperation envisaged is appropriate to the situation of this Mediterranean country which is still in a state of development?

Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council. — (I) The new cooperation agreement between the EEC and Yugoslavia basically concentrates on two areas — economic and technical cooperation and trade cooperation — and of course takes into account Yugoslavia's level of development.

The aim of economic and technical cooperation is to contribute towards Yugoslavia's development by additional measures supplementing that country's own efforts, and to strengthen the economic and neighbourly links between Yugoslavia and the Community. The agreement covers industry, energy, science and technology, agriculture, as well as transport, tourism, the environment, ecology and fisheries. The agreement also establishes that the two parties will devote particular attention to measures arising out of the objectives set out in the agreement between Italy and Yugoslavia signed at Osimo on 10 November 1975, particularly those contained in the agreement on the promotion of economic cooperation between the two countries. In the field of commerce, the aim of the agreement is to promote trade between the two parties having regard to their respective levels of development and the need to improve the balance of trade between them so as to provide better access for Yugoslav products to the Community market.

The tariff-free entry into the Community which will be enjoyed by a considerable proportion of Yugoslav products, including ECSC products, should be a start to redressing Yugoslavia's large trade deficit with the Community over the last few years.

Mr Bettiza. — (I) Just two points. Firstly, what, according to the Council, are the main priorities which must be taken into account if we are to bring about a reduction in the balance of payments deficit between

Yugoslavia and the Community which, as you know, rose from \$ 659 million in 1969 to \$ 4 317 million in 1979?

Secondly, and I am now addressing you in my capacity as chairman of this Parliament's delegation for relations with the Yugoslav Parliament, does the Presidency not think that we were justified in deploring the fact that we were not consulted by the Council before these agreements were concluded?

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) As regards the first of the points made by the honourable Member, I think it could be said that these agreements taken as a whole all contain elements which might contribute to reducing Yugoslavia's trade deficit. I mentioned one of these elements towards the end of my brief reply, i.e. tariff-free entry into the Community. However, we cannot disregard the stimulating effects which an economic and industrial cooperation policy will have on the structure and productive capacities of Yugoslav industry for the improvement of the economic situation.

In spite of the whole range of proposed action it provides for, an agreement is certainly not enough to give a positive reply to a major problem such as that raised by Mr Bettiza. I think, however, that the implementation of the agreement in the light of common interests and of aims such as those to which you have just drawn our attention, may permit us to determine all the instruments which, in the context of the agreement, might enable us to achieve the best possible results in the direction you mentioned. I must, however, remind you that a country like Yugoslavia, which is developing at a particularly rapid rate, cannot avoid having a balance of payments deficit. It is therefore essential that we should try to highlight certain elements, while at the same time taking due account of some other elements which were characteristic.

Then there is Mr Bettiza's second point which was also put to me on the occasion of the meeting with the Parliamentary Committees, in accordance with the Luns procedure, for the examination of the contents of the EEC-Yugoslavia agreement. I can only repeat what I said on that occasion. The Council followed the procedure which involves informing the competent Parliamentary committees of the contents of the agreement before it is signed. As regards official consultation of Parliament, this can take place after the signing of the agreement and before its conclusion — and I should remind you that the agreement is concluded when it is adopted by the Council of Ministers — if the agreement in question is based on an Article of the Treaty which provides for consultation of Parliament and, in this connection, the Presidency looks closely at the proposals from the Commission to ensure that, in its choice of Treaty article, it indicates an article which permits a full procedure involving consultation of Parliament. It is up to the Commission

Zamberletti

when submitting its proposal to the Council, to give this indication, which is the legal basis suggested by the agreement itself, and it is up to the Council to decide — which means, as far as the Presidency of the Council is concerned, to choose the option involving the most extensive consultation of Parliament.

I must say, therefore, and I should like to repeat what I said to the Committees meeting on the question of the EEC-Yugoslavia agreement, that, with reference to certain procedures followed by the national parliaments, an additional step has been provided for in this case, as in the case of agreements of a general nature, compared with the cases of national agreements on which Parliament is consulted only before ratification and after signing. Here we have an informal meeting with the Committees before the agreement is signed, and afterwards, as in the case of the relations between many governments and the national parliaments, the agreement is discussed before ratification, i.e. before ratification in accordance, as regards Community relations, with the final decision of the Council of Ministers.

Mrs Bonino. — (I) The question I wanted to put was in fact the same as the second point raised by Mr Bettiza. I will take this opportunity to say quite simply that I hope the Commission will make its proposals and the Council its decisions without any buck passing. I hope that the Commission will make proposals and the Council make decisions along the lines already indicated by Mr Zamberletti so that this consultation procedure will finally come into operation.

In view of the openness of the Council of Ministers, I hope that the Commission will not now fail to make a proposal. Since they are sitting here face to face, I hope they will have understood each other perfectly.

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) This procedure is provided for by the Treaties. I myself have referred to it as a procedure to be followed on the basis of proposals by the Commission, so that the procedure adopted in the case of this agreement will be the same as that adopted in similar cases. Thus the wishes of the Presidency on this matter have already been clearly stated.

President. — We now proceed with the questions to the Foreign Ministers of the nine Member States meeting in political cooperation.

We begin with question No 73, by Mr Rogers (H-67/80, formerly 0-144/79)

Are the Foreign Ministers aware of the campaign of Amnesty International in the United Nations and elsewhere for the abolition of the death penalty, will they take steps to coordinate their policies on this matter with the aim of speaking with a single voice in the United

Nations and other international bodies against this practice?

Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (I) The Nine are aware of the campaign of Amnesty International for the abolition of the death penalty, which was discussed at the conference which Amnesty International itself arranged in Stockholm in December 1977.

They are also aware of the approaches made to the Secretary-General of the United Nations — in particular in 1979 — with a view to calling a halt to the reintroduction of capital punishment for political reasons.

In a recent statement in the third committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Presidency said on behalf of the Nine that the ever increasing recourse to capital punishment for political reasons was intolerable.

Since the beginning of the campaign of Amnesty International, the General Assembly of the United Nations has not as yet considered this question of the abolition of capital punishment, and the Nine have not re-examined the question in the course of their consultations. However, I should remind you that the General Assembly of the United Nations has dealt with the problem of capital punishment in adopting Resolution No 3261 of 8 December 1977 and has decided to give this question priority at its 35th session.

Mr Rogers. — Would not the Foreign Ministers accept that, in spite of their constantly reiterated desire to speak with a single voice, it is rather anomalous that France alone in Western Europe applies the death penalty — more in accord with all the countries of Africa who do so and Asia and South America, with the honourable exception of Venezuela, whose President visits us tomorrow, which was civilized enough to abolish the death penalty in 1863 and whose constitution states that the right to life is inviolable and that no law may establish the death penalty or any authority carry it out. Would not the Ministers think this a rather anomalous situation that one country in the Community should still carry the death penalty?

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) The view of the Nine is that the application of the death penalty for political reasons is unacceptable. I should add that this question will be given priority this year at the next General Assembly of the United Nations, as I have already explained, and when I speak of this position of the Nine, I mean that it is in fact the position agreed upon by all the Member States of the Community.

President. — I call Question No 74, by Mrs Ewing (H-9/80):

President

Bearing in mind the aid given by the European Community to political refugees, will the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation coordinate their policies towards Latin-American political refugees to ensure that a humane and mutually acceptable policy for the granting of visas for these refugees is established in all Member States?

Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (I) The honourable Member's question relates to a matter which has not been discussed within political cooperation.

Aid to refugees from Latin America — or from any other country for that matter — is a question of the national policy of the individual Member States. All the Nine are party to the Geneva Convention of 1951 regarding the Statute on Refugees, which is applied according to the statements and national reservations which accompanied the ratification.

The Nine, for obvious humanitarian reasons, are particularly sensitive to the problem of refugees and have never failed to grant visas for entry into their territory to persons in this situation, including refugees from parts of the world in addition to those specified by the countries who are party to the Convention of 1951.

Mrs Ewing. — Could I ask the President why it is that, in view of the fact that the Council of Foreign Ministers coordinated their policy in the summer of '79 on aid to south-east Asian refugees — 'boat people' — and Member States opened their frontiers to thousands of these unfortunate people, we cannot not use the same means now to assist the refugees from Chile and Argentina. Moreover, as the Council has admittedly been studying a new approach to the Latin-American countries since October, can we not, therefore, adopt a humane policy on visas for refugees from Chile and Argentina?

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) As regards the Community's general position on this matter, I should like to remind you of the statement made by the President of the Council of Foreign Ministers at the international Conference of the United Nations on refugees from Indochina. He said:

We believe that everyone should enjoy the right to leave his country freely and re-enter freely, but should not be obliged to leave because of fear or because conditions have been made intolerable. We also feel that anyone who leaves his country for any of these reasons should never be repatriated against his will, nor should he be refused political asylum elsewhere.

I think these words with which the President-in-Office stated the Community's position last summer clearly reflect the Community's commitment as regards refugees. I would emphasize that they apply just as much in the case of refugees from South-East Asia as from

anywhere else in the world. For the rest, I must point out that the Member States have acted regardless of the particular geographical areas from which they stated they were prepared to accept refugees. For example, my country, Italy, received refugees from South-East Asia, an area which was not one of those for which responsibility had been assumed under the terms of the Convention. Italy also undertook to accept refugees from Latin America, and the other countries of the Community acted in the same way as Italy, and all demonstrated, at the most dramatic moments, the humanity of the people of our countries. All the Member States have received refugees from all parts of the world in the spirit of the statement made by Mr O'Kennedy in Geneva, thus demonstrating once more the extent to which Europe is civilized and sensitive to the problems of our fellow men.

Mrs Lizin. — (F) Has there been any discussion or recommendation within the context of political cooperation on the subject of the reception of Cuban refugees? The Belgian Foreign Minister, for example, took a year to adopt the last reception programme for Argentinian and Uruguayan refugees, but only needed two days to grant the same budget to Cuban refugees. Was this a question of a joint position on the part of the Nine meeting in political cooperation?

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) No decision has as yet been reached on this matter. It is, however, being discussed.

President. — I call Question No 75, by Mr Ferguson (H-12/80):

Following the reply to my previous question on this subject, H-429/79¹ will the President-in-Office inform Parliament of the progress of his efforts to bring about a solution to the Afghan crisis in close cooperation with all governments sharing concern for peace and security in the region, in particular the progress of consultations with the Conference of Islamic Foreign Ministers and with the Arab League?

Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (I) At their meeting in Rome on 19 February, the nine Foreign Ministers devoted their attention to finding suitable ways of bringing the situation in Afghanistan into line with the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations of 14 January, which contains an appeal to all States to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Afghanistan, together with its position as a non-aligned country and to refrain from any interference in the internal affairs of that country.

The Nine took the view that a positive solution to the current crisis might be found by means of a formula

¹ Report of proceedings of 13 February 1980, p. 230.

Zamberletti

which would permit a neutral Afghanistan to remain outside the conflicts between the major powers. I would repeat in this connection that the prospect opened up by the Nine does not in any way imply the imposition, from outside, of a particular legal status on Afghanistan. What the Nine wished to do was to demonstrate quite clearly their willingness to do all in their power at international level to permit the establishment of a neutral Afghanistan.

The intention of the Nine in putting forward this idea is to make their contribution to a solution which requires the agreement of a large number of members of the international community to provide the impetus necessary for the practical realization of this idea.

The Nine have therefore initiated major diplomatic action — which is still in progress — to explain these ideas to friendly countries and to all countries which are interested in constructive efforts to solve the crisis in Afghanistan.

Various countries, including some belonging to the 'non-aligned' block and the Third World have reacted positively, as can be seen, for example, from the results of the recent EEC-ASEAN ministerial meeting in Kuala Lumpur which issued a joint communiqué on political problems which stressed that the crisis could be overcome in a constructive manner by the emergence of a neutral, non-aligned Afghanistan outside the power struggle.

The Secretary General of another multilateral organization, the Islamic Conference, has reacted favourably to this idea put forward by the Nine.

The Nine will continue to act cohesively and responsibly, basing their objectives in their international efforts to bring about peace on the facts as they stand, with a view to establishing constructive agreement as regards possible solutions which would be objectively valid.

Mr Fergusson. — I am afraid that, once again, the Council has left me rather dumbfounded. The kernel of the question was in the last two lines that I have here, which were barely referred to in the very last stages of the Minister's reply, when he referred to the progress of consultations with the Conference of Islamic Foreign Ministers and with the Arab League. Are we to understand that there have been really no substantial consultations and no more are planned with that particular Conference? Would the President-in-Office not agree that there is now a serious danger that events in the whole area from the eastern Mediterranean to Pakistan may slide beyond the stage where consultation and negotiation and diplomatic anticipation can control or defuse them? May we urge the Nine to play their part in preventive consultative action?

Just one further question: may I ask whether in view

of the pressure and the need to reopen and develop a constructive Euro-Arab Dialogue in the context, of course, of Afghanistan he has any comment to make, on the report that four Muslim States, plus the Palestine Liberation Organization, have apparently just agreed in Tripoli to establish a unified military force equipped by the Soviet Union?

Mr Zamberletti — (I) I should like to reply to the honourable Member since he has asked me a question on something, which I have not said.

At the end of my answer to the question regarding relations with the Islamic Foreign Ministers of the Arab League, I spoke of major diplomatic action which had produced positive results, which was still in progress and which had also been received favourably by the Secretary General of another multilateral organization, i.e. the Islamic Conference, which has expressed a favourable opinion regarding the ideas proposed by the Nine. Clearly, this is not the end of the matter, but is the result of ongoing consultations with the Arab countries on the question of the prospects for development of the initiative of the Nine.

President. — At its author's request, Question No 76 (H-20/80) is postponed to the next part-session.

I call Question No 77, by Mr Schwartzberg (H-25/80):

Are the Ministers aware of the anomalous situation in which certain Community countries grant quasi-diplomatic privileges or full recognition to the PLO, which nevertheless repeatedly affirms, in its charter and through its President, that its objective is 'to destroy Israel', a country whose existence and security are of the greatest importance to the people of the Community, represented by the European Parliament?

Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (I) The contacts between the governments of Member States of the Community and the PLO as a Palestinian political force are initiatives taken within the context of the national sovereignty of each of the Member States concerned. Similarly, the official status of the offices of the representatives of the PLO in certain European capitals is governed by the relevant provisions laid down by the States in question within the context of their own national sovereignty.

At a general level, the then President-in-Office, the Irish Foreign Minister Mr O'Kennedy, explicitly referred to the PLO in his speech on behalf of the Nine to the United Nations in New York on 25 September 1979. In particular, he said that Resolutions 242 and 338 of the Security Council, together with the principles listed by the Nine formed the essential framework for a peaceful settlement. In the view of

Zamberletti

the Nine, these must be accepted by all parties involved, including the PLO, as the basis for the negotiation of an overall solution in which all the parties concerned will have their part to play.

Mr Schwartzberg. — (F) I am sure you will agree that the people of Europe whom we represent have the right to know what foreign policy is being conducted in their name, and that they should not be simply presented with a *fait accompli* on which the European Parliament has been neither consulted nor informed.

My question, therefore, is as follows. What are the Nine intending to do regarding the Middle East, and can you formally assure us that the Nine, while taking due account of the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinians, will refuse to give any assurances or *de facto* recognition to the PLO, which continues to declare in its charter that it wishes to destroy the State of Israel, which it refuses to recognize, and which is continuing to organize or encourage bloody attacks on the civilian population of Israel?

Do the Ministers of the Nine realize how ill-advised, unwarranted and unseemly any such recognition of the PLO would be?

Mr Zamberletti. — (I) This supplementary goes back to the problem of the basic attitude of the Nine which I outlined in my first answer by referring briefly to the speech made on behalf of the Nine by the then President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers, Mr O'Kennedy, which marked a significant phase in our relations with the Arab world and served as a reference point which is not only still valid but continues to serve as the basis for diplomatic and political action on the part of the Nine.

The Nine continue to hope that it may be possible to achieve peace in the Middle East and to find the just, lasting and overall solution to which — as Mr O'Kennedy said — the vast majority of this Assembly is committed. They feel that a solution of this kind should be based on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 applied in their entirety and on all fronts. It should also be based on the principles contained in the declaration by the Nine of 29 June 1977, i.e. the unacceptability of acquisition of territory by force; the need for Israel to put an end to the territorial occupation which it has maintained since the 1967 conflict; the respect of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of all States in the region and of their right to live in peace within safe and recognized borders the recognition of the fact that any just and lasting peace must take account of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians.

This approach and the problem of Israel, which has a right to exist in peace within safe, recognized and guaranteed borders, represent, I think, the basic policy

of the Nine on this matter. In spite of all attempts to destroy the unity of the Nine by seeking to demonstrate radical differences between the various governments, the views of the Nine, as reflected by the Heads of State and Governments and the Foreign Ministers, have shown themselves to be substantially similar on this problem. On the basis of this unified policy of the Nine, at a time when their action might be of increasing importance for peace and security and for the development of peaceful relations, we will be able to develop a basic element for peace in the Mediterranean and the world.

President. — The second part of Question Time is concluded.¹

16. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received from Mr Boyes and others, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, a motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-109/80) with request for urgent debate on the electronic voting system of Parliament.

The reasons supporting this request for urgent debate are contained in the document itself.

Parliament will be consulted on this request at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

17. Membership of Parliament

President. — The *Corte suprema di Cassazione* has informed me, by letter of 14 April 1980, that Mr Antonio del Duca has been appointed Member of Parliament to replace Mr Colombo.

I welcome this new Member among us. Pursuant to Rule 3(3) of the Rules of Procedure, until his credentials have been verified, he shall provisionally take his seat in Parliament or on its committees and have the same rights as other Members of Parliament.

18. Membership of committees

President. — I have received from the Group of the European People's Party (CD) a request to appoint Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti as Member of the Political Affairs Committee.

Since there are no objections, her appointment is ratified.

¹ See Annex.

President*19. Agenda for next sitting*

President. — The next sitting will take place tomorrow, Thursday, 17 April 1980 from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m., 3 p.m. to 8 p.m. and 9 p.m. to 12 midnight, with the following agenda:

- decision on urgency
- Ruffolo report on the European Monetary System (continuation)
- Linde report on energy saving
- joint debate on two oral questions to the Commission, on the surveillance of shipping routes and on the code of conduct for oil tankers
- Seligman report on an EAEC research programme
- Poncelet report on textiles/clothing
- oral question with debate to the Commission of the World Conservation Strategy

- Nyborg report on public supply contracts
- oral question with debate to the Commission on defective products
- Maij-Weggen report on colouring matters in food-stuffs
- Combe report on intra-Community trade in fresh meat

3 p.m. to 5 p.m.

- debate on the situation in Iran

5 p.m. to 5.45 p.m.

- address by Mr Campins, President of the Republic of Venezuela

6 p.m.

- voting time

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 7.25 p.m.)

ANNEX

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

1. Questions to the Council

Question No 64, by Mr Ansquer (H-15/80)

Subject: Development of the European Monetary System

How does the Council envisage the medium-term development of the European Monetary System?

Answer

In its first year of operation, which has just come to an end, the European Monetary System functioned satisfactorily and has made a considerable contribution towards stabilizing exchange rates within the Community. There is now more consultation between competent authorities both as regards internal monetary policy and relations with currencies of third countries.

As regards the future development of the system, the European Council planned in 1978 to consolidate into a final system the provisions and procedures laid down for the introduction of the scheme. The system was to entail the creation of the European Monetary Fund and full utilization of the ECU as a reserve asset and a means of settlement.

At present, the competent committees of the Community are actively examining the problems relating to the development of this system. It should, however, be pointed out that the international situation has changed considerably since the 1978 meetings of the European Council. The rise in oil prices, combined with the increase in the price of raw materials, has led to a worsening in the Community's terms of trade and to a reversal of its balance of payments situation, which is generally becoming negative. This has resulted in greater inflationary trends, and the gap between national inflation rates is growing. All these developments, combined with the desire for diversification which the OPEC countries seem to be experiencing at a time when their surpluses are becoming considerable, are naturally influencing thinking on the future of the EMS.

*

* *

Question No 65, by Mrs Ewing (H-22/80)

Subject: Uniform electoral procedure

What plans have the Council made for consideration of the proposal for a uniform electoral procedure, which is in course of preparation by the European Parliament, so that it can be adopted by the Council and the national parliaments well in advance of the 1984 direct election?

Answer

When the matter is put before it the Council will be required to act, on the basis of Article 138 of the EEC Treaty and the corresponding articles of the other Treaties, on the draft which the European Parliament may prepare in accordance with Article 7 of the Act of 20 September 1976 on the introduction of a uniform electoral procedure for the election of representatives to the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage. Since even the approximate date of the adoption of such a draft by the European Parliament is not known, it would be premature for the Council to prepare any programme of work with a view to its examination.

*

* *

Question No 66, by Mrs Cresson (H-28/80)

Subject: Amendment of Chapter VI of the Euratom Treaty

What action does the Council intend to take on the French proposals for amendment of Chapter VI of the Euratom Treaty relating to the common policy for the supply of ores, source materials and special fissile materials?

Answer

As already stated in its reply to Written Question No 907/79, at its meeting on 18 September 1979 the Council noted that the Commission will examine the French request in accordance with Article 76 of the Treaty establishing the European Atomic Energy Community.

Following examination of the matter, the Commission may if appropriate submit proposals on the subject.

The Council has not received any such proposal to date.

*

* *

Question No 68, by Mr Van Miert (H-39/80)

Subject: Restrictions on the application of Article 235 of the EEC Treaty

Is it true that at the request of some Member States the Committee of Permanent Representatives is currently investigating the possibility of restricting the application of Article 235 of the EEC Treaty with a view to impeding, *inter alia*, new initiatives to cope with the increasing difficulties caused by the economic crisis?

Answer

The Council is not aware of any initiatives such as those referred to by the honourable Member.

It can, however, inform the honourable Member that at the Council's request the Committee of Permanent Representatives is currently investigating ways of resolving certain legal difficulties with regard to recourse to Article 235 of the Treaty establishing the EEC.

*

* *

Question No 69, by Mr Balfé (H-57/80)

Subject: Community budget

Whether in any of the months of January, February or March they have exceeded the provisional twelfth allocated to them under any of the chapter headings of the Council budget and is the Council willing to authorize the provision of an additional twelfth for any of those sub-headings of the Parliament budget which are overspent?

Answer

On 5 February 1980, in conformity with the provisions of Article 204 of the EEC Treaty, the Council authorized several provisional twelfths in respect of Article 210 (rents) and Article 211 (insurance).

This Council decision was forwarded to the European Parliament on 6 February 1980, and a week later the European Parliament adopted a resolution in which it did not dissent from the Council's decision.

Since that date, and on the basis of the aforementioned decision, the Council has incurred expenditure in excess of the monthly provisional twelfths on these two budgetary lines.

Apart from these two budgetary headings the Council has not exceeded the provisional twelfths allocated under any chapter heading either in respect of commitments or payments.

In accordance with the provisions of Article 204 of the EEC Treaty, a request by the European Parliament for the authorization of extra provisional twelfths, would, in the first instance, be examined by the Council, which may take a decision, acting by qualified majority.

Should such a request be received it will be examined on its merits with all necessary speed and attention.

*

* *

Question No 71, by Mr Kavanagh (H-85/80)

Subject: Delays in supplies of rice seed for Cambodia

Will the Council act to ensure that shipments of rice seed, apparently delayed by red tape at the Thai border, arrive in Cambodia by the beginning of its rice planting season, so that the Cambodians' efforts towards self-sufficiency in food in 1981 will not be totally destroyed?

Answer,

Community aid for the victims of the events in Cambodia is distributed through public or non-governmental organizations. The proportion allocated to the FAO should enable this UN body *inter alia* to send supplies of rice seed from Thailand. According to the information of the General Secretary of the Council, the Commission departments are in close contact with FAO to see how the situation develops. FAO approached the Thai authorities recently and again urged them to do all in their power to speed up the procedure for granting export licences, so that these seeds would arrive in time for the forthcoming rice-planting season in Cambodia, which may be considered crucial for supplies.

*

* *

2. Questions to the Foreign Ministers

Question No 79, by Mr Van Miert (H-40/80)

Subject: Amendment of UN Resolution No 242

How do the Foreign Ministers view the possible amendment of UN Resolution No 242 to incorporate recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people?

Answer

The honourable Member's question refers to a position which must be considered from the angles of substance and procedure.

On the substance of the question, i.e. the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, the Nine have formally stated their position on several occasions.

In their statement of 6 November 1973 on the Middle East the Nine recognized that 'in the establishment of a just and lasting peace account must be taken of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians'. In a statement of 5 November 1975 the Nine reaffirmed the principle of the 'recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to express its national identity'. In a joint statement on the Middle East adopted by the European Council at its meeting in London on 29 and 30 June 1977, the Nine 'affirmed their belief that a solution to the conflict in the Middle East will be possible only if the legitimate right of the Palestinian people to give effective expression to its national identity is tran-

slated into fact, which would take into account the need for a homeland for the Palestinian people'. In a further statement on the Middle East issued by the President-in-Office of the Council on 26 March 1979, the Nine declared that a comprehensive settlement 'must be based on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and must translate into fact the right of the Palestinian people to a homeland'. It was hoped that there would be 'a comprehensive agreement in which all the parties concerned, including the representatives of the Palestinian people, would participate'.

This position was reiterated in explicit terms by the Irish Foreign Minister, Mr O'Kennedy, when he addressed the UN General Assembly on behalf of the Nine on 25 September 1979. He stated on that occasion: 'It is essential that there be respect for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. These include the right to a homeland and the right, through its representatives, to play its full part in the negotiation of a comprehensive settlement. Security Council Resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), together with the principles I have mentioned; taken as a whole, set the essential framework for a peace settlement. In the view of the Nine it is necessary that they be accepted by all those involved — including the Palestine Liberation Organization — as the basis for negotiations of a comprehensive settlement in which all the parties will play their full part. . . . This includes the Palestinian people, who are entitled, within the framework set by a peace settlement, to exercise their right to determine their own future as a people.'

With regard to the procedural aspect, in particular the international bodies which can adopt resolutions on the issue of recognizing the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, it must not be forgotten that the Nine as such are not members of the UN Security Council. If the Security Council were to examine the question of a new resolution to supplement Resolution 242, the Nine might well give consideration to issuing a statement on their position within the framework of European political cooperation.

*

* *

Question No 80, by Mr Moreland (H-45/80)

Subject: Elections in Namibia

Is it the policy of the Foreign Ministers to ensure that elections are held in Namibia as soon as possible which will include a secret ballot and an absence of intimidation?

Answer

In the Namibian question, the Nine have consistently urged the implementation of the United Nations' plan for Namibia by all the parties concerned, adopted by the Security Council with Resolution 435.

As laid down in the plan, 'free elections will be held, for the whole of Namibia as one political entity, to enable the people of Namibia to freely and fairly determine their own future. The elections will be under the supervision and control of the United Nations in that, as a condition to the conduct of the electoral process, the elections themselves, and the certification of their results, the United Nations' special representative will have to satisfy himself at each stage as to the fairness and appropriateness of all measures affecting the political process at all levels of administration before such measures take effect'. Consequently, it is the United Nations' and the special representative's responsibility to make sure that the electoral process is free and fair.

*

* *

Question No 81, by Mr Michel (H-52/80)

Subject: Fresh wave of arrests in Chile

In view of the profound concern felt at the developments following the mass arrests carried out by the Chilean police during the celebration of the International Day of the Woman on 8 March in Santiago, and the continual silencing of the trade unions in Chile, what steps do the Foreign Ministers of the Nine Member States meeting in political cooperation intend to take with a view to helping those people, numbering about one hundred, who have been imprisoned, exiled or expelled from their

country or who are threatened with such arbitrary measures, against which there is no means of legal redress?

Answer

The President-in-Office of the Council has made it known on several occasions that the Nine have always followed with particular attention the development of the human rights situation in Chile. They have constantly expressed their concern on this matter, both in their contacts with the Chilean authorities and at the United Nations. However, the Nine recognize that in recent years this area has shown signs of improvement, albeit of a fitful nature.

The honourable Member's specific question refers to an event which has not been discussed in political cooperation. The Nine are nevertheless aware that the 136 persons detained during the demonstrations which marked the International Day of the Woman were released by the Chilean authorities within the legal time limit of five days, apart from 17 detainees who were alleged to have taken part in similar demonstrations before and who were ordered to spend three months in compulsory residence elsewhere in Chile. They are entitled to apply for habeas corpus.

*

* *

Question No 82, by Mr Provan (H-54/80)

Subject: Greece's application for entry to the Community

Further to question (H-503/79) ¹ and the answer that the Presidency was not in a position to reply, does the President-in-Office not consider that the imprisonment of Greek nationals on conscientious grounds should be taken into consideration on Greece's entry into the Community and that they be asked to state their position on these matters prior to their entry on 1 January 1981?

Answer

As the Presidency has already pointed out, this matter has not been discussed within the arrangements for political cooperation among the Nine Member States of the European Community.

Greece is due to join the Community at the beginning of next year. From then onwards it will be fully involved in all community activities and the Presidency has no doubt that the new Member State will wish to make its contribution to the common effort to further the cause of human rights within the Community and elsewhere.

However, the honourable Member will readily appreciate that it is not possible at the present time for the Presidency to provide a reply to his question on behalf of the Nine.

*

* *

Question No 84, by Mr Tyrrell (H-75/80)

Subject: Penal Convention

What are the main provisions of the Penal Convention, on which the Ministers of Justice are now near agreement, and what opportunity do they propose to give to the Parliament and citizens of its Member States to discuss the issues involved before the agreement is signed?

Answer

As the honourable Member is aware representatives of the nine Member States are discussing the text of a draft convention which has the principal objectives of facilitating extradition between the Member States of the Community and of providing in certain circumstances an obligation to submit a case

¹ Debates of the EP, 12. 3. 1980 (Provisional Edition).

to prosecuting authorities where extradition has been refused. As indicated to the honourable Member in reply to Written Question No 126/79, these discussions are confidential. No text has yet been approved by governments. I therefore regret that I am not in a position to give more detailed information on the state of deliberations at this stage because the draft is still subject to alterations and amendments and therefore more detailed information could be misleading.

However, I expect that such information will be made available to the members of national parliaments, and thus to the general public in the various countries, after the convention has been signed and before ratification.

*

* *

Question No 85, by Mr Radoux (H-78/80)

Subject: Cyprus

In the opinion of the President of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, should the European Community not attempt to bring about a resumption of negotiations on Cyprus in view of its current relations with Greece and Turkey?

Answer

The Foreign Ministers of the Nine have for a long time closely followed events with regard to Cyprus. With the aim of bringing about a fair and lasting settlement of the crisis affecting the island, they have acted on several occasions in the way suggested by the honourable Member and have appealed to all involved.

It is the opinion of the Foreign Ministers that only a direct agreement between the two communities on the island will bring about a settlement. Such an agreement can be reached only on the basis of proper negotiations between representatives of the two sides. The UN Secretary-General has been making strenuous efforts with the specific aim of bringing about a resumption of talks between the two communities. These talks were interrupted in June last year.

The Nine support Secretary-General Waldheim's endeavours and are sorry that his efforts have not yet led to the desired results. The feasibility of new moves to bring the two sides together for talks will be examined by the Nine in the light of the situation as it develops.

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 17 APRIL 1980

Contents

1. Approval of minutes	189		
2. Agenda	189		
Mr Glinne (S); Mr Scott-Hopkins (ED) . . .	189		
3. Documents received	189		
4. Statement by the President	189		
5. Decision on urgency			
Mr Sarre; Mr Chambeiron (COM);			
Mr Boyes	190		
6. European Monetary System (continuation)			
Mr Moreau (S); Mr Herman (EPP); Mr			
Hopper (ED); Mrs Poirier (COM)	191		
7. Welcome	194		
8. European Monetary System (continuation)			
Mr Damseaux (L); Mr Ansquer (EPD); Mrs			
Castellina; Mr Walter; Mr Giavazzi; Mr			
Bonaccini; Mr Seal; Mr Fich; Mr Ruffolo;			
Mr Delors, chairman of the Committee on			
Economic and Monetary Affairs; Mr Ortoli,			
Vice-President of the Commission	195		
9. Urgent procedure	207		
10. Membership of committees	207		
11. Agenda	207		
Mr de Courcy Ling	207		
12. Speaking time for the debate on Iran . . .	207		
13. New lines of action by the Community in the			
field of energy saving — Report (Doc. 1-816/			
79) by Mr Linde on behalf of the Committee			
on Energy and Research	208		
Mr Linde, rapporteur	208		
Mrs Groes (S); Mr Fuchs (EPP); Lord Douro			
(ED); Mr Ippolito (COM); Mr Calvez (L) .	209		
14. Agenda	213		
Mr Beazley; Mrs Macciocchi	213		
15. Verification of credentials	214		
16. Situation in Iran — Joint debate on the			
motions for resolutions by Mr Fergusson			
(Doc. 1-89/80/rev. II), Mr Prag (Doc. 1-98/			
80) and Mr Glinne (Doc. 1-113/80) . . .	214		
Mr Fergusson, author of the motion (Doc.			
1-89/80/rev. II)	214		
Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission			
Mr Glinne, author of the motion (Doc. 1-113/			
80)	216		
Mr Blumenfeld (EPP); Mr Galuzzi; Mr			
Berkhouwer (L); Mr Ansquer (EPD); Mr			
Capanna; Mr Paisley; Mr Pedini; Mrs			
Macciocchi; Mr Romualdi; Mr De Goede;			
Mrs Castellina; Mrs Hammerich; Sir Fred			
Warner			
Mr Prag, author of the motion (Doc. 1-98/80)			
Mrs De March; Mr Zamberletti, President-			
in-Office of the Council	218		
17. Votes	229		
Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-89/80/rev. II)			
by Mr Fergusson and others: Plight of the			
Americans held captive in Tehran	229		
Amendment seeking to replace the entire text:			
Mr Fergusson	230		
Amendment to the second indent	230		
Amendments to the fourth indent	230		
Amendment to the fifth indent	230		
Amendments to paragraphs 1 to 4	230		
Amendments to paragraph 3	230		
Amendments to paragraph 4	231		
Amendment to paragraph 5	231		
Adoption of the resolution	231		
Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-113/80) by			
Mr Glinne and others: Situation created by			
the taking of hostages in Iran	231		
Rejection of the motion	231		
Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-85/80) by Mr			
Gouthier and others: Involving the northern			
Adriatic in the European unification process			
Mr Gouthier; Mr Barbi; Mr Cecovini . .	231		
Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-90/80) by Mr			
Cecovini and others: Involving the northern			
Adriatic in the European unification process .	232		
Amendment seeking to replace the text of the			
motion for a resolution	232		
Adoption of the resolution	232		
Van Miert report (Doc. 1-821/79): Human			
rights in Chile	232		
Amendment after paragraph 2:			

<i>Mr Colla, deputy rapporteur</i>	232	<i>Points of order: Mrs Van den Hewoel; Mr Haagerup; Mr Spinelli; Mr Scott-Hopkins</i>	238
<i>Explanations of vote: Mrs Groes; Mr Fich</i>	233	<i>Blumenfeld report (Doc. 1-49/80): Greece's accession to the Community</i>	238
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	233	<i>Explanation of vote: Mrs Roudy</i>	238
<i>Points of order: Mr Martin; Mr Sutra</i>	233	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	238
<i>Antoniozzi report (Doc. 1-723/79): Situation in Nicaragua</i>	233	<i>Ruffolo report (Doc. 1-63/80): European Monetary System</i>	238
<i>Amendment after the second indent:</i>		<i>Amendment after paragraph 2:</i>	
<i>Mr Antoniozzi, rapporteur</i>	234	<i>Mr Ruffolo, rapporteur</i>	239
<i>Amendment to the third indent:</i>		<i>Amendment after paragraph 7:</i>	
<i>Mr Antoniozzi</i>	234	<i>Mr Ruffolo</i>	239
<i>Amendment to the fifth indent:</i>		<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Jaquet; Mrs Castle; Mr Bonaccini; Mr Bangemann; Mrs Castellina</i>	239
<i>Mr Antoniozzi</i>	234	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	240
<i>Amendment to paragraph 1:</i>		18. <i>New lines of action by the Community in the field of energy saving (continuation)</i>	240
<i>Mr Antoniozzi</i>	234	<i>Mr Lalor; Mrs Dekker; Mr Sassano; Mr Moorhouse; Mr Petronio; Mr Müller-Hermann; Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission; Mr Herman, draftsman of an opinion</i>	240
<i>Explanation of vote: Mr Chambeiron (COM)</i>	234	19. <i>Surveillance of shipping routes for Community supplies — Oral Question with debate by Mr d'Ormesson and others (Doc. 1-30/80/rev.):</i>	
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	235	<i>Points of order: Mr Baillot; Mr Veronesi; Mr Luster</i>	246
<i>Hänsch report (Doc. 1-815/79): Human rights in Czechoslovakia</i>	235	<i>Mr d'Ormesson, author of the question</i>	
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	235	<i>Point of order: Mrs Hammerich</i>	248
<i>Gonella report (Doc. 1-40/80): Right of residence for nationals of Member States in the territory of another Member State</i>	235	<i>Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mrs Charzat (S); Mr von Hassel (EPP); Mr de Courcy Ling (ED); Mr Baillot (COM); Mr Haagerup (L); Mr Deleau (EPD); Mr Skovmand; Mr Hutton; Mr Barbi; Mr Prag; Mrs Weber; Mr Hänsch; Mr Schall; Mr von Bismarck; Mr Griffiths; Mr d'Ormesson</i>	248
<i>Amendments to Articles 4(2) and 6:</i>		20. <i>Code of conduct for oil tankers — Oral Question with debate by Mrs Ewing and others (Doc. 1-59/80):</i>	
<i>Mr Ferri, deputy rapporteur</i>	235	<i>Mrs Ewing, author of the question</i>	259
<i>Amendment after Article 11:</i>		<i>Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mrs Weber (S); Mr K. H. Hoffmann (EPP); Mr Cottrell (ED); Mrs Le Roux (COM); Mr Calvez (L); Mr Josselin; Mr Turner; Mrs Ewing; Mr Davignon</i>	261
<i>Mr Ferri</i>	235	21. <i>Urgent procedure</i>	268
<i>Amendment after the preamble:</i>		22. <i>Agenda for next sitting:</i>	
<i>Mr Ferri</i>	236	<i>Mr Seal; Mr Coppieters; Mr Johnson; Mr Normanton; Mr Luster</i>	269
<i>Explanation of vote: Mrs Macciocchi</i>	236	<i>Annex</i>	271
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	236		
<i>Rey report (Doc. 1-71/80): Relations between the European Parliament and the Commission</i>	236		
<i>Amendments to paragraph 2:</i>			
<i>Mr Rey, rapporteur</i>	236		
<i>Amendments to paragraph 3:</i>			
<i>Mr Rey</i>	236		
<i>Amendment to paragraph 4:</i>			
<i>Mr Rey</i>	237		
<i>Amendment to paragraph 6:</i>			
<i>Mr Rey</i>	237		
<i>Amendment to paragraph 7:</i>			
<i>Mr Rey</i>	237		
<i>Amendment to paragraph 8:</i>			
<i>Mr Rey</i>	237		
<i>Explanations of vote: Mrs Roudy; Mr Coppieters</i>	237		
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	238		
<i>Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-33/80) by Mr Scott-Hopkins and others: Report of the Committee of Three</i>	238		

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Since there are no comments, the minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Agenda*

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Mr President, I should like you and the House to take a very careful look at the nature of Item 43 on today's agenda. Document 1-30/80/rev., and even more so the motion for a resolution which Mr Scott-Hopkins has tabled to wind up the debate on this oral question, show that the authors here want to get into a debate on an issue where the European Communities have no power. We are referring to the military protection of shipping routes for raw materials.

In the text put forward by Mr Scott-Hopkins there is even mention of military measures to safeguard the route around the Cape. I am really astonished at the frequency with which Members of this Parliament — who naturally have ample right to raise issues — get carried away and want to put on the agenda items which ought not to be discussed in this Chamber but elsewhere. Let me say again that the issue here is the military protection of shipping routes which does not come within the responsibilities of the Community.

I really cannot see Mr Jenkins and the President of the Parliament pressganging the staff into service and sending them off in their 'Sail for Europe' kit to protect the shipping routes as a result of any decision taken by the European Parliament. I am really upset by this Item 43. I cannot stand this growing habit in Parliament of putting on the agenda items which are quite clearly not the responsibility of the Community.

At all events, Mr President, on behalf of my group I request that we have separate debates on Item 43 and

Item 44 on the code of conduct for oil tankers, since we in the Socialist Group have no intention of taking part in the debate on Item 43. Parliament must do the proper thing and not get into an intolerable muddle by confusing Item 43 with Item 44, which has been quite rightly placed on the agenda.

President. — Mr Glinne, the agenda has been accepted by the chairmen of the political groups. It was discussed by the Bureau. However, it is Parliament which has the last say on its proceedings and you are perfectly entitled to express your disagreement.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* I fully appreciate that the group chairmen, pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure, are entitled to enter on the agenda of the House an oral question on behalf of their groups. What I am complaining about is that they use the Rules of Procedure to put on the agenda political items which are in no way the responsibility of the Community.

President. — Mr Glinne, as this agenda was drawn up some time ago and since it was agreed to by the groups, I propose that we do not have a debate on the matter now but refer it to the Bureau which will be meeting in ten minutes. We can then have the debate this afternoon, because your question is of such importance that it merits serious discussion.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Mr President, I do not think we should change the agenda — that would be a grave mistake — but the motion for a resolution standing in my name will be withdrawn.

President. — Since there are no objections to my proposal, that is agreed.

3. *Documents received*

President. — I have received several documents, details of which will be found in the minutes of proceedings of today's sitting.

4. *Statement by the President*

President. — I have been informed by the chairman of the Committee on Transport that the Committee has decided not to draw up a report on the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-583/79) by Mr Lima on the motorway situation between Brussels, Luxembourg

President

and Strasbourg. Details of this decision will be found in the minutes of proceedings.

5. *Decision on urgency*

President. — The next item is the decision on the urgency of two motions for resolutions. We begin with the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-100/80) by Mr Jaquet and others: Events in Tunisia*.

I call Mr Sarre.

Mr Sarre. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, at the end of last week the Tunisian Supreme Court rejected the appeal of the 13 persons condemned to death at the Gafsa trial.

The reason why together with other colleagues I have tabled this motion for a resolution appealing for clemency to the Tunisian Head of State is that the events which are at the root of this affair are quite clearly political in nature. In saying this, of course, I am not making any judgment about the motives or the methods of the accused.

What are the facts of the matter? On 26 and 27 January 1980 members of the Tunisian Armed Resistance took over and held the oasis town of Gafsa. In spite of official statements by the Tunisian Government, it is evident that these events were linked to a great extent with domestic politics inside Tunisia. The date of the raid was significant. It occurred on the second anniversary of the general strike which the UGTT — the General Union of Tunisian Workers — called on 26 January 1978. You will need no reminding of the repression which followed, since the main union leaders are still in prison.

It is an open secret of course that the raiders received Libyan aid and had the support of the régime in Tripoli. Nevertheless, we must realise that a suicidal attempt at insurrection should have come as no surprise in a country which blocks every political outlet, where intolerance and repression are the order of the day, where one fifth of the working population is looking for a job and where 30 % of the population is living below the poverty line. The events which occurred at Gafsa were in any case inspired by political conviction. This is why Parliament must protest against the death sentences passed at Gafsa. Since the only hope now is a pardon by the Head of State, an urgent appeal for clemency from this Parliament to the President of the Tunisian Republic may arrive while there is still time.

President. — I call Mr Chambeiron.

Mr Chambeiron. — (F) The Communist and Allies Group seconds the request for urgency which has been made. Since this is a procedural matter, and for the sake of brevity, I shall not go into details but I should like to say that I cannot see how Parliament can fail to share the international outrage which has greeted the Gafsa verdicts. We cannot fail to add our voice to this international appeal. We are dealing with human lives, quite apart from anything else. We can and we must stop the carrying out of these sentences of death which have been passed. For this reason we support the request for urgency.

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, 18 April 1980.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-109/80) by Mr Boyes and others: Electronic voting system of Parliament*.

I call Mr Boyes.

Mr Boyes. — Mr President, I do not think a long statement is needed. I just wish to say that if we have another big voting session and demand roll-call votes, and the electronic system is not working then, once again, people will be appealing for shorter speeches and speedier action although we have a very sophisticated system that ought to give us at all times a record of the way people voted and, very speedily, the results of votes. I for one find it extremely disappointing that we have not got this system working after all this time. All I am really saying is, before we come to another session on budgets or prices, for goodness sake, let us have it working. This Parliament ought to be informed why a system costing as much as this one is not working after all this time. I could be mischievous and say that perhaps we ought to have a roll-call vote, using the electronic voting system, on this resolution.

President. — It 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, 18 April 1980.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

6. *European Monetary System* (continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the Ruffolo report (Doc. 1-63/80).

I call Mr Moreau to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Moreau. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we welcome the fact that, in the present difficult economic, monetary and political situation, this House is debating the report by Mr Ruffolo on the EMS as an aspect of the international monetary system before the preparatory meetings for the Venice summit.

I would like straight away to pay tribute to the good work of our colleague, whose explanatory statement includes, in particular, an objective analysis of the good points, faults and uncertain aspects of the system introduced following the Council meeting of 5 December 1978. As far as we Socialists are concerned, there can be no independent Europe capable both of controlling its social and economic development and of helping to prepare and establish new economic relations in the world — and therefore to create a new international economic order — without a European monetary system.

But let there be no mistake, the establishment of such a system must go hand in hand with the implementation of social, economic, regional, industrial and structural policies which will enable the Community and its Member States to achieve their objectives, especially in employment and in reducing the various forms of inequality. A European monetary system is necessary both for the Community's internal functioning and for establishing a new world monetary system.

The present monetary disorder does not help the Community, as it causes profound inequality and imbalance in the Member States. It delays the drawing up of Community policies and the development of the Community. It calls existing policies, including the Common Agricultural Policy, into question, with each country more interested in protecting its interests than in cooperating with the other Community countries. Such a situation is dangerous for the future of Europe.

Such a system is also necessary within the Community, as it should enable us to monitor the flow of eurodollars and to control exchange and interest rates and the monetary activities of the multinationals. With regard to external affairs, namely the establishment of a new world monetary order, which must be pluralist and many-faceted, it is crucial that Europe should be able to exert a stabilizing and positive influence to remedy the present imbalance. Europe must be capable of acting with complete independence and of helping to create a new basis for world cooperation in the economic and monetary sphere.

However, when we say that a monetary system is necessary, we do not imply that we unreservedly approve of the system which has been in operation for over a year. Despite the half-hearted declarations of the Council of Ministers, the EMS shows signs of weakness and vulnerability which are due to the circumstances surrounding its inception, the instruments set up and the lack of any real Community cooperation in the social, economic and industrial spheres. If we compare the hopes expressed at the Bremen meeting with the Council decisions of December 1978, we have to admit that there is a considerable discrepancy. The monetary system established is, in many respects, merely a continuation of the 'snake'. The Community sought short-term answers to monetary problems without creating the economic and social conditions needed for a real improvement of the situation in the Community countries.

As the rapporteur has said, things are not going well. Although the system has produced some results, the impending difficulties are likely to expose its weaknesses even more clearly.

What, in fact, do we find? The debate on the budget has clearly shown that the Council wants nothing to do with a budgetary policy based both on new resources and the restructuring of Community expenditure. What is the present situation? Inflation rates are rising and are sharply divergent, interest rates are increasing unevenly and the national governments have conflicting views on the very concept of convergence. The gap between the wealthy and less wealthy countries will therefore continue to widen, and the system will collapse if this situation persists.

One of the conditions necessary for creating an effective and reliable system is that the Council on Ministers, apart from improving agriculture in ways which are fair to all, should draft and implement joint policies to pave the way for genuine convergence and effective cooperation in certain fields — by trying to achieve full employment by appropriate means and by combating unemployment; by sustained action in energy and scientific research, by applying an ambitious regional policy, as well as industrial policies which safeguard and reorganize vital sectors in the interests of the workers — but these policies should also make Europe ready to meet the challenges of the future and of international competition in key industrial and technological sectors.

Without this economic basis, we Socialists believe that the EMS will not be able to fulfil the hopes placed in it. We have always conceived the future of Europe in terms of the simultaneous development of economic, social, trade and monetary policies. Without these necessary accompanying measures, any further move to unify the market will make the rich richer and the poor poorer. We must reaffirm this fact all the more forcefully now, since the Community's enlargement to include three new members will bring home the truth

Moreau

of this assertion even more clearly. Having said that, we do not wish to minimize the importance of the monetary aspects of the Community's problems; we just want to view this matter in its true perspective. Monetary policy should serve the interests of economic and social development, and not the reverse. Stringency in monetary affairs cannot be used to bolster policies which create unemployment and reduce purchasing power, a point which Mr Ruffolo's report rightly emphasizes.

In conclusion, Mr President, the majority of the Socialist Group approves of the report by our colleague, Mr Ruffolo, even though some of us have expressed reservations because of the terms under which the EMS has been applied and the lack of any accompanying policy; we do not, however, challenge the concept of, our question the need for, a European monetary system.

Finally, the Socialist Group believes that we should tackle these problems systematically, and not put the cart before the horse. This is essential if the EMS is to survive; otherwise, instead of serving the Community, it will become a weapon used by a few people to dominate others. It is up to the national governments to react to this situation.

President. — I call Mr Herman to speak on behalf of the European People's Party (CD Group).

Mr Herman. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to join our colleague, Mr Moreau, in complimenting Mr Ruffolo on his excellent work, which without doubt made it easier for the committee to hold its highly constructive discussions, on the basis of which the report was adopted almost unanimously.

Progress towards monetary union is too slow and too spasmodic for us not to welcome the positive achievements of the EMS. Compared with our experience of the 'snake', the EMS is a step in the right direction. The divergence indicator, the ECU, intervention credits and increased cooperation between the central banks have produced considerable results in that Community currency exchange rates have been more stable than in the past. One can therefore understand the Council's statement of 17 September 1979 that the system has worked well and that there is therefore no need to improve it. We cannot, however, agree with this rather optimistic conclusion. I have already drawn the House's attention to the technical shortcomings which hamper the working of the divergence indicator and shall not go into these again, but I feel it is premature and clearly rather irresponsible to claim that we have no need to change the functioning of the EMS.

However, our anxieties extend far beyond this and concern a basic aspect of the EMS, namely the second

phase of consolidation, which was supposed to enter into force in March 1980. At its latest meeting the Council said that it intended to observe the timetable agreed upon, while the Commission undertook to draft a report and some proposals for a Council meeting in the near future. It is now April 1980, which means that the deadline has passed, and, what is worse, we have heard nothing about the Commission's proposals or the preparations for the next Council meeting on this matter. But it is possible that we have not been fully informed, and perhaps the Commissioner would care to give us further details.

We have been greatly disturbed by rumours concerning the latest meeting between Chancellor Schmidt and President Giscard d'Estaing, according to which France and Germany agree that it would be inopportune or inexpedient to embark on the second phase of the EMS now. I can see that the initial phase could be extended to ensure that we profit from all our experience, but if these rumours are confirmed and we have to leave things as they are, we would be obliged to express our anxiety without hesitation, for, as the Ruffolo Report most appositely points out. The EMS is still at a very precarious and delicate stage.

It has worked well because in 1979 and at the start of 1980 the divergence between the inflation rates of the nine Community countries was less marked than in 1974, 1975 or even 1976, and because the various balance of payments figures had regained some equilibrium in recent years. A further reason is that the United States has finally ended its policy of 'benign neglect' and has decided to defend the value of the dollar. All this has eased the functioning of the EMS.

But our prospects now look very gloomy, and inflation rates are beginning to diverge very sharply. Balance of payments figures have been distorted by the increases in oil prices, interest rates are reaching unprecedented heights and there is little prospect of economic growth. We are therefore about to cross very troubled waters or, if you prefer, to continue the meteorological imagery, the storm is approaching and the building is not yet finished. Since it does not rest on solid foundations, it could get swept away.

I hope, therefore, that in the few weeks remaining to us before the meeting of the Council of Ministers and of the European Council, we shall be able to complete the work which has been started, for as it stands at present, the EMS would not survive. Cooperation between the central banks is not enough. We need the support of the European Monetary Fund to ensure that decisions are reached autonomously and that appropriate measures are taken with regard both to interventions affecting the dollar and the use of swap facilities. To sum up, this highly powerful authority must play a prominent role if we want to preserve what we have achieved so far.

President. — I call Mr Hopper to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Hopper. — Mr President, may I warmly welcome this report on behalf of the European Democratic Group and, like Mr Moreau before me, commend in particular the explanatory memorandum as a lucid and penetrating piece of economic analysis.

It emerges from the memorandum that the system has changed markedly in character since it was founded. A year ago, it was conceived to be a fixed-rate system in which occasional adjustments to parities were permitted to meet market pressures. But no fixed-rate system can survive intact when the currencies of the Member States suffer inflation rates which vary from 6 % to 22 %. Mr Ruffolo sums this up very clearly in paragraphs 28 and 29 where he says that the possibility which seems to be emerging from the first phase of the EMS's operation is the transformation of the system into one of free but controlled fluctuation with increasingly frequent parity adjustments. He puts this in more technical language in paragraph 43: 'The system is thus moving towards a crawling-peg arrangement, with no formal decisions being taken on the timing and extent of the crawl.' Mr President, in the hemicycle of theoretical possibilities, crawling pegs must be at least half-way between fixed rates and floating rates.

This change in nature, if Mr Ruffolo's analysis is correct, alters the situation in which the British Government must make its decision about full membership and indeed must make it easier for it to reach a positive conclusion. The European Democratic Group is, of course, an Anglo-Danish group, and it is certainly not my object to represent here the views of the British Government. But I think it is in order for me to say that in my opinion the decision taken a year ago by the British Government not to participate in the exchange-rate mechanism was a correct one—and not only from the point of view of the United Kingdom. Let us imagine that the United Kingdom had joined then and had been accorded a 6 % margin. On at least two subsequent occasions, sterling would have penetrated its upper limit. Under the rules of the EMS, massive intervention by the Bank of England would have been mandatory. The Bank would have sold hundreds of millions of pounds in the exchanges. In order to sell the pounds it would have had to borrow them, and the only place it could borrow them is from the commercial banking system. This would have increased the credit base of the system and fuelled inflation in the United Kingdom at a time when inflation was accelerating. The effect on the other currencies would also have been serious. In order to sell the pound, you must buy something else, and the Bank of England would have bought German marks, French francs, guilders and the other member currencies. These would have risen sharply—probably contrary to the policies of the Member States; the entire system

would have been de-stabilized and perhaps even brought to a sudden end.

It was, and is, the policy of the British Government to become a full member when conditions permit, which is what Mr Ruffolo calls for in paragraph 9 of his motion for a resolution. It seems to me that there are two conditions. One is that the British economy, and in particular the money supply of the United Kingdom, must be brought under control, and the second is that the pound must be at a lower and more competitive level.

Mr President, this leads me to refer to the single amendment which we have tabled to this excellent report. This amendment reads: 'Parliament welcomes the abolition of all exchange controls by the United Kingdom and the decision by the Federal Republic of Germany to ease informal controls on the inflow of capital'. We have not moved this amendment simply to congratulate ourselves, although I believe that the government of Mrs Thatcher and the government of Mr Schmidt are to be congratulated. The reason is that if the pound is to be brought down on the exchanges, which is a pre-condition of our entry, this can only be achieved through a fairly massive outflow of capital, and a *sine qua non* of such an outflow is that outward exchange controls should be abolished in the United Kingdom and inward controls removed in other countries. Private flows of capital may not be sufficient to achieve this object. It may be necessary for the United Kingdom to make official exports of capital, as Germany has done for many years. This might involve the Bank of England in selling the pound when it was not at its upper limit. I had always understood that this practice was contrary to EMS rules; I was therefore fascinated to read in Mr Ruffolo's memorandum that intermarginal dealings by Member States are ten times as great as dealings at the margin. If inter-marginal dealings are indeed permitted under EMS rules, then one of the principal obstacles to British membership is removed.

But I must not deal solely with United Kingdom aspects. Abolition of remaining exchange controls has much wider implications. A common market requires freedom of movement for goods, services, people and capital. Since the foundation of the Community much time and effort have been expended on the first three of these elements; since the Segré report over ten years ago, very little time has been devoted to the fourth. In the opinion of our group, the moment has come to give new impetus to the creation of a common market in credit and capital in the Community.

Finally, Mr President, let me say that the European Democratic Group is totally committed to the principles underlying the EMS and to the achievement of complete economic and monetary union in the Community. We shall vote enthusiastically for Mr Ruffolo's paper.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Poirier to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mrs Poirier. — (*F*) The Treaty of Rome makes absolutely no provision for the setting up of a European monetary system. To discuss this question therefore means discussing the powers and authority of this House and the other European institutions. This is all the more essential since the second phase in the creation of this system would inevitably erode national sovereignty, a prospect which we French members of the Communist and Allies Group categorically reject.

We do not, Mr Ruffolo, support the view that we should accept the decline of our country for fear of having it imposed on us later. I am very familiar with this argument. It is tailor-made for the Social-Democrats and should be easily acceptable to the right-wing majority of this House. For our part, we are struggling to convince and to win.

To return to the EMS, it is planned, in the second phase, to set up a fund which would acquire a sizeable share — 20 % — of national gold and dollar reserves. It is also planned to create a real currency to be used as a reserve and for settlement purposes; not only would this be applied on a permanent basis, since national assets would be deposited permanently, but it could be converted into any other reserve asset or currency.

Mr Ruffolo's report also says that the EMF should become a European monetary authority. This is really a euphemism since, although they did not dare say so, the ultimate objective is to set up a central European bank.

When all is said and done, this phase of economic and monetary integration goes much further than anything which has been achieved so far, and much further than anything which this House and the Community has the right to decide.

You claim that the purpose of the EMF is to create a stable monetary zone in the Community, but you know full well that that is untrue. Economic stagnation and the coordinated policies of austerity have given an illusion of monetary stability, while the EMF remains at the mercy of any worsening of this crisis, which has been deliberately engineered.

This is borne out by the fact that Italy has been allowed a 6 % variation in its currency — much more than anyone else — by the wide fluctuations in sterling and by the fact that Great Britain was unwilling or unable to join the system.

The setting up of the EMF has, in fact, other objectives which you are careful not to mention. Firstly, in the context of the serious crisis which is affecting all our countries, the obvious consequence — indeed, the

deliberate consequence — is to institutionalize the domination of the mark in the Community. Germany's present trade deficit will in no way detract from the power of West German capitalism to dominate Europe and from the supremacy of its currency. The EMF will institutionalize this domination.

Like the International Monetary Fund, the EMF will be used to support the currencies of the Member States and to make up the deficits in their payments. It will therefore also be used to make the granting of loans or credits subject to political conditions. In future, the capitalists and German bankers will thus be able to dictate France's policies and programme austerity, as the IMF has done in Portugal and in many other countries.

There is no earthly reason why we should accept such a situation. On behalf of whom or what would we be acting?

There is another thing which is not mentioned in the report and which is one of the main purposes of this system. It is intended to serve as a sort of 'spare wheel' for the dollar, a fact to which we have already drawn attention. The United States is now able to pay for its trade deficit by issuing dollars. The inflation of the dollar is therefore being used to pay off America's debt and to finance American investments, mainly in Europe. Germany and Switzerland, which were previously required to absorb these dollars and thus consolidate the American debt, will from now on be in the comfortable position of being able to fall back on the EMS. This is exactly what the Commissioner, Mr Brunner, was saying recently in a French newspaper when he stated that the world should now know that the Community supports the United States in its difficulties. The EMS will therefore offer the additional advantage of consolidating America's world domination while easing its monetary difficulties.

This form of solidarity in which money is of prime importance, and this headlong rush towards supranationality and austerity have nothing to do with the interests of the people. Since the Community moreover has neither the power nor the competence to make such a system work, we are opposed to the EMS, and in particular to its second phase.

In conclusion, I would like to put a very specific question to the Commissioner: how do you propose to reconcile the possible further application of this system with your plans to enlarge the Community to include countries with inflation rates of up to 20 % or more?

7. Welcome

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of Parliament I welcome the President of the Landtag of

President

Schleswig-Holstein, Mr Lemke, who has taken his seat in the official gallery.

(Applause)

8. *European Monetary System* (continuation)

President. — I call Mr Damseaux to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Damseaux. — (F) Mr Ortoli, Mr President, it is to be regretted that the European Monetary System now has certain faults and that it is not fulfilling the expectations aroused by the Bremen Summit. Nonetheless — and we have to be realistic in politics — the main thing now is to consolidate what we have achieved. To do this, we must be aware of the weaknesses, shortcomings and imperfections of the system. I would here like to congratulate the rapporteur, Mr Ruffolo, who has most effectively drawn attention to both the strengths and the weaknesses of the EMS.

Like certain other speakers, I believe that the divergence threshold has quite considerable technical shortcomings. If we analyse the system's economic basis, in other words convergence, we find that little or no progress has been made in structural convergence and in the convergence of economic structures, the two objectives on which economic integration was to be based.

It is true, also, that the only innovation introduced by the EMS for the instruments set up to reduce economic imbalance and strengthen the weaker economies is the new Community instrument which enables the Commission to contract loans and grant interest rebates to promote investment.

Lastly, it cannot be denied that the Member States have had an unhappy tendency, when applying their national policies, to rely increasingly upon monetary measures to combat inflation.

Nevertheless, despite the system's weaknesses and imperfections, we must continue our work, bearing in mind what we can achieve in the short term and also what can only be achieved in the longer term. I believe Parliament must take a broad view of the situation, that is, it must not only determine what can be done in the immediate future, and insist that this is done, but it must also set its sights on the longer term.

I shall confine myself to making four observations: firstly, I feel it is essential to set up a central monetary authority in Europe. Admittedly, the tasks of this authority, the European Monetary Fund, would be limited in the short term; it could issue recommendations and supervise the intra-Community mechanism

governing credits, and it should also supervise the flow of eurodollars. But ultimately I think we should aim to halt effectively the massive flow of currency and to supervise the other policies, i.e. the fiscal and employment policies and the economic and budgetary policies. It would be unrealistic at present to concern ourselves with the other policies because of the present lack of political will, but this should be possible — indeed, it will be vital — in the future.

My second comment concerns our observance of the timetable in readiness for the meeting in Venice in 1981. The EMS should be backed up by an effective European Monetary Fund financed by 20 % of the gold and currency reserves of the countries in the system. Certain countries, in particular France and Germany, have already agreed to delay implementing this measure, which, I would remind the House, requires the agreement of the national parliaments and which involves an extremely lengthy procedure.

I think that we should nonetheless insist that the timetable should be observed. I am aware that the ECU, as a back-up instrument for the system, will not have any magic effects on the progress of the EMS, and that, like the other currencies, it will be subject to pressure and tension, but I feel this is unavoidable and necessary. President Jenkins once said before this House that the Community was to be built up 'step by step', and I believe that the setting up of a European Monetary Fund is one of these steps.

My third point concerns the entry or non-entry of the United Kingdom into the EMS. Sterling has probably been pushed up artificially by Britain's more comfortable internal situation and by its oil revenue, but the situation could be abruptly reversed since Britain is going through or will go through in 1980 a serious economic recession, and an unprecedented rate of inflation approaching 20 % has been forecast for that country.

I sincerely believe that our British friends are right in saying that sterling is not yet capable of joining a stable exchange rate system in Europe, and I even think that the immediate entry of sterling into the EMS would weaken it. We can only hope, therefore, that Britain will act in such a way that the conditions necessary for the entry of sterling into the system are fulfilled as soon as possible.

Clearly, our British friends have already worked hard. I obviously welcome Britain's decision to abolish all exchange controls, and I do not underestimate the importance of this move, but I would not go so far as to congratulate Britain, as Mr Hopper has done: a Member State should not be congratulated for observing the rules; I feel it is only right that Member States should conform to Community decisions.

My fourth and final comment relates to the fact that in general our governments tend to overdo monetary

Damseaux

measures to combat inflation. While many people are convinced that economic activity and, in particular, investment can only be boosted by lowering interest rates, the national governments usually do the exact opposite. In general, the economic policies of the industrialized countries have for the most part consisted of monetary measures, and what is more, orthodox monetary measures, i.e. stringent and inflexible ones.

If the growth in the volume of financial resources is limited, money becomes scarcer and consequently increases in value, which leads to higher interest rates. True, movements in interest rates have varied. Real interest rates, that is the difference between visible, i.e. nominal, interest rates and the rate of inflation has shown a downward trend in Italy and the United Kingdom, a slight upward trend in Germany and a marked upward trend in Belgium, the Netherlands and Denmark. Nevertheless, the main purpose of monetary policy is to protect the national economies against inflation. We feel that this approach is misguided.

Inflation is now no longer due to increased overall demand but to rising costs. Inflation and rising prices, unemployment and the failure to utilize production capacities all exist side by side. Inflation cannot therefore be attributed to excessive overall demand, and so it would be wrong to combat inflation by restricting this demand. The orthodox approach to monetary policy is to regulate demand, but to tackle inflation we must get at its roots; our efforts must therefore be directed at costs, and I believe that reasonable people who constantly aim to maintain the living standards of the people of the Community must accept that incomes should be limited or brought to more moderate levels.

I feel it is not unreasonable to expect the Member States to adopt a policy on incomes.

We must remember that the EMS would be weakened by any lack of convergence in our economic policies; indeed, the convergence of policies was the original purpose of the EMS, but, in the medium term, it is also essential for its survival.

Finally, we should initially call for Community cooperation on the fixing of interest rates. I believe that the fixing of interest rates by the Community is a very long-term, indeed an extremely long-term objective which will mark the culmination of the EMS. This will be the 'point of no return', when the ship will be unable to return to port for lack of fuel. We have not yet reached this point, but the ship is about to leave port, and Community cooperation on interest rates would be an excellent point of departure for the EMS.

Mr President, Mr Ortoli, my Group supports the EMS; it supports its second phase and hopes that the timetable will be observed. Finally, it hopes that the EMS will be studied, improved and developed to the

full as quickly and as thoroughly as possible. For this reason the Liberal and Democratic Group will support the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Ruffolo.

President. — I call Mr Ansquer to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Ansquer. — (*F*) Mr Ruffolo's report on the EMS is being debated at a time when Europe's economy is marked by both inflation and depression. But let there be no mistake, the inflationary aspect of the world economy is the predominant feature. It is inflation which is most in evidence and most pernicious: we see it in the movements of the dollar and gold, in currency speculation; unemployment, in the reduced purchasing power of the lower income groups and in the increasing deficits of the developing countries. This chaotic situation is due mainly to the fact that the heads of state in the West have been unwilling to reorganize the international monetary system and appear to be suffering from a chronic inability to lay the foundations for mutual trust on which the organization of monetary affairs must be based.

To combat this situation, we have always thought that Europe needed effective machinery capable of establishing other links between the Member States, such as the Community administration of European reserves, the setting up of a European monetary fund and the establishment of a stable monetary standard. Admittedly the EMS exists, and we asked for it.

Yet it has serious weaknesses to which we have frequently drawn attention. Our exchange rate policy depends to a large extent on the fluctuations of the dollar, and it was precisely to protect itself from these fluctuations that Germany has led its partners in a scramble to push interest rates up. In the short term, this spiral entails very serious risks of depression.

Is it necessary to remind the House of the need for the nine Member States to coordinate their economic policies? Yes of course, but coordination must not mean falling in line with a restrictive policy which suits one country but not another. The fight against inflation and unemployment calls for the application of measures which can be implemented to varying degrees in Germany, Britain or France. For this reason, although our objectives are the same, greater freedom should exist with regard to the measures applied. The EMS could therefore provide a basic framework if certain conditions are met.

Firstly, all the Community countries should join the system, otherwise discrepancies might arise which would have disastrous effects on all the partners. We therefore urge Britain to become a loyal member of the EMS in the near future.

Subsequently, Europe's policy on exchange rates will be doomed to failure if it is not supplemented as soon

Ansquer

as possible by an effective monetary policy to establish and supervise international liquidity and supervise eurodollars. The enormous mass of petrodollars, which are reckoned to total one thousand million dollars, will be an increasingly heavy burden on subsequent events, on fluctuations in exchange rates and on international relations. The Community, which is directly affected by this form of capital, should make arrangements to control its influence. The Community's monetary policy also implies cooperation on interest rates, the spiralling of which contributes towards the weakening of certain Community currencies to the detriment of the stronger currencies. If the system is to be coherent, we shall have to be keenly aware of American policies. The surplus dollars are still being absorbed, willingly or otherwise, by the Community monetary authorities thanks to cooperation between the Member States. Movements in capital resulting from speculation may be temporarily stemmed, but the time will come when the system may be swept away or collapse like a house of cards. To oppose American policy as a matter of course is not in Europe's interest. Similarly, the United States cannot be content to export its inflation to Europe. It is in the interest of America and Europe to organize their monetary affairs differently — on the basis of a concerted and resolute policy to be pursued by all partners. The Member States must overcome their differences and present a united front in order to negotiate on equal terms with the United States. We can then embark on the second phase of economic and monetary union by setting up the European Monetary Fund.

We would furthermore like to ask the Commission what stages have been envisaged in the establishment of this Fund. We hope, Mr Ortoli, that your proposals will be put before the next meeting of the European Council, which will have to spur Europe on towards greater monetary independence and create harmony rather than discord. The main advantage of the EMS is that it enables the Community to speak with one voice and substantially strengthens its negotiating power in international monetary discussions. Thus, by allowing economic and monetary union to be seen in its true political perspective, the Community will be able to play its full part vis-à-vis not only the United States but also the Communist countries and the developing countries, provided, Mr President, that Europe's policy does not become fragmented and is directed at all nations.

President. — I call Mrs Castellina.

Mrs Castellina. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, having carefully read the Ruffolo Report I am all the more convinced that it was a mistake to set up the EMS; a mistake, without any doubt, for a country like Italy, as for other weak Member States of the Community, who find themselves caught up in

mechanisms which presuppose a non-existent equality amongst the partners in the system and who must suffer the consequences of it; an equality which, as we are well aware, does not exist in reality.

This means that the weak countries are called upon to demonstrate a solidarity which in fact has none of that 'give and take' which is the true characteristic of solidarity. Consequently the 'adjustment costs' imposed on the weaker countries become unbearable in the absence of any form of compensation.

It was — I repeat — precisely the critical arguments put forward by Mr Ruffolo — that strengthened my convictions in this matter, and the three minutes which I have been given this time are thus enough for me to explain my reasons, since I can confine myself to referring to his report, particularly those parts of it where he emphasizes the absence of a genuine process of convergence between the national economies, which should have been the basis of the EMS. This problem of convergence is reduced to no more than a division of the financial burdens of contributing to the Community budget.

The rapporteur himself not only admits the disparity between the original ideas worked out at Bremen and the present situation, but also the fact that the present outlook is even bleaker.

All we need to do is think about what is happening with the Common Agricultural Policy, about the total lack of new sectoral and regional policies, the deadlock over the Community budget. All this is certain to get worse rather than gradually get better in a world which, as we are well aware, is dominated by growing disorder.

So it seems to me highly contradictory that, though he makes these criticisms of the experience gained during the first stage of the EMS, Mr Ruffolo should nevertheless draw from it the illogical conclusion that the EMS should be kept alive.

He says — it is true — that some positive results have been obtained as regards exchange rate stability, though I have my own doubts about the veracity of that statement.

Is it not perhaps true that the EMS has in fact been a way of wrapping up a very negative reality in a blanket of mystification? During recent months it has become quite plain that Europe has missed the chance to carry out a reform of internal Community policies and launch an initiative of its own aimed at setting up a new international order. Within the Community we argue about pigmeat and sheepmeat or about a few lire contribution to the budget. Externally we waver and hesitate timidly when faced with American demands, without having the courage to launch a new genuine economic and political initiative.

Castellina

In such conditions it is very much better to stop the mystification and not only not go ahead with setting up the planned monetary mechanisms for, but even put an end to the EMS with the aim of examining the problem afresh when it no longer constitutes a risk.

This seems to me all the more necessary since, although hitherto the negative consequences have been contained, it is easy to see that we are now getting to a stage when these consequences could be very serious for the weaker countries. Even today, in fact, and perhaps even more so, the reasons that led my party, the PDUP, to vote in the Italian Parliament against Italy's joining the EMS still seem to me perfectly valid; nor were we alone, because the decision taken by the then Italian Prime Minister, Mr Andreotti, to participate in the EMS very nearly caused a government crisis.

Consequently I shall vote against the motion presented to us by Mr Ruffolo, because this seems to me the most effective way of expressing my agreement with the substance of his report.

President. — I call Mr Walter.

Mr Walter. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, a monetary system designed to guarantee long-term monetary and exchange rate stability depends on the political will of the parties concerned and on the practical measures they take if a genuinely Community policy is ever to be developed with the aim of eliminating the regional and social differences within the European Community. In other words, in a system like this — and particularly in further developing it — we must avoid burdening the weaker Member States and regions with the lion's share of the social and economic cost of monetary and exchange rate stability.

If this is to be the basis on which to judge a European Monetary System, we can only conclude that the EMS suffers from a kind of congenital defect arising from the Brussels decisions of December 1978, when the heads of governments expressed themselves in favour of the European Community taking measures to protect the economic potential of the less well-off Member States, but at the same time decided that this should be the responsibility of the Member States themselves. This means in practical terms, ladies and gentlemen, that the economically and socially weaker Member States of the Community will be left far too much to their own devices to solve their social and economic problems. This congenital defect has had practical repercussions on the form of the European Monetary System. The negative result of this defect has been that the EMS has not produced any new initiatives in developing Community policies. Since Mr Damseaux raised the point, I should like to add that the Ortolí Facilities — which are the only new instrument — should not be confused with the development

of genuine Community policies; they amount to nothing more than a loan, credit and interest subsidizing instrument which cannot claim to be a genuine Community policy. For this reason, we are grateful to Mr Colombo for the critical comments he made in his speech yesterday on the way the EMS functions, but we should add from Parliament's point of view that any such words of criticism must of course be backed up by action on the part of the Council. In a few weeks' time, we shall again be debating the 1980 budget in this House and we shall expect the Council to make its political budgetary proposals reflect the words we heard here yesterday. If the European Community fails to make greater efforts to bring the richer and poorer sections of the Community closer together, the European Monetary System could subsequently be brought to its knees in the face of the very real social and economic differences within the European Community. The outcome would be the need to make increasingly frequent changes within the system, ending up perhaps with systematic floating rather than a system of fixed parities, which was original aim. We have already seen signs of a negative development along these lines, and I am thinking here of the recent increase in bilateral interventions within the fluctuation margins, and of the increasing rather than decreasing divergencies in the rates of inflation and interest levels within the Community. Against this background I should like to point out that the special value of the Ruffolo Report lies in the medium-term guideline it gives the European Parliament for Parliament's own decisions. After all, ladies and gentlemen, our problem is that the decisions we take here at intervals of a few months are not always entirely consistent. By voting for the Ruffolo Report — as all the political groups in this House have said they will — we shall effectively be showing this House's determination to maintain the line taken in the decisions we took in November and December last year when we came to deal with the revised 1980 budget. It also means that you must be prepared to hold a searching debate in this House on the structural problems facing the Common Agricultural Policy, and not simply postpone this debate until the next round of agricultural price negotiations, which would be the wrong time to hold a debate on matters of principle. Voting for Ruffolo Report will mean you are prepared to discuss the matter of increasing the Community's own resources only in the context of this House's determination to work for the development and financing of new Community policies. Increasing the Community's own resources must not be used as a means of covering up Parliament's reluctance to commit itself to reform in this sector.

I should also like to say a few words on the question of the 'European Monetary Authority' or, as it is sometimes called in the Committee, the 'European Central Bank'. The spokesman for the French Members of the Communist Group has already said what she thinks about this, and I should now like to make two points. Firstly, there are many in this House who

Walter

are afraid of a loss of national sovereignty to such institutions. But, ladies and gentlemen, does the term 'national sovereignty' really mean anything in the face of international capital markets and businesses operating on an international scale? Is the point not, in fact, to restore political sovereignty over uncontrolled economic interests within this Community? If this is, in fact, so, we surely cannot support a position which, in the final analysis — as Mrs Poirier implied — would mean neglecting our policy towards uncontrolled economic interests.

My second point is addressed to many members of the Socialist Group. Indeed, we are in favour of improving cooperation in the field of monetary policy, but we are deeply sceptical about new monetary policy institutions being established and developed, equipped with new powers without any consideration for the development of new Community policies or for social consequences and the social and democratic answerability of such a system.

We are grateful to the rapporteur for bringing out these interrelationships particularly clearly in this report. In conclusion, I think we can say that the Ruffolo Report brings out three clear facts. Firstly, convergence of economic and social policies will not come about automatically in the wake of the European Monetary System; in other words, the EMS itself is the best indicator of the weaknesses of the Community policies pursued so far. Secondly, it is politically meaningless — at least as far as the Socialist Group is concerned — to set up a European Monetary System without developing new Community policies otherwise it will have no real future as a monetary system. Thirdly, this report has clearly shown that a majority of my Group and the whole House owe their thanks and support to the rapporteur.

President. — I call Mr Giavazzi.

Mr Giavazzi. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the limited amount of time allowed me means that I cannot say at length how much I appreciate this report. All I shall say is that I share the favourable comments that have been made by those who have spoken before me. I think it is necessary and right to emphasize the timeliness of this debate, coming as it does after a period during which the EMS has been fully operational — a period which is neither too short for us to assess its effects, nor so long that we can no longer rectify in time any defects or doubtful points which have arisen during its operation. But in order to do this we need the requisite political will, and it is therefore a duty, even more than it is a necessity for the Parliament to make its voice heard, without being unrealistically impatient, but with absolute firmness.

I think that three particular decisive aspects can be derived from the analysis that has been made of this

report. First of all, there is the unanimous conviction that during this first stage the EMS has functioned well from the technical point of view, though less effectively in some respects. The fact that the exchange-rates for Community currencies during the period following the adoption of the EMS were more stable than in any previous year since 1972 — the extent to which they have varied has been approximately one — third less than the previous average — excludes any possibility of doubt on this score.

The second point is that the EMS cannot stop at the point it has reached: either it is further developed and reinforced, or there is an extremely serious danger that its credibility will diminish, perhaps even to the point of its premature demise. No occasion is more appropriate than this to say that there is nothing worse than half measures. The fact is that, during this initial period in the life of the EMS, whilst there has been greater stability in exchange rates, there has also been higher inflation in general in the Community and greater divergence between the inflation rates in the individual Member States. In other words, this improved exchange-rate stability has not been accompanied by a sufficient degree of price stability, so much so that the Community balance of payments has gone into deficit. On the other hand, however, in spite of all this, the economies of the Member States taken as a whole have fortunately been through a fairly favourable period judging by the real level of economic activity. It is therefore logical to deduce from this that, while the EMS has for the moment had the effect of preventing the internal price instability from creating a vicious circle with exchange-rate instability, it will not be capable, within its present limits, of having an adequate and decisive influence if the economic policy of the Community as a whole is not directed more effectively towards that substantial larger agreement which is the primary aim of the Treaty and the *raison d'être* of the Community itself.

Thirdly there is the need for the development of the EMS to be substantial and effective, though this must be accomplished realistically and gradually. For this to happen, for this genuine solidarity to be achieved, at least this much is needed: firstly, the Community budget must develop in the direction of a structure which, by promoting more effectively the convergence of the Member States' economies, will strengthen the economic basis of the monetary agreement. Secondly, there must be a genuine common monetary policy, to be achieved in particular by means of an appropriate and concerted policy of controlling EMS exchange rates vis-a-vis the international monetary system, and particularly vis-a-vis the dollar. Thirdly, the necessary adjustments provided for in the system must be made, and there must be a decisive and timely implementation of what might be called perhaps improperly, but certainly realistically — the most significant part of the EMS, i. e. the setting-up of the European Monetary Fund, with real powers of guidance and coordination of common monetary policies. This will involve — as

Giavazzi

the motion so rightly recalls — the gradual transfer of the functions of a central monetary authority to that institution, to create as well as the creation of ECUs in the manner and the quantity necessary to constitute reserves and function as an instrument of settlement.

All that, Mr President, requires a genuine will to overcome the obstacles which still stand in the way of a real Community policy in this field. Nothing can be done without this will, and Parliament, in the full exercise of its prerogatives and functions, must refer to it in order to take the decisions that can no longer be put off until tomorrow. This is what we hope for, and this is what we are counting on, and this is the real decisive significance of the display of will which, in all plainness and in all firmness, Parliament must make.

President. — I call Mr Bonaccini.

Mr Bonaccini. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my party contributed during the meetings of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs to drawing up the report which Mr Ruffolo presented to us this morning on behalf of the Committee. We remain in favour of the report and of the thinking behind it, and we hope that the outcome of the debate will not overturn it.

The motion puts at the top of the list the problems posed by the need to bring the economic structures and their results into convergence, since this is an essential feature of the transition to the second stage of the EMS.

A year ago an attempt was made to give preference to agreement on exchange rate fluctuation margins, partly sacrificing convergence policy, whereas today the pressing need is to bring Community decisions into equilibrium by reinforcing the economic basis of the EMS and developing its institutions. This, Mr President, is why we take the view that the communiqué issued by the heads of state and government at Dublin was elusively tautological, and this is why I should like to reproach Mr Colombo in all courtesy for having yesterday — albeit in an otherwise interesting speech — applied a further sedative to that sacharin-sweet vision of the situation at this difficult moment in the economic life of Europe. This is why I should not be so optimistic — and I seem to remember that Mr Herman was not either — regarding the coming meeting of the European Council and the decisions which we may expect from the heads of government.

I notice that Mr Ortoli is here, and I hope that he will say a few words to us before the debate is over, just as I hope that he will take the trouble to explain to us why our preparatory work appears to be late, precisely which parties are opposed to making more rapid progress in this direction, who is in favour of solution A and who is in favour of solution B, and who is using

matters of general principle as a means of hindering the developments which we all have the right to expect. I am in agreement with Mr Giavazzi; it would be unreasonable to hamper things with a quite unrealistic display of impatience but it would be even more unreasonable to make our objective a highly realistic marking-time. This is why my group, while fully aware of the difficulties of the undertaking, calls for decisive progress to the second stage of the EMS. The first stage constituted a useful step forward compared with the international confusion that followed on the abrogation by the United States of the Bretton Woods agreement. It has not escaped the notice of those of us who have participated with other members of this House in the debates on convergence, on the budget and on unemployment, how many structural difficulties still remain to be overcome. But we are motivated by the awareness that it is our duty to offer to the more than 100 million workers of the Community and to the companies which employ them, a clear and reasoned prospect that employment levels, incomes and living standard will be defended and improved; and it is our common duty to offer to the workers and to world opinion the prospect of a Europe capable of growing in an atmosphere of free trade and not solely on the basis of protectionism, a Europe collaborating in the job of creating a more rational international division of labour, with other industrialized countries and with the considerable portion of the world which is still underdeveloped. We have always been aware that the forces which prosper in monetary anarchy are many and powerful and that in the atmosphere of speculation which they help to promote they flourish and increase their strength, just as we are aware that it is wide sections of the people and the workers who have to foot the bill for this foreign exchange anarchy. This is why we refuse to believe that national, European or world-wide monetary anarchy can possibly be of any benefit to the condition of the working classes. We therefore call for increasing convergence between the internal policies of the Community and its Member States, for the requisite international agreements with third countries to be signed, and for exchange-rate agreements and credit mechanisms to be developed and improved. We must go on to the second stage of the EMS as planned, i.e. we must go on to develop the role of the ECU so that it may gradually turn into a genuine currency by taking an effective and precise political decision which will reinforce the autonomous character of our decision in favour of Europe.

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Seal.

Mr Seal. — I would like to say immediately that the British Labour Party and its Members here cannot

Seal

support all the paragraphs of this report. British Labour policy is firmly against British participation in the EMS, and so we cannot support the paragraphs on the UK entry or those on the rigid timetable. In spite of what the Conservative speaker said, the Tory government in the UK is also split on EMS. Politically they would join, of course, if it would help them reduce the contributions to the budget, but economically they are against it. The Treasury is against it; even the Bank of England seemed to be against Britain joining the EMS. The reason for this, Mr President, is that there is no responsible way that Britain could join without a massive devaluation of the pound, and this is certainly not acceptable to the people of Britain because it would only exacerbate the problems which already exist there, problems caused by the present government and its rigid monetary policies. It would create more unemployment, less investment and more inflation.

Of course, we accept that there is a need for some stable exchange rate and that we must have some stable currency to measure this against, for instance, the Deutschmark. But the EMS clearly does not do this. Even if there were no economic problems in the UK at the moment, we would be against Britain joining, because as long as inflation rates differ between Member States' the EMS must eventually fail. The only way that the UK could back this present government and make the EMS a success is to ensure that Germany and all the other countries allow their inflation rates to rise to 20 %, because the British government at the moment are incapable of reducing theirs. Yesterday Mr Colombo was talking about inflation rates and averages, but we must not look at average inflation rates. Even without the UK there is already a 12 % difference between the inflation rates in Italy and those in Germany. So the EMS is bound to fail. It is only a matter of time before it does.

Joining the EMS, of course, as the report clearly indicates, gives a large amount of monetary control to the masters of the strongest currency, and at the moment this tends to be, as one of my colleagues said yesterday, the gnomes of Frankfurt. The Deutschmark last year forced two devaluations of the weaker currencies. We feel that economic control should rest with Member State governments. There is no point in electing governments if economic control is exercised by some remote unelected body.

Neither, Mr President, can we support paragraph 6 which calls for an increase in the Community's resources to strengthen the budget. Of course, we can accept that there should be a redistribution of resources amongst the sectors, but this must be at the expense of the common agricultural policy. While that consumes 80 % of the budget, we cannot support an increase in resources, and the report completely ignores this fact. We can accept economic convergence, if economic convergence means positive discrimination in favour of the poorer countries and the

poorer regions until their standards of living are brought up to the same level as the standards of the highest country. However, the EMS cannot achieve this. I will not quote the report, but even the rapporteur himself in a previous report to Parliament stated clearly that EMS is wholly inadequate in respect of achieving economic convergence.

Why should the United Kingdom join the EMS? Is it merely as an academic exercise? Of course it is not. EMS is a step towards a common monetary policy and a common currency; it is another step towards Federalism and one which the British Labour Party cannot support. For once the Labour Party agrees with the British Treasury and perhaps with the Bank of England. However, let us not be negative, because, as I say, we do accept that there must be some standards to have a stable currency.

We would favour a system which first of all encouraged economic growth as well as currency stability. Secondly, we must have symmetry in any system. The onus of correcting fluctuations should be shared by all the countries involved, and not those with the weaker currencies. Thirdly, we must have a system which is accompanied by transfers of resources within the EEC, mainly through changes in the common agricultural policy. Last year, only 200 million units of account was allowed, and that clearly was not enough. Finally we must have a system which does not destabilize the dollar and must not be to the disadvantage of the least developed countries.

Mr President, we cannot support all the paragraphs in this report, although we acknowledge the amount of work which has gone into it.

President. — I call Mr Fich.

Mr Fich. — (DK) I should like to start by thanking Mr Ruffolo for his excellent report which deals with many problems in depth. However, I must also say that I fundamentally disagree with the solution he proposes. On what points do I disagree with Mr Ruffolo? Firstly, Mr Ruffolo stresses that the EMS is the first step towards Economic and Monetary Union. Secondly, Mr Ruffolo wishes to turn the European Monetary Fund into a Community central bank, and thirdly, he intends that the ECU should ultimately be used for reserve and payment purposes. This is a solution which I can in no way accept, since it would make it impossible to conduct an independent monetary policy — something which is so important for us, particularly in times of crisis — and since it would also in the longer term, naturally involve as has also been pointed out, harmonization of fiscal policy, social policy and other sectors which are not covered by the Treaty, and which we do not think should be included under Community cooperation.

Fich

Naturally, as Danish Social Democrats, we are in favour of currency stabilization. Indeed, we must all be in favour of this with the exception of the currency speculators. In our view, the existing system has functioned reasonably satisfactorily since it was first introduced. We are even in favour of extending the EMS to include more countries — not only the United Kingdom, but also third countries. We feel that the development of this international cooperation would result in a further stabilization of the currencies without the disadvantages of Mr Ruffolo's proposals. We are thus in favour of technical cooperation in monetary matters which we would gladly see involving more countries and technically stabilized. However, we are not in favour of Economic and Monetary Union. We are in favour of broader cooperation, but not of closer cooperation, and we therefore have no choice but to vote against Mr Ruffolo's report.

President. — I call Mr Ruffolo.

Mr Ruffolo, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, I shall require very little time indeed to make one or two final observations, given the enormous and extremely flattering consensus which the report that I had the honour of presenting on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs appears to meet with in this Parliament. Whilst I am happy to thank all those Members who have spoken for the kind remarks they made about the rapporteur, I must nevertheless remind everyone that this report is the collective product of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

Mr President, I should just like to make one remark. Two kinds of criticism, essentially opposite in nature, can be made of the European Monetary System, as indeed they have been made. The first criticism is that there is too little integration of Member State's economic policies for it to have a solid basis. This is the criticism which my report makes and develops. A second criticism is that, on the contrary it involves an excessive risk of integration and supra-nationality. To me this second criticism is based on two illusions; the first, which one or two people who have spoken before me have already pointed out, is that the alternative to completing the European Monetary System is the *status quo*; the second illusion is that it is possible for the countries of Europe to pursue independent and autonomous monetary policies.

I believe in neither the first nor the second of these two propositions. The alternative to the European Monetary System is monetary disorder and economic disintegration; as for monetary policies, I think that no country, not even Germany, is in a position to pursue a monetary policy on its own. In any case, as far as the weaker countries of Europe are concerned, the alternative to the system is subordination to the policies of the stronger countries.

This, Mr President, is the paradox of a certain kind of attitude which I should call 'ultra-nationalistic'. What an ironic fate — to pursue independence and end up dependent on someone else. As the Spaniards would put it, '*Buscar el levante por el poniente*', i.e. achieving the opposite of what you set out to achieve.

President. — I call Mr Delors.

Mr Delors, Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for allowing me to speak as Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. I should like to speak briefly in this capacity alone.

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs took the initiative of asking the Bureau for permission to draft a report on the EMS because it felt that Parliament should be involved, to a reasonable degree but on a regular basis, in assessing the EMS, in monitoring its development and in exchanging ideas on its future.

My Committee has worked in a spirit of frank cooperation with Mr Ortoli and his staff and I cannot thank them too much for their help and understanding. Our work has culminated in a report which I have no hesitation in describing as a 'reference document', whatever the opinions expressed in certain quarters or whatever differences of interpretation there might be. By 'reference document' I mean a report which will not be discarded overnight or, if you prefer, one which will last longer than a plenary session. We shall be able to refer to it again and again, both to elucidate the technical complexity of the subject and, looking beyond this complexity, to appreciate the political implications and the opportunities and dangers for the building of Europe. But since I have mentioned the rights of the European Parliament — and these are often invoked, rightly or wrongly, here — allow me to remind you of the rights of the national parliaments. The transition to the second phase of the EMS will require a whole series of legislative, acts at Community and national level which will have to be ratified by the national parliaments. I wanted to emphasize this point here to ensure that there is no misunderstanding with regard to harmonization in general and the balance between the institutions.

The discussions held by my Committee have taught me three things, which I would like to pass on to you. Firstly, the economic environment of the EMS is not sufficiently healthy, and this is a source of anxiety. Secondly, before we embark on the second phase, the EMS still has to prove its worth, as it was not tested sufficiently in 1979. And thirdly, the time has come for the Community to use this initial experience to assert its independence and its role in helping to create a new, fairer and more effective world economic order by making proposals, on the basis of this experience,

Delors

for alleviating, at least in part, the monetary and financial disorder in the world. I am grateful to the Bureau for including this matter on the agenda precisely because we hope that Parliament's work will help those in the Commission and in the Council of Ministers who, in the coming months leading up to the summit of industrialized countries in Venice, will be considering ways of remedying this monetary and financial disorder, which, I must say, is also a disorder of ideas.

The first conclusion I have drawn is therefore that the economic environment of the EMS is not sufficiently healthy. On this point, I wish we would stop deceiving ourselves with words by talking about 'convergence' when discussing disputes concerning the budget and 'economic union' when we are talking about monetary cooperation. These words are meaningless in the present situation. They can give rise to extremely unrealistic discussions. The fact is that we in Europe are now witnessing the beginnings of monetary and economic cooperation, no more and no less. If we want to go further — and this is necessary, for I personally fail to see how the currency system can be developed in advance of the economic and social aspects — economic and social development must go hand in hand with monetary progress in our efforts for economic cooperation. If we wish to go further, we must never forget what we learned from the failure of the project for economic and monetary union launched following the Werner Report in the 1970s in a period of economic euphoria fuelled by the intoxicating effects of inflation. Economic union failed on that occasion because we are unwilling to recognize that progress towards economic cooperation in Europe could only be achieved if we accepted pluralism and the diverse structures, cultures and traditions of each country. Now, to contemplate building Europe on the basis of currency alone would be to abandon realism and all possibility of moving forward and disregard the specific opportunities and capabilities of each Member State. In saying this, I do not wish to appear to support a lax approach and encourage inflation. I do not want to encourage the Member States to make foolish mistakes. But the causes of inflation are now structural and are not due simply to short-term economic circumstances, and we shall not solve the various Member States' problems by adopting the straitjacket of a single model.

Hence the importance, ladies and gentlemen, of the two proposals put forward in Mr Ruffolo's remarkable report. The first is that we should calmly review all the instruments which the Community has at its disposal through its budget so that expenditure is used to correct imbalance and to help the Member States overcome their problems. For the same reason the report also calls for an increase in own resources. Here again, this is not a for lack of rigour but because it is difficult to see how we can develop our economic policy can keep in line with monetary policy if own resources are not increased. The second major proposal — this is only mooted, but I am sure it will be a subject for

debate in the future — concerns the notion of 'differentiated growth', the realization that the methods adopted in the new approach to development cannot be the same in the north as in the south and cannot be applied to all Community countries. The need at present is to seize the opportunities available to the individual Member States, discard the idea of a single model and turn our differences to good account. Recognizing the right to be different in Europe will be the most effective means of ensuring the Community's development.

The second thing I have realized is that the EMS has still to prove its worth. As other speakers have pointed out, 1979 was a trouble-free year: there was no monetary upheaval leading to frantic parity adjustments, and when parities were adjusted, this did not trigger off speculation. Nevertheless, we are facing two very difficult problems which will have to be discussed in the Member States.

I shall merely stress the main points. Firstly, there is the diversity of the situations in the Member States: for the first time we find countries which have, on the one hand, a high rate of inflation and a low rate of growth and, on the other, a strong currency and a sound balance of payments. How can such countries be expected to pursue the same policies as countries whose situation is more uniform? And secondly, the usefulness or otherwise of a strong currency to spearhead economic development and help to resolve structural problems is a much-debated issue in certain countries.

But apart from that, there are three things which suggest to me that the EMS still has to prove its worth and that we must exercise caution. The first is that in the 'Belgian compromise' so cleverly incorporated into the EMS, a balance was struck between the use of the snake, bilateral adjustments and the use of the divergence indicator. The divergence indicator has so far not been put to the test. It is extremely important since it ensures that all the Member countries have the same rights and obligations. This means that if a country's currency increases in value for reasons which are not connected with that country's domestic situation, but are due to speculation, it is up to that country to try to return to the system and not to the countries currently in a weaker situation to push upwards. The system has not yet been tested in such a situation, but this must come.

The second reason why we must be cautious is the extraordinary disparity in inflation rates. If all the forecasts are right we shall have by the end of the year one group of countries with price increases of 5 or 6 %, another with 12 or 14 % and another with 17 or 20 %. How will the EMS overcome this hurdle? Will reasonable parity adjustments be made, as in 1979? We shall have to wait and see.

Delors

The third reason is the risk of aggression from outside. By that I mean that if the dollar rose again, how would the German authorities react and what would be the effects on the other countries? Those are the reasons behind my appeal for caution.

My third and last conclusion — and I shall end on this point — is that the time has come for the Community to assert its independence and come up with proposals to try to limit the monetary and financial disorder in the world. Experience shows that whenever the dollar rises a little, the question of reforming the world monetary system is shelved — as if a satisfactory rate for the dollar were sufficient to resolve all the questions raised, in particular by the Brandt Commission on North-South relations or just recently — and this is a very important point — by the governors of the central banks, who have for the first time made public their anxieties concerning the development of the international credit system.

The governors of the central banks are publicly anxious about the 'house of cards' of international loans, on which the refinancing of the dollar is now based. They have adopted certain measures, but these could prove insufficient if the Bretton Woods institutions, the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development are not involved. I earnestly hope, therefore, that the Community will take this opportunity to try to implement measures on the following lines: firstly achieving greater cooperation on monetary policies between all the industrialized countries, and particularly on interest rates, in order to halt this insane spiralling of interest rates which discourages investment, intensified recession and increases unemployment.

Secondly, measures to resolve the indebtedness of the poorer countries which have no oil or raw materials. It is time the Community, in a spirit of generosity, made proposals to write off certain debts and created machinery borrowing at reasonable rates of interest.

Thirdly, we must break the vicious circle of inflation in the West and oil price increases. We are all free to argue about figures, but the fact is that this vicious circle has been with us since 1973, the year of the first jump in oil prices, as we try to offset part of the drain on our resources from the price of oil by increasing the prices of our industrial goods, which in turn leads to further increases in the price of oil.

This loss of economic stability is a very serious matter, ladies and gentlemen. A great deal of attention has also been focused recently on the loss of political stability. The reason why the EMS is so important and why, despite being trimmed down to its bare essentials, it must be one of our main priorities, is that the flames of political instability are fanned by the threat of economic instability due to the increasing poverty of the Third World countries and to this vicious circle. I believe that by adopting a generous and realistic

approach towards remedying the monetary and financial disorder in the world, the Community will be furthering the cause not only of a fairer world economic order, but also of peace.

President. — I call Mr Ortoli.

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, when it comes to discussing problems such as the EMS, I think there are many of us who experience a certain feeling of frustration. At any rate, this is what I feel, as in my view the time we are devoting to this subject is inadequate. The EMS deserves much more thorough discussion in this House, in view of the fact that, when we talk about this system, we are dealing with the whole problem of the economic development of Europe and its stability and its position in the world. I am therefore sorry that we have so little time at our disposal.

I am all the more sorry as it seems to me that the report from the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs is a very good one. When I say this, I do not mean that all the Members of the House must necessarily agree with all the points in it. We are all free to see things our own way and the speeches we have heard have given ample proof of this. But the serious thinking that has gone on inside this committee and the way this is reflected in Mr Ruffolo's report deserve our special attention. The great value of this document is that it provides us with an intellectual framework within which different opinions can be expressed. The report is sometimes harsh but it seems to me that it clearly outlines the problems and clearly brings out the link which has been established between the start of the European Monetary System and the whole range of current developments in the economic construction of Europe and in the international monetary system. I know this is no exaggeration as I was able to attend at least some of the meetings of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and was greatly impressed by the animated, forceful and cogent discussion which took place.

Having said that, Mr President, I should like to make a few brief remarks on Mr Ruffolo's report, on the various conclusions which have been put forward and on various points which have been raised during this debate.

What has been said about the first year of the system is, I believe, correct. It has helped to achieve stability. There are objective reasons for this stability which have been mentioned by several speakers: There have not been any major upheavals on the monetary markets, for example, during this first year. But there are also other reasons which I fear have been a little underestimated in Mr Ruffolo's report and by Mr Delors in his speech and which I think we ought to remember.

Ortoli

By this I mean that this system features a series of measures designed to protect the system which are much more comprehensive than anything which existed before. The system is also marked by a well judged flexibility, in my view, and the instruments which were devised have operated quite successfully. Naturally there have been some adjustments of central rates. But those have been made in a quiet and orderly fashion and without any fuss, even though this system operates in countries with a variety of economic trends where, in addition, the economies themselves show structural differences.

My second point concerns the function of the divergence indicator which has functioned as it should, Mr Delors has reminded us what an ingenious mechanism it is. It not only serves to warn us of approaching problems and of any currencies in special difficulty but also compels us to think about what action to take and this action is no longer to be seen solely in terms of the intervention in the money market, or necessarily, even in terms of adjustments to the central rates, but can, if necessary, involve changes in internal policies so that the currency under pressure, which could thereby put pressure on the whole system, can be helped by means of suitable monetary or budgetary policies.

The increased scope for action which the divergence indicator has brought must not be underestimated. Despite certain technical imperfections Mr Ruffolo mentioned which can easily be rectified, the divergence indicator has been put to use on several occasions. Thus the problems have not always been tackled at the level of parity arrangements but have also been seen from the angle of general economic policy.

But here is a second aspect to this question which is extremely important. It is quite obvious from all the arguments put forward on the particularly worrying problem of divergent rates of inflation and there is one condition associated with the success of the system, namely convergence.

Discussion within the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs has, I think, clearly shown that this word has two meanings. Firstly, there is structural convergence which consists of harmonizing the conditions for growth, and it is this aspect that has been referred to by some of you here who have spoken about budgetary policy and industrial policy. Secondly, and much more simply, there is economic convergence, which involves an attempt to balance satisfactorily the fundamental elements of a particular economic situation which are reflected in exchange rates, rates of inflation, and the balance-of-payments figures.

In other words, the concept of convergence covers a wide variety of situations, in fact, from the 'fundamentals' to questions of overall economic policy and to its uniform application. On this point I can agree with much of what has been said by the previous speakers.

Convergence is a vital factor which means that we must seek ways of strengthening the system in its present form. I shall be saying a few words about the second phase later, but our first task is to consolidate the system we have at the moment. This is not a question of achieving a genuinely homogeneous situation — we do not have anything of the kind, nor is it in the near future — or even of developing identical policies, for though all our policies share common features, nevertheless the situations in the various countries differ so much that the policies practised are bound to reveal slight differences or even wide divergences, given that there have been a very wide range of results not only in terms of inflation but also in terms of growth and the balance of payments.

We must, however, try to find policies which achieve the same objective which is to combat inflation. For inflation is not only a contributing factor to the problems of the monetary system but also a formidable obstacle barring the way to successful policies for growth and employment. And this is something we all have in common, even though the action to be taken is bound to vary from one country to another.

We must also make sure that policies are compatible with each other and appreciate that, in an interdependent Community, no matter how much the individual situations vary, different policies can be followed on condition that they acknowledge a common aim, are subject to common rules and share common interests. It is therefore vitally important to arrive at coherent and compatible policies.

This brings me to a third point, which is that, for want of a powerful instrument of integration, the satisfactory and lasting operation of the EMS depends on coordinated policies. We must increase and strengthen this coordination which is in fact already happening. This means coordinating the budgetary policies in a way which goes beyond the budgets of the individual Member States so that we can tackle the problem of public expenditure as a whole and the question of financing deficits.

Monetary policies must also be coordinated, and I am quite convinced that we cannot overlook the need to discuss together our intermediate objectives, in other words, the form we give — via the objectives determined in most countries by the central banks — to the kind of development we consider desirable in economic and monetary terms.

Neither can we forego joint discussions on the policy of internal and external interest rates. This is a key issue, all the more so as it is directly connected with the coordination of policies with regard to third currencies, notably the dollar.

This problem comprises various elements, as some of you have pointed out. The first is that of market trends: this means purely and simply the determined

Ortoli

coordination of intervention policies. This involves many technical points, which are nevertheless vital and which are handled by the central banks. We obviously need to ensure that these policies are closely coordinated in order to combat fluctuations in one currency or another.

The second element is deliberating together to formulate joint monetary policies using the mechanism of interest rates. We must go beyond the intervention policies and exchange policies practised by the Member States to tackle internal monetary policies and their mutual compatibility. This is a very delicate matter as it strikes at the very heart of the Member States' policies. Frequently, there are clashes of interest and there may even be conflict between two separate aims, such as the fight against inflation on the one hand and participation in the international system on the other, but I think the trend is irreversible. Finally, there is a further aspect which is basically development of the international monetary system via the international monetary instruments themselves. I am referring to the joint position we must adopt on substitution accounts and Europe's active participation in solving the recycling problem. There is no doubt in my mind that we are going to be faced with this problem for a long time, that it is by no means an imaginary problem, and that it is one which a certain number of countries — the poorest ones — will find particularly intractable. It is therefore up to us to help find solutions. Although this falls outside the scope of our own European Monetary System as such, it is in our interest to cooperate in tackling this problem.

I am therefore wholly convinced of the crucial importance of this for us in the present phase, before we can talk about the development of the European Monetary System, since we must 'converge' and progress together towards a single currency, by means of the coordination, harmonization and compatibility of national monetary policies.

But I would add that this process must be accompanied by another, which involves the need to boost the efforts of each individual Member State, through our interdependency and a certain number of common measures, in order to achieve not only economic and monetary stability but also a little more growth.

It has always been my belief that the concerted action we decided on in Bremen was particularly significant for our aims in the monetary sphere. All these developments are now taking place. Coordination is beginning to become a habit and I think a very real effort is now being made — partly as a result of the existence of the European Monetary System — to bring policies closer together, even though such efforts may not be too apparent to outsiders; coordination of monetary policy, for example, is pursued mainly by the Committee of Governors of the Central Banks. The serious approach taken to these problems gives me great hope

of achieving real convergence in the results of economic policies.

This brings us, as the Ruffolo report explained to the second phase on which there seems to me to be fairly wide differences of approach.

I should like to remind Mr Ruffolo that it is no easy thing — and that is putting it mildly — to set up a system which at the same time is ambitious and purports to be a final solution in a world where the economic facts are such as they are and where a great deal of brain-power is being concentrated on how to deal with the problems, and that there are objective reasons for us to ask questions about such a far-reaching second phase.

Considering that the system must be ambitious and yet long-lasting, and that all the Member States should be able to participate in it (and I was very interested to hear what Mr Hopper had to say on the specific problems of the United Kingdom and on the action taken by that country) this seems to me of such paramount importance that we must take great care to choose the next phase, so that it will be meaningful, valid for all countries and able to stand the test of time.

Secondly, this process must not only aid the development of the Community but must also serve to consolidate, or rather to repair, the international monetary system. The title of the report is in fact very revealing here as it shows that, at this level, a monetary zone designed around a certain European system cannot easily be separated from developments in the international monetary system as a whole. You do not need to be a genius to realize that if you live in a world in which a decisive portion of international trade is carried on via a single international monetary and financial market, then it is impossible to separate these problems. We thus find we are subject to an additional requirement: We must contribute to or perhaps even initiate developments in the international monetary order which will reduce or, let us hope, banish some of the problems which we are experiencing today.

We have reached the stage of deliberations but have not yet progressed to the stage of proposals and guidelines. Serious studies are nevertheless under way and certain broad options are emerging, such as those which some of us have mentioned and those which are clearly set out in Mr Ruffolo's report: The whole question, for example, of the consolidation of the credit system, which raises the institutional problem of the European Monetary Fund, the problem of the expression of Europe's monetary individuality by means of a new institution, whatever form we may choose to give it.

In this context there are two other fundamental questions we must ask ourselves. The first is concerned with the operation of the Fund, not just to consolidate credit facilities, but, if need be, to create new liquidity.

Ortoli

This is a complex question, the main aspects of which — the question of desirability, the mechanisms, guarantees, regulatory procedures — lead us directly onto a whole series of major monetary problems, and this also effects the structural question of how the Fund would be managed.

The second question refers to the development of the ECU. I hope that we shall have occasion to talk about this again in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. At the moment, the ECU is an instrument which operates within the closed system of the Community and, in monetary terms, within the closed system of the central banks. Should we introduce it in the financial markets?

What is more, should we proceed to a situation where the ECU will in its turn become a reserve asset? In considering this issue, we must think about how such a system would operate, and about the time factors and operational conditions involved. Good will alone is not sufficient. All this must have some meaning and must not simply be a symbolic gesture or an additional source of complications.

Having said this, it is my belief that the present stage of enquiry and reflection must both be prolonged indefinitely. When the time comes, we are going to have to be able to give answers to the various questions quickly we are at present trying to define.

In this respect, Parliament's contribution, both through this debate and through the documents it has drawn up, strikes me as being very important. This contribution shows that this is not just an affair for specialists or technical experts, but is a major issue for Europe — and not only for the sake of European integration, but also for the establishment of a better monetary organization on a world scale.

(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 6 p.m. today.

9. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received a motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-113/80), tabled by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the situation created by the taking of hostages in Iran.

The reasons supporting the request for urgent debate are contained in the document itself.

In accordance with the decision taken by Parliament yesterday, the debate on this motion and the other motions on the same subject will be held at 3 p.m. today.

10. Membership of committees

President. — I have received from the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) a request to appoint Mr Del Duca as member of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport to replace Mr Piccoli.

Since there are no objections, Mr Del Duca's appointment is ratified.

11. Agenda

President. — At its meeting this morning the enlarged Bureau decided to propose that Parliament consider separately the oral question (Doc. 1-30/80/rev.) on the surveillance and protection of shipping routes and the oral question (Doc. 1-59/80/rev.) on a code of conduct for oil tankers, which were initially scheduled to be taken in joint debate today.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

I call Mr de Courcy Ling.

Mr de Courcy Ling. — Mr President, may I just raise a query on the agenda as you have just explained it? Would you please confirm that you understand that the withdrawal, announced by Mr Scott-Hopkins this morning at the beginning of the debates, of the resolution to close the debate on the oral question by Mr d'Ormesson, Doc. 108/80, was conditional on the tabling of a joint motion to close the debate by the European People's Party and the European Democratic Party. Will you also confirm, Mr President, that you have the joint resolution to close that debate.

President. — I myself attended the meeting of the enlarged Bureau this morning, and instead of the motion being withdrawn, it was agreed that Items 43 and 44 would be dealt with separately, and not together as stated in the original agenda. The change in the agenda is thus that the two items will be taken separately.

12. Speaking time for the debate on Iran

President. — At its meeting this morning the enlarged Bureau also proposed that speaking time for

President

the debate on Iran this afternoon between 3 and 5 p.m. be allocated as follows:

Council and Commission	15 minutes in all
Socialist Group	15 minutes
Group of the European People's Party (CD Group)	15 minutes
European Democratic Group	15 minutes
Communist and Allies Group	10 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

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

13. *New lines of action by the Community in the field of energy saving*

President. — The next item is the debate on the report (Doc. 1-816/79), drawn up by Mr Linde on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research, on the

communication from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 217/79) on new lines of action by the European Community in the field of energy saving.

I call Mr Linde.

Mr Linde, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, if the energy supply situation were not so serious, it would be a pleasure to present a report on energy saving. After all, I am sure we all realize that only a third of total energy input actually serves its stated purpose, while the other two-thirds literally disappear into thin air. We all realize by now that our reserves of raw materials, which we have always used so wastefully, are finite, and we know from bitter experience how vulnerable we are and how open we are to blackmail.

Energy saving — which I take to mean the elimination of waste and unnecessary consumption and the rational use of the available energy — is a common objective. I shall therefore waste no further time on extolling the virtues of energy saving; instead, I shall concentrate on those aspects which first raised our hopes and then led to disappointment. Our hopes were raised by the way in which the Commission analysed the problem. Its constantly updated data on the Community's energy situation, our dependence on outside sources of energy and the extent of waste are an outstanding piece of work. Mr Brunner, in particular, has never missed an opportunity recently of pointing out in unmistakable terms, here in plenary session, in committee and in public, how serious the energy situation is and how important it therefore is for us to save

energy. I am sure that he will also take the opportunity offered by this debate to spell out for us the implications of the latest figures which he made public last week and which have since been published in the Statistical Telegram.

But the Commission has done more than that. It commissioned a report from a group of independent experts on an energy conscious society. This document — which has become known as the Saint Geours Report — has drawn our attention even more clearly, if that were at all possible, to the gravity of the situation and laid down clear guidelines for the future, urging us to take more rapid and more specific action. The disappointing aspect of all this is how little has so far actually been achieved. Let us not try to hide behind such excuses as the severity of the 78/79 winter or the fact that stockpiling may have distorted the figures. We all know that we are still far from reducing our dependence on outside sources of energy to reasonable proportions. We cannot yet look back on a job well done; indeed, we still have it all to do.

What consequences has the Commission drawn from its brilliant analyses? Well, it has made statements underlining the need to save energy. In its proposal on energy policy objectives for 1990, it recommended a figure of 0.7 for the ratio between the growth in energy consumption and economic growth as a whole. That is something we have already talked about in this House. The Commission subsequently drew up new Community guidelines in the field of energy saving, together with a draft Council Decision. That is the subject matter of this report, and we now have to ask ourselves what it in fact boils down to.

Of necessity, the guidelines can only give a vague indication of what has been achieved so far and of the potential for energy saving and the available methods. In specific terms, the Commission proposes that the Council should undertake to draw up comparable energy saving programmes for all the Member States. The Commission itself intends to have discussions with car manufacturers to establish voluntary standards for reducing fuel consumption. Finally, the Commission intends to continue pressing for the formulation of international standards; these points are backed up by recommendations for the basic outline of an effective energy-saving programme. Now, views may differ as to the appropriateness of some of the Commission's points — and the debate will no doubt give us the opportunity to go into this or that aspect in rather more detail. Generally speaking, though, I can only describe this proposal as a disappointment. There is too wide a gap between the Commission's own realization of what is needed and the specific proposals it has made. Here it can truly be said that the mountain has laboured and brought forth the proverbial mouse.

This acute sense of initial disappointment led us in the committee to consider rejecting this proposal lock, stock and barrel. In the end, however, we decided to

Linde

approve it for the following reasons. We believe that every means — however modest — should be used, and the Commission has again given us a glimmer of hope by explaining that it regards the proposals put forward so far as a framework to be filled out in the near future with wide-ranging, specific proposals. We shall be reminding the Commission of its promise, and to give the Commission the necessary support we have taken the trouble to pass on at an early stage our own ideas and views in this important field. I would appeal to the Commission to give consideration to these views. In our opinion, they are the most concrete proposals the Community has at the moment.

The Commission must now fulfil its political role and provide Council with proposals as a basis for Community action. The example of one of our Member States shows that there is potential for action. Only six months ago, French Government sources were heard to say that even major investment in France would produce no further energy savings. The potential was, it was said, exhausted. Just recently, though, France has surprised us all by coming up with a comprehensive energy programme which contains quite striking statements on the subject of energy saving, such as the stipulation that cars coming onto the market from 1990 should have an average fuel consumption of only 6 litres per 100 kilometres. This development gives me new cause to hope, but at the same time new cause for concern. It is vital that we find a European framework for action: not because I think the Community is such a good thing in itself, but because convergence of national economies is indispensable, and because any distortions to competition resulting from different energy saving campaigns must be avoided right from the outset.

Finally, a few words to the Council. After months of assurances that this Commission proposal was particularly urgent, this subject recently disappeared from the Council's 'urgent' list. We trust that this does not indicate a retreat from the aim of joint energy savings. On the contrary, we expect the Council not only to adopt this proposal but to go one step further and encourage the Commission to draft specific plans for the Community.

This report and the ensuing debate should be seen as an expression of our insistence that specific steps must be taken. The future structure and standard of our society will depend upon energy production and distribution. By adopting energy saving programmes, we can perhaps avoid hardship and crises. Without energy saving, there is no chance of our retaining our independence and our free, civilized Community. Every possible step — however small — must be taken in the interests of energy saving. This House will not, however, be satisfied with just small steps.

President. — I call Mrs Groes to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Groes. — (DK) Mr President, I should like to thank the Commission on behalf of my Group for having taken up the problems of energy saving, and Mr Linde for the report he has drawn up on behalf of his committee.

Having said this, however, it should nevertheless be noted that the Commission hardly goes beyond good intentions — and in very limited fields — and that Mr Linde's original proposals were far better than the document before us today, which reflects the compromises made in committee.

Firstly, may I stress that what we want is to break the vicious circle involving bad planning, poor energy economics and a high level of dependence on third countries. Secondly, I would remind you that we must make considerable use of our technological know-how to reduce our energy consumption by 15-50 % depending on the sector concerned. Thirdly, I should like to point out that energy saving is a sector which has a considerable, but as yet unexploited, potential for creating jobs. I should also like to say that I am amazed that both the Commission and the majority of the members of the committee are hesitant about using this knowledge and translating it into specific proposals for action. Finally, I should like to express my disappointment at the Council's attitude as reflected in its budgetary practice, where even the most modest Commission proposals regarding innovations in the field of energy policy have been drastically cut.

The options open to us with a view to dealing with the energy problems lie in making use of all we know about how to increase indigenous energy production, and how to make better use of imported energy sources and in placing the planning of energy supply in the right context, i.e. as part of a social planning system which includes environmental, road, housing and town planning.

Mr Linde's original report contains a consistent and sensible outline of the principles which should govern Community work in this field. I urge the Council to make available the necessary economic resources. I should like to add, if I may be permitted, that, in my view, an obvious thing would be to offer, on the basis of the Saint Geours report, interested Member States economic aid to develop local projects aimed at making integrated use of existing technological knowledge in a specific geographical area.

It is often claimed by non-socialists that the free market mechanism is the only way of solving the energy problems, which is of course not correct. It is also claimed that free price development is in itself an adequate means of managing the situation. This is also incorrect. As we all know, if we leave things in the hands of the suppliers and the free market mechanisms, far too much energy is used, and the result is that costs in both the national and private sectors reach a level which is disastrous for the overall situation in the

Groes

Member States and places far too great a burden on the weak consumers. It is not satisfactory that the report refers, a little condescendingly, to the consumers merely as people to be informed and educated. The consumers should be involved in planning to a far greater extent than is currently the case and the fact that the Committee on Consumer Affairs of this Parliament was not consulted on such an important report as the one under discussion today, strikes me as curious, and at any rate fails to indicate any particular interest in the points of view of this committee. Thus, the original idea of working out a statement for the Council and a report for the Committee was, to put it briefly, far better than what was ultimately produced. If the Commission wishes to preserve credibility in the energy sector, I should like seriously to urge it on behalf of my Group to do something specific in connection with the ideas I have outlined which, there can be no doubt, have a sound grounding in reality. I should like to urge the Council to create the necessary economic framework for work of this kind. Unless the Council does increase appropriations for the energy sector within the Community, we will get nowhere, and even the most impressive speeches will only be hiding the hollowness of the views expressed.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Fuchs to speak on behalf of the European People's Party (CD Group).

Mr Fuchs. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the energy crisis is coming to a head and is threatening our very existence. Generally speaking, our people are not aware of the gravity of the situation, or if so, they are putting it to the back of their minds. Our governments are failing to act decisively and consistently and — above all — with the necessary solidarity.

This is unfortunately also true of energy saving. I am sure that the Commission's proposal represents a step in the right direction, and I also think that the form the report assumed as a result of the Committee's deliberations is aiming in the right direction, which is why it meets with the approval of the European People's Party. However, we must urge the Commission to submit more proposals of this nature as soon as possible, leaving the Council to take decisions likewise as soon as possible.

Some of the elements in the explanatory statement attached to the report are undoubtedly aimed in the required direction, but I would warn you most emphatically against seeking salvation in compulsory measures, state *dirigisme*, mushrooming bureaucracy and an allocation and supervision mentality as advocated just now by the spokesman for the Socialist Group and as the explanatory statement also unfortunately seems to advocate.

History shows that any attempt to achieve a fair spread of scarce commodities has succeeded only in making people poorer and — above all — less free and placing them at the mercy of the state. As regards energy policy in particular, any such attempt would result in sterility and immobility. It would prevent us from trying out any new ways, new ways which are so very vital. We must therefore press ahead with the research and development work, and above all we must invest in energy saving in such fields as transport, engines, household appliances, thermal insulation, utilization of waste heat and so on. The price factor is of course of decisive importance, and anyone who denies this is closing his eyes to reality. We therefore wholeheartedly support the Commission, and I believe that the amendment tabled by the Socialist Group would effectively reverse this situation entirely, and this — as far as we are concerned — is unacceptable. Of course, we must give special consideration to those people on low incomes. We must be on our guard against self-delusion. All this will require an enormous amount of money. Let me give you just one example. It would cost us in the Federal Republic of Germany 20 000 million EUA to renovate 10 % of our housing stock — in other words 2.5 million dwellings — from the point of view of energy saving. Assuming that we would thereby save 50 % of the energy consumed beforehand, the net result would be saving of 1 % of our total expenditure on energy, whereas the additional consumption of oil last year alone amounted to 2.7 % on the total. We must be realistic about this, and we must not expect too much even from savings in percentage terms. As far as electrical household appliances are concerned, the Commission cannot get off entirely scott free with the answer they gave to a question. We must also bear in mind the time factor as regards, for instance, the replacement of household appliances. In individual households we need ten years. That is a fact.

If energy saving is to be effective at all, our people must be convinced that their own lives and their own futures depend on solving the energy problem. That is why the Council, the Commission, the governments, the Members of Parliament and all social forces — especially the mass media — are duty-bound to conduct a veritable crusade to make people aware and to change their attitudes. Above all, we must hammer into people's heads a realization of four crisis situations: the running down of fossil fuels, the growing threat to the oil tanker shipping lanes, the doubling of the world's population in 30 to 40 years and the need to provide energy for these new thousands of millions of people.

If we ignore these facts, we shall never be able to solve the problem, and it is wrong to think that the solution lies solely in saving energy. We must have access to enormous quantities of additional energy and there is simply no alternative to the increased use of nuclear energy, coal, natural gas — in the longer term — and additional sources of reusable energy, although these

Fuchs

latter sources will only be able to provide a maximum of 5 % by the year 2000. If we ignore these realities, we will never solve the problem of energy supplies. However, there can be no doubt that a determined effort to cut back on energy consumption can make a decisive contribution, and we are prepared to do this.

(Applause)

President. — I call Lord Douro to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Lord Douro. — Mr President, on behalf of my group I would like to thank Mr Linde very much indeed for his report on energy saving. We welcome the report, and I would also very much like to associate myself with the remarks of Mr Fuchs.

Nearly all projections show that it will be extremely difficult for the Member States of the Community to obtain sufficient sources of energy over the next 20, 30 or 40 years if we are going to have any chance whatever to sustain anything like the rates of economic growth that we have had in the last few years. Certainly, Mr Fuchs is right: one cannot exaggerate, or one should not exaggerate the extent to which the gap in energy resources can be filled by making more efficient use of energy, but it is a very effective way of filling part of that gap and we should all be extremely conscious of it. Mr Fuchs talks about a programme to educate people to make them aware of how important this is. I fear that economics will come into it more than propaganda.

We are all far too dependent already on imported oil. To develop new sources of indigenous energy will take many years. To sink a new coal mine takes 5 to 10 years, and the same is true for nuclear power stations. To develop completely new sources of energy, solar energy and other sources of energy, would take many more years. The one good thing about investment in energy saving is that, although the cost is considerable, the effect is very quick. Unfortunately, when considering the return on investment in energy saving schemes individuals and corporations realize that the return is not very great. So we will almost certainly need fiscal and financial incentives. In the United Kingdom there is a small grant available to people to insulate their houses. But it is only £ 50; approximately 75 units of account. We should not be surprised that it is not taken up by many people. It really is too small to encourage people to improve the insulation in their houses. I very much hope that the governments of the Member States will consider increasing the fiscal advantages and incentives to introducing and to investing in ways of saving energy.

In this group, Mr President, we attach great importance to the recommendation in the report that this House should receive from the Commission at

6-monthly intervals progress reports on the measures adopted in each Member State to conserve energy. We think that that is very, very important.

We have very little time to discuss this extremely important subject, but in conclusion, we must all realize that energy saving is urgent and it is very important, and I commend this report to the House.

President. — I call Mr Ippolito to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Ippolito. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Italian members of the Communist and Allies Group are in favour of Mr Linde's report and motion for a resolution. However, we give our approval with some reservations which do not reflect on Mr Linde's praiseworthy efforts, but derive from our impression that the energy saving measures so far taken by the Commission have had only very limited success. The Commission's action to date seems all the more inadequate to us because it would be possible in the energy saving field to issue strict directives which the legal systems of the Member States could easily incorporate.

We do not think there should be too much *laissez-faire* in this matter, nor that the Community response should be confined to pious hopes, for we now regard energy saving as equivalent to a source of energy — so much so that in the energy policy document recently approved by our Party this principle is strongly stressed, and we estimate that by the year 2000 energy saving in Italy should amount to 25 % of the increase in total energy consumption.

In this connection, we do not believe that savings can be achieved merely by a prices policy. Mr Linkohr and Mr Veronesi have therefore submitted on this point a specific amendment to paragraph 12 b) of Mr Linde's motion for a resolution, and both my Group and I myself support this amendment. In our view, in order to achieve worthwhile results in the energy saving field it is necessary to take decisive steps in two sectors — agriculture and transport.

In the agricultural sector an enormous effort is required to reduce the consumption of non-renewable energy, and particularly of petroleum products, to what is strictly necessary. In technical terms, this means maximum encouragement for the use of solar energy, low-energy geothermic — i.e. hot springs, where possible — and biomass energy in the form of bio-gas.

In these sectors the Commission's activity must be more extensive, more incisive and more reliable, without hesitation or second thoughts. Display projects, especially those involving the production of bio-gas on a commercial scale, must be financed within the limits of the budget — which are unfortunately narrow — by

Ippolito

agreeing to the requests for aid which have been received and will continue to be received from Member States.

In this connection, I am pleased to say that last month the first large European plant for production of bio-gas by anaerobic digestion of the waste from about 10 000 pigs was opened near Todi in Umbria. This bio-gas is entirely used to produce electrical energy and heat, while the dried manure is used as fertilizer and the clarified waste water for growing aquatic plants which in turn provide proteins for animal feed-stuffs, irrigation and fish breeding. In this way the farm comes close to self-sufficiency in energy, while the cost of cleaning up environmental pollution is transformed into an economic benefit.

I am pleased to tell you that the firm which has set up the plant in Todi will, as soon as possible, invite Parliament and the Commission to send representatives to visit the plant.

Secondly, energy saving in the transport sector can bring about a significant fall in consumption by reducing the quantity of cheap and non-perishable goods transported by road encouraging rail transport, for which only a third of the energy is required per kilogram per kilometre as compared with that required for road transport, and encouraging transport by internal waterways and coastal vessels, for which the costs are less than a tenth of those for road transport.

Ladies and gentlemen, I do not wish to bore you with a technical and detailed analysis, but the examples I have given are enough, in my view, to show that it is necessary to use intelligence and imagination to work out an effective energy saving policy, with strict and firm directives, instead of confining ourselves to purely verbal statements of intent which are subsequently disregarded.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Calvez to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Calvez. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we all talk of saving energy but what we must do is actually save some, and this includes the building in which we hold our sittings, because energy saving is decisive for our whole present-day existence. We also need to change our habits and attitudes of mind, because using energy more rationally calls for a great deal of innovation and research, since whenever industrial activity picks up again this immediately has the effect of raising energy consumption.

However, it is worth mentioning one positive aspect of this problem, which is that this change necessitates new investment to replace old equipment with high

energy consumption by more efficient machinery. We are all convinced that more needs to be done by all of us and that any investment in research and innovation in the field of energy saving will show a greater return in the future and will probably — which is a point of some importance — create new jobs. The answer to the oil crisis involves creating new companies specializing in energy saving methods.

It is a good idea to fight waste, and in fact it is a necessity, but it is even more important to provide further training for staff, especially in energy-guzzling industries such as cement works, glassmaking or steel, by enabling them to take part in retraining or refresher courses organized with a view to a more efficient use of energy. This would make it easier to circulate information on the goals and the achievements of energy-saving programmes. And we should not forget those who install equipment, who should be aware of any new techniques.

Using the price mechanism as a means of stimulating energy-saving, is to adopt a solution which will increase inflation and hit hard at certain sectors of the population, in particular the low-income groups. The Liberal and Democratic Group is not convinced that the price mechanism is an effective way of achieving a more rational use of classical energy sources. Of course, prices must reflect true costs, but energy will in any case become more and more expensive and will have to be paid for at cost price. We should prefer a voluntary system aimed at making the private citizen, local authorities and companies responsible for taking action, because appealing to people's public spirit, education in schools and consumer information through press, radio and television are methods which have not lost their impact when it comes to bringing home to people the absolute need to save energy. We all know that the price structure and the tax system for energy vary from one Member State to another and that in order to cushion the inflationary effect of rises in the cost of oil, some governments have only passed on a very slight percentage of these price rises to consumers and have preferred to shoulder the burden, or a least part of it, via the national budget. A lot is said about new energy sources. I shall take solar energy as one example. It is a heaven-sent source of free energy which our engineers and technicians are striving to harness. The same is true of geothermal power, which comes from hot water. Should not we be doing our best to harness these energy sources, which are more or less wasted at the moment. We need to combine all these new forms of energy. We should encourage research in them, but not just by expressing our good intentions. On the contrary, if we are to achieve positive results, we must overcome the difficulties and face up to price rises.

We must think up new systems, and we must also think in terms of small and medium size companies, which with interest rates at close to 20 % are unable at present to borrow the capital necessary for the mini-

Calvez

mum of investment which should be made. Is not the present financial climate a disincentive for companies? I should like to know the Commission's opinion on this. The private consumer of energy would very much like to do something about this problem. He is aware that he should, but there are no regulations forcing him to save energy and the financial incentives, where they exist at all, are not very convincing. Let us not lose sight of the fact that a large number of energy consumers are reluctant to invest in saving energy because they have some difficulty when it comes to paying their bills. Tax incentives, and low interest loans would be welcome.

In conclusion, I should like to say that the Liberal and Democratic Group is convinced that appeals to save energy are in themselves not enough. We should like to see the implementation of a prices policy — and this would be an extremely effective incentive for carrying out energy saving measures — which would include in the price to the consumer a replacement element percentage aimed at covering the cost of future energy demand, and would at the same time exclude, except in the inevitable needy cases, any subsidizing of the retail price. Mr Linde referred, in his explanatory statement, to the Saint-Geours report. Could the Commission give the Members some information on the follow-up to this report? What is to become of these proposals? Should not our directly elected Parliament have something to say on this matter? Any reduction in energy consumption will lead to a reduction in our dependence on oil producing countries for our energy supplies and will provide new jobs in the field of research and development. Let us not miss this opportunity which is now within our grasp.

(Applause)

14. Agenda

President. — Mr Poncelet has proposed that his report (Doc. 1-730/79) on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research on a second research programme in the field of textiles and clothing, which was on the agenda for today's sitting, be deferred until the next part-session in May.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

I call Mr Beazley on a point of order.

Mr Beazley. — Mr President, may I be permitted to ask why Mr Poncelet has put forward this proposal, bearing in mind the urgent need for a decision to be taken? We in my group can no doubt accept this if the reasons are most important, but we are extremely concerned at the urgent need for a decision by the Council on this proposal.

President. — Mr Poncelet has given no explanation as to why he withdrew his report. However, since today's agenda is extremely full — among other things because, in addition to the existing items, we also have the major debate on Iran and the subsequent votes — I personally am grateful to Mr Poncelet for his withdrawal, just as I am grateful to you for not opposing the withdrawal. The discussion on this point is now closed.

The debate on energy saving will be continued after voting time this afternoon.

The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 1 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MRS DE MARCH

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

I call Mrs Macciocchi.

Mrs Macciocchi. — (I) Madam President, before we begin proceedings, on behalf of myself and other Members I should like to ask the House to pay tribute to Jean-Paul Sartre, the greatest French philosopher of the age, the modern Jean-Jacques Rousseau, a man who believed in the strength of reason and the contagious appeal of the idea of liberty.

Although Sartre always refused institutional tributes, I feel that a gesture of this sort would not be out of place. It would be a simple and solemn tribute to mark a loss which is felt not only by the world of culture but also by the young generations of Europe, to whom Sartre throughout his life imparted the lesson of liberty and human dignity.

There is no one among us who would dare claim that the history of our peoples could exist, or may even be known, without an understanding of the ideas that have shaped it or of the great thinkers who leave on their age the uniquely indelible stamp of civilization.

For the late Jean-Paul Sartre, I want simply to quote the words of Hobbes: It is on the shoulders of these giants that we, like dwarfs, must hoist ourselves to see far into the future of history and culture.

Macciocchi

I ask the Chair to permit a minute's silence in memory of Jean-Paul Sartre.

(Applause)

President. — Mrs Macciocchi, I am sure that I am speaking for everyone in the House when I say that I share your feelings and echo the tribute you have paid to Jean-Paul Sartre. I am sure that I am speaking for every Member here.

(Applause)

However, there is no precedent in this Parliament for what you propose. We shall continue with the proceedings.

15. *Verification of credentials*

President. — At its meeting this morning the Bureau verified the credentials of Mr Jalton and Mr Del Duca, whose nominations had been announced earlier. Pursuant to Rule 3 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau found that the appointments of Mr Jalton and Mr Del Duca conformed with the provisions of the treaties. The Bureau therefore proposes that Parliament ratify their mandates.

Since there are no objections, the mandates of Mr Jalton and Mr Del Duca are ratified.

16. *Situation in Iran*

President. — The next item on the agenda is the joint debate on three motions for resolutions:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-89/80/rev. II), tabled by Mr Fergusson on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Blumenfeld on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) and Mr Berkhouwer on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the plight of the Americans held captive in Tehran;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-98/80), tabled by Mr Prag and others, on the hostages held at the American embassy in Tehran;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-113/80), tabled by Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the situation created by the taking of hostages in Iran.

I call Mr Fergusson.

Mr Fergusson. — Madam President, on the face of it the crisis of the American hostages in Tehran is an old one, five months old, and though it would be cal-

lous not to measure it also in terms of the terrible, continuing and increasing stress on the innocent victims of Iranian policy, in the uncertainty and loneliness of their incarceration, we must ask what has happened in the middle of April that has made a new, united Community response more urgent than, say, in the middle of March or the middle of February.

The simple answer is to look first westwards at an America — not just the Administration, but the people — understandably nearing the end of its tether, beside itself with frustration and worry, after a long period of superhuman restraint in the face of conscious, calculated provocation, like a huge animal that feels it could stamp out a smaller one simply by lifting its foot if it wanted to.

But we must also look closely at what is happening in the Middle East and in South Asia, virtually all the way from the Mediterranean to Pakistan, to realize that the crisis of the hostages, like a grumbling appendix, has suddenly blown up into an acute threat to the remnants of what peace remains in this most sensitive area of the entire world. Let there be no doubt of what poses the real dangers there today. First, there is Russia's invasion of Afghanistan and her ruthless suppression of the Afghan people: there can be no peace and no rest for any of us until the Soviets have gone home and left the Afghans alone. As Russia's military build-up on Iran's northern and eastern borders continues, it is clearer than ever that rest will be a long time in coming. Secondly, there is the growing acrimonious tension — tension is too moderate a word, I fear — between Iran and Iraq. A fine opportunity, if ever there was one, for the forces of darkness again to start stirring the pot!

But I need not take you all the way along the long trail from Tripoli to Islamabad, trouble boiling or brewing at every halt, to argue that the now all-engrossing human and diplomatic problem of the American hostages is crucially preventing effective or timely action to neutralize these greater dangers. It is this problem that vitiates the ability of ourselves and the outside world to understand or even consider the trials the Iranian people themselves are undergoing, not to speak of the struggles and strains among those who affect to give them leadership. The hostages are the obstacle, almost the only real obstacle, to the resumption of the West's proper relations with Iran. If metaphors were useful, I would say that while the hostages are there, no fire-extinguisher could be used, no fire brigade called out to quench the blaze around them. With military forces now building up east, west and north, the hostages may indeed be the spark that sets fire to the powder-keg.

Now I mentioned the diplomatic problem. Human rights apart, the principle at stake today, as last November, remains the sanctity of diplomatic convention, without which civilized life between nations is impos-

Fergusson

sible. That is why we must stand, and be seen to stand, by the United States now, . . .

(Applause)

. . . whose diplomats and citizens illegally held captive are at risk. This is the nation which finds itself in the unenviable role, the leading role, in demanding restoration of the rule of international law, and that role is almost impossible to play convincingly opposite an Iranian Government — if that is a fit description — which denies its responsibilities, whose main authority at times seems almost to rest on its professed powerlessness, and which has now said in effect to America and to us all: Go away, we do not open again until the summer, if then!

It is right, then, that sympathy for the American hostages and their families be written into our resolution. But let us recognize openly what the Iranian authorities seem unable to see: that this is no simple two-sided quarrel between them and the United States; it is a vendetta against us all; the civilized world is being held hostage — the West, the East, Islam, anyone in short who desires or requires that diplomacy be maintained as an alternative to war and to the use of force in settling disputes or gaining ends.

(Applause)

It is right that the resolution we pass should insist that the states of the Community act in concert, that we should all do together whatever we have to do. The motion tabled in the name of the three groups nearest me here is not the only one in recognizing that. There is the consideration that only by acting as one shall our full potential be realized as a moral force in support of America or in persuading the Iranian Government into reasonable behaviour. If we split, our net weight will surely be less than our gross weight. More than that though: if more economic measures do now prove necessary to achieve the international justice we seek, we must face the fact that they may result, temporarily at least, in the contraction of some Community energy supplies — not to say of some external trade. Earlier this decade we saw the uncomfortable consequences of our failure to promulgate to the world that a threat to one of us — economic and not just military — was a threat, and would be regarded as a threat, to us all. We cannot call for uniform policies *vis-à-vis* the outside world unless we jointly bear their consequences. Therefore let us be sure that, if the Community stands for anything, it stands for mutual support when anyone of us is under pressure or attack, external as well as internal. Moreover, what goes for ourselves must go for our friends, most of all when they appeal for our help and our backing. What twisted sort of mind can only look for the basest motives when that request comes? The reference we heard yesterday, Madam President, to 'candidate Carter' was not worthy of this House. Besides, whatever practical measures the US Government may

require of us, it is the American nation that needs our moral support and expressions of our friendship and understanding.

(Applause)

This is no meaningless gesture. The point has been well taken across the Atlantic: the consultations on diffusing and resolving the crisis in the area of the Persian Gulf must henceforth be continuous in time and two-way. We share the frustration which is driving us all to consider whether the use of force, let alone economic sanctions, can be avoided. And may I say to Mr Glinne, who yesterday seemed to fear that the resolution to which I am speaking called for military action, that that is precisely what it is aimed to avoid. The fourth preamble is crucial to the argument, for it recognizes the danger that violation of treaties can lead to the use of force, even in the pursuit of just objectives. There has been speculation, for example, about the eventual blockading of the Iranian ports; but does anyone suppose that we or America would be blind to the peril — and let us hope that those who would lead an independent Iran are not blind to it! — the peril of shutting up Iran behind locked doors in the company of Afghanistan and the Soviet Army? What this House can therefore do to help is to prevent events from surging forward on a tide of emotion alone. We can help to maintain rationality in which firm, measured steps can be taken, precisely by proclaiming to the world and to the American people that their humiliation is shared by us, that their anger and their mortification are ours, as is their determination finally to see an end to it all. I cannot suppose that the people of the United States are ignorant now of the support gathering for their cause among their friends here.

Now to our motion for a resolution. We are asking for the approval of the whole Parliament, including the approval of those who have tabled resolutions of their own, hardly any of which in spirit or intent is far distant from this one. No doubt there are Members who consider it less strong than it might be. To them I say: No, this resolution repeats our appeals of November and March, requires a date for action, rules out no subsequent steps to achieve its ends and pledges our support. And it is perhaps for the Americans, not us, to judge what is the best way of achieving the specifically humanitarian objective of getting their citizens out quickly and alive. And do some Members, perhaps, think it is too strong? Again I would say no. It is hardly stating anything new to say that the rupture of diplomatic relations, which the Iranian authorities themselves hold in such scant regard, is in our minds. But I must point out that the resolution speaks of these relations being suspended not *until* the hostages are released but *unless* they are released. Sanctions are not inevitable: the door is still open, the choice is there for those who are deliberately and provocatively flouting international convention and bent on extortion to change their minds. Would we give them too the

Fergusson

choice of continuing with impunity in their present odious, blind, vengeful course? We have tried appeals: we should be wasting our time.

Madam President, this resolution is neither too modest nor immoderate. I hope it will find favour with a great part of this House in something close to its present form, and I hope that thereafter, in the interests of peace and of humanity, it will go on to do what it is designed to do.

(Applause from the right)

President. — I call Mr Davignon to make a statement on behalf of the Commission.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — *(F)* The Commission wishes to make clear how it intends to bear its responsibilities as defined by the Treaty, both at political and institutional level, by taking part in this important debate which Parliament is today devoting to a problem which is absolutely fundamental in terms of both the specified case and of the principles involved and with respect to the justification for united European action.

Thus it is that it is with some seriousness that I undertake to express our opinion. Yesterday, the President of the Council referred to the measures of action decided upon by the Nine at their meeting in Lisbon. On this subject, I should like to state that the Commission agrees wholeheartedly with the decisions taken on 10 April last in Lisbon, decisions which cover three basic points. Firstly, the statement stressed that the attitude of the Iranian authorities is unacceptable and contrary to the principles upheld by the nine countries of the European Community principles which form the basis of international relations, I refer of course to the maintenance of the rule of law, and thus of peaceful relations between States. The second point was the demand that the staff of the United States Embassy in Iran must be freed immediately. Thirdly, and this is an important point, the Nine expressed their solidarity with the United States and the American people.

This point is especially important because all our countries have experienced in the past, and particularly in recent times, fearful situations in which innocent people have been threatened because violence had the upper hand and justice was forgotten. So the European authorities — be they individual governments, the Commission or the elected representatives of the European people — can fully appreciate the dignity and patience with which the American people has faced up to this denial of the rule of law, and it is our duty to see that no new element of confusion would intervene to complicate the situation. Certainly no-one wishes to deny the aspirations of the Iranian people, who today want to lay the basis for a society in keeping with their historical and religious traditions.

But, yesterday Mr Colombo said something of great importance which the Commission supports: 'One cannot expect justice unless one lives by it.' And the Commission, when seeking its guiding principles for action — and its guiding principles are based on an understanding of what is the Commission's responsibility in this matter, i.e. the need to discover what is in Europe's interest as a whole — found, in the Declaration that the nine governments and the Commission adopted in 1973 in Copenhagen on the European identity, those principles which should guide our actions. If Parliament permits, I should like to recall them.

Here are some extracts from the agreement made between us in Copenhagen which are relevant to the situation which exists today. I quote: 'The nine European states might have been pushed towards disunity by their history and by selfishly defending misjudged interests. But they have overcome their past enmities and have decided that unity is a basic European necessity to ensure the survival of the civilization which they have in common. The Nine wish to ensure that the cherished values of their legal, political and moral order are respected.'

Ladies and gentlemen, it is the task of the European States to bear in mind the type of activity they have at a time when they must clearly define their political options. The Declaration goes on to say: 'The Nine believe that this enterprise corresponds to the deepest aspirations of their peoples who should participate in its realization, particularly through their elected representatives.' This is the reason behind today's debate.

The Declaration then raises two practical points:

Present international problems are difficult for any of the Nine to solve alone. International developments and the growing concentration of power and responsibility in the hands of a very small number of great powers mean that Europe must unite and speak increasingly with a single voice if it wants to make itself heard and play its proper role in the world.

The Declaration then refers to relations with the United States in these terms:

The close tie between the United States and Europe of the Nine — who share values and aspirations based on a common heritage — are mutually beneficial and must be preserved.

The Declaration concludes with these words:

These ties do not conflict with the determination of the Nine to establish themselves as a distinct and original entity.

I think that what I have just said is important. This is the spirit which guides the Commission in its analysis of what Europe's role is — a role which must reflect its responsibilities, the whole range of relationships it has formed with others and the value of its objectives.

Davignon

This means that, firstly, a common and united plan of action should be maintained because this is the only way in which the Nine's ability to exert influence can be increased. The Commission will do everything within its power to encourage this unity of action within Parliament, in meetings in the context of political cooperation and in the Council. Secondly, I feel that our action can only be effective if we act with caution, and by this I do not mean timorously, because peoples' lives are in danger. This is why we are at a crucial moment. The Nine have defined a plan of action, the nine ambassadors have been called in for talks and we must decide, as a result of this and of reports which will be made this week and next, on what steps we must take in order to put our plans into operation. I should like to say, in this respect, and in the clearest way possible, that the Commission has a certain responsibility for implementing the political action decided on. I do not believe that the time has yet come for us to draw up the complete list of all we could do in order to ensure that our objective, that is, respect for the law, is achieved, and not just talked about. On this subject, I should like to state that Article 224 of the Treaty of Rome provides for united Community steps in the event of threats of war and that this Article is absolutely fundamental.

I should like, Madam President, to make three last points. The first, is that today the Commission formally promises this Parliament that it will accept its political responsibilities in the coming days and weeks in order to put into effect a policy aimed at achieving the aims we have agreed upon. The second point is that the Commission joins with the Council and Parliament in demanding that international law be observed and that the hostages be freed. My last point is that Parliament today has a special responsibility to ensure that Europe's strategy succeeds, a strategy which is based on Europe's determination to defend the type of society it wishes to have and which means implementing a foreign policy which is neither half-hearted nor selfish so that the rule of law may not merely be affirmed in principle, but in fact. If this is to be done, the representatives of the European people must associate themselves with this resolve.

It is unusual for the Commission to appeal to Parliament, but I should like to do so today in order to make clear how important it is that both outside Europe — in Iran or in the United States — and within Europe, people should realize that whatever the differences in outlook or interpretation which may exist in this Parliament, a vast majority of its Members have restated their resolve to see that the fundamental laws of society are observed, and that this resolve is not wishful thinking, but a living reality.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I think the Socialist Group may take some credit for the fact that this Parliament is now considering the distressing problem of the Tehran hostages.

Our Group was in fact the first, on 13 November 1979, to submit a motion for a resolution, tabled by Mr Schwartzberg, myself and my colleagues Mr Friedrich, Mr Pisani, Mrs Roudy and Mr Lezzi. It was our Group which as early as 13 November 1979 requested that this House examine the problem of the hostages held in the United States Embassy in Tehran. We were pleased to note that two days later four other political groups pledged their support for our motion. We were pleased to note at that time, on 16 November, that our text was approved by Parliament with only a few minor alterations. I wish to remind the President of this because in this affair we really do not need to take lessons in humanity or democracy from anyone, and I shall return to this point later.

Madam President, since in addition to the text approved on 16 November Parliament adopted another text on this question on 14 March, we are not convinced that Parliament will gain in stature or efficiency by organizing virtually every month a plenary debate on this distressing problem, when it has already succinctly and eloquently expressed its position on this affair.

Parliament's problem was and still is to express its downright disapproval for this taking of hostages. The important thing for Parliament is not that its political groups should set up in competition to find the correct ways and means to be applied in order that right should triumph over might. The various executives are more and better qualified than us to do this, both at national and Community level, and in the context of political cooperation between the Nine.

Parliament's role in an affair of this nature is not to make the task of the European governments and executive authorities more difficult by putting forward proposals which the future will show to have been too strongly worded.

Madam President, my Group would have been happy to participate in the seeking and finding of common ground between the political groups of this House. But we cannot follow those who deliberately seek to overstate their attitude in order to raise the stakes between the various groups. Given the situation which prevails this week and this month, our group wishes only to express clearly and concisely its belief in the use of peaceful means alone.

We know that some groups in their motions for a resolution explicitly refer to the interrupting or breaking off of diplomatic relations. Were they not so inflexible on this point, we might well have been able to table a motion together with them. But we do not

Glinne

think that interrupting diplomatic relations is the best method.

On many occasions in this House, we have discussed the relations which exist between our respective countries and between the Community and especially foul dictatorships in various parts of the world. There has never been any question of breaking off diplomatic relations! We have suggested reducing their status — for example by putting *chargés d'affaires* in the place of ambassadors, but we have always insisted that the diplomatic channels should remain open and that these means should remain available.

This approach will no doubt become valid for Iran also in a few weeks' time and will enable us to protect Community nationals by granting them at least some diplomatic cover.

Madam President, it is with pleasure that I today recall the words of the motion for a resolution put by Mr Schwartzberg and others in December at the instigation of the Socialist Group:

Any taking of hostages is utterly inadmissible. Respect for the inviolability of diplomatic missions constitutes one of the most imperative obligations under the law of nations.

The American hostages in Tehran must first be handed over to the regular Iranian authorities so that they may be freed immediately. Our attention in these circumstances is focused on the peoples concerned, in particular the American people. The wording of the motion tabled praises the latter for the restraint and patience it has shown over almost 70 days, qualities which were displayed both by the government and by the people of the United States. Our thoughts go out today to our friends, the people of the United States.

But there is also an Iranian people and we have never been in the habit of confounding any people with the outrages committed in its name by its government or its authorities. The Iranian people has rights! And, Madam President, we are almost the only group in this House to have tabled a motion recalling that at our instigation this Parliament debated the question of the flagrant violations of the rights of man perpetrated by the government of the Shah of Iran. For some people, one would think this had never happened. But this problem still underlies and surrounds today's affair of the American hostages!

The Iranian people has good reason to show its frustration and impatience. The government of the United States took it upon itself to conclude an agreement with the Shah's regime for the supply of military equipment to the tune of 20 thousand million dollars. Training and servicing and maintenance networks were operating in Iran under the imperial government for the furthering of the army and the regime's repressive apparatus, and even if it is not justified in tolerating the outrages perpetrated today, it is understandable

that it should rise up against its oppressors and also against those who aided and abetted them from outside.

Madam President, the text of our motion also contains a warning against the dangers of fanaticism. We believe that it would be unacceptable for the Iranian authorities to indulge in any form of blackmail involving the cutting off of oil supplies to the European Community and its member countries. In this affair, we wish to appeal — and to the Iranian people itself rather than to the government — to the good sense of all parties so that a solution may be found using only peaceful means.

And what do we expect from our Community? After the moderate and exemplary speech made yesterday in this House by the President-in-Office of the Council, we expect the Council to inform the Political Affairs Committee of this Parliament of the outcome and follow-up to the mission which the ambassadors of the Nine undertook in Tehran. We also ask that our governments and the Community decide on gradual political measures, aimed at stressing the resolve of the member countries to see the hostages freed. We should like the Community to adopt as far as possible a common stance on this question and to bring to bear all the resources of its own diplomacy.

Lastly, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, we wish this appeal to be made before it is too late, before the upsurge of hatred forms an insurmountable obstacle. We must now launch an extremely solemn appeal to all those who have already spoken on this problem in this House to recognise the close interdependence of all the peoples involved in this terrible affair.

(Applaus from the left)

President. — I call Mr Blumenfeld to speak on behalf of the European People's Party (CD Group).

Mr Blumenfeld. — *(D)* Madam President, the Group of the European People's Party would like, at the beginning of this important debate, to thank the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Colombo, once again for his exemplary speech yesterday.

(Applause)

As Mr Colombo reminded us, he is determined that the Nine should, in the Ministers' consultations over the coming week and in preparation for the European Summit at the end of this month, join together to find a solution using the instruments of international law. So the point has been made very clearly that the European Community and also the European Parliament — as Mr Fergusson pointed out earlier — are not thinking of having recourse to military intervention, but that we intend to use the available means of inter-

Blumenfeld

national law, politics and the courage of our Governments, our politicians and our peoples to bring about a solution . . .

(Applause)

. . . The European Parliament must, and can, say more in a free, public debate than can the President-in-Office of the Council at this present time, given the considerations and consultations awaiting him. This we intend to do by way of the motion for a resolution tabled by three political groups and elucidated just now by Mr Fergusson. At this point, I should like to thank Mr Davignon most sincerely on behalf of my Group for the speech he gave at this historic moment on behalf of the Commission and which was characterized by courage, clarity and a sense of responsibility . . .

(Applause)

. . . I too, Mr Glinne, should like to express my Group's regret — and I am sure I am speaking also on behalf of the other groups which joined in tabling this motion for a resolution — at the fact that no agreement was reached because of a single political point which you, Mr Glinne, referred to. The responsibility is all yours. You kept us waiting for three days. We were ready and waiting to cooperate . . .

(Applause)

. . . and it was not until last night that you gave the first indication of your willingness to join with us in tabling a joint motion for a resolution. Those are the facts, Mr Glinne, those and no others. It is entirely the fault of you and your Group if you cannot manage to agree on a common stance; no blame . . .

(Applause)

. . . attaches to the rest of this House. I have the greatest respect for those members of the Socialist Group who are prepared to stick up for their views to the last. But we also expect the same treatment from you, and if we are prepared to go to the limit to ensure a large majority in this House, I would ask you, Mr Glinne, to give us the respect we deserve. I believe that once all the political, diplomatic and other possibilities have been exhausted, the Governments of the Nine — and I hope, all European Governments — will consider and — if necessary — decide to break off diplomatic relations with the authorities in Iran. This is a very balanced — indeed, a very restrained — political view, which I at least shall not — and indeed, cannot — deviate from on behalf of my Group.

The time has come when we, the nine Member States, must take over the leadership of the whole of Europe, and we are faced with decisions which will have enormous repercussions. Will we — I should like to ask the European partners and allies of the United States of

America — make common cause with the Americans and take joint action against the world's troublemakers in Iran and in the Middle East as a whole, or are we going to leave the West's leading power to its own devices? By adopting the second course, we Europeans would effectively — and I want to make this point calmly, but with the emphasis it deserves — be abdicating politically as a result of a lack of political will and the necessary courage to defend ourselves energetically against blackmail. Let me add too that we are not prepared to do our 'partners in detente' of the 70s, the Soviet Union, a favour by issuing a statement which is not 100 % watertight.

If the governments of Europe do not now stand and act together, taking a coolheaded look at all the facts, we shall not only lose the confidence of the American people once and for all, we shall also gain the contempt of all those who have thought for a long time that we could and should be the victims of blackmail. That, though, is not our function in life.

(Applause)

I should like to remind you of what I said here in this House at the beginning of this year when we were debating the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. I pointed out that the Soviet Union is very much more dependent on Europe's and America's financial resources, technological capabilities, industrial capacity, consumption capacity and efficiency than we are on the raw materials and the limited range of export products which the Soviet Union has to offer us.

As regards Iran and the oil states on the Persian Gulf — and let us not forget that there is a very great difference between the two — I would say that if we in Europe and the West cannot pay for Iranian or Arab oil with hard currency and thus contribute towards the establishment or consolidation and reform of the economic and social systems in that part of the world, who on earth can?

Finally, Madam President, I should just like to say that we should not be apprehensive about what the future holds in store. Our people, our working people, the trade unions, entrepreneurs and housewives are very much more robust in their political determination and are prepared to put up — in view of the dangers they see ahead — with much more than many governments and politicians think they can reasonably ask them to tolerate. Our motion for a resolution is therefore an appeal to the Nine to show that we can meet this challenge. We want to work with you to secure the peace and to give prominence once again to justice, morality and politics in international law and the relationships of people to people. That is the point of this motion for a resolution, which I hope will receive the support of a large majority of this House.

(Applause from the right)

President. — I call Mr Galluzzi to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Galluzzi. — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, we have not tabled any motion for a resolution for the end of this debate. We have not done so, because we think that the tense situation which has arisen requires not defiant attitudes or extreme positions, but rather — as Mr Colombo said yesterday on behalf of the Nine — a tenacious and patient mediation effort, and an equally patient search for a solution, making use of the constructive contributions of all.

We regarded, and still regard as unacceptable, the taking and holding of the American hostages by the Iranian students. We regard it as an act which is contrary to international law and violates basic human rights. We know that the Iranian people were subjected to unheard of oppression and suffering under the Shah's cruel dictatorship, and that the responsibility of the leaders of the United States of America is considerable for they supported the Shah's tyrannical and ferocious regime to the last. But no injustice, no offence and no suffering can justify reprisals and the use of force against men and women who cannot be held responsible for what occurred. For this reason, we have continued to associate ourselves with those who demand that the hostages be placed under the jurisdiction of the Iranian Government as a first step in a negotiation which could lead to their early release.

However, ladies and gentlemen, we must acknowledge that if this has not been done, it is not merely the fault of the Iranian leaders or because of the dominance of the most intransigent groups within their government, but also because the Americans failed to respond to President Bani Sadr's request for them to make amends by means of a declaration condemning the old Iranian regime and recognizing the new Iranian reality.

Ladies and gentlemen, we can appreciate that the United States of America having driven itself into this corner should ask its allies and particularly those in Europe, to help it to find a way out. What we cannot accept is not the request for help or solidarity, but the blunt alternative presented to us — 'either you accept our proposals unconditionally, or we Americans will have to take military measures'. We find this unacceptable primarily for a procedural reason, since acceptance would mean the end of any real political independence for Europe it would mean that our solidarity with the United States of America would no be a commitment or a joint contribution to the solving of shared problems, but an admission that we are subordinate to American policy choices. But we also find it unacceptable for a substantive reason, for we believe that economic sanctions and diplomatic reprisals are pointless and harmful, and military measures downright irresponsible. Economic sanctions and the break-

ing off of diplomatic relations are pointless because they force Iran to find other sources and outlets for its trade and to point its political compass in another direction. They are harmful because ultimately they give room for manoeuvre to the Iranian extremist groups, making the situation increasingly tense and a solution to the problem more difficult to achieve.

Moreover, ladies and gentlemen, as we all know Europe is not in the same position as America. Europe depends almost entirely on oil supplies from the Middle East, and a confrontation with Iran would — as Algeria was the first to warn us yesterday — bring about a confrontation with the whole Arab world and would ultimately lead to disaster for Europe.

Finally, military measures would be even more dangerous for Europe, in view of the fact that the American requests for a naval blockade of Iran and for extension of the geographical area of the Atlantic Alliance would ultimately lead to escalation and widening of the conflict, and a mere error of judgment could, as Chancellor Schmidt has said, lead to a new Sarajevo.

In these circumstances, the suggestion made in Paragraph 4 of the motion for a resolution tabled by the Socialist Group, which otherwise contains many interesting and constructive ideas — the suggestion that the Community should urgently introduce a plan to protect present and future energy supplies — becomes highly ambiguous, if one bears in mind, among other things, that the Christian Democratic Groups has tabled an oral question calling for the creation of a military structure operating under NATO auspices to link the American fleet with the fleets of the Member States of the EEC to meet what is described in extremist terms as a Soviet threat to the oil routes, and if one also bears in mind that the Soviet Union has proposed an agreement among all States to guarantee secure oil supplies for all, and that agreements are being drawn up between the Soviet Union and Western Europe for the supply of tens of thousands of millions of cubic metres of Soviet natural gas, which is an excellent alternative to scarce crude oil. The fact is that the Iranian crisis is only an aspect of a larger crisis, that of North-South relations — a crisis which is both economic and political and which can be tackled only by means of a policy of peace and international cooperation. Europe can and must make a contribution to formulating this policy. But it can do so only if it realizes that its strength alone is not enough, and if it is thus capable of involving in a policy of peaceful and patient mediation of these new North-South relations, the two superpowers in addition to the peoples concerned. The problems of Iran, Afghanistan, and the Middle East, and even the question of arms control and disarmament — which is Chancellor Schmidt's reason for going to Moscow — are different aspects of the same problem, the solution of which requires firmness and caution, but above all an independent policy and an independent initiative which takes account of the interdependence of the problems

Galluzzi

and of the impossibility of solving them in the absence or against the interests of any of the countries and peoples concerned.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is the true courage which we must display if we wish to be capable of tackling the problems confronting us.

President. — I call Mr Berkhouwer on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Berkhouwer. — (NL) Madam President, I should like to start by saying on behalf of my political colleagues that we agree totally with what has been said by Mr Fergusson, Mr Davignon and Mr Blumenfeld.

Mr Glinne has also spoken in this debate and, unlike him, I intend to uphold the principle that we should not indulge in attempts to outbid each other with political promises.

I should like to say as a European Liberal that peace, law — including international law — and political courage are not the monopoly of any individual political party. There is no socialist, liberal or christian-democratic peace, no socialist, liberal or christian-democratic law or political courage. Peace and law are indivisible and have no political colour.

In the case of Afghanistan and Iran, it is easy to sit back and speak fine words. However, as time goes on, it gets more and more difficult to devise and carry out practical measures jointly with our allies which might lead to the release of the American diplomats who are being held hostage in Tehran, or to the end of the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. Iran and Afghanistan cannot be considered separately. Both countries occupy an important position as regards tensions, in the field of world politics and as regards Soviet expansion.

Let us make it quite clear that it is not we who wish to return to the cold war, it is not the West, it is not Europe which has presented this threat to détente. We must not get things the wrong way round. It is not we, but Brezhnev and Khomeini who are presenting this threat to détente. As regards Iran, the longer we wait the more difficult it becomes to do what might well have been possible at the beginning, including even steps such as those taken in connection with the Mogadishu and Entebbe incidents, which would have been technically feasible.

There are in fact authorities on international law — perhaps Mr Schwartzberg will be pleased to hear this — who take the view that reprisals on the part of the United States against the Iranian Embassy in Washington would not be contrary to international law.

I should like to state explicitly in connection with what Mr Galuzzi has said that there is no question of our giving up European autonomy or letting our actions be determined by domestic electoral considerations in the United States. Do not electoral considerations, however, sometimes have a part to play here in Europe too? In spite of that, it is not American electoral considerations we are concerned with. Nevertheless, should we not, as Europeans, perhaps give some thought in this year of 1980 to the fact that so far, during this century, we have twice stood on the edge of the abyss and been saved by American intervention on our continent?

And if we in fact wish to maintain European autonomy and demonstrate it in the world, we must certainly realize that what is involved here is one of the most flagrant violations of charters, conventions and diplomatic practice. This is what is involved here, and this affects us all! Today it is the Americans, but tomorrow or the day after tomorrow it might be one of us, German, Dutch, French or English, anywhere in the world!

Helmut Schmidt — who appears to think along the same lines as Mr Glinne — has said that the situation at the moment is so serious that he finds April 1980 similar to the summer of 1914! I think this is exaggerating somewhat, and I will leave the responsibility for this statement with the German Chancellor. I tend rather to think in terms of what an American statesman said in '38 or '39 — I think it was Franklin Roosevelt — 'to hang together or to hang separately, that is the question'. This is undoubtedly the question at the moment and, we cannot therefore do otherwise than show solidarity with our American allies. We must also realize that we cannot let our defence and security in the West ultimately depend on the United States, while at the same time we all conduct our own private détente with the eastern bloc! This is impossible! On this point, I go along completely with the views of Mr Davignon and Mr Colombo. The European Liberals can therefore wholeheartedly support what was said by Mr Davignon regarding the 1973 Declaration of Copenhagen which all nine Member States signed. If we act independently in a way which is consistent with, but not dependent on, what the American Government does, we must at the same time realize that the American people are becoming extremely impatient and disturbed. Imagine if it happened to one of our countries! How would our people react then? We know that it is well nigh certain that economic sanctions will not work. In Rhodesia, for example, sanctions of this kind were so ineffective because the Russians bought the cobalt which we refused to buy from Rhodesia, for use in their armaments. We know that sanctions and so on are difficult, we also know that the breaking off of diplomatic relations also means breaking off the opportunities for talking and that either or both of these measures could drive Iran into the hands of the Soviet Union and result in Soviet troops marching into the Persian Gulf region, but

Berkhouwer

should this knowledge stop us from doing anything at all?

We, the representatives of the people of Europe, cannot specify the nature, time or place of measures to be taken. This is the task of the governments of the Member States, which must maintain the greatest possible solidarity, and we urge them, therefore, to do so. However, in the context of European political cooperation, the context mentioned by Mr Davignon, we are the parliamentary interlocutors of our governments.

This is the dialogue with which we are familiar, and it is with a view to this that the Christian-Democrats, the European Democratic Group and the Liberal and Democratic Group have prepared in a joint motion for a resolution a statement by the representatives of the people of Europe. No one, none of our 410 members, should be in any doubt as to the fact that the authors of our resolution have exercised the utmost restraint, as should be clear to any objective reader. The holding of hostages is condemned once more.

We should like to make an appeal for solidarity both between the nine Member States and with the United States, and we suggest consideration be given to breaking off diplomatic relations as a last resort. Finally, Europe's thirst for oil from the Middle East should not cause it to lose all self-respect or respect for the basic principles of law and decency! There are limits even to humiliation.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Ansquer to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Ansquer. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the European Community has not been inactive in the face of the critical situation facing the hostages held in Iran. The nine Member States, the Commission and this House have already taken steps to try to bring to an end the captivity of the members of the US Embassy. Between 15 November 1979 and 14 March 1980, the two dates on which resolutions were passed by this House, we had reason to believe that the hostages would be freed. Since 14 March, our hopes have rested on those in power in Iran taking note of the Nine's declaration in Lisbon, calling emphatically for the hostages to be freed.

Today's debate represents a fresh appeal to those in positions of responsibility in Iran and the Iranian people as a whole to bring this intolerable situation to an end with all due speed before it has serious repercussions on world peace.

This situation is intolerable not only because international treaties have been violated, but also because human rights has been ignored. The European Com-

munity — and this House in particular — therefore have a dual responsibility: to defend the basic principles of the international community and to uphold respect for human rights. In short, we are only doing our duty. Let us do it with determination.

That, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, is why my Group has tabled an amendment to the motion for a resolution submitted by Mr Fergusson, Mr Blumenfeld and Mr Berkhouwer. We approve the main points of this resolution, but we feel that Europe must take its own determined stance on this issue, steering a course between alignment and neutrality; however, we also feel that the governments of the Nine must join forces with the government of the United States to obtain the release of the hostages and re-establish normal and peaceful relations with Iran.

Our motives in tabling an amendment to the motion for a resolution submitted by Mr Fergusson, Mr Blumenfeld and Mr Berkhouwer was not simply to see our names in print. We have no desire to draw attention to ourselves, but we do think that this text can command the support of a majority in this House. Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, let us put aside certain party-political disputes and instead affirm our determination and our desire to see international law and human rights respected; let us unite to save world peace before any irreparable damage is done.

(Applause from the right)

President. — I call Mr Capanna to speak on behalf of the Group for Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members of Parliament.

Mr Capanna. — *(I)* Madam President, two forms of logic are ranged against each other in this Parliament on the difficult and dangerous situation in Iran. The first is that which lies behind the motion tabled by Mr Fergusson, Mr Blumenfeld and Mr Berkhouwer, and consists of breaking off diplomatic relations.

Modern history is all too familiar with this argument. When diplomatic relations are broken off the initial move is straightforward but the consequences are unpredictable. This logic, taken to extremes, has already given us two World Wars.

The second form of logic is the one which I proposed yesterday and which, with other Members, I have enshrined in a number of amendments. It seems to me that it has a good deal of support on the Left of this Parliament. The central point is this: Europe can and must be an active force for peace, not through words or force of arms, but by means of a practical initiative. The President of the Council of Ministers could offer his services as a mediator between the Iranian government and that of the United States. The moral, cultural, political and economic strength of Europe may

Capanna

enable him to succeed where the Secretary-General of the United Nations, for example, has failed. Of course it is wrong to take diplomats hostage, but Mr Ferguson, Mr Blumenfeld and Mr Berkhouwer cannot cover up, or pretend to be unaware of, the fact that the Shah of Iran tortured his own people for years while serving the interests of the United States.

In general, there is in this Parliament too continuing and considerable concern for the Middle East, but I would ask all the Members present what Parliament has done and what the governments of the Nine have done, to recognize the PLO which represents the Palestinian resistance. This is now regarded by all as the decisive factor in trying to find a peaceful solution to the difficult and dangerous problems of the Middle East.

I believe that only in this really incisive way can this Parliament and the governments of the Nine act in the interest of their own peoples, rather than in the very narrow interests of a President and presidential candidate known as Jimmy Carter.

President. — I call Mr Paisley.

Mr Paisley. — Madam President, perhaps the people of Northern Ireland are best able to understand the feelings and resentment of the American people at the situation arising from the violation of their embassy in Iran and the holding of their citizens as hostages. A few years ago the British embassy in Dublin was burned down without any intervention by the police of the Irish Republic, and I know personally the resentment which was felt at that time. Later the British Ambassador was murdered in Dublin and that also caused deep resentment. Of course, the Dublin government never apologised. The people of Northern Ireland can therefore well understand the resentment of the people of the United States of America today. In Iran the government evidently is not prepared to face up to the consequences of this violent breach of international law. By its actions it not only condones but justifies and confirms, this breach. This Assembly of the Community, the Member States of which owe so much to the United States of America, both for defence and commerce, should demonstrate in unity its support of its ally at this time. From this House there ought to go out a resolution which will declare to the whole world where we stand — right behind the rule of international law. The hostages must be released. If one diplomatic method has failed, then another must be tried.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pedini.

Mr Pedini. — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, only a few minutes are left to my Group, and I

shall use them to take up a few points in Mr Blumenfeld's speech, with which I agree. I should like to say that at such a crucial moment in international life a greater effort could have been made to find wider agreement amongst us which would lead to widespread support for a resolution. To the members of the Socialist Group, I would observe that the document, with which I agree, rightly mentions the consequences in diplomatic and other fields of the persistence of a situation of this kind. Indeed, there is no doubt that the Iranian attitude strikes not only at international law but also at the heart of diplomatic law. We therefore feel it incumbent upon us to stress our position, because it is necessary to warn the Iranian authorities and the new Iranian Parliament that the consequences of this situation could even lead us to break off diplomatic relations. However, I think that between this necessary warning and actual measures there is still scope for many initiatives, which we can take only if the Commission and Council of Ministers are supported by an agreed position of Parliament.

Mr President, I would like to point out that today — if you will allow me to say so Mr Galluzzi — we are not merely discussing a crisis which is understandable in terms of North-South relations, but a choice between the certainty of law and the risks entailed by abandoning international relations to mere violence and to the lowest instincts of nations (and we all need the rule of law, whether north of south of the Equator, whether old or new nations). And that is why in this case, as has been rightly pointed out, even the basic economic problems of supplies of raw materials of energy are of secondary importance in comparison with the essential conditions of national sovereignty, human rights and the rule of law. What emerges most strikingly from this crisis is the precarious and subjective nature of future international relations in these closing decades of the millennium, since, on the one hand, scientific and economic progress could enable us to create a peaceful society, whereas on the other, human barbarism could endanger the very survival of our civilization. North-South problems are important, but they can be solved only by respecting the sovereignty and rights of nations, and certainly not by reviving Munich-style appeasement.

Finally, Madam President, I would like to express a view on what I see as a risk underlying the action, however timely and intelligent of the Council of Ministers and the European Economic Community. Today, Mr Capanna, there is no question of taking 'mediation' initiatives, for to mediate would mean that we had not already decided which side was right and which side was wrong. Alas, there is no doubt that it is those who violate the law against the interests of the new Iran with whose anxieties we sympathize — who are in the wrong. So it is not a question of mediating, but of taking action to restore justice in accordance with a European approach which can be different from the American approach in some ways, and based on the special conditions and traditions of our civiliza-

Pedini

tion. It is a question of unequivocally stating not only to the American people but to the whole world that Europe, as Mr Davignon rightly said, is on the side of the rule of law, and that it is to defend the rule of law that it expresses its active solidarity with the American people.

This morning an authoritative article in *Le Monde* spoke of the present weak position of America and the free world. This may be true, but if so our weakness is that of those who have always upheld the rule of law when other peoples resort to violence. Mr Capanna, wars have never been caused by the breaking off of diplomatic relations, since that act and wars themselves both result from the violation of law. That is why, with all the necessary caution, we are on the side of those who are now suffering injustice. I would like to make only one recommendation — that in defending an international community based on law, and in the undisputed solidarity between us and the American people, we should never forget what the great President Kennedy said in 1961 of the Atlantic Alliance — that it was an alliance of peoples which consulted each other, pooling their ideas and responsibilities to create a new order. If I may make a recommendation to the Council of Ministers and the Commission, it would therefore be that solidarity with the American people be complemented by the necessary readiness to consult in order to compare different methods and meet a common need — to safeguard the rule of law as the only guarantee of peace for all nations and human beings.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

Mrs Macciocchi. — *(I)* When we took up a position on 13 November 1979 in the resolution mentioned by Mr Glinne on the problem of the hostages, we did so with great firmness, expressing, on behalf of our Group, an extremely strong and forthright attitude — that international law could not be trampled underfoot by the Iranians, and that if the United States had submitted to this blackmail they would have deprived international law of all meaning.

Moreover, we mentioned even then the North-South crisis, of which the Iranian question is an aspect, and we added that we looked to the European Parliament for initiatives. The problem with which we are now faced is precisely the lack of initiatives, and I agree with Mr Colombo's statement that we need a tenacious and patient mediation effort. This phrase will indeed be our constant refrain.

The main point to bear in mind is that we must avoid plunging once more into the sort of stupor from which we awake every time there is a rumour of an impending catastrophe, uncertain and afraid to link

our position with the interests of one or other super-power.

We must not give way to Iran — we are all agreed on that. How can we make Iran give way? That is the problem. The proposals which have been put forward here are not realistic. It was this that prompted Mr Capanna — and I agree with him — to talk of the need for mediation. This does not mean making a choice, Mr Pedini. To mediate, if I understand the term aright, means to try to find new common ground.

We are now witnessing exasperation in the Islamic world with American imperialism, combined in the last few weeks with disillusionment with the imperialism of the Soviet Union, which invaded Afghanistan in order to have easier access to sources of oil.

This, then, was a completely new situation which developed in the last few months, giving us scope for possible action. No action was taken, and I would like to remind you, in agreement with Mr Galluzzi, that Iran will have no problem in finding another outlet for its oil. The customers in the East are ready, and there is still in existence a 1921 treaty giving the Soviet Union the right to intervene if the Iranians call for assistance. We are therefore in a situation in which Iran could choose to ally itself with the Russian bear — as suggested in an article in *'Le Monde'* quoted by Mr Pedini — to resist the American wolf.

Between the bear and the wolf, Europe now has a role to play — it can once more be a pole of attraction. This is the question which we raised, and this is the purpose of the amendments we have tabled, calling for a bold, realistic and dynamic initiative by Europe, which would not be confined to condemnations or complaints.

President. — I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as the tablers of a motion for a resolution, we do not think it necessary to add very much in order to express the strongest possible condemnation of, and the greatest possible concern about what is occurring in Iran, and to stress the exceptional nature of the situation, which, apart from any favourable or unfavourable political assessment of the type of revolution which has convulsed Iran in the last few months, can in any case not be justified. It is a situation which the continuing and repeated refusals of the Iranian authorities not just to free the hostages, but even to take them out of the insecure situation in which they find themselves, in the hands of the group of so-called Islamic students, have aggravated to the point of making inevitable — after many months of patient waiting — the sanctions announced by the United States Government and its request for help from the countries of the Atlantic Alliance and of the EEC.

Romualdi

This explains the need for Parliament to reiterate its condemnation and once more firmly to urge the Iranian authorities to release the hostages immediately. Apart from anything else, this is the only way of restoring the possibility of normal political and economic relations, and indeed relations of any other kind, between the Western peoples and the Iranian people, whom we regard as friends and who are fortunately not composed solely of fanatics.

This explains also why it is essential, in the spirit of the statements made here yesterday — perhaps rather too vaguely — by the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Colombo, that Parliament urge the Nine to consult once more after the Lisbon meeting, in a more suitable context, in order to find the best and most effective way to express in practical terms our solidarity with the people and government of the United States, and to state their readiness to adopt any diplomatic or political measures which might be necessary to bring about a more rapid return to normal in one of the most troubled regions of the world — a region subject to the tension of a thousand conflicting interests and a thousand potential economic and political disputes, which we would not wish to become military confrontations — a region over which, above all, hangs the threatening shadow of Soviet imperialism, which the recent invasion of Afghanistan has made only too evident.

It may be — as some say — that the attitude of the United States Administration and the measures it has threatened to take are a mistake, and that the way in which the support of the Atlantic Alliance and of the Nine has been called for without preliminary consultation is also a mistake.

Of course, there are many points to be cleared up with the United States Administration, many procedures and aspects of mutual respect to be insisted upon, but, even accepting — and we do not accept it — that the United States may have made a mistake in their way of proceeding, that mistake, which could always be redressed through open discussions, is a thousand times preferable to a refusal by any of the Nine. Such a refusal could mean the end of the solidarity among the countries of the Community, the Atlantic Alliance and indeed of the free world. In other words, this is exactly what is wanted not only by the more fanatical of the present Iranian leaders, but also by all the enemies of the Western countries, especially the Soviet Union, its satellite countries and parties, to whose threatening presence we must all react in a united way in order to create the conditions for peace with security for all the peoples of the world.

President. — I call Mr De Goede.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Madam President, we cannot imagine the horrific situation the American hos-

tages have now been in for five months. This affront not only to diplomatic conventions but also to basic human behaviour, the fact that nothing less than peace in the Middle East, or even world peace, has been put in jeopardy by a conceited old man who thinks he must act as if he was a sort of representative of the Almighty on this planet, is incomprehensible and unacceptable. There can be no denying the fact that the Americans, and particularly President Carter, have shown virtually infinite patience, but there are limits to everything in the lives of nations, and patience is no exception. This is certainly true in situations as provocative as these.

Naturally, it would not be right for us to criticize the American attitude severely on the one hand, even though our criticism may partly be justified, while at the same time realizing that we ourselves as Europeans have fallen short in taking effective steps in good time with a view to alleviating the situation. Secondly, not everything President Carter says on this matter is equally fortunate and allies should not present each other with ultimatums, with or without dates. However, it should be quite clear that we as Europeans are behind and not against our American friends.

The question was, what can we do? We failed perhaps to answer this question satisfactorily. The question now is, what must we do? I should like to say that the two resolutions, both the one tabled by Mr Fergusson and others and the one tabled by Mr Glinne and others meet with my approval. They are both balanced in tone and structure. It is in fact regrettable that we have not managed to produce a single joint resolution in the name of the entire Parliament. There is one important difference in the operative paragraph, in that the Fergusson resolution goes so far as to consider the possibility of breaking off diplomatic relations. I am not actually saying that this must now happen, but that it is a possibility. The same possibility is implicit in the resolution tabled by Mr Glinne and others. I think I can therefore say that it is a pity that we have not managed to produce a single joint resolution, since there appears to be such broad agreement on this matter. I do not think you will be surprised, Madam President, when I say that I hope to be able to vote in favour of both resolutions.

President. — I call Mrs Castellina.

Mrs Castellina. — (I) Madam President, it seems to me that we have lost sight of the original reason for this debate, for the recent worsening of international tension was not caused by the taking of the hostages, which now unfortunately dates from several months ago and which we have all roundly condemned.

We are now debating the matter because, when it seemed that a solution was about to be found, President Carter unexpectedly introduced serious reprisals

Castellina

against Iran. I think this was for reasons of electoral propaganda, and, more importantly, perhaps to cover up — by means of an act likely to arouse the worst nationalistic instincts — the failure of what had seemed to some to be his only political success to date — the famous Camp David agreement. It is, therefore, this American action which we must now assess, together with the threat to peace which it represents. For this reason I was one of those who insisted that this question be debated urgently, since it would have been absurd for the European Parliament not to have expressed an opinion at such a crucial juncture. I think that Parliament should refuse to follow the United States along the road of the political, economic or military sanctions which have been imposed or threatened, and which, apart from any other objection — as many have said serve no purpose and would only jeopardize the chances of solving the problem.

I think that this Parliament — which in my view unanimously believes that it is wrong to take hostages — should however try to understand that acts such as this are prompted by a reaction — however irrational and unacceptable — on the part of peoples who have been oppressed and downtrodden for centuries, and who for too long have seen bloodthirsty dictators like the Shah of Iran kept in power by governments which claim to be democratic and which now invoke the rule of international law. We must start from this fact, and realize that international tension is likely to worsen if we fail to give positive answers to the just demands of peoples who are freeing themselves from age-old subjugation. Yes, Mr Pedini, cases such as that of the American Embassy in Tehran will occur more frequently if the response of the developed countries — so-called developed countries, or at least so-called advanced countries — remains, as in the past, that of arrogant oppression.

The first thing that needs to be done, to show that there is a different way to respond to the demands — I repeat, the just demands — which these people are making, is, I think, to find a political solution to the Palestinian problem, recognizing that people's right to self-determination. I mention the Palestinian problem because it is one of the unsolved problems in that explosive area of the world. But it seems to me that this road is not being followed decisively enough, and that even those in this Parliament who refuse to follow the extremist American line are not acting decisively. I do not think we can content ourselves with half-measures, with mere words or fruitless attempts at mediation which essentially accept the logic and — let us admit it — also the advantages of American policy, while at the same time trying cunningly to retain the chance of some trade and a few barrels of oil. Such a policy is undignified and pointless, and is therefore not the one to follow. A change is needed, and Europe must take an independent and practical initiative in economic and political terms in order to make a positive response, with all that that entails, including sacrifices on our part for the benefit of the peoples of the Third

World. In this respect Iran is only a test. Failing such a commitment, Europe's position will become downright untenable, whereas it could play a decisive role if it showed more courage.

This was the purpose of the amendment which I tabled together with other colleagues, since, as you are well aware, we cannot put forward our views even on such an important question, because even in this case 21 signatures are required.

President. — I call Mrs Hammerich.

Mrs Hammerich. — (DK) Madam President, one sometimes wonders whether or not one is dreaming. Here I am sitting in the European Parliament which, according to the election propaganda, was to have been an instrument for peace. And what do I hear but voices of a majority speaking in such unpeaceful terms that one would not have thought possible.

At this present time, the whole world is pressing for rational and peaceful solutions. Here in the European Parliament, however, the conflicts are being exacerbated and complicated still further and the competency of the Community is being extended to include those areas normally covered by NATO. The majority are speaking, in their short-sighted arrogance, in more warlike terms than the NATO Council. What a contrast to the more balanced views put forward yesterday by the President of the Council, Mr Colombo, and to the wishes of the people of the nine Member States. There is just one consolation in all this, namely that the warlike majority of this Assembly is not going to get its own way. We are glad of this.

President. — I call Sir Fred Warner.

Sir Fred Warner. — Madam President, I am really somewhat surprised by the last two speeches. Mrs Castellina has no greater admirer in this House than myself. What on earth was she saying to us? She said that because the Iranians had had a bad time some time ago, it was fully understandable that they should now today seize all the American hostages. What is she telling us? Because Italy was once ruled by the Borgias and the Bourbons, and even Mussolini, are the Italian students going to seize all the diplomats in Rome tomorrow and put them in solitary confinement and blindfold them? I hope not, and I am sure you did not mean that.

Now I understand that I am the last speaker in this debate, so I am in a position to say that with a very few exceptions we have had almost total unanimity in this debate. We have been unanimous on the obvious need that these hostages should be released as quickly as possible. We have been virtually unanimous on the

Warner

need to support the Americans. We have been virtually unanimous on the need to act together and on believing that the Nine are a far more effective force in world politics than each of us acting separately. In that connection I think we were all greatly heartened and encouraged by what Mr Davignon said on behalf of the Commission.

We have heard some very good ideas expressed in this debate. For instance, the Socialist resolution suggests that a delegation should go to Tehran. That doesn't appear in our motion, but we accept it. If the House wants that, we would be very glad to see it happen and even to take part in it. The only thing which has marred this debate has been a certain number of party remarks from that quarter of the House in which they invariably seem to arise in the first place. I would have thought that this was the one debate in which we would not have to advertise the virtues of our own party as opposed to the others. I would have thought our American allies needed something better from us than self-advertisement. There is one issue nonetheless, which clearly does deeply and sincerely divide this House. That is the issue of diplomatic relations and whether they should be interrupted or not. I have a special interest in this because for 30 years I was a diplomat, and it is very difficult being a diplomat today. On one occasion, as I lay in my bath, a bomb dropped at the end of my garden. It was not aimed at me, but it is typical of modern diplomacy that it has to take place under a rain of bombs. On another occasion I was shut out of my embassy and had stones thrown at me. My friends and colleagues were kidnapped, sometimes shot.

These are the difficulties of modern diplomacy, but countries, governments and diplomats carry on because they believe in the principle of diplomacy and that international relations can only be carried on effectively through diplomatic relations. Underlying all this is the assumption which has underlain it for thousands of years, namely, that all concerned agree that it should work and that it should be made to work, that the persons of those who are carrying it on, barring accidents, are sacred and that only in a breakdown of international relations, only in the case of war or where diplomacy is totally abandoned, do you withdraw your embassy. But what has happened today? The whole underlying assumption of diplomacy has broken down. The Iranians did not say to the Americans, 'We do not want to talk to you, take your embassy away'. That is not what they did. That would have been understandable perhaps, although mistaken, but what they did was to seize all these innocent individuals and hold them as criminals. You cannot carry on diplomacy in those circumstances. It makes no sense at all, and the lives of all other diplomats are at risk so long as that kind of thing is condoned. How can you expect other countries, how can you expect other students, how can you expect other madmen to refrain from seizing diplomats if you sit there quietly month after month doing nothing.

The present situation is a great danger not only to our world, but to Iran. The Iranians themselves are at stake in this matter. We appeal to their government to realise that they need the friendship of America and that only the hostages stand between our friendship and the present totally unsatisfactory state of affairs. We appeal to the Government of Iran to make this gesture, and my party appeals to this House to support the resolution with the largest possible number of votes, not because we wish to support a presidential candidate, nor to support the President of the United States, but to support our unswerving friends and allies, the American people and the American nation.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR JAQUET

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Prag.

Mr Prag. — Mr President, I rise to withdraw the motion which my co-signatories and I tabled on this subject, and I hope you will allow me to give a very brief explanation of why we are doing so. We put the resolution in right at the very start and it reflected the strongest feelings of the signatories. We are withdrawing it *not* because we want to withdraw the strong disapproval we expressed of the behaviour of the students, which is entirely contrary, as we said in the resolution, to justice, to diplomatic convention, to the spirit of humanity and to the rules of civilized behaviour. We maintain our full support and solidarity with the United States, not only with the people of the United States but also, in this difficult time, with the United States administration. As Mr Berkhouver said, whoever heard of any government not having electoral considerations and I was surprised, as Sir Fred Warner was, at the muddy meanderings of Mrs Castellina who, presumably, has never done anything for electoral reasons.

We are withdrawing this resolution very simply because we believe that our views are fully expressed in the joint resolution of the European Democratic Group, the European People's Party and the Liberal Group, and I trust that we shall have from the vast majority of the members of this House a firm vote for that resolution.

President. — I call Mrs De March.

Mrs De March. — (F) The situation in Iran is once again up for debate in this House, and I should like to

De March

point out on behalf of the French Communists and Allies — as I did in plenary session on 14 November last year — that we are fundamentally opposed to the taking of hostages and to any form of violent repression. We believe in respecting the principle of diplomatic immunity and the rule of international law. But can we really deny that the situation in Iran is essentially an expression of the demands and the legitimate right of the Iranian people to judge their own persecutor, to take their fate in their own hands and assume full sovereign responsibility for their own affairs?

Judging by the motions for resolutions which have been tabled here by the other groups and the speeches I have listened to attentively from the Conservatives, the European People's Party and the Liberals, we are still far removed from the humanitarian ideals that people have been proclaiming, and what is in fact at stake is something completely different. The important thing, you say, is to formulate a common policy on that politically sensitive region. You say we must lose no time in demonstrating our total solidarity with the United States. These resolutions even refer to having recourse to force in what amounts, in my view, to the pursuit of unlawful objectives.

In his speech earlier in this debate, Mr Fergusson could not have expressed himself more clearly in justifying the attitude of his group. Oil, he said, was to be found behind the locked doors of Iran. Here is the real problem. As far as you are concerned, urgency is justified by President Carter's appeal. When the Liberal Group talks of new factors what they really mean is the US President's ultimatum to his allies. The new factor — as Secretary of State Warren Christopher pointed out — is the deadline: 21 April 1980, the date on which the Foreign Ministers of the Nine will be meeting again. The new element is the very clear and unflattering appeal by Carter to those of his allies who only rally round halfheartedly to support his decisions; the new element is the Brussels Commission's headlong rush to get down to work on these planned measures, and which has in turn caused Mr Davignon to appeal to the European Parliament to contribute to the success of a common European strategy.

But what about the Community's independence? What about the Member States' freedom of decision? What about national interests? What has happened to the myth of an independent Europe as the flag-bearer of the democratic ideal? We are far from protecting the lives of the hostages and the supreme principle of peace in that part of the world. Even the American press is starting to question the point of all this. For instance, the New York Times, discussing the possibility of a naval blockade and of mining the shipping lanes, wondered how this would affect the hostages and America's allies, who are likely to be the main victims of an American policy of blockade. The truth is that a majority in this House refuses to acknowledge that the Iranian people are now following the Vietnamese in inflicting a severe defeat on American stra-

tegy. You do not think it legitimate that a people should have freed itself from a 25-year dictatorship, put an end to SAVAK torturing and demanded the extradition of the Shah as other peoples — including the French — have done for their persecutors in the past. You will not accept that the Iranian people have put an end to a dictatorship installed as a result of a *coup d'Etat* engineered by the CIA and are now calling for justice to be wrought on those who committed these crimes. What this House is in fact being called upon to do is to give in as quickly as possible to Washington's demands.

The Members of the Communists and Allies Group will be voting against these motions for a resolution because we stand firmly behind peoples struggling for their independence. We cannot support the adoption of a resolution in which the authors call for solidarity, armed intervention and sanctions which have nothing to do with the humanitarian and legal problem of the people held in the American Embassy. Unlike you, we have no intention of hastily turning over the page of the Iranian people's struggle for national liberation, because we cannot forget the price they have had to pay with their sons and their blood to be free.

In voting against these motions for resolutions, we shall not allow party political interests on the part of President Carter, or rather — begging your pardon — candidate Carter to jeopardize seriously the peace and security of Europe and the whole world. In so doing, we shall be defending the sovereign rights of our own country, because, Mr Davignon, a Europe which speaks with one voice is — we are bound to say — an aligned Europe.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Zamberletti.

Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council. — (I) Mr President, I would like to tell the Members of Parliament that, as representative of the Presidency, I listened with the greatest attention to this debate opened yesterday by Mr Colombo.

I also took note of the requests for information put to the Council by Parliament. In this connection, I would like to say that Mr Colombo's statement and my presence here today take account of your requests for information and continuous contact, and also bear witness to the importance which your work has for us, particularly when it concerns a serious crisis such as, in this case, the plight of the American hostages in Tehran, which is continuing to poison international relations.

Mr Colombo yesterday informed you fully about the lines along which European cooperation is developing at this critical stage, with regard to the distressing epi-

Zamberletti

sode of the occupation of the American Embassy and the taking hostage of its staff. I have nothing new to tell you. In this Parliament, which has shown such great interest and such justified concern over recent events and developments in Iran, may I make the necessary assessment of the Iranian problem in so far as it concerns the functioning of the Nine's political cooperation.

I would like to assure you that there has been considerable coordination and singleness of purpose, both at the highest levels of political cooperation and in the joint action of the diplomatic representatives of the Community countries in Tehran who, in their contacts with the Iranian authorities, have always followed instructions agreed among the governments of the Nine.

This augurs well not only for future action by the Nine, but also for ever greater agreement and an increasingly constructive and incisive approach in the foreign relations of the Nine.

Mr President, the Presidency will inform the Council in detail about the interesting debate held here and the points which have emerged in it, on a subject which is important for peace, security, the lives of the Teheran hostages and the safeguarding of international law.

Through these assurances I wish to stress that the Presidency will follow your debates as closely as possible, in order to improve the coordination of Parliament's work with the aims and important decisions with which the Council will have to concern itself from time to time.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

The motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

President. — We shall now interrupt the proceedings to welcome His Excellency Mr Luis Herrera Campins, President of the Republic of Venezuela.¹

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 5 p.m. and resumed at 6 p.m.)

¹ See Annex.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

17. Votes

President. — The next item is the vote on the motions for resolutions on which the debate has closed.

We shall begin with the motions on the situation in Iran. We shall consider first the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-89/80 rev./II), tabled by Mr Fergusson on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr. Blumenfeld on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) and Mr Berkhouwer on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group: Plight of the Americans held captive in Tehran.*

Mr de la Malène has tabled Amendment No 1/rev. seeking to replace the entire motion for a resolution by a new text, as follows:

- having regard to its resolutions of 15 November 1979 and 14 March 1980,
- pointing out that the European States have indicated their support in the United Nations for the principle of economic sanctions if the Iranian Government continues to hold the hostages,
- noting that the representations made by each of the nine European governments to the Iranian Government have so far elicited no action,
- noting that the continued violation of diplomatic conventions and of the most elementary human right infringes the fundamental principles of international life, constitutes a serious threat to the security of all nations and endangers peace,
- aware of the fact that the gravity of the present situation calls for concerted action by all nations which are attached to the principles of justice and freedom;

1. Puts on record its deep sympathy with the hostages and with their families and expresses its solidarity with the United States of America;
2. Addresses a renewed urgent appeal to the Iranian Government to comply with international law and immediately release the hostages;
3. Invites the Governments of the Nine to take urgent steps to convene a meeting with the Government of the United States in order to decide jointly on appropriate measures to secure, at the earliest possible date, the release of the hostages and to restore normal, peaceful relations with Iran.

What is Mr Fergusson's position?

Mr Fergusson. — The answer is no, Mr President.

President. — I put Amendment No 1/rev. to the vote.

Amendment No 1/rev. is rejected.

(Parliament adopted the first indent of the preamble)

On the second indent of the preamble, Mr Capanna and others have tabled Amendment No 3 seeking to delete this indent.

I put Amendment No 3 to the vote.

Amendment No 3 is rejected.

(Parliament adopted successively the second and third indents of the preamble)

On the fourth indent of the preamble, I have two amendments seeking to reword the indent:

— Amendment No 4 by Mr Capanna and others:

— recognizing that the continuation of the situation in Tehran and the economic and military measures announced and taken by President Carter constitute a serious threat to international peace and security;

— Amendment No 11 by Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group:

— drawing attention to the unforeseeable consequences which refusal to release the hostages might have, and appealing to the feelings of mutual dependence shared by all the peoples concerned.

I put Amendment No 4 to the vote.

Amendment No 4 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 11 to the vote.

Amendment No 11 is rejected.

(Parliament adopted the fourth indent of the preamble)

On the fifth indent of the preamble, Mr Capanna and others have tabled Amendment No 5 seeking to reword the indent as follows:

— anxious that traditional friendly relations between Iran and the countries of the European Community should not be perturbed by events unconnected with the profitable cooperation between the peoples of the two parties.

I put Amendment No 5 to the vote.

Amendment No 5 is rejected.

(Parliament adopted successively the fifth and sixth indents of the preamble)

On paragraphs 1 to 4, Mr Castellina and Mr Capanna have tabled Amendment No 2 seeking to replace these paragraphs with the following paragraphs:

1. Calls on the Foreign Ministers of the European Community to give serious thought to the dangers arising from the diplomatic, economic and military measures taken or threatened by the United States and to bear in mind that
 - a. action of the kind taken by the Iranian students is no more than a reaction — however irrational and mistaken — on the part of a people which for centuries has lived in oppressive dependence and for too long has seen regimes which claim to be democratic (and today appeal to the rules of International Law) support dictators like the Shah of Persia;
 - b. there can be no relaxation in international relations and no lasting peace until such time as a positive response is given to the just claims of the developing peoples;
 - c. it is in this direction which Europe must move, refusing to follow the United States in adopting retaliatory measures against Iran, but pursuing instead a clear-cut economic and political course of action *vis-à-vis* the Third World, independently of the line taken by either of the superpowers;
 - d. in this context it is even more urgent that Europe should adopt an approach that faces squarely up to the Palestinian problem, failure to settle which makes the situation in the Middle East even more explosive, and one which, in view of the mistaken assumptions made at Camp David, reaches the only fair and reasonable decision, which is to recognize officially the PLO as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people;
2. Decides
 - a. to send to Iran a delegation representative of all its political groups in order to establish contact with the representative bodies in Iran and in this way, to help find solutions that lead to the release of the hostages and meet the requests made by President Bani Sadr regarding the trial of Reza Pahlevi,
 - b. to request the Council to assign to the President-in-Office a role of mediator between the governments in Tehran and Washington, instructing him to report back to the Council and the European Parliament so that a debate can be held in the House as soon as possible based on the findings of the President of the Council and the European Parliament delegation.

I put Amendment No 2 to the vote.

Amendment No 2 is rejected.

(Parliament adopted paragraphs 1 and 2)

On paragraph 3 I have three amendments. Mr

President

Capanna and others have tabled Amendment No 6 seeking to replace the paragraph by the following:

- Requests the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, and in particular their President-in-Office,
- to take all necessary and practicable steps to restore peace and friendly relations between the peoples involved, thus giving Europe the opportunity, in this difficult period, of playing an active role in promoting peace,
- to offer the governments of the United States and Iran the 'good offices', and possibly the mediation, of the President-in-Office, thereby demonstrating the Community's determination to promote peace in an area increasingly threatened by a sudden aggravation of the situation.

Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group has tabled Amendment No 12/rev. seeking to delete the first indent.

Mr Glinne has also tabled on behalf of the Socialist Group Amendment No 9/rev. seeking to replace the third indent by the following:

- to decide on progressive political action to underline the Member States' determination to obtain the release of the hostages.

I put Amendment No 6 to the vote.

Amendment No 6 is rejected.

(Parliament adopted the first sentence of paragraph 3)

I put Amendment No 12/rev. to the vote.

Amendment No 12/rev. is rejected.

(Parliament successively adopted the first and second indents of paragraph 3)

I put to the vote Amendment No 9/rev.

Amendment No 9/rev. is rejected.

(Parliament adopted the third indent of paragraph 3)

I have two amendments on paragraph 4. Mr Capanna and others have tabled Amendment No 7 seeking to delete the paragraph.

Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group has tabled Amendment No 10 seeking to replace the paragraph by the following:

Appreciates the moderate attitude, after 170 days of imprisonment of the hostages, adopted so far by the government and the people of the United States, and appeals to the reason of the parties concerned to seek a solution solely by peaceful means.

I put Amendment No 7 to the vote.

Amendment No 7 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 10 to the vote.

Amendment No 10 is rejected.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 4)

On paragraph 5, Mr Capanna and others have tabled Amendment No 8 seeking to replace the paragraph by the following:

Instructs its President to forward this resolution with the utmost urgency to the President-in-Office of the Council, the Commission and the governments of the Member States.

I put Amendment No 8 to the vote.

Amendment No 8 is rejected.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 5)

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole.

The resolution is adopted.

(Loud applause from the centre and the right)

*

* *

President. — I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-113/80) tabled by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group: Situation created by the taking of hostages in Tehran.*

The motion is rejected.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *three motions for resolutions on involving the northern Adriatic in the European unification process.*

We shall begin with the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-85/80) by Mr Gouthier and others.*

I call Mr Gouthier.

Mr Gouthier. — *(I) Mr President, I am willing to withdraw my motion for a resolution if the other two are also withdrawn in favour of Amendment No 1.*

President. — I call Mr Barbi.

Mr Barbi. — *(I) Mr President, a replacement amendment has been tabled and I think it ought to be*

Barbi

voted on. If this replacement amendment is adopted, the three motions will obviously fall.

President. — I call Mr Cecovini.

Mr Cecovini. — (I) Mr President, I only want to say that I second the request made by Mr Gouthier and Mr Barbi. We have agreed on a text which is incorporated in Amendment No 1 to my motion. I think we ought to vote on the motion first, before we vote on the amendment, which if adopted will make all the others fall. I am perfectly happy with this procedure, as I also put my name to the amendment.

President. — We shall therefore vote on the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-90/80) by Mr Cecovini and others, on which Mr Arfé and others have tabled Amendment No 1 seeking to replace the entire motion by the following:

The European Parliament,

- considering that the European Community cannot postpone any longer the effective coordination of current efforts to rationalize and expand the Community's internal transport network and its links with third countries,
 - considering in this context that it is particularly important to improve North-South transport routes in view of the growing importance of relations between the Community and the countries of Africa and Asia,
 - considering that the Adriatic therefore constitutes the ideal terminus for the maritime routes linking these countries with those of Central Europe,
 - having regard to the problems resulting from the expansion of the Community into the eastern Mediterranean as a result of the forthcoming accession of Greece and the EEC-Yugoslavia cooperation agreement,
 - drawing attention to the energy savings which could be achieved by opening rapid transport links with the south which would considerably shorten the traditional routes from the countries in the central part of the Community towards Suez,
 - having regard to Community participation in the financing of the Austrian motorway from Passau to Spiefeld, which would establish a direct link between Greece, Yugoslavia and northern Europe, with serious repercussions for the regions in the south-east of the Community,
 - considering that the improvement of communications across the Alps will also strengthen cooperation between all the Alpine and Adriatic regions, including those in countries which do not form part of the Community, and that the projects envisaged must therefore not in any way prejudice other projects planned and submitted to the Community by the regions concerned,
1. Decides, in view also of the recent agreement between the EEC and Yugoslavia and of Greece's

forthcoming accession to the Community, to recommend the Council and Commission to examine the projects, which must be coordinated with the projects planned by the countries concerned so as to create an integrated system of direct road and rail links between Bavaria and the ports of Trieste and Monfalcone and between Trieste and Gorizia and Yugoslavia;

2. Calls for an initial Community contribution of 2 million EUA towards the elaboration of these projects;
3. Asks that the ports of the Upper Adriatic (like the other Italian ports) be included among the infrastructures eligible for financial aid from the European Community;
4. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission and to the Community regions and third countries concerned.

I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

The new resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution contained in the Van Miert report (Doc. 1-821/79): Human rights in Chile.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 and 2)

After paragraph 1, Mr Welsh and others have tabled Amendment No 1 seeking to add the following new paragraph:

- 2a. Recalls that the genesis of the present condition of Chile lies in the actions of the previous government which despite being elected by a minority of electors, sought to impose a social revolution which was contrary to the aspirations of the majority of the Chilean people.

What is the position of Mr Colla, who is deputizing for the rapporteur?

Mr Colla, deputy rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, as far as the first part of this amendment is concerned, the rapporteur considers it unreasonable and ridiculous to cite past events as an excuse for violations of human rights which are occurring at the present time. The idea expressed in the second part of the amendment is also incorrect. On the contrary, we can state quite explicitly that the previous régime ruled legally according to Chilean legislation. The rapporteur, Mr Van Miert, feels that this amendment is utterly biased and untrue. He requests Parliament to reject it with as large a majority as possible.

President. — I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is rejected.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

(Parliament adopted paragraphs 3 and 4)

I put to the vote paragraph 5, on which I have been asked to hold a separate vote.

Since the result of the show of hands is doubtful, we shall take a fresh vote by sitting and standing.

Paragraph 5 is adopted.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 6)

Members may now give explanations of vote.

I call Mrs Groes.

Mrs Groes. — *(DK)* Mr President, my decision to abstain from voting on the amendments tabled and to vote against the report is no doubt familiar to your from previous debates on questions of foreign policy, and I still refuse to get involved in the struggle of the various groups to arrogate to this Parliament greater powers in the field of foreign policy. I think we have seen from the debate today that the danger of conflict in connection with Parliament's discussion of matters of foreign policy is far greater than the possibility of establishing peace.

President. — I call Mr Fich.

Mr Fich. — *(DK)* Mr President, rarely have we seen such an excellent document as the Van Miert report on Chile. The document is not only good from a technical point of view, but it is also very clear from the political point of view and is unconditional in its support for the repressed people of Chile. I can therefore only say that I go along with the contents of this document. However, the reason why I can nevertheless not support its adoption here in Parliament is the fundamental question of what subjects this House should deal with. In my view, the task of this Parliament is laid down in the Treaties and should take the form of an interaction with the Council of Ministers and the Commission. The Parliament is not, however, an element in political cooperation which is conducted between the nine Foreign Ministers outside the Treaties. It would be a good thing if more people respected this distinction so that the Assembly did not spend its time discussing matters of foreign policy.

Naturally, in this specific case we could let the principle go by the board, particularly as the report is so good, and express our support to the people of Chile.

However, I am convinced that you yourself, Mr President, realize the danger of ever increasing powers for the so-called European Parliament which remains dominated by right-wing forces, which are not prepared to give their support to the people of Chile. For this reason, I cannot support the report.

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole.

The resolution is adopted.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

I call Mr Martin on a point of order.

Mr Martin. — *(F)* Mr President, we have just been informed that the 113 persons under sentence of death at Gafsa have been executed. I want to express our repulsion at this bloody and iniquitous crime which has been perpetrated by Bourguiba and the Tunisian Government with complete disregard for human life and the rights of man. There is nothing more I can say.

President. — Your statement is noted. No tragic death leaves us untouched.

I call Mr Sutra on a point of order.

Mr Sutra. — *(F)* I propose that the House observe a minute's silence on account of the news we have just been given.

President. — There is nothing in the Rules of Procedure and no precedent for such a procedure, and we shall not set a precedent today.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution contained in the Antoniazzi report (Doc. 1-723/79): Situation in Nicaragua.*

(Parliament adopted the first two indents of the preamble)

After the second indent of the preamble, Mr Chambeiron and others have tabled Amendment No 4 seeking to replace the text of the motion for a resolution by the following:

— having regard to the report of the Political Affairs Committee and the opinion of the Committee on Development and Cooperation (Doc. 1-723/79).

President

1. Asks the Commission to draw up a survey of the aid so far granted by it to Nicaragua and to keep Parliament regularly informed of any future aid;
2. Asks the Commission, while respecting to the full the political, economic and social options of the Nicaraguan Government, to increase its aid on the scale and in the form requested by the authorities of the country concerned in order to meet the various needs of Nicaragua;
3. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission and to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Antoniozzi, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, may I remind the House that this motion for a resolution was discussed at several meetings by the Political Affairs Committee, which unanimously adopted the present text after minor changes to the earlier one.

For this reason, I do not think there is any point in changing the existing balance of the resolution, especially as what is proposed in the first, second and third amendments is for the most part already contained in our motion.

I am against any change to the text.

President. — I put Amendment No 4 to the vote.

Amendment No 4 is rejected.

On the third indent of the preamble, Mrs Lizin has tabled Amendment No 1 seeking to replace the indent by the following:

- welcoming the fall of the dictatorship of Anastasio Somoza, notes with pleasure that the efforts of the Nicaraguan people have resulted in the restoration of democratic freedoms.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Antoniozzi, rapporteur. — (I) I am against the amendment, Mr President, for the same reasons as before.

President. — I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is rejected.

(Parliament successively adopted the third and fourth indents of the preamble)

On the fifth indent of the preamble, Mrs Lizin has tabled Amendment No 3 seeking to replace the indent by the following:

- fully aware of Nicaragua's present grave economic difficulties which might, in the absence of remedial action, encourage the return to power in that country of forces which were responsible for the tragic situation experienced by it.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Antoniozzi, rapporteur. — (I) Against, Mr President, for the reasons I have mentioned.

President. — I put Amendment No 3 to the vote.

Amendment No 3 is rejected.

(Parliament successively adopted the fifth and sixth indents of the preamble)

On paragraph 1, Mrs Lizin has tabled Amendment No 2 seeking to replace the paragraph by the following:

- Hopes that the Member States of the European Community will show real solidarity with the progress of democracy in Nicaragua and will invite their partners to take the same attitude and to encourage its observance.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Antoniozzi, rapporteur. — (I) I am against this amendment, Mr President, for the reason that there is an attempt here to replace a neutral attitude to Nicaragua by quite a different idea of interference — direct or indirect — in its domestic affairs. I am against the amendment for this reason, as well as for the reasons I have already mentioned before.

President. — I put Amendment No 2 to the vote.

Amendment No 2 is rejected.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 1 and then paragraphs 2 to 4)

I call Mr Chambeiron for an explanation of vote.

Mr Chambeiron. — (F) Mr President, the Communist and Allies Group tabled an amendment which illustrated our desire to see increased aid from the Community to the people and government of Nicaragua, and also to see this aid provided without any interference in the domestic affairs of the country. In other words, we did not want this aid to have any detrimental effect on whatever the decisions the Nicaraguan Government may have taken in the economic, political and social spheres.

Our amendment was rejected even though it had the merit of being straightforward and of dispelling a

Chambeiron

number of ambiguities which have crept into the text of the motion for a resolution. I am sorry about this. However, our first concern is to come to the aid of the people and government of Nicaragua. They are in a very tough situation and they have to heal the wounds which were inflicted for decades by the Somoza dictatorship with its imperialist backing.

We shall be voting for the motion for a resolution as a whole because we want to help the people and the government of Nicaragua.

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole.

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution contained in the Hänsch report (Doc. 1-815/79): Human rights in Czechoslovakia.*

The resolution is adopted.

(Applause from various quarters)

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution contained in the Gonella report (Doc. 1-40/80): Right of residence for nationals of Member States in another Member State.*

We shall vote first on the amendments to the proposal for a directive.

On Articles 4(2) and 6, Mr Tyrrell on behalf of the European Democratic Group has tabled three amendments:

- Amendment No 3 seeking to reinstate the Commission's text in Article 4(2);
- Amendment No 5 seeking to add the following new subparagraph after Article 4(2):
By way of derogation from the above provisions, citizens of at least 18 years of age who are studying or who wish to study in the host Member State shall not be required to provide proof of sufficient resources;
- Amendment No 2 seeking to reinstate the Commission's text in Article 6.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Ferri, deputy rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, the opinion of the majority of the committee members, of the rapporteur, and of course myself, is against these amendments which Mr Tyrrell has tabled. The aim is to reintroduce the restriction which appeared in the Commission's text and which the Legal Affairs Committee wanted to exclude by a large majority. In his reply to the rapporteur and to me during the debate we had, Mr Davignon himself acknowledged that this decision by the Legal Affairs Committee was appropriate for the purposes of further development by the Commission in this sphere. I hope that this line will be followed by Parliament and that these amendments will be rejected.

President. — I put Amendment No 3 to the vote.

Amendment No 3 is rejected.

Amendments Nos 5 and 2 therefore fall.

After Article 11, Mr Tyrrell on behalf of the European Democratic Group has tabled Amendment No 4 seeking to delete the entire 'Council Recommendation'.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Ferri, deputy rapporteur. — (I) I am against this amendment, too. This is a recommendation to the Council and its political and moral value is quite clear. I can see no reason for deleting it.

President. — I put Amendment No 4 to the vote.

Amendment No 4 is rejected.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

(Parliament adopted the preamble)

After the preamble, Mr Megahy and others have tabled Amendment No 1 seeking to replace the text of the motion by the following:

- noting that both the Commission's proposals and the Legal Affairs Committee's report stress the proposed Directive as having important political significance in the move towards European union,
- having regard, however, to the declining support for the EEC in most Member countries and the very low esteem in which it is held in two Member countries,
- furthermore, taking account of the severe political and economic difficulties which the Community is now experiencing,
- noting also the fact that free movement of workers within the Community is not yet complete,
- taking into consideration the problems now being encountered in many Member States by the vast numbers of guest workers,

President

- bearing in mind the fairly imminent accession of three additional Member States,
- 1. Resolves that the time is not yet opportune for such a move towards a 'Community of Citizens';
- 2. Therefore requests the Commission to withdraw its proposals till a later date following the second direct elections in 1984.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Ferri, deputy rapporteur. — (I) The rapporteur is definitely against, Mr President. This is an amendment which would undo the whole directive and postpone it to some date in the future. It grieves me that such a text should be proposed by other Members of my own group for whom I have the greatest admiration but with whose opinion I radically disagree. I ask that the amendment be rejected.

(Laughter)

President. — I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is rejected.

(Parliament adopted paragraphs 1 to 11)

I call Mrs Macciocchi for an explanation of vote.

Mrs Macciocchi. — (I) I shall only speak for a minute in saying that I am quite convinced — as is the majority of the Members in this House — that our work in the Legal Affairs Committee will serve to reinforce every European's hope to be recognized as a citizen with full rights.

Article 4 is particularly severe on the notion of wealth, class and difference between Europeans — between those in the north and those in the south. We gave it a very critical going-over and I hope, considering what Mr Davignon had to say, that the Commission will bear this in mind at the earliest opportunity.

In order to avoid any misunderstanding as a result of what was said yesterday by Mr Børg, who is violently against Article 4, let me say that our group, in the persons of Mrs Bonino, Mr Pannella, Mr Capanna, Mrs Castellina, Mr Coppieters and myself, will be casting a favourable vote.

President. — 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 Rey report (Doc. 1-71/80): Relations between the European Parliament and the Commission.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraph 1)

I have two amendments on paragraph 2. Mrs Castle and Mr Megahy have tabled Amendment No 5 seeking to delete the paragraph.

Mrs Focke has tabled Amendment No 10 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Is of the opinion that, in accordance with the proposal contained in the Spierenburg report, the number of Members of the Commission should be fixed at one per Member State.

Amendment No 3 by Mrs Van den Heuvel has been withdrawn.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Rey, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, the House may remember that when I spoke yesterday I expressed my support for these amendments, since they are in line with the Spierenburg proposal and with the opinion of the Three Wise Men. I also said, however, that these amendments were rejected by the Nothomb committee and then by the Political Affairs Committee. As rapporteur, I cannot therefore advise the House to adopt them. I ask for the House's understanding if, for the reasons I have outlined, I myself abstain in the vote.

President. — I put Amendment No 5 to the vote.

Amendment No 5 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 10 to the vote.

Amendment No 10 is rejected.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 2)

I have two amendments on paragraph 3. Mrs Castle and Mr Megahy have tabled Amendment No 6 seeking to delete the paragraph.

Mrs Focke has tabled Amendment No 9 seeking to add the words 'and before the appointment of a new President' after the words 'extension of the mandate of the President of the Commission'.

Amendment No 4 by Mrs Van den Heuvel has been withdrawn.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Rey, rapporteur. — (F) I think the committee's text ought to be left as it is.

President. — I put Amendment No 6 to the vote.

Amendment No 6 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 9 to the vote.

Amendment No 9 is rejected.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 3)

On paragraph 4, Mrs Van den Heuvel has tabled Amendment No 2 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Considers it desirable for the Commission to include at least *three women* among its members as from 1 January 1981.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Rey, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, the Political Affairs Committee was unanimous in considering it desirable — as the text says — for the Commission to include women among its members as from 1 January 1981. It was against adopting a text as rigid as this amendment, however, and I cannot recommend that the House adopt it.

President. — I put Amendment No 2 to the vote.

Amendment No 2 is rejected.

(Parliament successively adopted paragraphs 4 and 5)

On paragraph 6, Mrs Focke has tabled Amendment No 11 seeking to replace the paragraph by the following:

In accordance with the view expressed by the Three Wise Men, solemnly reaffirms that, pursuant to the Treaties, the Commission is the natural executive body of the Community and therefore requests that this criterion be observed and complied with in practice, pursuant to the Treaty provisions, when additional bodies are appointed or their terms of reference defined.

Amendment No 1 by Mrs Van den Heuvel has been withdrawn.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Rey, rapporteur. — (F) I shall rely on the good sense of the House, Mr President. I think that both texts are acceptable.

President. — I put Amendment No 11 to the vote.

Amendment No 11 is rejected.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 6)

On paragraph 7, Mrs Castle and Mr Megahy have tabled Amendment No 7 seeking to delete the paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Rey, rapporteur. — (F) The amendment runs completely counter to the general opinion of the Political Affairs Committee, whose members consider in fact that the provisions which follow, including this one, make up an essential part of the motion. I am against the amendment.

President. — I put Amendment No 7 to the vote.

Amendment No 7 is rejected.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 7)

On paragraph 8, Mrs Castle and Mr Megahy have tabled Amendment No 8 seeking to delete the paragraph.

Amendment No 12 by Mrs Focke has been withdrawn.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Rey, rapporteur. — (F) The same as for the previous amendment, Mr President. I advise rejection.

President. — I put Amendment No 8 to the vote.

Amendment No 8 is rejected.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 8 and then paragraphs 9 and 10)

Members may now give explanations of vote.

I call Mrs Roudy.

Mrs Roudy. — (F) Mr President, the French Socialists consider the Rey report interesting because it establishes the relations between this Parliament and the Commission and allows for a better check on the work of the latter. We are pleased — and I myself am particularly pleased — that the Political Affairs Committee decided to incorporate the wish that was expressed by various people, including the ad hoc committee on the rights of women and others and also myself last January, namely, that women should be included among the Members of the Commission. Personally, I should like to see more than just one token woman in the Commission.

We do have some reservations, however, about paragraph 3. Mr Ferri mentioned this. This paragraph goes a lot farther than the right of censure by Parliament,

Roudy

since it introduces the idea of a vote of confidence to ratify the appointment of the President of the Commission. This is not in line with the Treaties. Nevertheless, we shall vote in favour of the motion.

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, I shall be voting in favour because I entirely agree with the view which was so cogently put forward yesterday by Mr De Goede. This report in fact is a first step towards more democracy. However, there is one point. I should like Parliament to be concerned not just with the appointment of the President of the Commission. Its view must also be sought with regard to the allocation of portfolios among the Members of the Commission. If you take a close look at the list, you will have to admit that the allocation of responsibilities at the moment is in a hopeless mess. Take, for example, the division of responsibilities on energy. I have also taken the initiative of pressing in a motion for the appointment of a Commissioner with responsibility for youth affairs.

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole.

The resolution is adopted.

(Applause from various quarters)

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-33/80) tabled by Mr Scott-Hopkins and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group: Report of the Committee of Three.*

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

Mrs Van den Heuvel. — (NL) Mr President, as I said yesterday during the debate on the Rey report and the Scott-Hopkins motion for a resolution, our group feels that this is not the right time for Parliament to vote on this motion, because it received insufficient consideration by the relevant committee. I formally propose that the motion be referred back to committee and I urge Mr Scott-Hopkins to agree to this, so that the Socialist Group can collaborate constructively with him on this subject in the future.

President. — I call Mr Haagerup.

Mr Haagerup. — (DK) Mr President, although not for exactly the same reasons, I should also like to propose that this motion be referred back to committee.

President. — I call Mr Spinelli.

Mr Spinelli. — (I) Mr President, on behalf of my group I should like to second the previous two speakers' request for the withdrawal of this motion. The matter is still being discussed and will be dealt with in a number of reports.

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Mr President, although I regret having to say so, I think in the light of what has been said that it would be advantageous, in the interest of cooperation in this House on a matter which I consider of great importance — that is the future working of our institutions — to ask for this to be referred back to committee.

(Applause from the left)

President. — Are there any objections?

The motion for a resolution is therefore referred to committee.

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution contained in the Blumenfeld report (Doc. 1-49/80): Greece's accession to the Community.*

I call Mrs Roudy for an explanation of vote.

Mrs Roudy. — (F) Mr President, the French Socialists will vote against this motion. By seeking to obtain for the European Parliament the right to ratify the accession treaties of new Member States of the Community, the motion is attempting to ascribe to Parliament prerogatives which, according to the Treaties, must remain with the national parliaments.

President. — I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

(Applause from various quarters)

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution contained in the Ruffolo report (Doc. 1-63/80): European Monetary System.*

President

I have been asked to hold separate votes on a number of paragraphs.

(Parliament successively adopted the preamble, paragraph 1 and paragraph 2)

After paragraph 2, Mr Diana has tabled Amendment No 1/rev. seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

- 2a. Points out that stability in exchange rates which the European Monetary System is seeking to bring about also has repercussions on agro-monetary policy to the detriment of the member countries with higher rates of inflation, since the green currency rate has in the meantime been brought into line with the official parity despite the loss of purchasing power of the official currency, and that the most appropriate solutions should be found to this problem.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Ruffolo, rapporteur. — *(I)* Mr President, there is no doubt that the intricate problem raised by Mr Diana does exist. However, I do not think that this is the right place to deal with it. This is a complex problem which cannot be resolved in such limited terms, which would only serve to cloud the issue. I am therefore against the amendment.

President. — I put Amendment No 1/rev. to the vote.

Amendment No 1/rev. is rejected.

(Parliament successively adopted paragraphs 3 to 5, paragraph 6 and paragraph 7)

After paragraph 7, Mr Hopper on behalf of the European Democratic Group has tabled Amendment No 2 seeking to add the following new paragraph:

- 7a. Welcomes the abolition of all exchange controls by the United Kingdom and the decision by the Federal Republic of Germany to ease informal controls on the inflow of capital, since the free movement of credit and capital is important to the functioning of the common market.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Ruffolo, rapporteur. — *(F)* The rapporteur recommends the adoption of this amendment, Mr President.

President. — I put Amendment No 2 to the vote.

Amendment No 2 is adopted.

(Parliament successively adopted paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 to 20)

Members may now give explanations of vote.

I call Mr Jaquet.

Mr Jaquet. — *(F)* Mr President, the French Socialists intend to abstain from voting on the Ruffolo motion for a resolution, and I should like to explain briefly our reasons for doing so.

We are not, of course, against the idea of a European Monetary System. On the contrary, we are convinced that this is an important prerequisite for an effective and genuine European Community. In our view, however, a system like this must be based on the same rights and obligations for every country, for those with strong currencies as well as for those with weak currencies. The system introduced by the European Council after the Bremen summit is far from achieving this, whether you consider the relative weight of the various currencies or the general notions of economic policy which they underlie. It is true that Mr Ruffolo's report highlights criticism close to our concerns, and his very subtle assessment of the EMS in its first year of operation is far from being enthusiastic.

In spite of this, the motion makes a poor job of incorporating the criticism which we feel must be emphasized. The point is that we have to vote on the motion for a resolution and not on the explanatory statement.

We were among the very first to spotlight the ills of world monetary disorder, the *laissez-faire* attitude in Europe, the malevolent power of the multinationals and the sacrificing of jobs. We cannot help noting, however, that since the introduction of EMS there has been no decision on any wide-ranging common action to combat unemployment, reduce regional disparities and cope with new competition in the world. A simultaneous attack on all these problems is needed if full use is to be made of Europe's potential.

As things stand at the moment, we cannot give our support to a piecemeal policy. While we approve of a number of proposed modifications to the existing monetary system which are included in this text, we cannot go along with the idea that the situation on the whole at the moment is positive. For these reasons we shall be abstaining.

President. — I call Mrs Castle.

Mrs Castle. — Mr President, I and a number of my British Labour colleagues are going to abstain on this resolution, because we share a great many of the aims of our comrade Ruffolo, who has always spoken out most constructively in this House for the need for ironing out the economic inequalities in the European Community and securing greater economic convergence by better planning and more positive economic

Castle

and social policies. We believe that it is that alone which will create monetary stability, and unfortunately the stress that has been laid on the EMS puts the whole problem the wrong way round. Get your economic convergence first, and you will then get your monetary stability. To start by trying to get monetary mechanisms which may actually restrict the ability of individual Member States to improve and adjust their own economies is indeed to work for the very opposite of what you want. That is why we shall abstain.

President. — I call Mr Bonaccini.

Mr Bonaccini. — (*I*) Mr President, Mr Ortoli said this morning that it was at this point in the life and the development of the EMS that uncertain elements were emerging. We are thoroughly convinced of this, and I attempted to put across this conviction when I spoke this morning.

Precisely because we have arrived at this crossroads, however, we should not be thinking about these uncertain elements which we might have done better to consider a year or so ago, but we should be aware of the answers that need to be given. We have collaborated with other Members in the House to provide answers which work towards the development of the European Monetary System, with a view to the major dates in the future which we mentioned. These answers go some way towards coping with the deficiencies or the inadequacies of the system. As I said, the point is not to consider the unknown elements but to express the political will to bring about the full implementation of the European Monetary System and its second-stage features. We detect this approach in the motion for a resolution, and we shall therefore be voting for it.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (*D*) Mr President, I should like to inform the House on behalf of the Danish, British, Irish, German, Dutch, Belgian, Luxembourg, French and Italian Liberals that we shall be voting for this motion, because it offers a European solution.

(Laughter and applause from the centre and the right)

President. — I call Mrs Castellina.

Mrs Castellina. — (*I*) The uncertain elements about the European Monetary System did not emerge now but when the system started and when the national parliaments were called on to ratify it. What has emerged in the meantime, during the first year of the system, is how right those people were who expressed reservations and misgivings about the EMS and who

were against its introduction. All these arguments and all these misgivings appear in the Ruffolo report. It is precisely because of these arguments and these criticisms — well-founded in my view — that I shall vote against this motion for a resolution. Frankly, I fail to understand the reasoning of Mr Bonaccini who says that things are in a bad way, but that our task is to forge ahead and express our political will.

If things are in a bad way, our task is to say: put a stop to it, shut down this system and think about the problem again when the conditions are right for it to operate properly. At the moment — and this is even stated in the Ruffolo report — these conditions do not exist and the only sensible thing to do is to vote for a halt to the EMS.

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole.

The resolution is adopted.

(Applause from various quarters)

18. *New lines of action by the Community in the field of energy saving* (continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the Linde report (Doc. 1-816/79).

I call Mr Lalor.

Mr Lalor. — Mr President, it is evident from the report that Mr Linde and the Committee on Energy and Research have made a comprehensive analysis of the Commission's proposals on energy-saving and have found them very wanting. Clearly, in this day and age, in an 'I'm all right Jack' situation, appealing to the average individual's spirit of sacrifice and good citizenship is an idle exercise.

Neither do I accept that the fuelling of inflation by jacking up the price of oil as an energy-saver is a correct measure. In the short term, i.e. in 1979, it appears to have worked, but personally I believe that the consumer graph will show a rise in 1980. I am afraid we shall have to spend much more on research into further means of saving and developing new and alternative sources of energy. The Commission suggests negotiations with motor-vehicle manufacturers aimed at reducing the fuel consumption of cars. At present, transport accounts for over 20 % of the oil consumption. Why not plough further financial resources into massive research to develop the undoubted potential capacity of the wet-cell battery as a source of power to drive our cars and various other vehicles? If a car battery could be produced to fill this requirement, and I

Lalor

see no reason why not, it would not only mean a saving of 20 % of our oil, but in addition would go a long way towards ridding Europe and the world at large, of air pollution and noise. It may be claimed that if the battery had this type of potential, it would have been developed before now. I want to suggest that that is not necessarily so. And I go on to say that the second largest lead and zinc mine in the world is in this Community, in my country. So there need be no problem about the availability of the principal raw materials for the revolutionary battery, if properly studied and developed.

After that I look upon biomass as the most promising potential alternative source of electric energy. Again, not enough is being spent on research in this field. I was horrified to learn recently that, in fact, there has been a net cut-back in the cash provision from the Commission for my country for research in this area this year. I was dismayed also to note — and I want to register my deep disapproval — the Commission's apparent resignation to the absence of a joint energy policy.

Such a Community policy is a 'must'. It is very wrong for the Commission to say that energy-saving measures are primarily the responsibility of the Member States. This is too easy a way out. I know that the Irish Government recognizes the vital role of energy in our society and by establishing a new Ministry of Energy it has provided a means of coordinating national and Community initiative. In an effort to capitalize on the growing case for energy conservation, my government's Department of Energy is setting a conservation target of at least 10 % each year over the next decade. However, it is the Community as such which has accepted commitments at international level limiting oil imports and has set itself the goal of convergence. It is the Community which has the responsibility of ensuring that the full team combines and drives towards that particular goal.

IN THE CHAIR: MR ROGERS

Vice-President

President. — I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, energy saving in a broad sense and over a broad front is the essential key to the way in which we must approach the enormous problems facing us as regards energy supply. I intend to go into some of these problems and obstacles in greater detail this evening when we come to discuss the plutonium cycle. I will not go into the need for alternative energy sources

and diversification either as other speakers have already dealt with these questions. I shall merely deal with energy saving, if only because the time available is insufficient for me to go into the other subjects too. This does not mean, however, that I regard them as less important. Generally speaking, our energy consumption is increasingly becoming the focus of international conflict which might even lead to a serious restriction of our room for manoeuvre, particularly as regards European policy.

In my view, the Linde report deserves the greatest respect, particularly for the constructive approach to this question and the concrete proposals for an effective policy in this field. As we see it, it is particular considerations which necessitate a massive energy saving programme, i.e. the conservation of raw materials and the avoidance of waste of these raw materials. Here, it is not only our own current needs which count, but those of the third world and future generations are also of relevance. In addition, the quality of the environment is of great importance. It should be realized that practically any kind of energy consumption affects the environment. Thirdly, there is international security. Interference with the transport of fuels is currently one of the greatest threats to world peace. The fuel package and the level of consumption must be fixed in such a way as to avoid tensions of this kind as much as possible. Fourthly, there is socio-economic stability. In order to ensure this, we must maintain a production level and a balance of payments situation which prevent social tension as much as possible. These considerations also indicate the consequences of failure on our part to change our pattern of energy consumption. They also show that the reduction of our dependence on oil as prime objective, as mentioned by the Commission at the beginning of its proposal, is not enough. By energy saving in the broad sense over a broad front, I mean energy planning involving specific energy-saving targets. This would be different from the approach which is still taken whereby energy requirements are determined on the basis of the developments in policy which have remained essentially unchanged, after which this requirement must be met by energy sources which can in some cases involve resorting to energy sources which involve great or even unacceptable risks. This is something we will discuss in greater depth when we come to deal with the Seligmann report.

Mr President, a massive energy-saving programme must at least involve improving efficiency, use of waste heat and the avoidance of waste and superfluous consumption. A programme of this kind would have three advantages. It would mean an immediate reduction of our dependence on energy and energy costs, the available supplies would last longer and we would gain time for lasting solutions. With all due respect for the progress the Community has already made according to the Commission Communication, it is nevertheless disappointing that, according to the figures provided by Mr Brunner last week, oil consumption in the EEC

Dekker

was 5 % or 25 million tonnes over the target for the Member States last year. It is clear from its new energy-saving proposals, that the Commission certainly has the necessary goodwill, but the inadequacy of the Commission's powers for conducting an effective programme is equally clear. It must restrict itself to recommending methods and measures and simply hope that they will be effective.

An example of this is paragraph 5 of the Communication on voluntary indicative targets for the reduction of fuel consumption by private and commercial vehicles. In spite of the differences in the structure of the motor vehicle market here and in America, we can nevertheless definitely take the United States as our example in this field where far reaching and binding regulations to this effect already exist. Another example is the norms for energy consumption which are also included in paragraph 9. The lines of action at present under discussion are a typical example of why D'66, the party we represent here, would like to see the powers of the Community extended. All that is necessary is, however, already possible in the field of coordination — I am thinking, for example, of the exchange of experience and new techniques. Whenever new methods or techniques for energy saving are devised, even, for example, in the field of education or information, the Commission should be notified of them. It should also be possible for the many ideas and proposals regarding energy saving, some of which come from the citizens themselves, to be submitted to the Commission. Another useful idea would be to promote the dissemination of existing technology via the Community.

Finally, Mr President, the main thing here is that the people of Europe should come to be acutely aware of the need for economical and rational use of energy under current circumstances. The task of the Community is to reward this awareness by an active and clear energy-saving programme.

President. — I call Mr Sassano.

Mr Sassano. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think that agreement with the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Linde, depends on clarifying what is meant by energy saving. We undoubtedly need energy, and it is precisely the need to be able to rely on its availability in the largest possible quantities which forces us to save it. If we had an infinite supply of energy without geographical and political restrictions, institutionalized energy saving would be unnecessary, but since the basic relationship between energy consumption and gross national product is strictly proportional, in the sense that only by increasing energy consumption can one increase the gross national product, and thereby also employment, the problem must be tackled as rationally as possible. Indeed, a reduction of the rate of increase in energy

consumption which did not produce an increase in gross product would not be worthwhile. It would lead one to the absurd position of regarding those countries which have a lower specific energy consumption as more rationally organized.

We are only too well aware that a lower specific energy consumption means a lower specific gross national product, i.e. a lower level of wealth.

It is therefore extremely dangerous to talk about energy saving without making it clear that a lower level of consumption must be combined with the largest possible increase in gross national product.

All this is feasible. First and foremost, it is necessary to reduce waste, i.e. to cut down on those uses of energy which make no contribution to increasing the gross national product. In other words, it is necessary to divert energy from consumption which does not contribute to the gross national product to consumption which does contribute to it.

Secondly, a special contribution to energy saving can be made by replacing present techniques with other more sophisticated techniques which make possible a lower energy consumption for the same output.

Thirdly and finally, we should not neglect the saving which can be achieved by appropriate changes in social customs which make it possible to reduce energy consumption. Of course, we should not ignore the cost inevitably involved in creating the various equilibria which have so far been assumed. But, although these costs are certainly negligible or even non-existent when it is a question of reducing waste, they become significant if new techniques are adopted or social customs changed, even if the costs would be of different kinds in these two cases.

We must bear in mind that the position of the individual Member States varies according to the level of development reached, which makes saving easier the higher the specific energy consumption. The necessary support must be given to the effort which the Member States with an energy consumption lower than the Community average will inevitably have to make.

President. — I call Mr Moorhouse.

Mr Moorhouse. — Mr President, like Lord Douro I support the motion for the resolution and I would like to compliment Mr Linde on the good job he has made of a rather difficult task.

However, I do have some reservations about the explanatory statement, which, I suppose, is rather inevitable, because it covers a great deal of ground and a good deal of fairly controversial material. But there

Moorhouse

is one particular recommendation on page 18, under the heading of industry, concerning his proposal for a waste-heat levy on undertakings generating substantial amounts of waste-heat which I think is misconceived. It illustrates, to my way of thinking, how important it is to establish the facts very clearly. In this connection, I may say that I speak as a professional engineer. It considers that this levy would significantly reduce waste, but it is worth recording that waste-heat from industry has been greatly reduced over the past 25 years and it is really doubtful whether more than 8 % of the potential economies realizable in the industry can be eliminated from this source. So to my way of thinking this particular proposal is rather a non-starter.

However, I think the best contribution I can make as a member of the Committee on Transport in just two or three minutes is to look at transport and the potential savings, which are not, of course, dealt with in any detail in this report, because it was not really the purpose of the author so to do and it will be the job of the Committee on Transport when it holds its seminar on energy savings in transport later this year. Take the private motorcar, and let us just see for a minute or two what can be achieved to make economies. It is a very fruitful area, because one can in fact achieve no less than economies of between 20 and 35 %, as Mr Linde has said. Under this heading one could hope to achieve 15 % from engine improvements themselves and another 15 % from design improvements, from smaller engines, from reduced weights and better aerodynamics. On the other hand, not all this is prospective, because the point has been made to me only in the last few hours by the 'Comité de liaison de la construction automobile' that the European automobile industry itself has achieved economies in fuel of new cars by an average of 10 to 12 % since 1973 when we had the first oil crisis and they expect with some confidence — and I think they are justified — to achieve 20 % reductions by 1985 as measured against 1973. So that, I think is quite an achievement which is not altogether brought about by governments. In fact, I think perhaps one slight failing in this report is to tend to stress overmuch what the Community and member governments can do and not to put sufficient faith in the efforts of industry and of the ordinary consumers.

The other point I would just like to touch on in the remaining minute concerns public transport. Here, I think, as with waste-heat, it is very important not to be under any misconceptions about what can be done. It is commonly said that public transport will achieve many of the necessary economies if we use our private motorcars less and less in urban areas. Well, of course, there is some truth in that, but it does all depend on the passenger loads in public transport. Let us not be under illusions about that. If one has low loads, then one will certainly not get the economies one is aiming at and we must never lose sight of this sort of fact.

So let us think hard about transport economies. In the Parliament we can continue to make a contribution through this seminar which is to be held under the auspices of the Committee on Transport and which will be a formal public hearing in the autumn.

President. — I call Mr Petronio.

Mr Petronio. — (*I*) Mr President, the need for energy saving results — as Mr Linde said — from the well-known supply problems. In this sector we are vulnerable, and we must therefore avoid any waste and use energy rationally. But Mr Fuchs is right to say that this does not mean basing our actions solely on binding measures which distribute poverty and austerity impartially and thus paralyse industrial initiative. Instead, we of the Italian Right think there is a need to develop research to the full, so that more advanced technology may help us to reduce the energy costs of the product. Indeed, saving energy means to consume less, while continuing to produce and, if possible, producing more.

Two parallel approaches must therefore be followed — on the one hand, to avoid waste without lapsing into an unrealistic industrial policy, and, on the other, to encourage development through research. At this point, and without dwelling further on the philosophy of the matter, it is advisable to get down to brass tacks by referring to the resolutions which envisage financial aids for energy saving pilot projects, and to draw attention to the guidelines suggested by the Committee on Energy and Research, which recommended that the Community be given all the appropriate instruments for taking effective action in this sector while avoiding further banal and pointless appeals to producers and consumers. In short, maximum use must be made of combined heat and power for industry, and above all there must be made available a detailed report on the most useful practical experience acquired in the various Member States, especially at local level, in the field of energy saving.

In this connection, I wish to associate myself with Mr Ippolito's suggestion that a delegation from the European Parliament should visit a farm in Todi where bio-gas derived from manure is used as a source of energy. It would also be a good idea for this delegation to take the opportunity to visit an area in the Appennines bounded by Modena, Reggio Emilia, Sassuolo and Siena, where the Italian ceramic producers are based. As is well known, Italian ceramics are a Community product of prime importance, especially in view of the scale of their exports. In some of these ceramic factories plans and systems have been tried out which achieve an energy saving of almost 50 %, using new rather than traditional techniques. These involve roller kilns instead of the old tunnel kilns. Energy is saved both in the firing process and in the clearing of fumes. The electric power supplied and

Petronio

taken up is much less, consumption is considerably reduced, and only half the number of calories are used. In a more appropriate context, I shall provide the technical data, which are difficult to explain here and to interpret immediately. However, the basic fact — an energy saving of 50 % — is beyond question. Of course, it is in any case in the interest of the Italian ceramics industry to renew its plant, but, since the cost of the new plant is considerable, financial aid is needed from the Community so that the plans do not remain unfulfilled, especially since they are economically worthwhile and can serve as an example to Europe for the near future.

President. — I call Mr Müller-Herrmann.

Mr Müller-Herrmann. — (D) Mr President, I have only two brief remarks to make. Mr Linde's report, which my Group and I support, is basically no more than a pale image of what is really needed to bring home the importance of the energy problem and the need for energy saving to the public at large. We politicians — and especially the Member States' governments — must have sufficient courage to make our people realize that we shall have to change a lot of our fond habits, either by drivers exercising more self-discipline or by using lower-consumption appliances or by reducing the temperature in our offices or by saving energy in our homes. We must realize, though, that our people will only get the point and act accordingly if they are given the facts in suitable form. I think it is a better idea to get our people to do what is necessary voluntarily rather than introducing government regulations to force them into action. Secondly, Mr Linde, there was only really one contentious point in the Committee, to wit, what role the price factor should play in energy saving. Let me refer you to the speech given by the President of Venezuela, Mr Herrera Campins, who pointed out the importance of getting the price to reflect the degree of scarcity in the energy sector. However pressing the need to avoid social hardship — which we shall indeed do everything in our power to avoid — we should on no account diminish the saving effect of the price factor.

Finally, let me say that we in this House would, in my opinion, be ill advised, at the very moment when the Americans have realized the need to correct their price policy, to reduce the impact of the price factor by state intervention in the field of energy saving.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Brunner first because he has to catch an aeroplane.

Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission. — (D) Mr President, I should like to begin by thanking Mr Linde

for his very good report and for the words of praise he had for our work. The European Community is now gradually making some progress in this crucial sector which, over the next ten years, will require a great effort on the part of Europe not only in terms of energy policy but also as regards our security. Let us not underestimate the analytical aspect. Analysis is the basis for a coherent energy saving strategy, just as the words uttered by this Parliament are the basis for an effective effort on the part of the consumer. Our debates in this House have great potential importance, which is why I regret the fact that today's debate has become disjointed, that we have failed to get a real dialogue going, that the same members are not present in the Chamber in the morning as in the evening, and that we consequently cannot generate the desired effect outside this Chamber. After all, how are we ever to save energy unless the millions and millions of consumers take the right and necessary decisions? What we are faced with here is the greatest process of structural reorganization since the Second World War. How can we get such a process going without democratic stimulus from the elected representatives of the people of Europe?

We have a programme of action, and we are now instituting practical measures. In 1980 we are concentrating on measures in the field of heat generators and the labelling of household appliances. We are adding considerably to our demonstration projects for energy saving. We want 80 million units of account for this purpose over the coming weeks. We are pressing ahead with our research efforts, and finally, we are doing something whose importance cannot be overestimated as regards this research effort.

The Saint-Geours Working Party, which made a start by studying the question of energy saving, is now back in action, and is currently examining ways of saving energy and at the same time creating jobs in Europe. I hope that once results are available in the coming months — by the beginning of September, I hope — we shall be able to bring home to every person in Europe the macro-economic importance of this subject. We shall then be able to show that this is not just something which will make us less dependent on oil, but which will counteract inflationary tendencies and create new jobs.

This is an avenue we want to explore together with you. Over the last ten years, we have achieved a certain energy saving; after all, a saving of 7 to 8 % since 1973 is not to be sneezed at. There are plenty of other opportunities for saving, though. If we go about our work correctly, we can save another 100 million tonnes of oil by 1990, equivalent — if handled correctly — to a multi-gigawatt operational power station. I think it is up to us to get things moving in the right direction. The European Community cannot go it alone; we need the cooperation of the Member States, because legislation and fiscal support are vital factors. But we can do more than simply analyse the

Brunner

problem. We can continue with this practical work, and we also want to tackle the harmonization of prices and taxation. We want to do whatever is necessary, so that no government — no matter what situation it may be in — can seek excuses for not taking part in joint action. Joint action is feasible, and we can do more yet. With your support, we can put all this into practice.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Herman to speak on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

Mr Herman. — *(F)* Mr President, I shall do so in telegraphic style, since it is already very late.

First point. We feel that the problem of energy saving is a vast and complex one and that the three measures put forward are only a first step in the right direction. We hope that you will very soon submit a more wide-ranging programme.

Second point. It is not enough just to coordinate action between the Member States. Since you have neither the necessary instruments, nor the statistics, which are drawn up too late, nor the ability to impose sanctions, it is not enough to achieve the coordination you want unless it is really effective. So, at some point, there must be a definite move by the Member States towards a unified Community policy.

Third point. You are being over-optimistic when you state that good results have already been achieved and that a lot of energy has been saved. Somewhat deeper analysis would show that if there have been any energy savings this is above all because in many sectors which formerly used large amounts of energy, there has been a crisis and a deep recession. Indeed we have seen that even with the slight sign of recovery we had in 1979 there was an increase in energy consumption, which proves that private consumption has not fallen much but that it was industrial consumption which was harder hit — as far as it is possible to make a correct analysis of statistics for all countries, which is not always easy.

Fourth point. The idea of progressively reducing the ratio between rates of growth in energy consumption and the national product to 0.7 is in itself a sound one, but this is a dubious criterion which will be difficult to apply. It can be used with hindsight but it is not a very practical criterion given the margin for error which exists in defining both the numerator and the denominator of the fraction.

Prices policy is obviously an important point. We should like to draw your attention to the fact that, as is the case in some countries, higher prices will have no effect in reducing consumption if any price rise is

offset by measures for index-linking or adjusting incomes.

My last point is that we feel that in your proposals concerning standards for the energy efficiency of household appliances and the fuel consumption of cars you are being over-cautious. Of course, there must be voluntary cooperation, but what has been done in Japan and in the United States has been a little more radical. Perhaps we could set our sights equally high and ultimately adopt consumption standards which would enable us to save more energy.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

The proceedings will now be suspended until 9.05 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 8.05 p.m. and resumed at 9.05 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR JACQUET

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

19. *Surveillance of shipping routes for Community supplies*

President. — The next item is the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-30/80) by Mr d'Ormesson and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) to the Commission:

Subject: Surveillance and protection of shipping routes for supplies of energy and strategic materials to the countries of the European Community.

- Whereas the European Community is obliged to import from third countries almost all the oil and strategic materials necessary to its economic life,
- recalling that most of its supplies from the Middle East, Africa and the two Americas are transported by sea,
- whereas this is also true of its shipments to third countries, which represent 50 % of its exports,

President

- whereas the tense international situation, which has been aggravated by Soviet incursions into Africa and central Asia, gives rise to uncertainty about the strategy of the Soviet Union,
- whereas, for several years, the Soviet Union has been spending a considerable part of its military budget, which is the largest of any state, on strengthening naval forces designed for attack and external intervention rather than coastal surveillance,
- having regard to the disastrous effects that a break in its marine lines of communication would have on the EEC,
- emphasizing the importance for its security and for the cohesion of the Atlantic nations of freedom of shipping in the Atlantic Ocean, the Indian Ocean, the Mediterranean and particularly around straits and strategic islands, at a time when the coming accession of Greece, Spain and Portugal will lengthen the EEC's coastline,
- recalling that the intervention zone covered by the North Atlantic Treaty stops south of the Tropic of Cancer, while 90 % of the oil tankers pass around the Cape of Good Hope,

the authors of this question ask whether the common interests of the nine countries of the Community, which share responsibility for the development of the international situation, do not call for:

1. consideration by the Council meeting in political cooperation of the means to be employed henceforth to safeguard the shipping routes to Europe,
2. the reinforcement of these means through concerted diplomatic and military action by the members of the Atlantic Alliance possessing naval forces,
3. the setting up of an operational structure to coordinate in times of crisis the various external measures the Member States would need to take to safeguard their vital maritime interests, and particularly the pooling of detection methods (radar) and surveillance methods (coastguards).

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

Mr Baillot. — (F) Mr President, on behalf of the French Communist and Allies I should like to move the previous question on the oral question by Mr d'Ormesson and others, pursuant to Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure.

A careful reading of this question makes it abundantly clear that it has nothing to do with the present debate on energy and, what is more — and in our opinion this is the main point — it is not included among the responsibilities of the Assembly as laid down in the Treaty of Rome.

It is a military matter, as paragraph 2 makes it extremely clear:

'The reinforcement of these means through concerted diplomatic and military action by the members of the Atlantic Alliance possessing naval forces.'

I don't think one can be more explicit than that. It is therefore fraudulent for the authors of the question to seek to impose upon us, by means of a debate, problems which are not the concern of our Assembly. It is for this reason that we have moved the previous question and we therefore ask you to remove this question from the agenda.

President. — I call Mr Veronesi.

Mr Veronesi. — (I) Mr President, we are in favour of the proposal made by Mr Baillot but, if I remember rightly, the Christian-Democratic Group said earlier today that it would withdraw this subject from the agenda. For the sake of consistency, I think that this document should be held over or withdrawn.

President. — I call Mr Luster.

Mr Luster. — (D) Mr President, I would point out, first of all, that what we are concerned with is a previous question, not a procedural motion under Rule 32. It is only procedural motions within the meaning of Rule 32 — in this case Rule 32 (1) (e) — that can be considered here first. If, however, Mr President, you feel that this previous question amounts to a procedural motion — which according to the author of the previous question himself is not the case — then it must be said that we are, among other things, a European Economic Community, so that we have to deal with European economic problems, of which one vital economic factor is, of course, that supplies to the European Community include energy and strategic material, without which we could not go on.

In other words, for formal reasons because the motion has not been moved in the correct form, but also for practical reasons because the motion does not serve the objectives of the European Economic Community, the motion must be rejected. Furthermore, the authors of the motion were aware that this question was being considered in the context of our agenda. When the draft agenda was being drawn up, they could have then brought forward all they are bringing forward now, for they are not saying that new information has come to light. Are they trying to play the fool or something?

(Applause from centre and right)

... Anyone who proceeds in this way, Mr President, is doing what in law is known as a *venire contra factum proprium* i.e., an action running counter to one's previous conduct. This is known in law as a mischievous proceeding. For all these reasons the motion must be rejected.

(Applause from centre and right)

President. — I put the previous question to the vote.

The previous question is rejected.

(Applause from centre and right)

I call Mr d'Ormesson.

Mr d'Ormesson. — *(F)* Mr President and colleagues, before taking you around the Cape of Good Hope, I should like to turn back a moment to the past: the inexpiable wars in which Europe was so often plunged, metamorphosing each time, gave way, thanks to God, to the European Community. Thanks to God, but also thanks to men:

Who would have dared contradict in 1945 the exhortation of Paul Valéry:

Are we to go once again where we know not where and where we would not go, because there is chaos within us, or are we to get a grip on ourselves, and seek with yesterday's enemy the ways of peace?

Then came the event which was to change the course of contemporary history. It proves that the policy of states does not always follow a historic fatalism, for it is impossible to exclude the human element, the personal factor. At the end of the Second World War it was Winston Churchill, and it was towards him that my thoughts turned, on 25 March, when I heard a British Member express indignation at the burning of the Union Jack by demonstrators. Winston Churchill, the man who had only 'blood and tears' to offer the British people to save the freedom of all. The representatives of the United Kingdom sitting here, in whatever part of this Assembly, should know that every one of us, and every Frenchman in this group, will always have a special affection for proud and noble England.

The Community is also the creation of other noble figures, as Mr Luis Herrera Campins observed earlier this afternoon: Alcide de Gasperi, Paul-Henri Spaak, Queen Wilhelmina, Joseph Bech, Willy Brandt, a Member of this House, and Jean Monnet.

The event that was to upset the rhythm of history itself resulted, as you all know, from the friendship established between Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and President Robert Schumann, and from the latter's friendship with General de Gaulle. Friendship that was fraternal. These statesmen mapped out a policy from which would successively emerge, the Coal and Steel Pact and the Euratom Pact. This was followed by an agricultural common market that was to stand the test of time and of its enlargement. On 19 July last, the nine countries of the Community sent their representatives to sit at Strasbourg after having elected them for the first time by direct universal suffrage. Thanks to this popular backing, they gave a new impetus to the idea of a European Confederation. Since then, the

institution seems to be faltering in the face of Europe's hesitation in consolidating its union and healing its rifts, and also under the pressure of aggressive Soviet diplomatic and military initiatives. In his end-of-year message, the French President warned that there was a danger of war, and added: 'Never has peace depended so much on the coolheadedness of a few men.' Later, in a televised broadcast which many of us watched here, the British Prime Minister recognized the gravity of the threat to Western Europe.

Once a threat exists, Ladies and Gentlemen, there must be an end to quarrels and recriminations between partners. And budgetary and administrative disputes must be settled with due regard for the rights and duties of each Member State, but without parading them before the public in terms of confrontation. Now dissensions only serve the interests of Soviet strategy, a strategy which is, at least, brutally frank given that less than two years after the Helsinki Agreements, which confirmed the USSR's sovereignty over its immense conquests, Leonid Brezhnev declared in Prague in February 1977, in front of the entire Communist Party hierarchy: 'By 1985 we shall, thanks to our diplomacy, have attained most of our objectives in Western Europe, and the alternation of the balance will be so decisive that we shall be able to impose our will whenever it proves necessary.'

Western Europe at the mercy of the USSR with its men, its wealth, its granaries — that, since Yalta, has been the dream of the rulers of a totalitarian Empire that belongs to neither East nor West, and which has the traditions of neither! Any race, any land that has been successively Romanized and Christianized and subjected to the intelligence and discipline of the Greeks is absolutely European. But Greek culture, Christian civilisations, the Latin world have no more redoubtable rival today than that which reaches to the foothills of the Urals, which possesses the largest and richest territory in the world, and which holds in its thrall the peoples of the eastern borderland intended by Charlemagne to contain the barbarian invasions. Therefore, to the determination of the Community's Heads of State unremittently to seek peaceful compromise with reason, courage and dignity, must be allied the boldness of new proposals for Europe's defence and the security of its maritime routes.

(Applause from centre and right)

Let it not be said that the Treaty of Rome does not include defence. If the authors of the Treaty of Rome were today assembled at Messina or anywhere else, their first concern would be the defence of Europe, and the availability of supplies of mineral and fossile materials, including oil.

(Applause from centre and right)

In the September issue of 'Défense Nationale', Admiral Labrousse said that if the route around the Cape of

d'Ormesson

Good Hope — which is not covered by the North Atlantic Treaty since it lies south of the Tropic of Cancer — has become the oil route, it is also the route for raw materials. In a recent debate held here, Mrs Louise Moreau pointed out the Community's dependence on raw materials. Does it not import from Morocco, Senegal and Togo 83 % of the phosphates vital to the Community's agriculture? From Niger and Gabon 100 % of its requirements in non-military uranium; from Gabon and South Africa 75 % of its manganese; from Madagascar and South Africa 46 % of its chrome; from Zaire 100 % of its cobalt and 35 % of its copper; from Guinea, Ghana and Mozambique 83 % of its bauxite? More than this: this year a thousand million tonnes of oil will be shipped around the Cape of Good Hope, 60 % of which will go to Western Europe and 20 % to the United States.

But all along this route lurks a fleet of Soviet submarines. The Soviet Union has 305 of them, including 87 strategic submarines, (missile launchers) 83 nuclear-propelled offensive submarines and 135 conventionally-powered offensive submarines. The US, for its part, has 41 strategic submarines, 70 nuclear-powered offensive submarines and 8 conventionally-powered offensive submarines. The Community has 11 nuclear-powered offensive submarines, 10 of them British, and 49 conventionally-powered offensive submarines. In addition, France has 5 strategic submarines and the UK 4 missile-launching submarines. Taking all sea-going surface vessels together, the USSR has 132 vessels to the United States' 196 and the Community's 119; but the USSR has 75 000 tonnes more military tonnage than the United States! Why? Why does the Soviet submarine fleet emphasize attack rather than deterrence? That is my first question. Is the general public aware of the threat to its supply lines from some 218 Soviet offensive submarines? Need I recall that in 1939 Hitler had 8 submarines at sea and 20 in his shipyards? My second question is this: is it not time, therefore, for the Community to take over responsibility for protecting its sea routes, in concert with the Member countries of the Atlantic Alliance, a protection which obviously requires the coordination of surveillance missions and the construction of a naval fleet capable of counterbalancing the Soviet fleet from the North Sea to the Cape of Good Hope?

My conclusion is this: Europe, which yesterday ruled the world, has become, in the words of Arthur Conte, a Europe under siege, because the Community's political power, economic power and mutual-aid capacity depend very much on its military capacity. However, the Community only devotes 3.8 % of its budget to defence as against 6 % in the United States and 12 % in the USSR. That is why I tabled this question today, Mr President.

(Prolonged applause from centre and right)

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

Mrs Hammerich. — *(DK)* Mr President, we have just heard a very interesting lecture on strategy but I would ask whether you would be good enough to remind the honourable Member that we are meeting here under the aegis of the European Community and not of NATO. We would like to know where the Treaty of Rome says that we can discuss military strategy in this House.

(Applause from the extreme left)

President. — Mrs Hammerich, this point has been settled just now with the rejection of the previous question.

I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, member of the Commission. — *(F)* Mr President, I have already made it clear to the honourable Member who put the question that, given the importance of the problems raised here, which are obviously disturbing and of concern to Europe, the Commission will follow the debate with the greatest attention, take note of the resolution that is adopted and, in the context of its deliberations on these proceedings consider how it may best serve Parliament and Europe.

(Applause from various benches on the centre and right)

President. — I call Mrs Charzat to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Charzat. — *(F)* Mr President, the oral question put to the Commission of the European Communities by Mr d'Ormesson is another aspect of the war psychosis that has recently been organized. To divert attention from the economic crisis and the European Community's six million unemployed an attempt is being made to create a reflex of fear accustoming Europeans to the idea of war.

I would like to raise five points regarding the oral question. First: the establishment of an 'operational structure', as it is euphemistically called, is not within the ambit of the Community's responsibilities. Secondly, this oral question revives, by way of the oil issue, the debate on armaments and, in particular, the creation of a European intervention force totally integrated in the Atlantic Alliance.

Thirdly, as Europe depends on the Gulf nations for 85 % of its oil supplies, 97 % of its supplies being transported by sea, the region of the Near and Middle East, Red Sea and Mediterranean is particularly

Charzat

affected. The creation of an Atlantic operational structure would be contrary to any attempt to seek a solution aimed at establishing peace on the basis of the Camp David agreements and UN resolutions 242 and 338 that provided for the establishment of demilitarized zones independent of the two blocs. Honour for the European Community lies in giving its support to peace and not to war.

Fourthly, the establishment of a European operational structure would be part of a strategy for East-West tension. Certainly, the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan is inadmissible. But it must be remembered that oil is of decisive strategic importance for American imperialism in a system of blocs. The oil weapon enables the United States to strengthen its military and ideological dominance, first over Europe, and, as a result, over the Gulf nations and the underdeveloped countries.

The orchestration of a war psychosis in the Straits of Ormuz provokes anxiety among the people of Europe and the United States. The events in Iran, and the invasion of Afghanistan by Soviet troops, allow the United States to raise the level of American forces and tactical armaments in the Gulf region. Since 1972 the sixth and seventh fleets have been stationed in the strategic zone of the Middle East. In June 1979 the US President set up a 110 000-man intervention force in the Gulf states. Furthermore, the US military budget provides for the construction of a new fleet of vessels for marines patrolling the Gulf area.

In the face of bloc rivalries, the only realistic attitude on the part of the European Economic Community would have been to adopt a common energy policy when the first oil crisis began. Vulnerable because of its heavy dependence on oil, the EEC nevertheless rejected any idea of an independent common oil policy. When crude-oil prices shot up in autumn 1979, it did nothing to regulate open markets, the first stage of any coherent oil policy.

To those who favour an Atlantic Europe, it is easier to accept the idea of Arab responsibility for the oil crisis than to guard against the tensions systematically organized by American imperialism and the multinational oil companies.

Need I mention that at the Tokyo Summit, while the EEC states were fiercely fighting one another to buy oil at soaring prices on the open markets, the United States — thanks to the events in Iran — were taking in more imports still, via the open markets, with a subsidy of 5 dollars per barrel applied by the US President.

Need I mention that at the same time, the American oil industry decided, on the suspension of Iranian exports, to store crude oil rather than refine it for the production of petrol. Crude oil imports increased, the lack being made up by the other crude-producing countries. The Commissioner responsible for Energy

Matters also bears a heavy responsibility here. Completely lacking in Euro-Arab institutions, the Community prevented any possibility of Euro-Arab dialogue capable of giving it some room for manoeuvre *vis-à-vis* the oil multinationals.

And now to my fifth and final point. Europe's best supplies policy must consist not in brandishing the threat of war in a context of total economic vulnerability, but in establishing a peaceful dialogue with the Third World countries. Europe must reject the bloc system to pave the way for economic takeoff and non-alignment in the underdeveloped countries. The European Economic Community must not pile up difficulties, but create conditions for peace and *détente* by following a common energy policy independent of the bloc's strategies for tension.

President. — I call Mr von Hassel to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian — Democratic Group).

Mr von Hassel. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I must first reject the assertion that a war psychosis is being stirred up in this House, that we have been creating anxiety, and wish to spread anxiety, and that we have been concerned to stir up thoughts of war in Europe. I reject your reproach, Mrs Charzat, that we are spreading fear of war and building our policy on this fear.

(Applause from the EPP)

I failed to detect in your speech, Mrs Charzat, any reference to events on the other side of the Iron Curtain. You made no mention of the cause of all this concern over Afghanistan and Iran.

(Applause from the EPP)

I consider it most commendable that Mr d'Ormesson should have directed the attention of this House to the situation as it presents itself to the objective observer. And if what Mr d'Ormesson dealt with in only one of its aspects were to be expanded by myself to include others — there is not enough time for this — the great imbalance between the military forces of the other side and what we are building up for our defence, would be seen as tellingly as Mr d'Ormesson has already outlined. The upshot of all this, Mrs Charzat, is that the Soviets speak constantly of *détente* and at the same time are building the most powerful land, sea and air forces in the world. I find it quite incomprehensible, therefore, that it should be felt necessary in this House to express sympathy which the Soviet's concern at being threatened by the West.

Mrs Charzat — and this applies equally to Mrs Hammerich, who has also spoken — anyone who knows the facts of the situation — and I assume that

Von Hassel

Soviet politicians and Soviet generals are among that number — knows that NATO, to which you also belong, is totally unfitted for an attack. It is a defence alliance, and anyone who speaks of a war psychosis is speaking against his better judgment.

(Applause from centre and right)

I cannot understand how it is possible in this House to talk of warlike statements — as was the case in today's debate on the subject of Iran. Mrs Hammerich, it was you who raised this point today, and I would have you know that you can express yourself freely in this House today only because men like Mr d'Ormesson and others from all the leading parties in Europe have taken care that we can still talk openly over here in freedom.

(Applause from centre and right)

You also suggested that it is not the business of this House to concern itself with these questions. My friends and I believe that the world situation is such that this Parliament, also, must consider it. Basic principles must again be stated here. We are the most political of all Parliaments in Europe, directly elected by the voters and by our nations; and our voters, insofar as they concern themselves with the world situation at all, expect us to do whatever is required to make our contribution towards guaranteeing peace and maintaining our freedom.

(Applause from centre and right)

We all know that basically the West European Union is responsible for this area, but I know from bitter experience that the West European Union's Parliamentary Assembly does not have the requisite, strength, the directly elected politicians. If we are criticized for dealing with this subject here, then I suggest that this House consider whether we should not send some of our colleagues, like Mr d'Ormesson and others, as observers to the West European Union's Parliamentary Assembly to convey to that body our political views on the issues for which it is properly responsible.

Allow me to take up again Mr d'Ormesson's thesis: we must protect our shipping routes. We must guard against getting into a catastrophic situation. In all directions, that is to Europe and from Europe, our sea links must be so secured that nothing can happen to us, and I am grateful to Mr Davignon that the Commission will do all it can to meet the demands of this House. This involves not only 'paper' diplomacy, but also making available those instruments which alone will make it clear to the Soviets that we in the free world are to be taken seriously.

The aim of this question is to get East and West to take us seriously in our will to guarantee peace and maintain freedom.

(Applause from centre and right)

President. — I call Mr de Courcy Ling to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr de Courcy Ling. — Mr President, this oral question by Mr D'Ormesson mentions and has in mind the independent countries of Southern Africa. At midnight tomorrow Zimbabwe will become independent — the last former colony in Southern Africa to do so — and I know that all here would like me to say that we send our good wishes to Mr Robert Mugabe and President Banana for the continuance of their moral authority, so that the new government of Zimbabwe may continue for a long time in the democratic tradition which has so recently begun.

I have three points to make, Mr President. I believe that the French Communists' initiative to take this off the agenda was inspired by that same dreadful cynicism which we hear day after day in the speeches of Mr Marchais and of *'L'Humanité'*. It is they who are aggressive in support of Soviet, Bolshevik, perhaps Tsarist Russia — there has been no difference, there has been no change — expansionist policies.

The idea which we have heard expressed by Mrs Charzat is slightly different, because I believe that it is based on a false and extremely dangerous idealism. There is nevertheless a very important difference between Communist cynicism and Socialist idealism. I fear that among the many flaws in Madam Charzat's argument the most serious is that you can have a kind of neutrality in Europe or in the South Atlantic without defending it. What is the evidence that you can live in a military vacuum in the 1980s? What is the evidence that you can maintain the kind of system that we have in the Lomé Convention without being prepared to defend it against attack? We are not aggressive — you know we are not aggressive; we simply want to defend what we have.

As regards the Lomé Convention, we in Europe have a particular relationship with nearly the whole of Africa. A very large number of the countries of Africa have been colonies of the Member States of this Community. We have the Yaoundé Association, we have the first Lomé Convention and we will have many more Lomé Conventions. We have a reciprocal responsibility towards the independent African countries to make security of supply and demand in respect of raw materials a reality. If it is impossible to deliver the raw materials from Africa, and Southern Africa in particular, to the European Community, our guarantee means absolutely nothing; it would be an empty promise.

Finally, Mr President, I want to say that the NATO area is a restricted area. We are not this evening talking about NATO or the NATO area. I was extremely interested, on the other hand, in what Mr von Hassel said about the Western European Union. We must take into account the role of the Western European

Von Hassel

Union in these matters. I am inclined to support the suggestion by Mr von Hassel that Members of this Parliament should perhaps eventually participate as observers in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Western European Union and I would certainly think that Mr d'Ormesson, by the very high quality of his speech this evening, has earned our support for his candidature to go as one of our nominees to that assembly.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

President. — I call Mr Baillot to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Baillot. — *(F)* I should like, in a few words, to reply to Mr Luster concerning our procedure this evening. There were two ways we could ask for the dropping of a debate of this kind: we could either have acted on Monday when the agenda was being drawn up or we could have used the previous question, as the Rules of Procedure allow. We used the previous question. This was the choice we made and I do not see how Mr Luster can criticize us for this.

I should now like to deal with the question itself. The text tabled by Mr d'Ormesson and others, and the explanations we have been given, are at least clear. The first point to be noted is the reiterated wish to overstep the responsibilities of this House and the European Community by carrying the debate into the military sphere. This is the first time such a debate has taken place here. There are other European Assemblies that are specially designed to deal with these problems.

The Community in general, and this House in particular, are based on treaties which completely rule out military responsibilities. As a result, this debate is illegal, and its conclusions necessarily null and void. And if any proof were needed of the correctness of our position, we would find it in the reply of Mr Davignon, which shows how wary the Commission is of entering a debate that is outside its competence.

There remains, of course, the authors' political intention — to work for the violation of the Treaties and supranationality. The Straits of Ormuz and the Cape of Good Hope are pretexts for trotting out once again the old idea of a European Defence Community.

My second point concerns the very concept of the European Community, as expressed in this text. The Europe that you defend, Mr d'Ormesson, is merely one component of the whole Atlantic Alliance. Your plan is to build an imperialist bloc under American leadership whose reach would be worldwide.

My third and final point is this: to give some semblance of justification to this openly imperialist policy, you wheel out again the old myth of a Soviet threat on

the basis of the events in Afghanistan; those who have spoken here have merely been preaching anti-Sovietism and anti-Communism. But you know very well — and you will not need much reminding — that the United States did not wait for the events in Afghanistan to announce its intentions in this area. On 15 September 1977 the Secretary of State for Defence, speaking at the annual dinner of the Industrial Association for National Security, declared:

Outside Europe there are other parts of the world where the situation is delicate and potentially explosive, the Middle East, the Persian Gulf and Korea being three such regions where the United States and her allies have vital interests. A conflict in any one of these regions would not only force the United States to intervene with appropriate military force, but might precede or even provoke a crisis or conflagration in Europe. The initial attack might come from a hostile local force.

I repeat, this is a 1977 statement, it did not come after 27 December 1979: The United States did not wait for Afghanistan before substantially strengthening its military intervention force in the Indian Ocean, whether at the Diego Garcia base through the agreements for military facilities concluded with various neighbouring states or, in particular, by reinstalling at Bahrain the Dubai base, not to mention Masira airport in Oman, and all to what end? Allow me, Mr d'Ormesson, to also quote Admiral Labrousse, for you are not the only one who reads the *Revue de défense nationale*:

'Apart from the internal situation in Iran and the uncertainty over the role that country will play in the Gulf's future, it is South Yemen and the intermittent Dofar rebellion that will most concern Americans.'

Mr d'Ormesson and those who support him are merely reflecting at their own level the assessments of Mr Brown and Mr Carter. Two points emerge: first, the clearly affirmed readiness for military intervention to maintain imperialist domination of the so-called vital interests of the West, a phrase designed to deceive; second, the definition of forces hostile to the West, above all the people's liberation movements.

As my friend Danielle De March demonstrated this afternoon in the debate on Iran, it is clearly not Afghanistan but the situation in Iran that Mr Carter considers crucial. Mr d'Ormesson and others want a Europe that will fall into step with the United States and follow around the world an aircraft carrier policy. This policy is a danger to peace and we vigorously oppose it. This policy runs counter to history: your cruisers and your missiles will not stop the trends of the times — the liberation of peoples and the development of socialism. This policy is a disastrous mistake, the future does not lie in looting the Third World and imperialist violence, the future is a new world economic order respectful of the interests of all the world's peoples and, above all, those who have least, and your proposals, Mr d'Ormesson, go against the wishes of more than a thousand million men and women around the Indian Ocean who want to make

Bailiot

this area a demilitarized zone of peace and who, together with the UN, demand freedom of movement through all its straits and passages.

(Cries of 'Afghanistan' from centre and right)

In conclusion, need I point out that several of our countries, starting with Mr d'Ormesson's, receive no small part of their energy supplies — coal, oil and, above all, natural gas — from the Soviet Union, and that steps are currently being taken to try to obtain more natural gas? Need I also mention the proposal made by the Soviet Union last March — one of our Italian colleagues referred to it this afternoon in the debate on Iran — to investigate with the Community Member States ways and means of safeguarding their routes for energy supplies, rather than war-mongering and sabre-rattling? Mr d'Ormesson, the better course is to use political negotiation to consolidate *détente* and create the conditions for a steady improvement in international cooperation. For their part, the French Communists and Allies will continue to pursue this goal and will leave you and your like, Mr d'Ormesson, to stamp the warpath.

(Applause from the extreme left)

President. — I call Mr Haagerup to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Haagerup. — *(DK)* Mr President, it is no exaggeration to say that the question before us today is an unusual one. Unlike certain other topics which we from time to time consider in this House, no one will at any rate be able to deny that it deals with a very central problem.

It deals with our Community's extreme vulnerability and heavy dependence on supplies of strategic materials, in particular crude oil, from far-away countries. It is therefore difficult to imagine a more important topic for the Community. The question is unusual in that it broaches a wide-ranging subject in the field of security policy. We know from previous occasions that there are groups in this Parliament that react very strongly when such matters are raised. I don't think I need to expand on that point. Nevertheless, this has not prevented the spokesmen of a few groups from bringing up issues of security policy on previous occasions, albeit with the opposite purpose in mind. For example, they tabled motions for resolutions directed against the NATO decision in December to site American medium-range missiles during the 1980's in order at least partially to offset Soviet superiority in this field. These motions were rejected by a large majority, but it is worth noting that it was opponents of the right of the Community and of this Parliament even to discuss matters of defence policy who previously raised such matters in this very House.

This time the situation is different. The protection of the shipping lanes via which our strategic raw materials are transported to the Community has now been raised by a group of Members who have made a genuine and well-founded assessment of the threats to the safety of these shipping lanes. The fact that this question is addressed to the Commission, whose terms of reference do not of course include defence policy, underlines the unusual nature of the form and substance of the question.

Allow me, on behalf of my group, to put on record that we do not feel that there are any taboo subjects for this Parliament. We have no taboo subjects. The question as to our competence in this matter is entirely irrelevant as far as the European Parliament is concerned.

(Applause)

This Parliament naturally has the right to raise any issue which is felt to be of importance to the Community. Nobody can deny that this matter is of importance. It is one thing, however, to recognize the major and, indeed, entirely central importance of this question to the Community. It is quite another to determine what we in this Parliament can do to create greater understanding of the importance of this problem, not to mention what guidelines might possibly be proposed with a view to improving the situation. This would, among other things, involve ensuring better coordinated and more effective protection of the shipping lanes in question. The situation is, as we all know, that defence policy is not a Community responsibility and that most of the shipping lanes we are concerned to protect are not covered by the North Atlantic Treaty, to which eight of our nine member countries are a party. At the same time, it is of course possible for the Foreign Ministers of the Nine meeting in political cooperation to consider any issue. Indeed, the question contains a reference to this effect, although I suspect that it was not the intention of the authors of the question to alter the existing division of responsibilities. Between political cooperation in the European Community and military cooperation in NATO.

However, unless we simply intend to close our eyes to the problem raised here or consider it as a purely American responsibility or, possibly, adopt both views, which is not of course a very logical approach, this is clearly something that should concern us. It is, of course, at once far more difficult to indicate guidelines for what practical action can be taken when account is taken of the national, emotional and other reservations that stand in the way of an unbiased approach to these problems. It cannot really be said that these points have been satisfactorily clarified by the question that has been tabled. Neither is it certain that the recommended guidelines can be expected to be accepted as they stand by all the Member States.

Haagerup

My group cannot in all respects endorse the exact wording of the question that has been tabled but it is ready to engage in an appraisal of the problems raised when a number of questions have been more satisfactory clarified. In the first place — and these are my concluding remarks — it must be right to help shed greater light on the question of the protection of our shipping routes and the possibility of more effective coordination of radar and surveillance equipment. This should, let it be noted, take place in an unbiased atmosphere that also takes into account the widely differing views that are held of these questions. If an unbiased discussion of this nature can help to increase understanding of the importance of these matters to the Community as a whole and to cooperation between all the Western countries concerned, it will not encounter opposition from my group.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — I call Mr Deleau to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Deleau. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall be very brief so as not to fuel a debate which has no place in this Assembly.

I merely wish, on behalf of my group, to protest at the placing on the agenda of this oral question by Mr d'Ormesson and others. In our opinion, the protection of sea routes, the necessity of which we in no way deny, lies outside the Community's sphere of activities and is not, therefore, a matter for our Assembly. It is for other bodies to take up this matter if they see fit.

President. — I call Mr Skovmand.

Mr Skovmand. — *(DK)* Mr President, when I get home to Denmark I will endeavour to ensure that the whole of Mr d'Ormesson's speech reaches as wide a public as possible because it was constructed so logically and clearly and because it represents everything that the Danes fear about the European Community.

If there is anything that the people of Denmark fear, and this goes for 'so to speak' all sections of the population — with the exception perhaps of a small group around Mr Haagerup — it is the construction of an EEC military force whether on land, at sea or in the air. Mr d'Ormesson then comes along and presents a whole set of arguments explaining why the European Community should have such a military force. The formal justification — and I repeat the word 'formal' — is that the European Community's oil supplies are allegedly threatened by the Soviet Union which in recent years has expanded its fleet considerably. This expansion is a fact, although the Soviet Union's fleet is still weaker than that of the USA. However, to

imagine that the sole purpose of this build-up is to stop oil shipments to the EEC is absurd. The crux of the matter is that the EEC is to be transformed into a superpower, cost what it may. The intention is to build up a military force with disregard for the provisions of the Treaty. Even the feeblest pretext is employed.

Mr von Hassel virtually accused my colleague, Mrs Hammerich, of wanting to make us the slaves of the Soviet Union, but this claim is quite ridiculous. The Warsaw Pact countries as a whole have a somewhat weaker military force than the NATO countries, particularly when it is remembered that they must also count on having China as an opponent. In these circumstances any expansion of the EEC's military forces would be a direct threat to peace. It is clear that we in the People's Movement Against EEC Membership must oppose this proposal to extent the power of the EEC.

(Cries from the right)

President. — I call Mr Hutton.

Mr Hutton. — Mr President, this is one of the most important subjects that this Parliament will ever discuss. It ought to unite the House, since it is of such vital importance, not just to governments, but to industry and the trade unions as well. Any success in denying energy and strategic raw materials to Europe would result in massive unemployment. Europe is utterly dependent on imports for some of the most important raw materials we have. Practically all of the 14 or 15 million barrels of oil we import every day comes by sea, and the vast bulk of it comes around the Cape. We import 100 % of our chromium, manganese, nickel, platinum and phosphate. We import 97 % of the vital steel additive vanadium, 86 % of our tin, 85 % of our copper and 84 % of our iron ore. These are only a handful of the materials that we need to keep our industries running. The vulnerability of these materials should worry all of us, and it must now be embarrassingly obvious that it makes no sense at all to limit the naval defence of the western world to the northern Atlantic.

The sudden appearance last year in the south Atlantic and the Indian Ocean of noticeably aggressive vessels of the Soviet navy — an aircraft carrier, guided missile cruisers, the navy's largest amphibious vessel and a cruise missile submarine — are not myths, Mr Baillot, but a dramatic illustration of Admiral Gorschkov's threat that he is prepared to deliver crushing strikes against sea and ground targets of the imperialists on any part of the world's oceans and adjacent territories. Those are his words, not mine!

(Applause from the right)

How can we in the Nine give an appropriate lead within the Western world and the Western Alliance in

Hutton

effectively countering the Soviet threat to our supply routes?

It is of the greatest importance that the Conference of Foreign Ministers and the European Council should consider on a permanent basis the policies that should be adopted by the west to safeguard the most vital shipping links to Europe, including the Cape route. But they should not stop here. They must also take vigorous initiatives within NATO to ensure that an adequate response is made to the Soviet maritime threat. The North Atlantic Council should give urgent priority to setting up an intelligence-gathering centre to monitor the Soviet merchant fleet. 90 % of it is less than 20 years old, and we cannot overlook the potential for mischief and trouble from that in a crisis.

Those Member States of the Community who are members of the North Atlantic Alliance should provide more escort vessels to protect the main sea routes along which oil and other vital supplies are transported to western Europe. In particular they should consider the development and production on a joint basis — and here, Commissioner Davignon, Commission financing could be appropriate — of a standardized inexpensive escort vessel which could be used in an all purpose role and adapted for a specific antisubmarine warfare or electronic warfare role. Maritime aircraft and helicopters could be carried on standardized launcher pads, either on these escort vessels or on selected tankers or merchant vessels themselves. EEC or national government subsidies could be provided to improve the defence capability of merchant vessels used on major sea-routes and European industry could provide the weapons and equipment needed.

Consideration should be given by the governments directly concerned to the maintenance, possibly in cooperation with other member states of the North Atlantic Alliance, of a permanent Western naval presence in the Indian Ocean and in the south Atlantic to counterbalance the naval deployment of the Soviet Union in these areas. Bilateral or multilateral agreements made between the countries involved could provide a political and juridical basis for a southern supplement to the present NATO area.

Despite the sensitive political problems involved in establishing formal links between the North Atlantic Alliance and countries friendly to the West which lie south of the Tropic of Cancer, there is no reason why NATO's military boundaries should not organise defence planning and surveillance beyond this boundary and there is no reason why communications links should not be established now. I hope that the Foreign Ministers of the Nine will consider this proposal and that the permanent representatives of as many of the Nine as possible will urge this policy on the North Atlantic Council.

Make no mistake, Mr President, economic strangulation is today a more dangerous and immediate threat

than any military action in Europe, and although our resolution is addressed to the Foreign Ministers, we must question whether they are the proper body to discuss these questions which are of such vital importance to the future of our Community.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — I call Mr Barbi.

Mr Barbi. — *(I)* Mr President and colleagues, I welcomed Mr d'Ormesson's initiative and gladly appended my signature to his question. I am convinced that if our European Economic Community has achieved a certain autonomy in recent years, that autonomy only covers food products. However, our dependence on energy supplies is serious, very serious. I agree with my French Socialist colleague who said a short time ago that the Community needed to develop its own energy policy, and I hope that the French Socialists too will support the idea of appropriations to increase the Community's own resources for an adequate energy policy.

I fear that many years must pass before the energy policy produces results. It is necessary, therefore, to think about today, about the dangers of this moment. The nine Community Member States do not want to create a war psychosis, to send submarines and missile cruisers into the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans. It is the Soviet Union, the one country that still has an empire, a fast-growing colonial empire, that wants this. Faced with this reality, this terrible reality, we must open our eyes and not pretend we can ignore it, as if it did not exist. It is essential, therefore, that ways be found of ensuring freedom of movement across the oceans not protected by NATO commitments. I therefore welcome Mr d'Ormesson's proposal that, rather than apply to the Commission, we should apply to our Governments, to the Council, for a coordination not of aggressive action, as on the part of the Soviet Union, but of a surveillance by our merchant fleets which maintain economic life and keep in employment millions upon millions of Europeans — and not only Europeans. I welcome this idea and consider it among others — and here I disagree with many of my colleagues who see this almost as a threat — as a first step towards a wise and irreversible return to the concept of a European defence Community. If we had achieved this in 1954, we would now have a European force, commanded at Community level! The dangers that face us today would probably be less serious! I think this will be a very important step taken by our countries, and one that will enable many Europeans who now view the prospect with concern, to overcome any illusion in the face of the terrible reality of Soviet imperialist war-mongering, that they can effectively defend their own independence, the independence of their people, alone and isolated — as I heard a Danish colleague suggesting a little while ago. But, my Danish

Barbi

friends, you have already been through this before! When Hitler decided to invade Denmark, no one stopped him! If we are not united, if you are not united with the whole of Europe, no one will save your independence, no neutrality — now being waved before you by a menacing Soviet imperialism — no autonomy will be respected! I hope, therefore, that this Parliament will speak with an authoritative voice, a voice that expresses the opinion of the more than 200 million Europeans — addressed to our governments, so that by overcoming nationalist divisions and jealousies they may understand that only in unity can the people of Europe defend, first, their freedom and then their capacity for economic development and employment.

(Applause from centre and right)

President. — I call Mr Prag.

Mr Prag. — Mr President, listening to Mrs Charzat I wondered whether she thought that slogans and dogma about multinationals and blocs and war-psychoses would protect our sea routes from the massive Soviet submarine fleet.

To Mr Deleau I say only one thing: does he really believe that you can separate the questions of energy policy and foreign policy, which are the domain of this Community, and the security of our energy supply routes? Of course you cannot, and it is nonsense to say that you can discuss the one without the other.

I want to talk about Soviet encroachments, not at sea but on land. The Russians are not in Angola merely to stiffen the fighting power of the Angolan armed forces, any more than the 17 000 Cubans in Ethiopia are there merely to stiffen the rather dubious fighting qualities of the Ethiopian armed forces. Nor are the Cubans and East Germans in Angola merely to fly the Soviet-built aircraft or to operate the heavy weapons supplied to the Angolan forces by the Soviet Union. They are there to perform the same role in Africa as the Red Army performs in Eastern Europe: to impose on these areas a lasting Soviet control. These Cuban armies may be small in European terms, but they are extremely powerful and well-equipped in the African context. Military control of countries like Angola and Namibia, with its excellent naval base at Walvis Bay, constitutes a major threat, as does the naval armament of the Soviet Union outlined by Mr d'Ormesson, to our sea-routes.

Now I want to say a word about South Africa and *apartheid*, Mr President. The West should not be diverted from its vital interests by its just and reasonable detestation of *apartheid*. This would be particularly absurd at a time when the whole of South Africa's race-laws, and indeed its very constitution, are under examination by Prime Minister P. W. Botha, or,

indeed, at a time when the whole of the ungodly *apartheid* system is in the meltingpot. We must realize that the Soviets exploit the existence of *apartheid* to further their strategic aims in Southern Africa. And we must not let *apartheid* be the road along which the Soviet Union marches to control our vital sea-routes.

I would like to suggest two steps. The first is that we end the arms embargo to South Africa, and the second that we find a way, possibly at Community level, of renewing the Simonstown naval agreement to give us back the use of that crucial naval base at the Cape of Good Hope which is vital to the defence of the Cape sea-route.

(Applause from the right, protests from the left)

In reply to the gentlemen over there, who made a lot of rather pointless noise, I would say that I hope that the South African Government would agree to a timetable for the ending of South Africa's race-laws, and that is not as far-fetched as you might think to anyone who has been recently in South Africa and talked to Cabinet Ministers and listened to the sort of projects they are considering. The oilcrisis that we have gone through and the price inflation and economic stagnation which have resulted should be a warning to us. Let us wake up to the reality of the danger to our oil supplies and consequently to the whole of our European economy before the noose already round our necks tightens irrevocably!

(Applause from certain quarters of the centre and of the right)

President. — I call Mrs Weber.

Mrs Weber. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am really quite baffled by this discussion and would like to make this clear by one or two points.

First of all, I do not all that much agree with the strategic assessments of either side. But I believe that the last speaker has made it very plain that what we are concerned with here is a renewal of the Simonstown Agreement, an accord between the UK and South Africa providing for the support of warships in South Africa for the purpose of guarding the Cape of Good Hope. This point, and the call you have just made to lift the arms embargo on South Africa, clearly show, I believe, how questionable and uncomfortable this discussion is. For South Africa is the only country that, in the last three months, has massively rejected what you are this moment requesting. If we had funded a European protective fleet in the last budget, then early this year it would have had to move against South Africa, which in the most extraordinary way seized 100 000 litres of oil destined for the European Community and bought by Shell. A ship's captain even told his crew beforehand: 'Watch out, pack your bags,

Weber

there'll soon be things happening on this ship'! They all packed their bags and were told: 'Right, a bomb's going off right now! There is no room for doubt here. The veracity of this story has since been demonstrated by South Africa's having to make full compensation to Shell. I ask myself the meaning of all this and how it can be possible in such circumstances to look to South Africa, of all places. This is just one incident that shows who your protective fleet should be directed against. The debate might usefully be brought to an end at this point.

President. — I call Mr Hänsch.

Mr Hänsch. — (G) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is not my intention to talk about psychoses since it is extremely difficult to enter into the feelings of others. Instead I shall try to draw some inferences from your arguments; the only logical conclusion, if they are to be taken as seriously as you have presented them, is, I fear, the building of a European war fleet. Now this debate reminds me of an aspect of German history. I ask myself why you of all people, ladies and gentlemen of the European People's Party, should want to vindicate good old Karl Marx, who once wrote that all important events in history occur twice — the first time as tragedy, the second time as farce. You are now performing the farce. The tragedy occurred in German history. That was in 1848. This may be of interest to some of the other countries. In that year the first democratically elected German Parliament resolved, in one of its first decisions, to build a war fleet. But we all know how this story ends, ladies and gentlemen! The Parliament could get nothing through and collapsed, German unity was not achieved, the fleet was sold; all that remained was an admiral, for it is easier to scrap a fleet than to get rid of an admiral.

(Applause and laughter)

More than 130 years on you are repeating this episode, but I guarantee it will turn into farce. The worst of it is that you are burdening this Parliament, at the wrong time, with matters which should be dealt with quite differently, namely within NATO. Even if your intentions are of the best, André Malraux (I think it was he) might have had just you in mind when he said: 'In art as in politics, good intentions are anything but good'. With your propaganda proposal you are doing the very opposite of what perhaps we all really want — to bring this Europe closer together.

(Applause from the left)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ZAGARI

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Schall.

Mr Schall. — (D) Mr President, it is understandable that Mr Baillot and his friends should oppose the discussion of a topic of crucial importance to the vital interests of a free Europe, for the question by my friend and colleague Mr d'Ormesson opens up an area of discussion — and Mr Hänsch's witty remarks can not disguise this — in which it is clear, or should be clear, to everyone in this House that by occupying Afghanistan the Soviet Union has thrown down a world-wide challenge to the free West in general and — because of the mere possibility of influence over the Persian Gulf — to Europe in particular. Everyone knows how dependent the European economy is on oil and raw materials that have to be brought round the Cape, Mrs Weber, whether we approve of South Africa or not. It is a geopolitical fact that the raw materials underpinning our economy must pass along these sea routes, and we all know too that on this economy's prosperity depends not only our personal welfare in free Europe, but also the social system we have been able to develop for the first time in history, at least for the people of Europe, and further that we depend on an economy which alone is adapted to easing the great problems this House has already considered, such as hunger in the world, disharmony and the dispute between North and South, through the peaceful development of the European economy. We all of us know this.

To the many very important and good contributions I have heard from many colleagues here, I should like to make just four more observations and recall four facts, for with political problems of this magnitude no help can be gained from mere faith, imagination or ignorance; only sober facts can offer basis for assessing the situation in which we now, unhappily, find ourselves. I shall therefore endeavour to make some objective and sober observations.

First: in the history of the Soviet Union — which goes back 60 years — there is the solid principle, clearly substantiated by Leninist dogma, that the building of a Communist society must never be jeopardized by incalculable risk. This means that pursuit of the goal to disseminate worldwide an ideological blueprint for human life, namely Communism, only calculable risks may be taken, on the basis of two steps forwards, one step backwards. This fact is in keeping with Russian history. The conclusions are obvious.

Second, in dealing with considerations, with particular reference to security but also in relation to other kinds of political considerations, a clear distinction must be

Schall

drawn between a state a world power's political intentions and its military capacity to carry out those intentions.

Now I do not set myself up as a prophet nor would I suggest that the Soviet Union is intent on further advances in the Middle East, possibly as far as Africa — though they already have a foothold there — but it is a fact that the Soviet Union has now created the right military conditions for further moves in the direction of the Persian Gulf. This cannot be denied. We have proof that 12 Soviet divisions, equal in strength to the entire Germany Army, are now stationed at the North Iranian border. They are now manifestly carrying out their familiar large-scale manoeuvres there. They have increased their motorized capability. I am not saying they will cross the border tomorrow, but they could if they wished. The military capability is there. In southern Afghanistan military conditions are being created, by way of logistical camps, military vehicles and the development of international airfields, for seizing Baluchistan and reaching the Indian Ocean. I am not saying the plan will be carried out tomorrow, but again, the military capability is there. That is the position, and a responsible Europe must realize that this is a directly threat to its economic nerve centre.

Third: the enormous military escalation in the two months following the occupation of Afghanistan is perfectly obvious. Mr Baillot, you may call it anti-Sovietism and fantasy when facts are produced. I cannot agree. I have had occasion in my life to go deeply into the theories and goals of Marx, Lenin and Stalin, just as you have. I know I cannot convince you, for you possess the scientific truth that the Communist way is the right way — otherwise some of your remarks would have moved me to tears, but I turn to those of my colleagues who can consider sober facts and draw at least cautious conclusions from them.

And now, my fourth and last remark. We all know that today in free Europe millions of people are worried about the immediate future; they fear that peace can no longer be maintained, that our security is no longer assured. Why are they afraid, and is this fear justified? Free Europe has 50 million more citizens than the Soviet Union. Its gross domestic product is more than double the Soviet Union's. The only thing it lacks, — which is the reason we are still so anxious today — is the resolution to jointly take such steps as would make it an incalculable risk for the Soviet Union to go on disrupting its interests. If this is so, then it must be our duty as a European Parliament, to this most important end, to stimulate the Member States of our European Community and thereby guarantee a peaceful future for Europe.

(Applause from centre and right)

President. — I call Mr von Bismarck.

Mr von Bismark. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as someone born before the first World War, I have been somewhat concerned at the nature and severity of what has been said this evening by our younger colleagues in this debate. What are we being asked? We are being asked whether there is not a need for the Council to consider measures to safeguard shipping routes...

(Cries)

... — You could not be replying to my speech, I had not yet spoken —, we are being asked whether it would not be appropriate, in order to achieve this purpose, to consider concerted action among the Member States of the Atlantic Alliance. We are being asked whether an operational structure should not be set up for cooperation in times of crises.

What is there in these questions, honourable colleagues, to justify the severity of your reactions and the more or less cynical scorn which you, Mr Hänsch, have tried to pour upon us.

Cynicism and scorn are also to be read in your faces. What, I ask you, is the reason for this scorn? I would like to remind you of a time which I lived through, when I was on the other side. Adolf Hitler would not have acted in the way he did from 1936 onwards, if he had not himself been sure of his position, sure that, as he said, the western democracies were not capable of action. My honourable young colleagues, we cannot simply forget all about history and disregard the lesson to be learnt, simply because we are here being asked a question which you were not prepared for. It is ridiculous to suppose that the possibility of the Council considering the question represents a military threat against anyone, and you are well aware of that. You cannot expect anyone to believe that you are maintaining that Europe might want, or be able, to attack anyone. You really must ask yourselves how it is you cannot see that this Atlantic grouping, which does not at all concern the major areas of our problematic half of the world cannot possibly guarantee our protection. But you must see that the absence of any reaction on our part marks a complete lack of responsibility towards the voters who set us here. I ask you in all earnestness to bear in mind that period in history which has such clear parallels with the present.

All we are asking is have we thought enough? Are there not other things we should think about to ensure that our economy, upon which everything depends, is in a position to promote freedom and social justice? I ask you seriously to think and not simply to laugh. This is just not the time to pour laughter and scorn on others who are attempting a difficult task here, as we are all well aware.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — I call Mr Griffiths.

Mr Griffiths. — Mr President, I returned to this House this evening a little after the debate had started, after seeing my family safely to bed, and I must admit that, coming into this debate, I could only wonder whether they would in fact sleep safely. From my own personal point of view, I should like to see the day when we, certainly we in Britain, could give up having anything at all to do with nuclear weapons. However, I recognize that this is not a position which the majority of people in Britain would take. Therefore, we have to fight and we have to steer a very careful middle course in our international dealings with both the Eastern bloc and the under-developed or Third World.

A great deal of concern has been expressed here tonight about the aggressive intentions of Soviet Russia and about the possibility that the whole of southern Africa might become a Soviet sphere of influence. I would only ask the people who have predicated that possibility why much of southern Africa has already fallen under a great deal of Soviet influence. The answer, quiet simply, is that the Western world has failed the movements for black independence in those areas. That is why we have the problem of Soviet expansionism, as we see it, in southern Africa today. The way to save South Africa from Soviet influence, from a Soviet presence, before the end of this century is to give not support to the present South African régime in the hope that that régime will, slowly but surely and quickly enough, give equality and independence — not just political independence but economic independence as well — to its black population. It is only when that is done that we can support an independent black South African State and save it from possible Communist domination.

Now, there has been a reference to young people, and this I take it, was meant to include those who were not actually able to take up arms in the Second World War, people like myself who were only born during that war. We have been told that we should not forget history. I do not forget history; I read history at university and I taught history for many years before coming to this House. One of the lessons of twentieth-century history is that before the two major world wars in which Europe was principally involved, there was a period — in the case of the first World War, some 15 years, and in the case of the second World War, about 8 years — when there was a build-up of arms, when there was talk about the possibility of war, when people on one side of the fence said, 'Look, there are your possible enemies, get armed, get ready to fight them!' and the people on the other side of the fence were saying exactly the same thing, so that governments felt able to spend more money on armaments and created an atmosphere where people eventually could see that there would have to be a war.

Recently we have seen that the Soviet Union went into Afghanistan, and I do not at all deny that there is the possibility of further Soviet aggression. On the other hand, I cannot say that we in the West remain completely pure, that our hands have not been dipped in blood, because they *have* been. What I plead for is that we try to deal with this talk of war, which dangles before the public, as it certainly did in Britain, the prospect that if you buy a certain type of nuclear-fallout shelter, costing something between 10 and 15 thousand pounds depending whether you wanted a *de luxe* model or not, then there is a fair chance of surviving a nuclear attack. When that sort of attempt is made to influence people's minds you cannot help wondering what the powers-that-be have got in mind.

I do not believe that the deliberations of this House on this particular point are going to have any earth-shattering effects, but speaking here tonight I just want to plead with the House not to rush into some mad South Atlantic war-force which could result in increasing the number of areas of tension in the world. It should be our job to reduce those areas of tension and not to build up our military forces so that the number of places with a potential war conflict is increased. We want less possibility of war and not more — which is what this oral question is really leading to

(Applause from the left)

President. — I call Mr D'Ormesson.

Mr D'Ormesson. — *(F)* Mr President, during this debate I have heard myself referred to by Mr Baillot as a fire-raiser. I shall answer him without any acrimony. I have been mayor of my commune, right in the middle of Communist suburbia, for 33 years, 33 years in which you have opposed me; but you must admit one thing, if I have been mayor for 33 years, then it is because I am no fire-raiser...

You reminded us that Russia sells oil or gas to the West. Granted. But to Russia we sell wheat, when it has the richest territory in the world. And better so cheap that with the amount saved it has been able to construct the largest number of tanks in the whole history of humanity!

The thing which separates us, you see, is the fact that I am perhaps older than you. I saw my father weep on the evening of the Munich agreement, because he had understood that the West's capitulation to Munich would mean war for us. And since then I have sworn that I will fight to the last to prevent another Munich.

(Applause from the right — Protests from the left).

War. Since historians far more eminent than I have spoken this evening, I would venture to remind them of only one thing, that the largest world wars ever,

Griffiths

that in the 18th century under Napoleon, and the second World War, were both won at sea! Europe is exposed. Europe needs a naval fleet large enough to counterbalance the Soviet fleet, and I am not afraid to say so. This attitude could change the outlook for the future, because Europe's capacity to contribute to maintaining the balance of military power in the world would give it a prestige which its spirit and its culture could equal, and it would be a pledge of peace!

(Applause from the right)

President. — I have received from Mr d'Ormesson and others, on behalf of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group), and Mr de Courcy Ling and others, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, a motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-108/80) with a request for an early vote, pursuant to Rule 47(5) of the Rules of Procedure, to wind up the debate in this oral question.

I shall consult Parliament on this request at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

I declare the debate closed.

20. Code of conduct for oil tankers

President. — The next item is the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-59/80) by Mrs Ewing and others on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats to the Commission:

Subject: Code of conduct for oil tankers and vessels carrying noxious substances

- Whereas on the 7 March 1980, yet another disaster involving an oil tanker occurred off the coast of Brittany — one of a series of such incidents which comprise a grave threat to Community waters,
- whereas it is known that numerous tankers sailing in Community waters are sub-standard in basic respects such as construction, equipment, crew qualifications, etc.,
- whereas no single Member State has been able to control the behaviour of such tankers or the companies which employ them,
- whereas many such tankers cannot manoeuvre — some being even unable to reverse — causing grave hazards to Community waters and coastal communities,
- whereas whole coasts have been ravaged by oil slick onslaughts which have deprived these areas of marine life and associated fisheries, amenity and tourist appeal for many years,

Will the Commission draw up and institute a Code of Conduct for oil tankers and other vessels carrying

noxious substances to be applicable in all Member States and restrict access to Community Waters to vessels which have agreed to adopt the said Code of Conduct?

I call Mrs Ewing.

Mrs Ewing. — Mr President, I think this is an important question for all of us. I, as perhaps you know, have a lot of Community waters around my particular area in the north of Scotland, but of course the matter affects every country in the Community and every coast. Those Members who represent the area near the English Channel will probably be very concerned also to join in this debate, as it is such a busy sea area.

One of my areas around the Shetland Islands is, of course, almost as busy sometimes as the English Channel, with a great many oil tankers from many countries going there. The background is, I think, clear. There is good will on the part of all Member States of the Community to get this problem solved and to take preventive measures. The Commission has taken many steps, and there is no lack of documentation, no lack of initiatives. I would like to congratulate, for example, Mr Muntingh on his initiative. He has thrown light on many of the problems of what you do after you have got the horrible problem of pollution. I would also like indeed to congratulate all the groups who have tabled many resolutions over a period of time.

However, the time for talking is over. In this parliamentary session could we not ask the Commission now to start urging the Council to enforce a strict code of conduct which would apply to all Community waters? The obvious elements are, of course, control of sub-standard ships, arrangements for warning each other from port to port and from state to state, and arrangements as to what we do with pollution. We all know that we are just playing at solving this problem. Certainly in the UK we just do not have adequate ways of coping with a disaster, and we have already had a few of these, although none perhaps as bad as the disaster off the coast of Brittany. Another problem is that of compensation. Some of these problems we are on the way to solving.

Because I am limited in time I cannot read through the excellent paper which I thought of making available to the groups, Mr President, in order to save time. It was prepared by the Directorate-General for Committees and the Committee for Transport. It lists the Member States that have not ratified various international conventions which are relevant. Some have been ratified, in some cases by all of us, but most of us, including my own country, are guilty of not ratifying others. Now until we are all going to ratify the conventions we cannot begin to tackle the subject. Therefore I would like to make that document available and not to read it out tonight. It is a rather scandalous situation, and I am

Ewing

sure you will all agree with me when you get it in front of you.

The background here is that 2.2 million deadweight tons went down in 1979. 177 sailors died, with three ships per month sinking, colliding or exploding, some in very suspicious circumstances. There were falling standards and a cutback all round in maintenance and inspection. The problem is enormous, because since 1934 we have gone from 250 million deadweight tons to 2 billion tons last year. I think that perhaps is enough to say about statistics, except to say that the number of tankers went up in that period from over 3 000 to 7 000. Furthermore, 'older' seems to me to be more dangerous than 'bigger', if I could just make that general point.

I would like to say in advance that I understand that Mr Turner is going to put forward an amendment on compulsory pilotage. As far as I understand it, I totally support that. Indeed that has been one of the things that the Shetland Islands Council has tried to encourage, including a mandatory ten-mile rule. However, it has not had a tremendous amount of support from the British Government.

In the study done about the English Channel last year by the UK and France it emerged that 29 % of the vessels studied had not even up-to-date charts. It was a higher percentage in the case of ships flying flags of convenience. I was one of the cross-examiners in Lord Bruce of Donington's excellent public hearing in Paris in June 1978, where we were privileged to be able to cross-examine the Shipmasters Association, the Tugs International Association, IMCO, the oil companies, Lloyds and many other bodies.

I would like to say about the flags of convenience argument that unless you are going to disregard the Netherlands Marine Institute's figures and UNCTAD figures, you really have to come to the conclusion that there is something wrong here. All Lloyds' assurances to me in my cross-examination that there was no difference are just not good enough. That is a rather tragic position, because Lloyds give an illusion to the world that when they endorse something then it is all right. However, they are endorsing many of these flag of convenience ships.

I shall just give a few figures that the Netherlands Marine Institute published in February 1978 for estimates of substandard tankers — Greece 175, Liberia 200, Panama 30-50, Cyprus 20. Then if we look at the actual accidents, we find that Cyprus has eight times the average rate, Panama six and Liberia two. All these figures and many others are in the Bruce report, and I recommend it to you. It makes very sordid reading. However, the subject is so vast, including my own cross-examination of Lloyds which I would like to refer to, that I cannot go into it because I have only ten minutes tonight.

These enormous tankers are going to make it unnecessary for people like me to talk about fishing, which I am always doing, as you know. There will be no fish to argue about if we are not careful. These tankers are floating banks. The recent suspicious circumstances are admitted to be related to a new kind of piracy worse than hijacking. If something goes wrong it can affect a whole coast, or perhaps a whole tourist industry where tourism is really important, as in Brittany and to some extent in the Shetlands. If an accident happened in the Minch in Scotland, one of the richest fishing grounds in Europe would be very seriously damaged. The world is starved of oil in many parts. These tankers, unless they are controlled, are temptations. As I say, it is admitted at high level, the oil companies included, that there have been some very disturbing and puzzling incidents which suggest that what I refer to is on the increase.

With regard to insurance, in the Bruce report the insurers admit quite frankly that even when a country is clearly allowing substandard ships to sail, they will still go on dealing with that country, even after it has become clear that that country does not deserve to have Lloyds' stamp of approval giving a false impression to the world. I am not singling out Lloyds specially because, after all, insurance is a competitive world. Presumably if Lloyds does not insure there will be others who will do it, but I feel very alarmed in a way by some of the answers that we have got.

In relation to tugs, I would suggest to this House that the rules of salvage, when applied to tankers, are absurdly out-of-date. We made these rules in the Victorian age when there was no conception of the size, power and potential for damage of modern vessels. The rules of salvage and the way in which the evidence from the tug interests came out makes it plain that one cannot leave this matter to a bargain conducted at sea. I would ask the Commission if they are satisfied that competition rules are being observed by the tug interests of Europe. It seems to me that that is not the case.

Could I also draw to your attention the evidence in the Bruce report which indicates that when the master of a ship is shown to be negligent, unlike many other professionals — I happen to belong to the legal profession where we deal very severely with our professional brethren who default in any way from the standards that we lay down — there are very few examples where ships masters have withdrawn the stamp of their approval from the master of a ship who was proved to have been negligent. They do not seem to be in any way repentant about their attitude on this subject.

I have already mentioned the inability to cope if there is a disaster. That is a rather technical matter that Mr Muntingh went into, and I shall not rehearse his points. I suggest that there should be the strictest port protection laid down by a code of conduct accepted by

Ewing

all members of the Community. If the oil companies say, 'leave it to IMCO, leave it to international agreements like the Hague,' I say we have waited too long. First of all let us put our own house in order by means of international agreements. Let us start with this bit of the world. Let us show the rest of the world that we in Europe can get on and improve our standards. After all disasters could put whole coasts or parts of our countries out of action.

With regard to OPEC's directives on ports of destination this is a situation that makes it possible for us to exercise control if we want to control what is happening in our seas. This is already being operated by OPEC, so we can find out where tankers are heading. We can check and stop what is happening up in Sullom Voe in Shetland: the shocking behaviour of dumping the sludge when there are perfectly acceptable levels laid down. For instance, Shell told me today, when they lobbied me about this matter, about an excellent top-loading method which, if ports enforced it, would absolutely ensure that no tanker was allowed to berth at a European port unless it obeyed the rules. Whenever one port finds out that a tanker is not obeying the rules it is only necessary to cooperate with each other and have a system by which that port authority can get in touch with every EEC port, so that tanker is not allowed to go there. Now these are things that you are going to have to decide to do. It requires political will. I am sure you are all concerned. I am asking you for the political will, not to wait on the Hague convention but to ratify all these international conventions. By all means let us put our seas in order, otherwise all my speeches on fishing have been wasted and will continue to be wasted.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) At this late hour I should like to be as short and as precise as possible. At the last plenary session my colleague, Mr Natali, had the opportunity of expressing the Commission's deep and continued concern about incidents which continue to occur, and more specifically that relating to the tanker *Tanio*. I should like to say on behalf of the Commission that we agree very strongly with what Mrs Ewing has said, which we can continue to talk about for quite a time and all agree about for quite a time. As long as we do not really get to grips with the reality of the problem — and this can be done — nothing is going to change. I should like to put at Parliament's disposal, together with the documents that the honourable Member mentioned, our list of the various existing international conventions which effectively deal with the problems under review and would create the necessary legal basis for action if they were ratified.

They have been signed by the great majority of our Member States, but have not yet been ratified. I think

this is basically the problem. If we permanently think that we have to create a new legal instrument, before using the legal instruments which exist, then, by trying every time to be more precise, to deal with the problem more in detail, we shall just leave the vacuum and the void, as it now stands, and the Commission does not think that this is an acceptable situation. So there exists a proper agreement establishing the proper technical standards as soon as these conventions are brought into force.

Then the second question is enforcement. And here we have again not a very complicated problem. The enforcement task falls to the States themselves. The States have power to enforce these rules for ships flying their flags, and as port States they have the power for ships which do not fly their flag if they decide to close their ports to ships which do not obey these rules. Let us not delude ourselves, the possibility is there. It is not that we have to do something new. We might have to do something new on top of it. But let us begin by doing what we can without waiting for everybody to do the same thing. Let us put our eight European countries and port States in order. This would be a major step forward.

Then there is the very important question of information. We can look at how substandard we in Europe are, for instance, by comparison with what happens in the United States. We in the Commission hope to present in the coming months a draft directive which would set for Member States the basic objectives of identifying all substandard ships entering their ports and requiring them to bring themselves into conformity with the appropriate international standards set by convention and automatically giving this information to all the other port States of the Community. The new information data basis which this would also require would be a useful support for industry.

So basically, the question that we have to put — and I am suggesting here that the question be put not only in the European Parliament but in the national parliaments of the Member States — is why the Member States are not ratifying and why their ratification procedures are sometimes so slow in those parliaments. Here I also ask the Council what is its record and what are the target dates that have been set up. We in the Commission managed in 1978 to get through the Council a recommendation giving target dates for the ratification of these various international conventions. These target dates have not been met. Why? These questions should be put, not only here in the European Parliament but also in the national parliaments by your colleagues who are interested in this question, because there is here clearly an element of articulation between action at the European level and action at the national level.

So I think this is basically the message we in the Commission want to give. Our concern now obliges us to see that the proper enforcement action be taken.

Davignon

The enforcement possibilities exist. It is not a legal problem, the possibility is there if we decide to act in those circumstances. Please, as a first priority let us see what common action by this Parliament, by the Commission and in the national parliaments can be taken, so that these conventions are ratified and the enforcement carried out by the Member States. Then we can see what additional measures can be taken. I mentioned one that the Commission has in mind and intends to put before the Council before the summer. This would help us as a practical enforcement measure, which is so essential for all the reasons that the honourable Member gave in putting his question.

President. — I call Mrs Weber to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Weber. — (D) Mr President; ladies and gentlemen, I believe all the Groups are completely united in their assessment of the situation. The extent of the damage already caused by oil tankers in Community waters is so great, not only from the financial point of view, but also with regard to the environment, with regard to our seas and also our coasts, that we all appreciate that something must be done urgently. But we should at the same time recognize what has already been achieved in the Community, and Commissioner Davignon has kindly listed the numerous activities which have been undertaken in this area. I believe too that the European Parliament — both the old and the new Parliament — has already taken some steps in the right direction. For this reason I do not see such a need for this oral question, since everything is in a state of flux; our committees are studying the problem; authorization has been requested and given for an own-initiative report by the Committee on Transport, and at the end of last year Mr Muntingh made the very sound proposal of setting up a North Sea forum — a decision has already been taken on this. We have suggested a great deal of practical work, which has also been carried out, and yet the situation is still not satisfactory from this point of view.

We have already referred to the conventions which you too have just mentioned, and which contain all the major demands which we wish to make. We have the new proposal from the Commission, which you have just announced, and a few weeks ago the Commission published specific proposals for action in the event of disasters; in these it demands harmonization of the methods applied, better training, and — in my view this is very important if one is to be able to act quickly and effectively in the event of a disaster — the creation of a Community pool of large-scale equipment which would be too expensive and too difficult for individual Member States to obtain.

But the situation is not yet such that we can be satisfied with our demands. The position regarding the safety of ships is appalling; some of the ships still in

use are over 20 years old, and one cannot help wondering why much stricter safety regulations now apply to the transport of gases, for example, but are not yet applicable to oil. One must also ask why those who steer vessels through European waters are so poorly trained. When one reads that one in seven vessels has out-of-date charts — and that was the reason for the last accident in the Channel — it is clear that there is still much to be done.

You said, Commissioner, that there was no need for any new legal provisions, but in the field of international law with regard to average in particular some thought must be given to the extent to which the captain of a ship is responsible for deciding the moment at which the ship is to be handed over to a salvage company, for example.

I believe many captains hesitate for a long time because they are made personally liable; this is perhaps one area where something could be done on the legal side.

I would like here to mention another point which has not been referred to directly but which, by its nature, is an integral part of this proposal, the question of inland navigation. Much of the pollution of waterways in the European Community is also a result of the fact that inland vessels transporting dangerous cargoes in some cases still wash and empty out their tanks in rivers, thereby causing considerable damage. I believe that here too there is more to be done, and this is certainly an area in which the European Community could act.

My group would go very much further than our colleague, Mrs Ewing, in its demands; we do not believe that a further code of conduct will do much to change the situation in the waters of the European Community, because we all have such codes already. It is clear that the voluntary signing of conventions does not help the situation a great deal.

The first requirement is certainly the ratification of already existing conventions. But we must also have, on the seas and in ports, stricter Community control which cannot be evaded, and ensures that the provisions of the IMCO convention are not continually broken. The problem at the moment is that if vessels are likely to be subject to strict checks in one port, which is unfortunately not the case with the majority of ports, then they can head for other ports where these provisions are not respected, and this of course creates problems of competition for the ports, which they try to overcome by being less strict than they perhaps should be. For this reason Community control organizations must be set up to prevent this possibility. We should also consider the penalties to be applied within the Community; how, for example, one could close the other Community ports, or take similar measures, against vessels which infringe the regulations. This too is possible only at the European level,

Weber

which means within the Community, and possibly even outside the Community, since the other countries of Europe are also affected.

Thought should also be given to the possibility of introducing, as in the area of aircraft safety, a system of marine navigation control. I believe this idea has also been discussed already, and the question is whether a very thorough control system should be introduced in those danger spots where such accidents occur frequently, in order to avoid damage, and the question of pilotage, which you have just mentioned, would certainly provide a very good short-term solution to the problem.

In all, my group therefore agrees with the assessment of the situation, but in view of what has already been done in this Parliament and also by our predecessors, the demands should go much further than those put forward by Mrs Ewing and the other authors of this question. We therefore ask and earnestly require the Commission to take steps accordingly and to use the means available to prevent dangerous situations arising in European waters.

President. — I call Mr Hoffmann to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr K. H. Hoffmann. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the oil-tanker disaster on 7 March has once again drawn the attention of the citizens of Europe to the threat to our coastal regions represented by vessels which do not conform to international safety regulations. People everywhere, not just those in the regions affected, are outraged at the inability of those with political responsibility to take preventive measures which would largely eliminate such disasters. For years we have been asking the governments of the European Community for measures to improve the safety of marine vessels, but, Mrs Weber, our demands have so far met with very little response, and the most recent disaster off the coast of Brittany indicates that the situation is becoming ever more dangerous. What occurred in Brittany in March may occur again tomorrow at Rotterdam, at Genoa, at Wilhemshaven or off the British coast, for more and more shipowners from the European Community are abandoning the flag of their native country. They fly the flags of states which have what are known as open ship registers. These include primarily countries such as Liberia, Panama, Singapore or Cyprus. Anyone sailing under the flag of one of these states pays no tax and at most a minimal registration fee. Anyone sailing under the flag of one of these states need not comply with safety regulations on the vessel and need not employ a qualified crew with navigational training on the vessel. The result is that every day floating coffins with highly dangerous cargoes sail around our coastal areas and ports. It is a miracle that up until now nothing worse has happened.

But time is of the essence if effective protection is to be provided for coasts, ports and our environment, for the escape to flags of convenience is on the increase. On 1 January 1980 32 % of the total tonnage owned by German shipping companies was entered in foreign registers. 28 % of world commercial tonnage is today flying the flags of states with open registers, and this proportion is steadily increasing. Yesterday this House discussed the Blumenfeld report on the accession of Greece 24.7 million gross register tonnes, equivalent to 20.7 % of the tonnage in states with open registers, is in the hands of Greek shipowners. This represents more than 3 times the number of ships flying under the German flag today. I would ask the Commission, was this problem discussed during the accession negotiations with Greece? Were solutions found to prevent the large number of Greek ships flying foreign flags from causing further problems for shipping in the European Community in the future? Many dangerous substances, especially chemicals, are carried today also as dry cargo in vessels which should have been scrapped long ago. I can give you an example, because last year my union checked up on such a vessel which was chained up in Germany. When the tanker left Venezuela there was one captain on board, who had never been in charge of a tanker. There were no officers at all, just a trained boatswain and an untrained crew. During the voyage the captain promoted the boatswain to officer by a handshake. I would just mention as an aside that in the meantime the shipping company owed the crew \$ 80 000 in wages. This contraption was thus heading for the coast of Europe, and we tried to ascertain who it belonged to. We found out that there were shipping addresses of a broker in New York and a broker in London, but that neither of these was the owner. When the owner was finally traced in Sidney, he had already re-sold the tanker and we then had to look for the new owner. How can a captain in charge of such a vessel act responsibly in the event of loss? Who should he go to for instructions to avoid loss or damage, collisions, etc?

Ladies and gentlemen, my group welcomes and supports the oral question by the Group of European Progressive Democrats. What is being demanded here naturally does not cover everything, but the matter is being brought to Parliament's attention again. But my group also urges the governments of the Member States finally to ratify the conventions of the United Nations Maritime Organization IMCO, and on this point it shares fully the Commission's view. This can be done now. It is also our opinion that the ILO Conventions must likewise be adopted, so that it is finally possible to grant seamen some social protection.

But we also call upon the Commission to introduce minimum training requirements for captains, officers and sailors, and effective inspection procedures at Community ports for ships flying flags of states with open registers. It is our view that proper inspection of these vessels could assure better protection of seas and coasts against contamination and pollution; another

Hoffmann

ship has gone down off the coast of Sardinia with containers of arsenic on board which must be recovered now to prevent deaths during the next holiday season. We feel that higher qualification requirements for personnel on board could reduce the numbers of averages and collisions and at the same time improve the social conditions of seamen. Lastly, tighter restrictions on the use of flags and stricter control of vessels flying flags would eliminate the unfair advantages of competition which still handicap those shipowners who are prepared to sail their vessels under the flag of a Member State of this Community.

On behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, I therefore urge the Council, governments and the Commission finally to take action to ensure better protection of seas and coasts.

President. — I call Mr Cottrell to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Cottrell. — The people of Brittany are only too familiar, as we are well aware, with what an unwelcome gift from the sea can represent. A carpet of oily slime which is an ecological disaster is a problem that we are well familiar with in the United Kingdom.

I should like to concentrate my brief remarks this evening on two points that the Commissioner has himself made. The question is whether we need any additional safety measures beyond those which are in treaties ratified or unratified. I think that we do. The previous speaker referred, I think, to neuralgic spots. Well one of those is clearly the Channel which lies between the United Kingdom and the mainland of the continent of Europe. I think it would be absolutely extraordinary if it were suggested to the Aviation Authority that they should try to maintain one of their major air routes in the same way that the Channel route is maintained. In other words, it is a free-for-all, which in some respects has never changed since medieval days.

I would like the Commission to consider what the advantages would be — notwithstanding all the valiant efforts that are made by the existing safety organizations, such as Trinity House in the United Kingdom and the coastguards in France — of setting up a joint maritime safety organization to patrol what is Europe's E1, if you like, in shipping terms. It seems extraordinary that there is no provision for this under existing proposals from IMCO or from any conventions which will discuss this in the near future. I well remember as a journalist some years ago trying to unravel the mysteries and the nonsense which arose when it was suggested that it would be fairly sensible if ships going one way kept to the left and ships going the other way kept to the right. It seemed extremely difficult to persuade either the shipping authorities, and indeed in some cases the Member States, that this was a sensible proposal.

We know what happens when an oil tanker goes aground. May I make another proposal on how to prevent ships from going aground, because this is often the cause of the trouble. They collide, for instance, in mid-Channel and spill their cargoes. We had an extraordinary case recently in which, to a certain extent, Britain and France were both involved. A ship called the *Aeolian Sky* was involved in a collision in mid-Channel. She was not a tanker, but she was loaded with possibly dangerous toxic chemicals. The ship had a collision in mid-Channel and was taken in tow by a tug during a Force 8 gale. She developed a 16° list to port. She then went, like a proverbial Biblical beggar, from port to port, looking for somebody who would have her until finally, heading into the Force 8 gale, she sank and discharged her cargo, causing immense distress to local authorities in the south-east of England and immense cost to the tax-payers and the rate-payers.

If there were a system of havens of refuge where ships which are in danger of sinking following a collision or a mechanical failure could be taken and properly tended, I believe that it would be possible to prevent at least 50 % of all collision casualties in the English Channel from sinking. I know that in some areas — France, the United Kingdom and Denmark — local authorities might be sensitive to the prospect of having to provide a haven, as they might see it, for coffin vessels on their doorstep. What I would like them to consider is, if the *Aeolian Sky*, for example — and perhaps even the *Amoco Cadiz* as well — had been able to go to a haven of refuge, then she would not have sunk and she would not have spilled her cargo.

These are the two specific suggestions that I would like to make. Is it not time that we began to consider a commonsense police patrol in the English Channel to avoid disasters? We have had enough, Lord knows, already. It is impossible to imagine what the consequences would be of two or perhaps three supertankers colliding in mid-Channel. Surely it is time to have a commonsense police control in the Channel. Secondly, I think it is most important that we should consider the possibility of well-known havens of refuge which are marked on charts, which are known to captains and mariners, not just in the waters of the Channel but in the other Community waters as well, particularly in the Irish Sea and in the Mediterranean.

President. — I call Mrs Le Roux to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mrs Le Roux. — (F) Mr President, I would like to state the views of the French members of the Communist and Allies Group on the problems of oil-tankers sailing around our shores.

We have always taken every opportunity to express our commitment to international cooperation and soli-

Le Roux

curity, particularly in the area of scientific research, and we support all initiatives with this aim. We therefore consider that the European Community should increase its aid to teams of researchers and technical experts working to prevent accidents at sea and combat hydrocarbon pollution. Moreover, this international scientific and legal cooperation should not be limited solely to the Member States of the EEC.

But, for all that, we cannot agree with Mrs Ewing, Mrs Dienesch and Mr Josselin, when they speak of fate or the supposed inability of states to impose regulations on oil companies and shippers which would make it possible to prevent accidents at sea.

We refuse to leave it to the gods of the sea or to the European Communities to settle problems which concern first and foremost the government of our country. We refuse to invoke destiny or international law in order to excuse governmental negligence. We cannot support the explicitly supranational measures proposed here.

What, in fact, is the situation? Following the Amoco Cadiz disaster, a Commission of Enquiry of the French Senate, composed of 21 members from all political parties, adopted unanimously a report in which it was made quite clear that we do know how to prevent such accidents, how to fight and deal with pollution when it occurs, and in what areas national measures are required in order to guarantee our country an effective system of protection. The means for action to exist, is the political will to put them into effect which is lacking. We would assert that under existing law governments are quite capable of dealing with pirates at sea. For the information of Members not acquainted with it, I would refer to the Brussels Convention, enacted by the law of 6 May 1975, which provides that in the event of an accident at sea resulting in material damage or a direct threat of material damage the State may take necessary measures without notifying the natural or legal persons concerned, if urgency so requires.

I would also inform my colleagues, in case they do not already know, that this law was supplemented by further provisions introduced on 7 July 1976 which extended the State's power of intervention at sea to include even the risk of damage.

Today, we say piracy must stop, complacency must stop, we will not let the national governments disclaim responsibility, we refuse to leave everything in the hands of institutions which have demonstrated their total allegiance to those actually responsible for these accidents, the large oil companies, whose exorbitant profits we alone have denounced. We refuse to leave everything in the hands of institutions dominated by governments which fiercely support the system of maritime transport in operation today. I am talking, for example, of the Federal Republic of Germany, which ships around 80 % of its oil cargo under flags

of convenience. One cannot, with a clear conscience, take the lead in demonstrations of anger in Brittany and Paris and there level accusations at government authorities, and at the same time put forward resolutions in Strasbourg under the banner of supranationality which absolve those government authorities of all responsibility.

We shall not join the conspiracy against the shores of France, against those who work at sea and on the coast in Brittany. We cannot be part of these ploys to undermine the interests of the population of our country. We, for our part, will fight with the workers of our country to ensure that the strictest safety regulations are applied to tankers, their shippers and their states, when they sail around our coast.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

President. — I call Mr Calvez to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Calvez. — *(F)* Mr President, the Liberal and Democratic Group is in favour of drawing up a code of conduct for oil-tankers and vessels carrying dangerous substances — I prefer that term to noxious substances. It is discomforting to read in a text submitted to this Parliament that no single state is able to control the behaviour of certain vessels. Is this not an admission of impotence on the part of elected representatives of the Member States? It does not bear thinking about.

But has not the time come to decide to implement a system of Community cooperation to deal with the problem of non-ratification by certain Member States of international agreements to establish navigation rules, to determine methods of monitoring the routes used by commercial vessels, either with naval aircraft or with customs authority patrol boats, or to provide a basis for plans to protect the coast in the event of a disaster. We await a directive on this subject from the Commission, and I listened to Mr Davignon's remarks with much interest. I am sure that in him we have a commissioner who is much concerned with this present-day problem.

We cannot ignore the question of compensation for victims of disasters caused by commercial vessels. If this Assembly is to be provided with information, then it must be full information, and reference must be made to the fact that the oil companies, which have been spoken of in strong terms by some people, adopted provisions in 1969, 1971 and again recently, for compensating victims of damage resulting from accidents at sea, over and above the responsibility of the shipowners. It is said that prevention is better than cure and I agree, as do you. The so-called 'crystal' system of indemnity was created voluntarily by the large oil companies. Could it not be extended to

Calvez

include every vessels carrying dangerous substances, whoever the owner?

Most of all, we must not close our eyes to the infringement of safety regulations when vessels over 20 or 25 years old come into some of our ports, sometimes with inadequately qualified crew members. Strict measures should be laid down to deal with this situation. If there are flags of convenience, is it not also the case that there are ports of convenience and crews who are prepared to sail on floating coffins?

The Commission should invite the Member States to strengthen existing regulations and carry out the necessary checks. It seems to me that Community measures are essential today to prevent the recurrence, off the coast of Brittany, or perhaps somewhere else tomorrow, of shipping disasters which bring poverty to individuals, destroy animal life and divert tourists and holidaymakers elsewhere. Our group will support all proposals along these lines.

President. — I call Mr Josselin.

Mr Josselin. — (F) Mr President, during our last session, this Assembly adopted unanimously — I wish to remind you because some people seem to have forgotten — a resolution in which we invited the Commission to draw up a plan for monitoring the application of international standards. We asked the Commission to report to the parliamentary committees responsible, on the progress of measures concerning transport safety and on the budgetary measures involved, before 15 July 1980.

I do not wish to say that this evening's debate serves no purpose, since I consider it essential that we continue to put pressure on the Commission and the Member States to adopt a more responsible position than in the past with regard to this vital problem of coastal protection.

I agree with those who consider that the problem is not so much one of imagination but rather of will. Indeed, when one takes stock of all the instruments referred to earlier by Commissioner Davignon, it becomes clear that, at the international or Community level at least, the means are available, if not to prevent totally, then at least to restrict to a very large degree those accidents which we have recently had call to regret once again.

I would like here to mention various pieces of information which were mostly gathered together in Brittany during an extraordinary meeting of the general Council, of which I am chairman. This information leads us to conclude that, unfortunately, governments still have not learnt from experience. I would also like to say how deeply I regret the fact that the French Government felt it necessary to prevent the two offi-

cials from the Commission in Brussels, one from the Transport Directorate and one from the Environment Directorate, from coming to give us more information about what had been done by the Commission; in so doing it was acting upon a principle widely applied by the French Government, which prohibits any contact between Community bodies and local authorities. In this instance I believe that the local representatives were entitled to very specific information and I am sorry that they were refused it.

As far as supranationality is concerned, my position has been made clear: I said in effect that without Community or international measures, unilateral refusal to grant access would inevitably lead to the creation of ports of convenience. If oil is refused access to French ports, I cannot wait to hear the reaction of dockers from the CGT, for example, when they see the oil going to another country and then returning to us on lorries which are not French either. Having said that, here is the information which I wanted to give you. Firstly, automatic pilots are still used in the English Channel at night. Secondly, there is not a single tug in the world capable of pulling out to sea an oil-tanker of over 200 000 tonnes. I would add that the corrosion caused by the cleaning of oil-tankers causes them to age prematurely. Another interesting piece of information: the plan to destroy vessels which are too old, for which there may be a grant of financial aid as proposed by the Community, seems today to have met with refusal from a certain number of Member States who are afraid to pay to destroy vessels which will be rebuilt outside the Community. This is a problem which certainly needs attention.

In general terms, the question being asked is whether the Member States and the Community are prepared to pay the price of safety. It is possible, if not to prevent, then at least to limit the number of accidents, but it will be expensive. Vessels will be more expensive and ports will be more expensive because they must be equipped with certain specialized facilities which do not yet exist and which today, for example, prevent the ratification of a certain number of conventions, I am thinking of 'Marpol'. Larger and better paid crews will also be necessary. The measures will be expensive because the radical step must be taken of prohibiting the use of vessels which cannot be controlled. This means, and this is what the people of Brittany are asking for, a ban on oil-tankers of over 200 000 tonnes, because nobody can control them at the moment. It is essential, and this debate should play its part, that the Member States be persuaded to step up considerably their methods of inspection and surveillance.

That, Mr President, was the information which I wished to pass on, pointing out that I am not one of those who believes in fate or impotence. On the contrary, I am one of those who consider that if oil-tankers, which are no more than tools, are beyond

Josselin

the control of the society which created them, then clearly it is high time we considered the question of changing this society. And here I am thinking both of 550 000 tonne oil-tankers and 4 000 megawatt nuclear power stations.

President. — I call Mr Turner.

Mr Turner. — Mr President, I think that what has come through most in this debate is that one must have the same for all. Every port must have the same regulations so that nobody cheats on the other, so you do not have easier conditions in one port than in another. That is why Mr Davignon is here and that is why Mr Davignon is so important for what this debate is about. We must have harmonized laws for all the ports of Europe, and that is why it is not a matter of nation States or governments and parliaments, as he said; it is a matter for the Commission to make sure that all the governments of the Community have the same regulation.

Now I must point out that the Danish members of our group have reservations on what I am about to say, and so I speak for all except the Danish members of the European Democratic Group. I am proposing this. There is an urgent need for compulsory pilotage in all congested waters between the coasts of the Member States of the Community, i.e. the Mediterranean, the Channel and the North Sea. Now this is something that was put forward in 1971 by all the pilots of the International Maritime Pilots Association, the European Maritime Pilots Association and the United Kingdom Maritime Pilots Association and is, in fact, law now in German waters. So what I am proposing is something which it has been said for years and years should be part of the law of the Community. There should be compulsory pilotage of oil-tankers in the congested waters of the Community.

Now you might ask 'why compulsory', and the answer is this: the good ships do not need pilots so much and yet take them on board. It is the other ships, which do not take pilots on board, that need them and, therefore, one must have compulsion in this proposal. We need a directive, if I may say this to Mr Davignon, so that pilotage in the congested waters is compulsory and not optional.

Now you know that even a sophisticated master of a very large oil-tanker probably only passes through the Channel twice in one year, and yet every day of the year 800 ships pass through the Channel. Now it is clear from that that there is a very grave risk of accidents, either collisions or wrecking of one sort or another, and I understand that three-quarters of all accidents that occur are due to human error. Now the advantages of having pilots on board ships are numerous. First of all, they know the latest traffic schemes near the coast in question; secondly, they bring on

board their own communication equipment; thirdly, they actually speak the language of the coastal country along which they are passing. Lastly, and I think most important of all — and again I speak to Mr Davignon who, I think, is listening — if you have a pilot on board he is concerned solely with the traffic of the Channel he is passing through. He is not concerned with the commercial advantage of cutting corners, as is often the case when a master of a ship is in the hands of an owner anxious to make the greatest profit he possibly can. It is no good having merely voluntary pilotage because the good ships take pilots on board anyway and the older ones, who cause most of the accidents, do not take them on board, and therefore it must be compulsory. Now nobody in this debate except Mrs Ewing — who I am glad to say supported me in advance of my speech — has said that we must have compulsory pilotage in all the waters round our coasts in the Community, and I mean the Mediterranean, the Channel and the North Sea. I ask the Commission to bring forward a directive which provides for the nations themselves with their own maritime authorities to arrange for compulsory pilotage, and I hope this parliament will accept this proposal.

Tomorrow, my group will put forward an amendment to Mrs Ewing's motion, which will call upon the Commission to make proposals to improve standards of safety and conduct in Community waters, and I stress here it calls on the *Commission* of the Community to make these proposals. I draw attention to paragraph 2 (c) which speaks of 'the establishment of the aim of the maritime authorities of the Member States of *compulsory* pilotage for all oil-tankers in transit through congested waters between or adjacent to the coasts of Member States'. Now, if we pass this tomorrow, it will be something which the pilots have asked for for the last nine years. So I hope the Commission will propose a formal directive to be accepted by the authorities of the Member States.

President. — I call Mrs Ewing.

Mrs Ewing. — Mr President, I will not say more than just three things. I would like to know whether the Commission would really take very seriously one or two of my points that Mr Davignon did not comment on. One concerns the standard I referred to, which seems to have been observed and supported by a German colleague in his speech about the shipmasters: when they are negligent, it seems as if Member States do not rebuke the association for allowing them to carry on in their ships. There is also the question whether the coastal States should not accept the responsibility for the tug arrangements, instead of the old-fashioned Victorian type of bargaining that sometimes holds us up. I think also that the insurance comments I made are really very serious, and I do not think, to get back to it, that the semantics of whether

Ewing

you call it a code or a system of cooperation really separates myself from any of the speakers.

I just feel that there is so far not enough will, Mr Davignon, and anything the Commission can do to stress this to the Council and to the Member States — and we can all try and help — will, I am sure, only take us forward.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, I would like first of all to remove the doubts of the honourable Members, Mrs Ewing in particular, and assure them that the Commission has listened most attentively to everything that has been said. It is very difficult, Mr Turner, for a Commissioner to show his interest when his back is turned to the speaker. But perhaps the Commission will also be able to prepare a directive on this subject in due course; I will give thought to the matter during what is left of the night

(Laughter)

With regard to the two points raised by Mrs Ewing, there do in fact exist, on the subject of crew qualifications referred to by Mr Josselin, unratified agreements laying down training requirements; a recommendation was approved by the Council in December 1978 and the Member States were invited to ratify the convention on training standards. All this is already in existence and one wonders why these provisions have not been ratified by the national parliaments. I would inform Mr Turner that the Commission is going to consider the question of compulsory pilotage in certain circumstances. It would not be a bad thing if the Member States, his in particular, were to adopt the 1978 directive laying down qualifications for pilots. Substantial progress would already have been achieved if a directive adopted by the Council were implemented by the Member States and if one began by honouring outstanding commitments rather than weighing down the issue with further demands.

In view of the time, Mr President, I will arrange for the answers to some specialized and technical questions to be given directly to the honourable Members. I hope, and perhaps Mrs Ewing could give some thought to this between now and tomorrow, that the resolution proposed will call upon the national parliaments to assume their share of responsibility by ratifying agreements, otherwise we shall continue to talk pleasantly amongst ourselves until all hours of the day or night without actually solving any of the problems involved.

President. — I have received two motions for resolutions with request for an early vote, pursuant to Rule

47(5) of the Rules of Procedure, to wind up the debate on this oral question:

- from Mrs Le Roux and others,
- from Mr Cottrell and others, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Calvez and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, and Mr Janssen van Raay and Mr Hoffmann, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) (Doc. 1-115/80).

I shall consult Parliament on these requests at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

I declare the debate closed.

21. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received from Mr Martin and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, a motion for a resolution with request for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the execution of the thirteen persons condemned to death in Gafsa (Doc. 1-125/80).

The reasons supporting the request for urgency are contained in the document itself.

I shall consult Parliament on this request for urgent debate at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

22. Agenda for next sitting

President. — The next sitting will be held tomorrow Friday, 18 April 1980 at 9 a.m., with the following agenda:

- Procedure without report
- Decision on urgency
- Michel report on food aid
- Woltjer report on vessels flying the Swedish flag (*without debate*)
- Glinne motion for a resolution on the assassination of Archbishop Romero
- Diligent motion for a resolution on the granting of asylum to Cuban citizens
- Pruvot motion for a resolution on political prisoners in Guinea
- Josselin motion for a resolution on marine pollution
- Donnez motion for a resolution on EEC-US relations in the field of steel
- Jaquet motion for a resolution on events in Tunisia

President

- Boyes motion for a resolution on Parliament's electronic voting system
- Seligman report on research programmes
- Muntingh report on the World Conservation Strategy
- Nyborg report on public supply contracts
- Oral question with debate to the Commission on defective products
- Maij-Weggen report on colouring matters
- Combe report on fresh meat
- Seal report on India
- von Wogau report on international travel
- Nyborg report on the stores of vessels
- Mihr report on the noise emission of construction plant
- von Wogau report on binary textile fibre mixtures (*without debate*)
- Luster report on health problems in connection with the importation of animals (*without debate*)
- Simonnet interim report on Parliament's administrative expenditure in 1979
- Ed. Kellet-Bowman report on the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions

End of sitting: Voting time.

Mr Seal. — Mr President, one of the few things that has been decided in this part-session is that the report for which I am rapporteur, on the commercial cooperation agreement with India, will be heard by this Parliament. It was decided in plenary sitting that it would be put on the agenda for this evening. We have not reached this item, Mr President, through no fault of anybody's, apart from the organization perhaps, but it is not one that you have mentioned for tomorrow morning. I would request that, because this is one of the few reports that Parliament has said it will hear, we hear it as the first item on the agenda tomorrow morning. We should not delay it any longer than necessary, and I am sure, Mr President, that you will accept this and put it first on the agenda. Parliament thinks it is a very important debate: let us debate as Parliament wishes!

President. — I realize the importance of the subject you want to have debated, but requests for urgent debate take precedence over all other items. I cannot therefore amend the agenda.

I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, it is almost Friday morning and we still have the report by Mr

Seligman to discuss. To hold it over until Friday's meeting would not be very respectful to our colleagues present. This report is extremely important and by no means technical. It affects people's everyday life and therefore requires more than casual consideration on Friday. Moreover, a request will be made that it be referred back to the committee.

Mr President, I would request that the decision concerning the consideration of the report by Mr Seligman in this part-session be placed as the first item on tomorrow's agenda, before the requests for urgent procedure.

President. — Mr Coppieters, your proposal can be put forward again tomorrow morning. It is impossible to make a decision on it tonight in the few minutes we have left.

I call Mr Johnson.

Mr Johnson. — Mr President, I do not think it is reasonable that where we have not been able to conclude our business this evening, items which have appeared on the agenda for the whole of this week should suddenly find themselves shunted to the end of the queue tomorrow morning...

(Applause)

... because this Parliament, injudiciously perhaps, has voted a large number of urgent debates. It is not right, reasonable or fair, and I do beg you, Mr President, to let us finish the agenda first tomorrow morning before dealing with the item for which urgent procedure has been approved.

(Applause)

President. — Mr Johnson, you know as well as I do that the Rules of Procedure provide that requests for urgent debate shall have priority. However, the Chair will make every effort to meet the wishes that have been expressed.

I call Mr Normanton.

Mr Normanton. — Is there any reason, Mr President, why we should not, in the next 10 or 15 minutes, take the opening speech of Mr Seligman as part of the process of dealing with this matter? The debate could then take place and be completed tomorrow morning perfectly adequately: we have Commission representatives here and there is no reason, as I see it, Mr President, why that should not be done tonight. Ten minutes, and we have it firmly on the agenda.

President. — Mr Normanton, there is a specific agreement with the staff that the sitting will end not later than midnight.

I call Mr Luster.

Mr Luster. — (D) Mr President, you said that the remainder of today's agenda will be postponed until tomorrow. May I just point out that, aside from the question of whether it is dealt with before or after the requests for urgent debate, I have understood you to mean that item 50 on today's agenda — Oral question with debate by the Legal Affairs Committee on liability for defective products — will not be taken in the same sequence as intended for today. Might I ask that tomorrow this oral question be dealt with at the same time as it would have been today, between the Myborg report and the Maij-Weggen report.

I should point out that the Legal Affairs Committee

asked that this item be placed on the agenda in November of last year.

It is an item intended to uphold the reputation of this Parliament in the eyes of the Commission. It would be a poor state of affairs if Parliament did not take itself sufficiently seriously to defend its own reputation.

I therefore request that tomorrow we simply adhere to the order proposed in the agenda. I would be grateful if you would confirm that this will be the case.

President. — Mr Luster, I have already explained this matter when replying to those speakers who wanted to have the agenda amended.

The sitting is closed.

(Mixed reactions)

(The sitting was closed at 0.15 a.m.)

ANNEX

Solemn sitting on the occasion of the official of this Excellency Mr Luis Herrera Campins, President of the Republic of Venezuela, Address by Mrs Veil, President of the European Parliament

Mr President, the European Parliament is particularly happy to welcome you in this Chamber today.

On behalf of all the Members of this Parliament let me extend to you our heartiest greetings.

Your visit, Mr President, is an honour not only for our Institution, but also, and above all, for the citizens of Europe whom it is this Assembly's task to represent.

We welcome in your person the head of a State which is a model of parliamentary democracy in Latin America. Rightly concerned with the defence of democratic freedoms and human rights throughout the world, the European Parliament, which has placed these concerns at the centre of its debate at the present meeting, is particularly happy to hold at the same time this solemn sitting in honour of a country such as Venezuela, the country over which you preside.

We are also happy to welcome you as a parliamentarian of long standing who, before being called to the high office you now occupy, served for many years in this capacity, first as deputy and then as senator. We are pleased to remember, Mr President, that you were one of the founders of the Latin American Parliament with which the European Parliament has established links of friendship.

Your presence among us today, Mr President, provides illustrious evidence of your own and, through you, your country's interest in the European Community.

We are most grateful that, on the occasion of your visit to France, you have made a point of coming to Strasbourg to speak to the citizens of the nine Community Member countries.

And we should like to remind you that, in addressing the representatives they have chosen through direct universal suffrage, it is to 260 million Europeans, that you will speak.

Address by Mr Luis Herrera Campins

Madam President,

The existence of this great supranational Assembly does credit to Europe. I bring you the greetings of Venezuela, of its people and of its government, which I have the honour to preside, together with the expression of the admiration and respect of a democratic ruler who has always been a convinced advocate of integration among nations.

I am honoured to come before you on this occasion as the spokesman of the Heads of State of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru — countries which, together with my own, constitute the Andean Group, that dynamic proving ground and focal point of Latin American integration processes. I come with the task of promoting a closer and deeper relationship between our two groups of countries, which are linked not only by their significant economic and cultural exchanges, but also by their common attachment to the principles of integration, democracy and peace.

Strasbourg lies at the crossroads of the past and the present and it is here that you, the legislators elected by direct universal suffrage, meet to represent a Europe that is conscious of its historical individuality and of its world mission.

The men who forged the integrationist ideal on this continent not only founded Europe, but gave inspiration to other nations in their search for a form of integration that would harmoniously consolidate their own development.

The names of Jean Monnet, Robert Schuman, Alcide de Gasperi, Konrad Adenauer, Paul Henry Spaak and others, some of whom are present in this chamber today, resound gloriously from Europe as far as our own continent.

The noble inspiration which moved them to join together in the reconstruction of a war-devastated Europe has borne most valuable fruit. It is our hope that in these lands, which have witnessed man's most splendid achievements, armed conflict will never again hold sway.

In the world concert of nations the European Communities today play a leading part and they have a fundamental role in the building of a new society for all men.

And now, working for the cause of democratic Europe there is a political instrument of highest quality — this Parliament, in which leading politicians of every shade of ideology and opinion, are assembled.

The direct participation of your peoples in the selection of their representatives in Parliament has become precedent of historic importance, opening a new era for Europe and, by its example, for the rest of the world. Various political tendencies can now express themselves and take part in the making of binding decisions on all questions of common interest. A new phenomenon is taking place: the emergence of European political parties.

The joining of nations to deliberate together and their search for a Community of interests to guide efforts towards ever wider participation, are the guarantees of progress and peace.

I bring before this Assembly a message of optimism and hope, and of our desire to strengthen our common faith in participatory democracy. I come from a peace-loving nation which believes in democracy and which, in a joint effort, strives to lay the foundations for a more just and humane society.

In addressing this Assembly, exceptional in its quality and the degree of its political representativeness, I should like to outline the main characteristics of my own country, as it appears on the international scene: I shall speak of Venezuela as a democratic country committed to participation; as a developing Latin American country that believes in integration; and as a country that is an active member of OPEC.

Barely a year has passed, Madam President, since it was our pleasure to welcome you in Caracas. As representative of the French Government at that time, together with the Heads of State and representatives of other friendly Governments, you acknowledged by your presence the accomplishment of a simple, orderly and democratic act — the transmission of power that has continuously taken place in my country for two decades now through the process of free general elections in which every five years over 90 % of electors take part — a degree of participation perhaps unique in the world.

The distinguishing characteristics of a Venezuelan are his attachment to democracy and a strong egalitarian spirit. And my country's political importance is not, as some unforgivably simple-minded and ignorant observers seem to believe, due to its considerable oil wealth. It is the result of a protracted and heroic struggle, marked by many sacrifices, by which our nation achieved its freedom. If we were able to nationalize the petroleum industry without an upheaval, it was because our democracy was strong.

Not that we have a perfect system, but neither can one be found in the entire world. There is room for improvement, and it is towards improvement that we direct our hopes and our faith. It is the full and responsible exercise of freedom that gives to our system strength and imaginative power in following the road of democracy and exploiting its potential for renewal.

It is these ideals that inspire our daily struggle against corruption, against bureaucratization and against stagnation. Democratic renewal is more than a political objective — it is what the peoples demand. And to meet this demand there must be a powerful impulse to extend participation to everyone in matters that concern everyone.

The concept of participation is inseparable from the idea of democracy in a society of men who are equal and free.

Madam President, the high office which you occupy reflects an endeavour which is very close to my heart: the struggle for the participation of women in the world's affairs. It has been my dream throughout my political life. When I became President of my country, I began to realize this dream by setting up a Ministry of State for Women's Participation in Development. Who could deny the extraordinary enrichment of humanity's intellectual, scientific, cultural and productive wealth that the acceptance of women in fields which have so far been denied them can bring? Many other high and important offices are filled most satisfactorily by Venezuelan women.

We have been advocating the concept of the Promotive State, one that stimulates individual and social initiative and encourages participation by all sectors of the population, and particularly by those sections which are the most deprived.

My government's prime concern is with the fate of the poor. My fundamental commitment is to them. Our aim is to consolidate a participatory democracy that recognizes the aspirations of the workers and of the peasants, of young people, of women, of the professions and trades; a democracy that promotes an open society in which all Venezuelans can effectively share in decision-making; in which economic, social, political, civic and cultural rights have full recognition and effective force in a democratic context of solidarity and freedom, offering to each and all every opportunity for spiritual and material achievement.

In historical terms, Venezuelan nationhood was forged in the heat of two great ideas: of independence and of integration.

Both are associated with the name of a native of Caracas born in the Age of Enlightenment. One who astonishes us today by his ability to combine active and passionate participation in the three great historical processes of his times: North American independence, the French Revolution and the War of Liberation in Spanish America. He was the first to envisage 'Colombeia' — a country in which the peoples inhabiting the lands from the Rio Bravo to Cape Horn would live as fellow-citizens.

Francisco de Miranda, comrade of Lafayette and Hamilton, hero of Valmy, guiding light and instigator of the Latin American War of Liberation, ended his days in an obscure colonial prison.

His banner was taken up by his fellow countryman, Simón Bolívar, the Liberator, whose symbolic statue has been sculpted by David D'Angers. This beautiful work stands in this town's Gutenberg Square side by side with the figures of other great men whose lives serve as eternal models of humanity to the nations.

Bolívar realized from the start, and took it as an axiom that freedom for his country was possible only as part of the liberation of all Spanish America, and that unification of all the nations was a necessary condition for the preservation of independence.

This was how this extraordinary man conceived the idea of what, with his profound political understanding of integration, he called the 'nation of republics'. It was the underlying principle of the confederal formula he devised for Spanish America when he planned the Panama Congress of 1826.

As Bolívar saw it, this confederation, to be formed by all the new republics, was compatible with a process of more advanced unification between some of these republics. He thus envisaged, with quite extraordinary foresight, a federation of the Andes consisting of the five countries which he had liberated with his sword.

Nearly a century and a half later, these same countries decided to form the Andean Group to which my country belongs.

It cannot be denied that profound analogies exist between Bolívar's ideas and the present-day regional configuration of Latin America: this fact strengthens our conviction that what we are doing is right, that we are moving along the road of history.

In 1960, with the signing of the Treaty of Montevideo, by which the Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA) was set up, the first attempt at regional integration in our times was made. Twenty years after this experiment, fruitful in both lessons and practical achievements, we have begun negotiations which should, before the end of this year, result in its complete reorganization. Today we are trying to continue the Association on principles which will allow our region's inherent potential for exchange and complementarity, to be fully developed, in a flexible and pragmatic way, towards our common aim of Latin American unity.

From LAFTA, and the experience gained in the first years of its existence, there came the Cartagena Agreement of 1969 creating the Andean Sub-region, just as, at another level, from the experience of the inter-American system based on the Organization of American States, OAS, there emerged, towards the middle of the last decade, the Latin American Economic System, LAES.

With cooperation objectives complementary to those of LAFTA and, at present, with a wider geographical span — because it includes Central America, the Caribbean and the former British and Dutch colonies of Guyana as well — LAES (consisting of 26 Latin American states) acts as a coordinating, consultative and negotiating body fully representative of its region, thus increasingly gaining the status of *the* authoritative Latin American umbrella organization.

What is happening in Latin America today is a coherent and convergent process which might be described as a series of concentric exercises in solidarity, understanding and cooperation, varying in intensity according to local affinities and practical possibilities. It proceeds from the sub-regional to the regional level, operating through different but complementary channels of integration, interchange, dialogue and concertation. In this way, our regional system is developing in a highly

satisfactory way on the principle of participation, whereby the contributions of each and every one of its components are channelled and added up to give a voice to the entire region in the international concert of nations.

It is in this context that we should look at our most intensive and important integrationist undertaking: the Andean Pact.

On 26 May 1979, the five Presidents of the Andean countries met in Cartagena de Indias to celebrate the first decade of our Sub-regional Integration Agreement.

Created with the aim of speeding up the development of the member countries through economic integration in the context of harmonized, balanced and independent development, the Cartagena Agreement, on which the Andean system is based, can boast, despite the difficulties inherent in a process of this kind, significant achievements in the construction of an economic union.

But integration to us, means more than the economic sphere, and this is why, in addition to the monetary and financial agreements complementing the Cartagena Agreement, the Andean integration process over these years has had its parallel development in the cultural, educational, scientific and technological spheres through the Andrés Bello Convention; in the social and labour spheres through the Simón Rodríguez Convention; and in the matter of public health through the Hipólito Unanue Convention.

In Cartagena we reaffirmed our political resolve to promote the process of integration and we traced the aims which should guide us in the present decade. At the same time it became clear to us that conditions for Andean integration already existed and it was therefore essential to provide for a guiding and coordinating political authority.

Meeting again in Panama, we were inspired by the presence and activity of the Andean Foreign Ministers in the midst of the troubled political situation in Latin America, to establish the Andean Council of Foreign Ministers.

At the same time, in the conviction that integration cannot be pursued by governments alone, and that participation of the peoples must be ensured, we decided to set up the Andean Parliament — thus testifying to the unflinching attachment of the governments of this region to the democratic principle.

In a process analogous to what has been happening in Europe, our Parliament will at first have consultative status, to become in future a genuine Community legislative body.

The Andean presence in the context of developments in Nicaragua, and subsequently in Bolivia, became clear evidence of how important for our ultimate integrative objective the introduction of the political dimension had been.

This week's debate in this House on the situation in two of the sister countries of our continent — the debate calling for the respect of fundamental freedoms and the return of the rule of law in Chile, as well as for Community aid for the reconstruction and economic recovery of Nicaragua, to help that anguished country back on to the road to the re-establishment of its democratic institutions — demonstrates the concern of this august Assembly, emanating from the will of the peoples of nine European countries, for events and political developments in Latin America.

The Andean Council's decision to enter international politics has already resulted in understandings with Brazil and with Argentina. Shortly there is to be a meeting with Mexico. There is soon to be a meeting between the Andean Group and the Council of the European Communities, which should lead to a useful rapprochement between our two Communities and promote the success of the economic negotiations to be held between the Commission of the European Communities and the Commission of the Cartagena Agreement.

Contacts between the Andean Pact and the European Communities began in the middle of last year, with the visit to Brussels of President Turbay Ayala of Colombia, representing the Andean Group.

The subsequent visit of the Chairman of the Cartagena Agreement Commission, to open exploratory talks, was a further confirmation of our sub-region's interest in associating the two integration processes more closely and in laying down the foundations for a cooperation agreement between the two regions.

What we are seeking here is a qualitative change in our relationship with Europe. We want this relationship to be based on equality and increasing reciprocity, in the interest, and to the benefit, of both sides.

And we must acknowledge that from the start the European Community has met us half-way with initiatives for cooperation of its own. This gives us hope that now we shall be able to achieve tangible results.

The contacts being now established between the Andean Pact and the European Communities open a new stage in the Group's international economic relations, initiated some years ago when the Joint Cooperation Committees with Argentina, Mexico and Spain were set up.

Furthermore, last November the Cartagena Agreement Commission opened relations with the Government of the United States of America by laying down the basis for a dialogue in a general memorandum of understanding, as well as by signing an agreement on technology and, later, another document concerning trade.

Generally, it can be said that, in establishing its presence on the international arena, both in political and in economic terms, the Andean Group is increasingly tending towards joint coordinated and concerted action which strengthens its negotiating position and gives greater weight to its activities and status at regional and world level.

At the moment when the Third Development Decade is beginning, all the countries of the world should realize that they must concentrate all their efforts on the search for permanent solutions, to eradicate injustices, underdevelopment and exploitation, with everything that it implies. Like the Sovereign Pontiff, Paul VI, I believe that 'development is the new name for peace'.

We must look for mechanisms through which a new world system of economic relations can be established between the nations which today, more than ever before, are threatened by grave international crises

The world's economy is going through the most critical phase since the Great Depression. The spectre of mass unemployment has been haunting the industrialized world for more than five years now, and is accompanied this time by a chronic state of inflation, for which traditional economic policy measures can find no remedy. To the monetary disorder of the last decade there is now added a resurgence of protectionism by the industrial economies, but the present economic crisis has hit hardest the poorest countries of our globe.

In this dramatic situation the seeds of conflict germinate: kidnappings and assassinations of diplomats and violent seizures of diplomatic missions; the burgeoning of narrow nationalisms and religious fanaticisms; interference in internal affairs and high-handed occupation of countries in circumstances which threaten the world's peace. The proliferation of arms, increased military spending and increasing power and precision of the instruments of war — all these mean that scientific, technological and financial resources are being diverted to military ends, when they could be used to provide for the two-thirds of the world's population that has to suffer shortages and poverty — particularly in the developing countries. The economic and social consequences of massive and competitive armaments are totally incompatible with the principles of international social justice and then undermine every effort towards the establishment of the new world economic order.

It is optimistic folly to defer the necessary restructuring of the world's economy by substituting for it ad hoc palliatives which only threaten to revive a spirit of retaliation, instead of promoting an equitable climate of world cooperation.

More petrodollar recycling alone is not the way to stop the incessant emergence of points of tension throughout the world. Several recent developments go to prove it. Those who come to believe, by dint of constant repetition of the claim, that the underlying causes of the present economic crisis are to be sought in the readjustment of petroleum prices will be labouring under a dangerous misapprehension. The price changes of 1979, after two years of a virtual freeze, barely begin to compensate the loss of purchasing power resulting from the devaluation of the dollar and the inflationary spiral unwinding throughout the industrialized world. We also say that it would be a grave delusion to advocate petroleum price levels that do not reflect the supply and demand situation in the energy market.

If alternative energy sources are to be developed, the relation between the prices of conventional and new forms of energy must be such as to make their exploration and exploitation profitable.

We must face the reality of the natural, and increasing, limitations of available energy resources if we are to cope boldly and constructively with the problem of modernizing the technological civilization of our post-war era. If a new period of prosperity and growth is to be ushered in, this will require bold action, not only in restructuring the industrialized economies and achieving a new and equitable international division of labour, but also in creating an energy supply situation that can effectively check the resurgence of trade and financial protectionism that is now threatening to dislocate the industrialization effort of the developing countries, or bring us all into financial bankruptcy.

Venezuela's integrationist avocation falls naturally into the context of the strengthening of the solidarity and collective self-confidence of the developing countries. Dynamic, imaginative and fruitful methods of cooperation must be found to permit the Third World to become organized. This is an essential condition for the necessary transition towards more just and equitable international economic relations.

Twenty years ago the cooperation and solidarity of developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America in defence of their principal export — a resource limited in quantity, but frequently squandered — led to the creation of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, of which my country is a founder member.

The Organization's activities in the course of these two decades have been the subject of the most diverse assessments. Nevertheless, the rightness and the rationale of its actions are understood better with each passing day.

It is thanks to OPEC that the reality of the interdependence of our world has been recognized anew. It was OPEC that warned humanity against unrestricted and unjustified consumption of hydrocarbons and awoke it to the need for an ordered transition towards new systems, based on new and renewable energy sources, in order to avoid shortage situations which might generate conflicts that it is in everyone's interest to prevent. It was OPEC that was the moderating factor when the insatiable greed of the great oil transnationals led them to speculate in the spot market. It is OPEC's initiatives, and the solidarity of the other developing countries, that are going to bring about genuine North-South negotiations in which the political will of one side will generate a similar resolve on the other side, inspired by a mutual, equitable and just interest.

We must search for a new joint machinery that will enable us *both* to strengthen relations between Europe and Latin America *and* to contribute to the consolidation of a new world order.

Your Parliament offers an alternative — which is not merely economic, but essentially political — to the concept of a bi-polar balance in the world. To the domination of the super-powers we must oppose a model that, rejecting all domination, is directed towards participation and the respect of the principle of independent but cohesive development for all nations.

It is the fact of interdependence that dictates that we should help — not patronizingly, nor paternalistically, but as a duty — every country to achieve self-determination.

This is the great challenge to pluralism in Europe. This is the shape of the new world being born. Madam President, the Third World, in following its natural avocation in these troubled times, wants to become a force for peace and understanding. It is determined to proceed towards its fundamental objective of increasingly developing its own potentialities. This, far from weakening the ties which unite us to Europe, will make a decisive contribution to strengthening these ties on the basis of mutual benefit, equity and justice.

Madam President, today more than ever before, the world needs a Europe that is strong, but has no pretensions to hegemony, a Europe willing to cooperate constructively with all the nations, a Europe prepared to accept that ways of life appropriate to man's new social, global and cosmic dimension must be allowed to develop and prosper.

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 18 APRIL 1980

Contents

1. Approval of the minutes	279	15. Regions of Brittany hard-hit by oil pollution — Motion for a resolution by Mr Josselin and others (Doc. 1-87/80):	
2. Documents received	279	Mr Josselin, author of the motion	290
3. Membership of committees	279	Mrs Le Roux; Mr Harris; Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission	290
4. Petitions	279	16. Votes	291
5. Authorization of reports	279	Linde report (Doc. 1-816/79): Energy saving:	
6. Procedure without report	279	Amendment to paragraph 1:	
7. Agenda:		Mr Linde, rapporteur	291
Mr Coppieters; Mr Seligman	279	Amendment to paragraph 5:	
8. Decision on requests for an early vote:		Mr Linde	291
Procedural motion: Mrs Squarcialupi	280	Amendment to paragraph 7:	
9. Decision on urgent procedure:		Mr Linde	291
Mr Martin; Mr Irmer; Mrs Van den Heuvel (S); Mr Donnez (L); Mrs Macciocchi (CDI)	280	Amendment to paragraph 12(b):	
10. Food aid for 1980 — Report by Mr Michel on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation (Doc. 1-105/80):		Mr Linde	292
Mr Michel, rapporteur	281	Amendment after paragraph 12(c):	
Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mrs Focke (S)	283	Mr Linde	292
11. Fish conservation measures for vessels flying the flag of Sweden — Report, without debate, by Mr Woltjer on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 1-102/80)	283	Adoption of the resolution	292
12. Assassination of Archbishop Romero — Motion for a resolution by Mr O'Connell and others (Doc. 1-74/80/rev.)	283	D'Ormesson et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-119/80): Surveillance of shipping routes for Community supplies:	
Mr O'Connell, author of the motion	283	Procedural motion: Sir Fred Catherwood	292
Mr Penders (EPP); Mrs Poirier; Mr Fergus- son	284	Le Roux et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-115/80): Code of conduct for oil-tankers:	
13. Right of asylum for Cuban citizens — Motion for a resolution by Mr Diligent and others (Doc. 1-84/80)	285	Procedural motions: Mr Cottrell; Mr Fergus- son	293
Mr Seitlinger, author of the motion	285	Cottrell et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-117/80): Code of conduct for oil-tankers:	
Mr Baillot; Mr Seitlinger; Mr Boyes; Mr Langes (EPP); Lady Elles (ED); Mrs Hoff- mann	286	Adoption of the resolution	293
14. Situation of political prisoners in Guinea — Motion for a resolution by Mrs Pruvot and others (Doc. 1-86/80)	288	Michel report (Doc. 1-105/80): Food aid in 1980:	
Mrs Pruvot, author of the motion	288	Adoption of the resolution	293
Mr de Courcy Ling (ED)	289	Woltjer report (Doc. 1-102/80): Fish conser- vation measures for vessels flying the flag of Sweden:	
		Adoption of the resolution	293
		O'Connell et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-74/80/rev.): Assassination of Arch- bishop Romero:	
		Adoption of the resolution	293
		Diligent et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-84/80): Asylum for Cuban citizens:	
		Adoption of the resolution	293
		Pruvot et al. motion for a resolution (Doc.	

1-86/80): Situation of political prisoners in Guinea:		
Adoption of the resolution	293	
Josselin et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-87/80): Regions of Brittany hard-hit by oil pollution:		
Adoption of the resolution	293	
17. EEC-US relations in the field of steel — Motion for a resolution by Mr Donnez and others (Doc. 1-92/80):		
Mr Donnez, author of the motion	294	
Mr Oehler (S); Sir David Nicolson (ED); Mr Martin; Mr Deleau (EPD); Mr Welsh; Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission	294	
18. Events in Tunisia — Motion for a resolution by Mr Jaquet and others (Doc. 1-100/80):		
Mr Sarre	298	
19. Parliament's electronic voting-system — Motion for a resolution by Mr Boyes and others (Doc. 1-109/80):		
Mr Boyes, author of the motion	299	
Mr Seal; Mr Herman (EPP)	299	
20. Agenda:		
Sir Fred Catherwood	299	
21. EAEC research and development programme on plutonium — Report by Mr Seligman on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research (Doc. 1-813/79)	299	
Procedural motion: Mr Linkohr	300	
Mr Seligman; Mr Coppieters	300	
Mr Seligman, rapporteur	300	
Mr Linkohr (S); Mr Sassano (EPP); Mr Purvis (ED); Mr Coppieters; Mr Veronesi (COM); Mr Muntingh; Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mr Seligman	301	
22. EEC-India cooperation agreement — Interim report by Mr Seal on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations (Doc. 1-45/80):		
Adoption of the resolution	306	
23. Agenda:		
Mr von Wogau	306	
24. World Conservation Strategy (WCS) — Oral question, with debate, by Mr Muntingh (Doc. 1-31/80):		
Mr Muntingh, author of the question	307	
Mr Johnson (ED); Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission	308	
25. Public supply contracts — Report by Mr Nyborg on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (Doc. 1-814/79):		
Miss Forster	309	
Mr von Wogau (EPP); Miss Forster (ED); Mr Baillot; Mr Turner; Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission	310	
26. Agenda:		
Mr Luster	312	
27. Votes		
Von Wogau report (Doc. 1-818/79): Binary textile fibre mixtures:		
Adoption of the resolution	312	
Luster report (Doc. 1-811/79): Health problems in connection with the importation of animals:		
Adoption of the resolution	312	
Von Wogau report (Doc. 1-43/80): Excise duty applicable in international travel:		
Adoption of the resolution	312	
Donnez et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-92/80): EEC-US relations in the field of steel:		
Amendment to paragraph 1	312	
Amendments after paragraph 2:		
Mr Donnez	313	
Adoption of the resolution	313	
Boyes et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-109/80): Parliament's electronic voting-system:		
Adoption of the resolution	313	
Seligman report (Doc. 1-813/79): EAEC research and development programme on plutonium:		
Procedural motions: Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Scott-Hopkins	313	
Nyborg report (Doc. 1-814/79): Public supply contracts:		
Amendment to Article 25b	314	
Adoption of the resolution	314	
28. Membership of committees	314	
29. Dates of the next part-session	314	
30. Approval of the minutes	314	
31. Adjournment of the session	314	

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Documents received*

President. — I have received a number of motions for resolutions tabled under Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure. Details of these can be found in the minutes.

3. *Membership of committees*

President. — I have received from the Socialist Group a request for the appointment of Mr Jalon to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, in replacement of Mr Estier.

Are there any objections?

The appointment is ratified.

4. *Petitions*

President. — I have received two petitions. Their titles and authors can be found in the minutes, where you will also find a number of decisions relating to other petitions.

5. *Authorization of reports*

President. — The minutes contain details concerning a decision by the Legal Affairs Committee on the

motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Collins and others (Doc. 1-555/79/rev. II) on the procedure for consulting the European Parliament.

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 leave to speak and no amendments have been tabled to them, I declare these proposals approved by the European Parliament.

7. *Agenda*

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, I would like to make a purely practical proposal concerning today's agenda, of which item 45 is the report by Mr Seligman on the plutonium cycle. In my opinion, we should not be treating the subject with due respect if we tried to deal with or even introduce this highly important and entirely non-technical report. The other reason for my request, Mr President, relates to the content of the report. This report and its accompanying motion for a resolution is so incomplete, so premature, and therefore so misleading, that 30 amendments have been submitted, upon which a vote may be held. I would therefore urge you, Mr President, to hold over the report by Mr Seligman until the next part-session and, in view of the importance of this issue, I would ask my colleagues for their understanding.

President. — I call Mr Seligman.

Mr Seligman. — Mr President, I would resist very strongly Mr Coppieters' recommendation to put off this report. It is already one year late. If we put it off another month or two it will become irrelevant and, anyhow, Mr Coppieters had plenty of chance to discuss it in the committee.

President. — I put to the vote the request to hold over the Seligman report (Doc. 1-813/79).

The request is rejected.

8. *Decision on requests for an early vote*

President. — The next item is the decision on three requests for an early vote.

I put to the vote the request for an early vote on the *motion for a resolution tabled by Mr d'Ormesson and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and by Mr de Courcy Ling and Mr Hutton on behalf of the European Democratic Group (Doc. 1-119/80): Surveillance and protection of shipping routes.*

The request is approved.

The vote will be taken at the next voting-time.

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the request for an early vote on the *motions for resolutions tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others (Doc. 1-115/80) and by Mr Cottrell and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Calvez and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and Mr Janssen van Raay and Mr Hoffmann on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) (Doc. 1-117/80): Code of conduct for oil-tankers.*

The request is approved.

The vote will be taken at the next voting-time.

I call Mrs Squarcialupi on a point of order.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (I) Mr President, I would point out that this is a Parliament, in other words a forum in which any member may express his opinion pursuant to the Rules of Procedure.

Since the sitting began — only ten minutes ago — you have disregarded this rule several times. This is totally unacceptable and seems like an act of provocation to the Assembly!

I respect your role as President in directing the work of the Assembly, but the members must be allowed to express their views whether you approve or not! The Rules of Procedure, which the Assembly itself adopted, must be respected: if you are not in a position to ensure that they are observed, let someone else take over who is prepared to do so!

President. — The Rules of Procedure have been strictly applied. Any Member can ask for the floor during the debate.

9. *Decision on urgent procedure*

President. — The next item is the decision on the request for urgent debate on the *motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Martin and others on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group (Doc. 1-125/80): Execution of the 13 persons condemned to death in Gafsa.*

I call Mr Martin.

Mr Martin. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Bourguiba has just executed 13 people. I should like to reiterate the strong protests we have made. This execution crowns a series of violations of human rights and condemns the regime and its supporters. All those who allowed Bourguiba to do as he pleased give a poor impression of their commitment to human rights.

These 13 men could have been saved. We Communists made strenuous representations in this connection. However, in the meantime, others washed their hands of the crime being planned, just like Pontius Pilate. Even in this Assembly, certain members rejected urgent procedure on Thursday, thereby accepting or even encouraging the execution of the condemned men of Gafsa. Furthermore, in Tunis, stiff penalties involving forced labour and imprisonment were imposed on 17 other accused people. Political and trade union prisoners are now rotting in Tunisian prisons and dungeons. We feel that solidarity must be shown to secure their release and free the Tunisian people.

It would certainly have been better if the debate had begun immediately the request for urgent debate was approved yesterday. However, this did not happen, and now we have Bourguiba's gallows and the dead bodies of 13 men.

This is intolerable and we must make this point here in the Assembly. Those hanged in Tunis will not have died in vain if, as a result of their sacrifice, Mr Bourguiba's regime, the jewel of the so-called free world, is deservedly indicted and the need to fight against attacks on human rights wherever they occur is underlined. This is the reason behind our proposal for urgent debate, which we ask you to approve.

President. — I call Mr Irmer.

Mr Irmer. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, a few days ago I supported and voted for a proposal to appeal to the governments and ask that mercy be granted. I cannot now see why the matter should be so urgent. There is nothing we can do now to alter the sorry fate of those concerned. I am against the death penalty in general. However, I do not feel that I am in a position to interfere in Tunisia's internal affairs. I do not know the circumstances in which the

Irmer

death sentence was pronounced and carried out. There can be no question of urgent procedure. The matter should first be discussed in the Political Affairs Committee and then Parliament can express its views.

President. — I call Mrs Van den Heuvel.

Mrs Van den Heuvel. — (NL) Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group, I would urge that this matter be treated as urgent. Although we can do nothing more to save these people from their fate, we can nevertheless express our abhorrence at any system which believes in thus eliminating its adversaries. Therefore I would urge that Parliament give priority to this matter.

President. — I call Mr Donnez.

Mr Donnez. — (F) Mr President, I wish to speak both on my own behalf and on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

The Liberal Group has authorized me to make this statement. I have a son who is working on a medical cooperation project in Gafsa and it is through him that I learned what happened. I can tell you that those who came from Libya to Gafsa did not do things on a small scale and that many innocent people died as a result. Given these facts, it is not for me to judge the Tunisian Government, which took such action as it was entitled to in circumstances which I would describe as normal on the basis of its laws, regulations and penal code.

I deeply regret that the President of the Tunisian Republic did not take steps to ensure that those condemned to death would be pardoned. I regret this deeply from the human point of view, but from the strictly legal point of view, taking into account the information I have available and in view of what I have suffered personally, I can assure you that I will not vote for urgent procedure in this case.

President. — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

Mrs Macciocchi. — (F) I, on the contrary, should like to announce our intention to vote in favour of the request for urgent procedure which is before us in view of the fact that wherever assassinations, executions and deaths take place, we are opposed to the death of individuals, of men fighting one another whether on one side or the other. To be consistent with ourselves, therefore, and in the interests of coherence, a concern which I should like to see certain of my colleagues share, I ask you to approve urgent procedure immediately so that we who have so often fought against prisons, concentration camps and

death, can show the world that we set as our ideal respect for human life wherever it is in danger. We will always fight in favour of respect for life.

President. — I put the request to the vote.

The request is rejected.

The motion for a resolution is consequently referred to the appropriate committee.

10. Food aid in 1980

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-105/80) by Mr Michel, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the

proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-5/80) for regulations concerning food aid in 1980.

I call Mr Michel.

Mr Michel, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, colleagues, I have the honour to present this report on behalf of the Committee on Cooperation and Development.

The report was discussed on 15 April, in other words during this part-session. Account was taken at that time of the views of the Committee on Agriculture, which sent us a letter setting out its opinion, and of the resolutions adopted by the Committee on Budgets, which was represented in the Committee on Development by Mr Flanagan.

Mr President, colleagues, the appalling hunger and object poverty of over 500 million people highlights inequalities at world level which shame all mankind and throw down a challenge to the human conscience. There are two main instruments which should be used to remedy this tragic situation. In the short term there is food aid, which should be guaranteed and which should be better structured and planned at international level in order to ensure a continuous and effective flow and to respond in particular to emergencies. We should also be able in the medium and long term to make an active contribution to the policy of overall development through continuous international efforts, and this policy must be concentrated intensively on agricultural reform, rural and technical development and on seeking balanced and integrated overall development with food aid playing a key role. We should give constant thought to all these matters and I hope we will return to them during the debate on the problems of hunger in the world.

It was in the light of this basic concern that I agreed to present to you the report concerning the Commission's proposals on food aid in 1980, submitted to the

Michel

Council of Ministers. Adoption of this report is a matter of urgency for obvious and pressing reasons, namely with a view to continuing existing aid until such time as we will hopefully be able to increase it. We will certainly not be able to meet the world's total food requirements, which are immense, but we, the well-fed people of the world, can certainly provide more and we must learn to share more with those who are hungry.

The special reasons for the resolution and the report are stressed on page 7 of the document you have before you. Let me summarize the reasons for the request for urgent procedure: first, the lack of a budget for 1980; second, the forthcoming consideration by Parliament of a new budget; third, the fact that the Council of Ministers has still not adopted the proposal for a regulation on the management of food aid; fourth, the forthcoming publication by the Court of Auditors of a special report on this form of aid; and finally, and most important of all, preparation by our committee and the other committees involved of a comprehensive report on the problems of hunger in the world. For all these reasons, ladies and gentlemen, even if we cannot predict future guidelines and decisions still to be taken, we cannot remain inactive in a field of such crucial and prime importance, where the lives, or rather survival of starving men, women, and children is at stake day after day.

Let us now consider the three main points of the report. First, the immediate renewal of the quantities entered in the 1979 budget in order to remain operational, in other words to feed the people concerned. Second, the trend of food aid in 1980 and the need for our Parliament to adopt a position in this respect. Third, the consequences of the Council's failure to adopt the regulation for the management of food aid, which you will find on pages 10, 11 and 12 of this report.

I should like to sum up the main features of the Commission's proposals. First, the proposal concerning the renewal of aid; here, we must request authorization to act on the basis of the rule of provisional twelfths. Although the budget was not adopted, food aid must not be held up for several months more. If higher quantities of food aid are granted under the 1980 budget, which we will vote on as soon as possible, it would still be possible to carry out additional programmes; in the meantime, however, the quantities set out in the table on page 8 of the report must be made available immediately according to the above rule, namely, 720 500 tonnes of cereals, 150 000 tonnes of skimmed-milk powder and 45 000 tonnes of butteroil. In connection with these proposals, the Commission has suggested three main criteria for the distribution of the emergency food aid; first, the nutritional requirements of the populations concerned; second, the *per capita* gross national product of each country's external financial situation, starting with that of the most deprived countries. In practice, the latter

would get 90 % of the cereals aid, 82 % of the skimmed-milk powder and 89 % of the butteroil.

Second, the distribution of aid and future aid policy. Your rapporteur does not believe that there would be any point in studying the distribution proposals in detail given the present situation, as they were covered in a report presented to this House by Mr Broeks and in a resolution adopted by this Assembly on 27 April 1979 when Parliament approved the Commission's distribution criteria. We will have an opportunity to come back to all these distribution and commitment problems when in the coming months we discuss the report on the problems of hunger in the world, which you know is being prepared. However, your rapporteur must point out that, if no increase were granted, the *status quo* would have been preserved for five years. 1979 was the fourth year in which no food aid increase was granted. Consequently, we cannot simply be content to continue in this way because, given the level of need and unsatisfied requirements, this would be tantamount to ignoring a tragic situation for which we should be assuming responsibility in the interests not only of this generation but also of the next.

My third and final point is the failure by the Council of Ministers to adopt the regulation for the management of food aid. On 11 January 1979 — that is, sixteen months ago — the Council received from the Commission a proposal for a regulation, but has still taken no decision. In the light of the report presented by our colleague Mr Lezzi on 16 March 1979, the European Parliament adopted a qualified favourable opinion approving the main lines of the Commission's proposals. Parliament asked that the proposed management committee should only be consultative and should therefore not have the right of veto, and it stressed that the conciliation procedure should be initiated between the Council and the Commission in the event of any disagreement. Parliament also requested presentation of a report on the implementation of food aid.

Today Parliament has got what it wanted. A concise report has been prepared. Your rapporteur should like to thank the Commission therefore, but, like the majority of the members of the Committee on Cooperation and Development, would like this report to be less succinct and more explicit in future. The absence of a management regulation is highly regrettable. The Council's decisions are generally taken too late, which is bad for those who require the aid and, consequently, excessively short deadlines for implementing the aid and failure to implement the aid in time result in certain programmes having too much left over in the way of resources, which should clearly be used to help the people concerned. In this connection there is still the special problem of transport. A distinction must be made between responsibility for transporting food aid and that for supplying it, as the supplier does not necessarily transport the goods. The Commission accepts that it should be able to exercise control over

Michel

the suppliers and the recipients and assume financial control regarding the saving on transport costs, but it has inadequate material resources at its disposal; DG VIII must have sufficient staff to cope with the requests it receives and to exercise proper control.

Mr President, I have come to three conclusions. First, the opinion we are called upon to give in the immediate future should be confined to the programme which can be carried out directly within the framework of the budget on the basis of the system of provisional twelfths. Second, we do not wish to anticipate the 1980 budgetary decisions, as proposals will have to be made in this connection at the forthcoming budgetary debate. Third, we have to prepare a new food aid programme, but work cannot start on this seriously until after the debate on the many problems posed by hunger in the world.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) To avoid any misunderstanding, I should like to point out that this is merely a temporary situation resulting from the rejection of the budget. This emergency action is necessary to enable us to carry out our plans without delay in places such as Somalia and Bangladesh.

We also feel that the appropriations available are wholly inadequate to do what is required in this area, particularly as regards cereals, a fact which is important in the general context of the Community's situation. For this reason, in one of the annexes to the document, the Commission gave an initial indication of the guidelines it hoped to follow and which it intended to present formally as soon as the draft budget was adopted.

President. — I call Mrs Focke to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Focke. — (D) Mr President, I should like to state very briefly that the Socialist Group approves the Commission's proposal and consequently our rapporteur's resolution, despite the fact that we have considerable reservations regarding the quantity and form of Community food aid, which has been very low up to now, and also regarding the quality and implementation of the food aid. However, since the House will be discussing these subjects in detail in connection with the 1980 budget and the report on hunger in the world, we feel that at the moment the important thing is to give the Commission the green light as quickly as possible to implement the food aid in order to avoid any irreparable delays. We approve the proposal subject to this reservation.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting-time.

11. *Fishconservation measures for vessels flying the flag of Sweden*

President. — The next item is, without debate, the report (Doc. 1-102/80) by Mr Woltjer, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-35/80) for a regulation laying down for 1980 certain measures for the conservation and management of fishery resources applicable to vessels flying the flag of Sweden.

I note that no one wishes to speak.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting-time.

12. *Assassination of Archbishop Romero*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Glinne and Mr O'Connell on behalf of the Socialist Group and by Mr Penders and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), condemning the assassination of Archbishop Romero (Doc. 1-74/80/rev.).

I call Mr O'Connell.

Mr O'Connell. — Mr President, four weeks ago, one of the great defenders of human rights and a champion of the oppressed people in El Salvador, Archbishop Oscar Romero, was assassinated, and his death ended the hopes of the peasants of that country that freedom and justice might prevail. Oscar Romero was a courageous adversary of the repression, violence and injustice which had condemned the people of El Salvador to lives of desperation and despair. He fought against an oppressive economic system under which 2 % of the people control over 60 % of the land and an oligarchy of small but powerful families has succeeded in oppressing the vast majority of the Salvadorian people. He denounced the social deprivation which was the inevitable by-product of the obscene disparity between poverty and wealth: the malnutrition which afflicts 73 % of children under the age of 5; the illiteracy afflicting over half the population; the appalling housing conditions, where 80 % of houses in rural areas are unfit for human habitation; and the appalling lack of medical services, with a mere 3 doctors for every 10 000 people. Seventeen days before his death, Archbishop Romero said:

The cause of all our problems in El Salvador is the oligarchy, that small nucleus of families who do not concern

O'Connell

themselves with the plight of people except in so much as they have need for them as a source of cheap and plentiful labour.

The violence which has torn El Salvador has its root cause in this brand of economic tyranny, to which Archbishop Romero referred when he said:

The most widespread form of violence in our society is institutional violence, the product of an unjust situation in which the majority of men and women and particularly children in our country find themselves deprived of the necessities of life.

It is not only as a valiant warrior against economic and social evils that Archbishop Romero captured the minds and hearts of the Salvadorian people: he courageously denounced the excesses of the army. He was a defender of basic human rights and it is for that alone he will be best remembered; but even with the excesses of the army which he denounced, he appealed to the soldiers to lay down their arms and not shoot the defenceless peasants. In the three years that he was Archbishop of El Salvador, he became a living legend for his own people and a source of inspiration for those concerned with human rights in the world. I am certain I express the feelings of all parliamentarians from the nine Member States of the Community when I express sympathy with the people of El Salvador over the loss of this passionate defender of human rights and champion of the oppressed.

As Europe's first democratically elected Parliament, we should be failing in our duty to those we represent if our response to the brutal murder of Archbishop Romero were to rest with eulogies and expressions of sympathy. I think much more is called for. The repression in El Salvador continues, despite the *coup* last October, which installed a junta with civilian representation that promised a return to social reform. These promises have not been fulfilled. The junta has shown itself either unwilling or unable to confront the oligarchy and the military forces who protect their interests. In his letter to the US, Archbishop Romero asked that America stop supplying arms to El Salvador. This has continued. In the first two months of this year, over 600 people have been killed, and there is an average of over 25 people a day being slaughtered in El Salvador. The junta will point to its programme of agrarian and fiscal reforms. Unfortunately, they have been accompanied by the announcement of a state of seige, which has led to increased violations of basic human rights. I think the European Community has a moral and political responsibility to ensure that its trade and diplomatic links are not used to support a corrupt oligarchal system of government which has shown scant respect for human rights.

As an immediate measure, the Foreign Ministers should call for an international ban on the sale of arms to El Salvador. The members of the Community should also use political leverage in such forms as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund to

ensure that loans to that country are conditional upon the junta respecting human rights and agreeing to a timetable for the restoration of democracy. This is a country which has not had a genuinely free election for over half a century, and I think the restoration of democracy is essential. The Community should take the lead in calling for the establishment of a special United Nations committee to supervise free elections in El Salvador.

The civil war which threatens El Salvador has its root cause in the repression by the military and the inability of the junta to break the stranglehold on economic power held by the oligarchy in El Salvador. The only way to prevent civil war from occurring there is through the restoration of democracy, social reform and respect for human rights. Until these changes are made, Mr President, violence and death will be an everyday event in El Salvador.

President. — I call Mr Penders to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

Mr Penders. — (NL) Mr President, you have before you a motion for a resolution tabled jointly by the Socialist Group and the Group of the European People's Party. I am very pleased that a joint text could be drafted on this matter and would like to express my gratitude to my colleagues in the Socialist Group for their constructive attitude. We, the Christian Democrats, have expressed certain wishes concerning this resolution, and the Christian-Democratic World Union has tabled a number of significant amendments to the original draft by Mr Glinne and Mr O'Connell. Unfortunately, Mr Rumor, President of the Christian-Democratic World Union, who would have been pleased to speak on this matter, is unable to attend the debate. I fully agree with Mr O'Connell that it is the duty of the directly-elected European Parliament to raise its voice in protest at the murder of Archbishop Romero.

I would now like to say a few words about the resolution itself. In particular, I would like to draw your attention to paragraph 3, considered by my group to be the key paragraph. This can only be properly understood by those who have followed developments in El Salvador in recent months. We must think back to 15 October 1979, when Archbishop Romero himself expressed his belief in the possibility of a peaceful and constructive policy in El Salvador, appealing to the extreme Left to cooperate with the Junta, consisting of moderate members of the military and Christian Democrats. Unfortunately, the constructive work commenced by the Junta and referred to in paragraph 3, was blocked by the extreme Right. After 15 October 1979, the generals and big landowners to a large extent countered the social reforms introduced by the Junta and the Christian Democrats. For this reason, we consider paragraph 3 to constitute the heart of the matter.

Penders

I would also like to mention an open telegram sent by the Bureau of the European People's Party, meeting last week in Luxembourg, to Mr Napoleon Duarte, Christian Democrat and member of the Junta. The Bureau of the European People's Party appeals to Mr Duarte to accept his responsibility and use his influence as a Christian Democrat and member of the Junta to secure a return to peace, justice and, in particular, social reform in the country. The Group of the European People's Party fully supports the motion for a resolution.

President. — I call Mrs Poirier.

Mrs Poirier. — (*F*) Mr President, the people of El Salvador have our active support; our condemnation of the bloody régime which — with the assistance of the USA — oppresses them is unqualified.

Here we have an instance of another nation shaking off oppression, dictatorship and foreign domination by the only means open to it and Monsignor Romero was assassinated because he was on the side of the poor people, those who used up their short lives for the profits of capitalism and because he supported their fight and their revolt. His assassination was intended to set an example so that the people would recoil submissively in terror.

Here as elsewhere we are on the side of the workers, the poor people, those who are struggling whether they believe in God or not. So much for the substance: our attitude on this aspect is absolutely clear.

As far as the resolution before us is concerned, we would repeat yet again that while we have supported, are supporting and will continue to support the people of El Salvador, we also refuse to acknowledge this Assembly's right to investigate, to judge, to welcome or to condemn every event in the world. This is why we will not take part in the vote, particularly as there is a wide gulf between what is said about human rights and the actual expressions of political will: this was demonstrated in the vote on Tunisia this morning and in the almost tragic debate of yesterday evening.

It is up to the people of El Salvador to decide on how they should go about recovering their liberty and hence the right to live. It is not for us to advise a government which perpetrates murders daily to re-establish democracy and pre-empt civil war.

This government, Mr Penders, is in power simply because it represents the main financial forces and the large property-owners of El Salvador, who actively support it. Civil war will be avoided only if the popular movement is sufficiently strong and united to score a rapid victory and in this it can count on our vigorous and wholehearted support.

President. — I call Mr Fergusson.

Mr Fergusson. — Mr President, it was impossible to learn the details of the murder of Archbishop Romero without remembering that one of the most tragic and notable and seismic events in the history of Europe was the murder seven centuries ago, in the sanctuary of his own cathedral, of an English Archbishop. Perhaps Central America is today experiencing something of the same shock at such an outrage as hit medieval Europe, and we can only hope that the Archbishop's death in Central America last month will lead in due course, through the immediate violence which has followed it, to the spread of the peace and liberty for which he stood.

So far as the urgency of this debate is concerned, as my colleague said yesterday, this debate is obviously too late. Anyway, of course, it is always easier to pass resolutions of sympathy. I do not think that the EEC can very often seriously concern itself, very closely at any rate, with such matters as restoring order to such places as El Salvador or restoring democracy to that particular country. Nevertheless, we must accept that there is a forest fire going on in Central America today and that El Salvador is threatened by violence and terror and wildness from Left and Right. Without prolonging this debate any further therefore, my group is happy to support, with its very careful phraseology, the terms of the resolution before us.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting-time.

13. *Right of asylum for Cuban citizens*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Diligent and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and Mr Baudis on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the granting of asylum to Cuban citizens (Doc. 1-84/80).

I call Mr Seitlinger.

Mr Seitlinger. — (*F*) Mr President, colleagues, a few days ago we witnessed a spontaneous and spectacular event in Havana following a miscalculation by the Cuban government, which decided to withdraw protection from the Peruvian Embassy at a time when the latter had already received a number of requests for asylum. Hundreds and then thousands of Cubans, men, women and children of all ages and all degrees, abandoned their homes because they saw a window open on freedom.

Seitlinger

Completely overwhelmed, the Cuban government had to stand by and watch as a passive observer of this large-scale exodus, which in many respects reminds one of the flight of East Berliners before the concrete and barbed-wire wall was built to enclose a whole people.

The myth of this Communist paradise, inhabited by bearded idealists, this leader of the non-aligned countries has suddenly collapsed destroying the last illusions of those who made the pilgrimage to Havana in the same way as certain intellectuals used to go to Moscow in Stalin's day.

What can Europe do in the face of this disaster, which has uncovered the deepest wounds of the Communist world? It must play its part in the exercise of solidarity which the free countries of the Third World, of America and Asia have already begun, as happened several months ago in the case of Cambodian and Vietnamese refugees fleeing the standardization imposed by the soldiers and political commissioners from Hanoi.

Four thousand Cubans have already received permission to emigrate and a thousand of these are expected in Peru ...

Mr Baillet. — (F) What is the population of Cuba?!

Mr Seitlinger. — (F) You are disturbed, of course, Mr Baillet, by the thought that the countries of the Community should undertake joint action! You are one of those pilgrims who determine the number of Cuban refugees to whom they are prepared to give asylum!

The Member States of the Community should also intercede with non-member countries to find homes for all the remaining refugees. By adopting this motion for a resolution by urgent procedure, the European Parliament will confirm its role as the democratic conscience of Europe, passionately devoted to the defence of human rights wherever they are in jeopardy and whatever the colour of the flag under which freedoms are violated.

In concerning itself with the plight of the Cuban refugees and trying to find rapid and practical solutions to individual, dramatic situations, Parliament is carrying on the tradition of hospitality and tolerance which is characteristic of democratic Europe. France is proud to be at the forefront of this broad concept of international relations as it has taken in the largest number of political refugees in proportion to population of any country in Europe. Now it is up to the European Community to make known its opinion and to act.

President. — I call Mr Boyes.

Mr Boyes. — Mr President, we have another example here of the absolute hypocrisy of the Right in this Parliament in using every opportunity, no matter how small, to make an attack on governments outside the Community. I am surprised, ever since I have been in this Parliament, at the number of times that issues concerning citizens of the Community have been raised and the people over there on those benches have regularly refused to allow them to be debated. We had the classic case this week of Stanley Adams — no chance to debate it! We have seen it again this morning in the matter of the executions at Gafsa, in Tunisia. Again absolute determination not to let that matter be debated! That wasn't urgent. Yet something happens in Cuba, and instantly these people grasp the opportunity to table resolutions launching another attack on another Socialist country.

The speaker this morning used language that really wasn't applicable to this situation. He compared, for example, those requesting to leave Cuba with political prisoners in Hanoi and other countries. He talked about a spectacular occasion in Havana when thousands of Cubans were involved, and then he talked about the myth of Communist paradises. I don't think anybody here has ever attempted to describe Cuba in that way.

I am a little perturbed, Mr President, that every time something is reported in the newspapers, somebody in this Parliament tables a resolution, which is then debated without any information available on what is actually happening. On the morning that this resolution was tabled, I bought a *New York Herald Tribune* and pointed out to a colleague that I could have tabled 14 different resolutions on events that were occurring in countries outside the Community, because of some aspect that I wasn't too happy about. We could go on spending all our time in this Parliament reading press reports, tabling resolutions and having hundreds of debates on the Friday of every part-session about countries ranging from Argentina to Zanzibar. However, it makes me wonder why people table resolutions of this kind. It makes me think that some people are using resolutions this time to continue the debate on what I think is an answer in the cold war situation.

Last night there was further evidence of the way some of the debating takes place. I understand that in Cuba, for example, there are up to 10 000 people wishing to leave. I understand that, apart from the ones responsible for murder, these people are quite free to leave. I understand that the people who are occupying the Embassy are free to go home during the day and are also being provided with food and free medical treatment. So you cannot compare that. You cannot take the case of a few people wanting to leave a country and make it a pretext for a debate on the difficult world situation we have at the moment.

Boyes

I ask this Parliament to reject this resolution because it is factually wrong. Its phraseology suggests that the situation there is different from what it actually is. I ask this Parliament to concentrate primarily on putting right the human rights issues and the problems in this Community, which really do concern us and which we can do something about.

IN THE CHAIR: MR ROGERS*Vice-President*

President. — I call Mr Langes to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

Mr Langes. — (*D*) I would have thought that, following my colleague, Mr Seitlinger's presentation of our joint motion, the text would be intelligible to every Member of this House, but Mr Boyes of the Socialist Group has obviously not read this motion as he has raised points in his speech which are not even in the motion. Unfortunately, therefore, I will have to describe again the main points, which my colleague Mr Seitlinger has already presented in such outstanding fashion.

To come straight to the point: it is not our intention, Mr Boyes, to condemn any government in this resolution, but rather that it is the primary duty of Europeans to help people who are political refugees from whatever country, be it in the grip of right- or left-wing fascism, so that they can find asylum in Europe and that we in Europe should offer these political refugees such opportunities. As a young German Member of Parliament, I know only too well how important it was during the period of Hitler's brand of fascism that countries of the free world granted our refugees asylum. It may not suit your ideological concepts that these people are fleeing from a Communist country and have an opportunity to climb out of the window this way, as Mr Seitlinger put it, because the Cuban government has obviously made mistakes. It is one of the primary duties of Europeans to help these people and that is all that is involved. It is not a question of condemnation but a matter of our wanting to do something for people who do not know where they can live in freedom. One of your colleagues in the German Bundestag, Mr Küsing, took the easy way out, as Communist propaganda and propaganda in all dictatorships always does, by stating in doubtful cases that only criminals are involved.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are no longer taken in by this. History has shown that every dictatorship, every ideology which enslaves human beings always says that those who want to escape from it are only criminals. But we know better and we Europeans must give

them the opportunity to let them live in our countries the way they want to live — no more and no less. This motion is therefore more than a condemnation, it is also a duty on our governments to do what we demand in this motion, namely to help these people, to welcome them and to allow them the possibility of asylum so that they can live here in freedom. This, ladies and gentlemen, is the idea behind the motion and I would urge you to accept it as an urgent motion since men, women and children of all ages are waiting for Europe to give them the opportunity to settle here.

President. — I call Lady Elles to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Lady Elles. — I hope that Mr Boyes reads the same papers as I do in the same way and that he has read the resolution before this House. As the previous speaker has pointed out, Europe is specifically involved in this particular resolution, and this, I may say, is practically never the case where any resolutions put forward by other sides of this House are concerned: they are usually tabled for political purposes only, but we are directly involved and have a direct responsibility, as a haven in a world of oppression, to provide freedom and democracy for those who seek it. This is the purpose behind this resolution.

Ten thousand people in Cuba have tried to get out of that country. Now in the last few years, as Fidel Castro himself says, 36 000 have left to go to West Africa, another 12 000 have left to go to Ethiopia — not entirely, I suspect, of their own free will. He stated earlier this year that 10 000 would be sent to Siberia to hew the wood that the Soviet Union has failed to deliver to them. The only thing that Cuba has done is to violate systematically the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which recognizes the fundamental freedom of everyone to leave his own country and to return to it. This right has been denied to the people of Cuba. Therefore 10 000 assailed the gates of the Peruvian Embassy to seek sanctuary. I would like to express here the gratitude of the free world, including this part of the world, to the Peruvian Government for having honoured diplomatic sanctuary in these most difficult circumstances.

(*Applause*)

They certainly deserve our admiration and respect. We should admire and respect those countries which have already agreed to admit some of these people, whether they be exiles or refugees or whatever the real legal definition of their status is. Except those who have already been received by certain countries, they are not actually at the moment able to seek political asylum, because they have not yet left Cuba. So I strongly back this resolution on behalf of my group and know that in this part of the free world we will do all we can to help these people who have suffered from

Lady Elles

oppression, tyranny, fear and economic failure, which are the four characteristics of every Marxist country in the world.

President. — I call Mrs Hoffmann to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mrs Hoffmann. — (*F*) Mr President, I would like to address my remarks first of all to Mr Seitlinger: you seem very willing to use the word 'freedom' but I note that in a previous vote you helped, in the name of freedom, to condone the murder of the 13 at Gafsa.

(*Applause*)

I should like to make three points concerning the motion for a resolution before us.

First, it seems to us strange to say the least that people should be raising this fuss today about Cuba just because the Havana government has allowed a few thousand Cubans to emigrate and expressed hopes that residence permits will be granted to them in the countries of their choice. This is the policy of openness of the national territory which, I may add, is not new and dates back to the early years of the revolution.

Secondly, there is the fact that yesterday we saw all the most reactionary forces in the world back American imperialism, which for 21 years has organized with impunity an economic blockade, repeated its threats and carried out aggressive acts including the importation of counter-revolution in the hope of subjugating the Cuban people. Those who are so interested in Cuba today are the same people who voted yesterday for a blockade against the people of Iran and who did not raise their voices nor their little fingers in protest when a blockade was introduced against Cuba, the main victim of which is its people who have, and this is what really sticks in the gullet of most of those in this Assembly, regained their dignity and thrown down a remarkable challenge by constructing within 150 kilometres of the American coast a socialist State which guarantees its inhabitants, work, education and health in their tremendous efforts to overcome underdevelopment.

The same people today are supporting those who, through the intermediary of Peru, are encouraging Cuban citizens to leave their country illegally.

My third point is that as Cuba has no links with the European Community, our Assembly, as we have already stated in the past, is not competent to deal with this question for the more general reasons raised by Robert Chambiron on Monday. Consequently, the French members of the Communist and Allies Group will not take part in the vote.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting-time.

14. *Situation of political prisoners in Guinea*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-86/80), by Mrs Pruvot and others, on the situation of the political prisoners in the People's Republic of Guinea.

I call Mrs Pruvot.

Mrs Pruvot. — (*F*) Mr President, one cannot raise problems of human rights in a country which is a signatory to the Lomé Convention without wondering or knowing whether Lomé is a straightforward association on equal terms between nine European countries and 59 ACP States regardless of the latter's ideologies or political régimes. The People's Republic of Guinea has known difficult times since it became independent. As a result it has become more and more isolated and beset by serious economic difficulties.

In recent years Guinea has begun to open up gradually to the outside world. This has taken the form of the liberation of a number of political prisoners as a result of representations made by many European organizations or individuals. There are no longer any prisoners holding European or dual nationality in the jails of Guinea. But there is still one further group of prisoners of whom we have no news, namely the Guineans who have European wives.

Imagine the uncertainty and anguish felt by these wives and their children. There are more than 10 in this position whose husbands were arrested 7, 8 and 10 years ago and more. They have never been brought to trial and their wives for the most part have been expelled from Guinea with the children of several of them kept as hostages. This is one of the reasons why their efforts had to be kept on a very low key until last year when the last child fled from Guinea to rejoin its mother.

According to a report published by Amnesty International in 1978 some information has been obtained on political prisoners in Guinea as a whole. They come from all parts of the country and belong to different ethnic and professional groups. At various times since 1971 most social groups have been the subject of repressive measures. A large number of people belonging to the intellectual élite of the country — officials, officers, teachers, and students, Muslim or Christian religious leaders — have been imprisoned, executed or forced into exile. However, the successive waves of arrests have not been confined to the élite. Farmers and small traders have also been imprisoned in an arbitrary fashion or forced into exile. In 1976, measures were taken against the Peul ethnic group to which a

Pruvot

third of the population belongs and in particular against one of their number, the former Secretary-General of the organization of African unity, Mr Diallo Telli.

Most of the political prisoners still in jail have been in custody since 1971 or earlier. The vast majority of them has never had any kind of trial.

It is reported that between 1972 and 1976 and again in 1977 many people were arrested for 'economic offences', for having taken part in demonstrations against the government or having tried to leave Guinea without official authorization.

I will not describe the extremely harsh conditions in which the prisoners are kept and which in no way meet the basic standards required by minimum rules on the treatment of prisoners as defined by the United Nations. It is enough to read the report of Amnesty International or of the International League for Human Rights.

I intentionally mentioned the situation of all political prisoners in Guinea because this cannot be separated from any consideration of the plight of the Guinean husbands of European women who have been arrested for the same reasons and who share the same fate as their fellow-citizens.

All the member countries of the United Nations have ratified the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The member countries of the Organization of African Unity reaffirmed their support for these basic principles at the Monrovia Conference in 1979. Similar concern is to be found in the joint statements made by the Presidents-in-Office of the ACP-EEC Council of Ministers at the signing of the Lomé Convention on 31 October 1979.

We have high hopes of this appeal which we are making to the Guinea government and to President Sékou Touré on the eve of his departure for a trip to Europe. We have not forgotten that before going to the United States in August 1979, he freed Monsignor Raymond Tchidimbo, Archbishop of Conakry, and a number of other detainees and I am sure that he would now wish to improve his country's image abroad.

The release of the political prisoners still held would mark a watershed in the history of relations between Europe and the People's Republic of Guinea.

Let us think for a moment of the families who have had no news of one of their number for such a long time. What anguish! What uncertainty, quite apart from the difficult legal, financial and social problems which can result from such a situation.

We would ask the Commission, and in particular Commissioner Cheysson, who was received by President Sékou Touré several months ago, and the Coun-

cil of Ministers of the European Community to take all the necessary steps to secure the release of those still in detention.

I would add that our intention is to help these unfortunate women and perhaps to save human lives. We are not attacking a government nor even judging it; we would like to make a humanitarian gesture for the benefit of citizens of the European Community and their husbands who are the fathers of European children.

We have no illusions about this matter. Many of these people are no longer alive but at least their families should be informed about their fate.

For many of the wives of political prisoners the action which we are taking today is their last resort. It may also mark a new stage in relations between Guinea and the Community.

President. — I call Mr de Courcy Ling to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr de Courcy Ling. — Mr President, the Danish and British Conservatives in this Parliament passionately wish to support the resolution tabled by Mrs Pruvot and the efforts of the French Government in this dreadful matter, and, as Mrs Pruvot has suggested, we urge Mr Cheysson in particular to use his considerable influence on the Guinean authorities to secure a humane solution. As you remember, Mr President, the history of Guinea, since her independence in 1958, has not been happy, but this is a matter which is central to the Community: Guinea has been associated with the Community under the Lomé Convention since 1975. I hope that we have now reached the beginning of the last sad chapter of vindictiveness in relations between France and Guinea and between the Community and Guinea and that we can obtain news of these unfortunate political prisoners whose wives have been deported, whose children have been held hostage. We hope that from now on, relations between the European Community and Guinea will be happier and that the human situation in Guinea will be improved. So, on behalf of my group, I ask all our colleagues, and Mr Boyes and his colleagues, to join in voting for a resolution which I know will be of considerable interest to President Sékou Touré. I have faith that he will take note of it.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting-time.

15. *Regions of Brittany hard-hit by oil pollution*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-87/80) tabled by Mr Josselin and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on financial aid from the Community to the regions of Brittany affected by oil-slicks.

I call Mr Josselin.

Mr Josselin. — (F) Mr President, colleagues, Brittany today appeals to you again for European solidarity following the latest disaster which has hit it as a result of the sinking of the *Tanio* on 7 March. I have tabled this resolution pursuant to Chapter 59 of the budget, which makes specific provision for this type of aid in the case of disasters. I do not propose to make a long speech this morning — yesterday evening's debate allows me to dispense with this — as we have already discussed the problem of rules concerning oil.

I would, however, like to remind you briefly that, while it is difficult to evaluate the damage precisely, there is no doubt that it is substantial in extent and degree. The oil this time is quite different from that which the *Amoco Cadiz* was carrying. It is of low volatility and there are fears that it may remain where it is for a long time. As far as fishing is concerned, clearly the cumulative effect of two catastrophes of this kind within this time makes it extremely unlikely that certain species of fish will recover. As for birds I would quote one figure: it is estimated that about 40 000 birds died in the latest disaster, i.e. twice as many as when the *Amoco Cadiz* sank. Allow me to dwell on one detail which is important: this type of oil does not smell so that birds unfortunately become caught up in it unawares. Seaweed is also affected and there is an obvious risk of damage to the tourist trade. There is plenty of justification, therefore, for this aid, particularly as the present facilities for financial compensation are limited — changes will have to be made to the rules on insurance — and slow to implement as we already know to our cost. However, I would like to point out that one of the ways in which the European Community can help Brittany, in addition to giving financial aid, which I hope will be approved in a moment, is by providing honest information. Although 200 km of coastline are affected, the total Breton coastline is 1 500 km long and the important thing for us Bretons is to see foreigners continue to come in large numbers to our coast thus enabling at least the unaffected areas to benefit from the tourist development which they so badly need.

These then, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, are the remarks that I wish to make. I would like to thank you in advance on behalf of Brittany for the aid which I am sure you will shortly approve.

President. — I call Mrs Le Roux.

Mrs Le Roux. — (F) Mr President, all the oil bound for the European Community passes along our coast. One third of world oil production passes through the English Channel. As a result Brittany has suffered these disasters.

The request for aid which I tabled on behalf of my group at the March part-session, that is in the days following the *Tanio* accident, were not intended to substitute Community responsibility for those of the oil companies and the French government. Its aim was to encourage our Assembly to show immediate solidarity to cope with the initial needs of my region and to help those for whom this accident has meant the sudden loss of all that they have. I am thinking for instance of fishermen who have heavy instalments to pay each month for their boats.

This request was also intended to help Brittany dispose as quickly as possible of the oil which had stuck to rocks, covered the beaches and ports, as the tourist season has started and many visitors from other European countries come to our part of the world each year.

The most reactionary forces in this Assembly — including our British colleagues despite the fact that they also had to suffer serious oil pollution and should remember what that means — decided to refuse the aid which I requested. Perhaps now, with greater awareness and better information, the Assembly will agree to help Brittany. The aid for which we ask will not prevent us from demanding that the French government insist on a contribution from the oil companies to help remove the consequences of the disaster for which they are responsible.

President. — I call Mr Harris.

Mr Harris. — In view of the last remarks, could I explain that, in fact, we supported the last request for urgent procedure. I personally support very strongly this one.

President. — I call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, the Commission can well understand the very strong feelings and the very deep concern which the honourable Members have expressed on behalf of their constituents in Brittany. Clearly, disasters of this kind are of profound significance in that part of the world and can do lasting damage to the infrastructure and the economy. Obviously, the House will understand that the Commission's resources in this field are extremely limited. It is of course up to the budgetary authority to decide how substantial of otherwise they should be, but they are very limited.

Tugendhat

Now although the shipwreck was a technical accident and not a natural disaster, the appropriate Commission departments have monitored developments to establish the gravity of the repercussions. We have, however, been unable to obtain any assessment of the nature and scale of the damage from the authorities and the other parties concerned. The 'Mission Interministérielle de la Mer' has informed us that the FF 10 million intervention fund provided for under the Polmar plan is now exhausted. The French authorities are collecting comprehensive data on the damage caused by the accident. The Commission is waiting for this basic information, which, even if only summary, is essential if the Commission is to continue and complete its own examination of the situation.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting-time.

16. Votes

President. — The next item is the vote on the motions for resolutions on which the debate has been closed.

We shall first consider the motion for a resolution contained in the *Linde report (Doc. 1-816/79): Energy saving.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble)

On paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Fuchs and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), seeking to replace this paragraph by a new text:

1. Stresses the vital importance of saving energy by avoiding waste and ensuring a more rational utilization of energy supplies; in particular, a more favourable relationship must be established between economic growth and energy consumption.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Linde, rapporteur. — (D) I can accept the first paragraph of the amendment but not the second, from the words:

in particular, a more favourable relationship must be established between economic growth and energy consumption.

In principle the statement is correct and it was included among the energy policy aims for 1980; but I do not consider it useful to repeat it in this connection.

President. — Mr Linde, as rapporteur, can you tell me whether it would be possible to vote on the two separate parts?

Mr Linde, rapporteur. — (D) We must vote on them separately. I shall read you the text I accept and the one I do not accept.

I accept the following part of the German text:

Stresses the vital importance of saving energy by avoiding wastage and ensuring more rational utilization of energy supplies.

That part I accept. I do not accept the remainder.

President. — I put the first part of the amendment to the vote.

The first part is adopted.

I put the second part to the vote.

The second part is adopted.

(Parliament adopted paragraphs 2 to 4)

On paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr Sassano and seeking to replace this paragraph with a new text:

5. Recognizes the stimulating effect that energy-saving measures can have, *either as a consequence of the development of energy-saving technologies or more generally*, in many sectors, particularly in the case of labour-intensive manufacturing industries with a low energy consumption.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Linde, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour.

President. — I put Amendment No 2 to the vote. Amendment No 2 is adopted.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 6)

On paragraph 7, I have Amendment No 3, tabled by Mr Sassano and seeking to replace this paragraph by a new text:

7. Stresses the need for action at Community level to promote convergence between the Member States, not only in respect of all energy policy actions, but also in the economic and social sectors in accordance with the principles embodied in the EEC Treaty.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Linde, rapporteur. — (D) Unfortunately I must vote against it. I think the reference to the economic

Linde

and social sectors, in accordance with the principles embodied in the EEC Treaty, would overload the resolution. So I cannot accept this part.

President. — I put Amendment No 3 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 3 is adopted.

(Parliament adopted paragraphs 8 to 11 and 12 (a))

On paragraph 12 (b), I have Amendment No 7, by Mr Veronesi and Mr Linkohr, seeking to replace this subparagraph by a new text:

- (b) the price mechanism as the sole regulatory instrument would have serious disadvantages for substantial sectors of the population and should therefore be used on a limited scale and only in conjunction with other instruments; it must also be accompanied by a campaign to promote the use of other types of energy, demonstrate the possibilities to the most receptive sectors (agriculture and transport) and inform consumers.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Linde, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour.

President. — I put Amendment No 7 to the vote.

Amendment No 7 is rejected.

(Parliament adopted consecutively subparagraphs (b) and (c) of paragraph 12)

After paragraph 12 (c), I have Amendment No 5/rev., tabled by Mr Sassano, seeking to add a new subparagraph:

- (c)a Particular attention must be given to a reduction of consumption in the road transport sector by rationalizing administration and improving techniques.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Linde, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour of this amendment.

President. — I put Amendment No 5/rev. to the vote.

Amendment No 5/rev. is adopted.

Amendment No 4, tabled by Mr Sassano to paragraph 12 (d), has been withdrawn.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 12 (d))

Amendment No 6, tabled by Mr Sassano and seeking to insert a new paragraph 12a, has been withdrawn.

(Parliament adopted paragraphs 13 to 16)

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole, incorporating the amendments which have been adopted.

The resolution, as amended, is adopted.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *d'Ormesson et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-119/80): Surveillance of shipping routes for Community supplies.*

I have received a written request under Rule 33 to establish whether a quorum is present.

Will the ten Members please stand?

(Ten Members stood)

We shall now proceed to ascertain whether a quorum is present.

(Interruption from the floor of the Chamber)

The number of Members present is 129. A quorum is therefore not present.

I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

Sir Fred Catherwood. — Thirty people asked for the quorum and those 30 people walked out. I suggest you add them to the quorum.

(Applause)

President. — The rules are quite explicit. Ten Members can request a quorum, the President then instructs the secretariat to establish whether a quorum is present. They can only count those Members who are then in the Chamber. If there is no quorum present, the vote is then adjourned to the next sitting.

(Uproar)

Pursuant to Rule 33 (4), the vote will be placed on the agenda of the next sitting.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *Le Roux et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-115/80): Code of conduct for oil-tankers.*

(Uproar)

I call Mr Cottrell on a point of order.

Mr Cottrell. — Mr President, I wish to establish whether a quorum exists. I have the support of 10 Members to establish a quorum.

President. — A quorum is not present. Pursuant to Rule 33 (4), the vote will be placed on the agenda of the next sitting.

We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Cottrell and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Calvez and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and Mr Janssen van Raay and Mr Hoffmann on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) (Doc. 1-117/80): Code of conduct for oil-tankers.*

I call Mr Fergusson on a point of order.

Mr Fergusson. — I am raising a fresh point of order. May I suggest that the moment when the quorum is called is the moment when the necessary number of Members should be in the Chamber. If your staff — and I am not criticizing them in any way — had counted quickly enough, they would have established that the number of people who walked out, both on this occasion and the previous occasion, if added to those who remained, was enough to constitute a quorum. The quorum was therefore present. I hope you will accept that as a suggestion.

(Applause)

President. — I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Michel report (Doc. 1-105/80): Food aid in 1980.*

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Woltjer report (Doc. 1-102/80): Fish conservation measures for vessels flying the flag of Sweden.*

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution by *Mr Glinne and Mr O'Connell on behalf of the Socialist Group and by Mr Penders and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) (Doc. 1-74/80/rev.): Assassination of Archbishop Romero.*

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution by *Mr Diligent and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and by Mr Baudis on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group (Doc. 1-84/80): Granting of asylum to Cuban citizens.*

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution by *Mrs Pruvot and others (Doc. 1-86/80): Situation of political prisoners in Guinea.*

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution by *Mr Josselin and others on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-87/80): Regions of Brittany hard-hit by oil pollution.*

The resolution is adopted.

17. EEC-US relations in the field of steel

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-92/80) tabled by Mr Donnez and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on EEC-US relations in the field of steel.

President

I call Mr Donnez.

Mr Donnez. — (F) The request for urgent procedure which you accepted last Wednesday for the debate on EEC-United States relations in the field of steel is largely motivated by the following facts: the main American steel company, US Steel took anti-dumping proceedings on 25 March 1980 against all the Community producers except those in Ireland and Denmark. Following these proceedings, the American administration suspended the trigger prices mechanism which for the past two years has laid down minimum import prices and thereby ensured that the American industry could develop free of any anarchic competition on its own market. The American administration felt that under the above conditions it was no longer necessary to start anti-dumping proceedings. The situation this has created is thus a quite novel one and all the more serious in that the American department of trade has just declared the proceedings in question admissible and that the other 7 major US firms have just announced their intention to associate themselves in practice with these proceedings.

The first result of this is clear. Such a situation destroys the consensus which had emerged within the OECD in 1977. Under that consensus the major industrialized countries recognized that the efforts to improve the position of the steel industry and the sacrifices involved should be shared fairly by the international community as a whole. The second result is as follows: since 1974 we have seen a deterioration in the Community's relative share of the American market: 16 % in 1979 as against 47.4 % in 1973. At the same time, third countries have gradually been replacing the Community, without this however leading to US Steel taking any action of the kind now causing us concern. In this context, may I point to a material error in the text of the resolution before you. European exports to the USA did not fall by 1 million tonnes in 1979 in relation to 1978 but by 2 million tonnes and I would ask the administrative services to rectify this editorial error. I thank them in advance.

The suspension of trigger prices will only worsen the situation, for, aware of their responsibility, the European steel industries do not want to start a trade war against the American steel industries; but it is to be feared that third countries will not have the same scruples.

My third remark concerns the serious social implications of this situation. Tens of thousands of European iron and steel workers work solely for the traditional outlet of the American market. It is to be feared that if this market were more or less closed, this would very soon have repercussions on these workers' jobs. The steel industry, hard hit by the crisis which has been blowing up since 1974, has begun to revive, thanks to the efforts of the European Commission. It can certainly not tolerate any new difficulties.

If I may, Mr President, honourable Members, I would now like to discuss the two amendments to the motion for a resolution I tabled on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

The first takes note of the fact that the Commission protested at this failure to observe the consensus adopted in 1977 in the OECD. I think here I am repeating what the speaker for the Christian-Democratic Group said on Wednesday. My second amendment tries to take account of the request made by several speakers for the responsible committee of the European Parliament to draft an exhaustive report as soon as possible. I think it is essential to draft it by next July: this is imperative. For that is the date on which the American administration should give us its views on the anti-dumping proceedings brought by US Steel.

I will conclude by stressing that it is essential for Parliament to adopt a resolution on this matter today, without delay, in order to demonstrate the great importance it attaches to this sector by attempting to find a solution to this critical situation.

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER*Vice-President*

President. — I call Mr Oehler to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Oehler. — (F) Mr President, honourable Members, Europe is not the main steel supplier to the United States. Community exports to the United States only amount to half the Japanese exports. Canada alone exports one third of the volume of Japanese exports to the United States. Moreover, European steel firms are nowhere near the top world producers. In fact our exports to the United States fell by 20 % from 1978 to 1979.

So what is the reason for the US-European dispute? It in fact results from a deliberate attempt by American imperialism finally to destroy our European steel industry. How else can we explain the fact that simple antidumping proceedings lead to the immediate suspension of the system of reference prices for American steel imports?

The Community must react vigorously, for it is a question of the future of our industry, the future of the jobs of our European workers and the credibility of the European Community. After our debate today, no further doubts should remain about the content of the negotiations which should be opened with the American authorities. There are some things one does not negotiate: employment and the future of our coun-

Oehler

tries. Any *modus vivendi* or arrangement which in any way penalized European exports to the United States would soon affect employment, just as any disturbance to the world market during a process of internal transformation can only have disastrous effects on the very existence of these sectors of industry. And, as everyone knows, the Community's restructuring plan is very costly for the workers, sometimes permanently depriving them of their jobs. So we must all be very watchful. European industry, which is in a crisis, a period of transformation, following a restructuring plan which penalizes the workers, will be destroyed for all time if new external difficulties arise, which is just what the Americans want.

Mr President, in agreement with the author of the motion for a resolution, I call for a modification to Amendment No 2. Instead of 'instructs its committee' we should say 'instructs its committees', for I feel that the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment should also be involved in this most important debate.

President. — I call Sir David Nicolson to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Sir David Nicolson. — Mr President, I should like to start by stressing that this subject is currently under examination in the United States and that we should therefore hesitate before taking too firm a line or expressing unduly strong comments. On the other hand, I feel we must make a few points which are in the interests of the United States as well as the EEC. The first is surely that protectionism is a very dangerous and insidious thing and might easily sour our relations and imperil the goodwill on which the Atlantic Alliance basically depends. I think both partners must be very much aware of this, as indeed we must be aware of some of the problems of protectionism in our own Common Market at home.

Recently, we have unfortunately seen controversy developing in EEC-USA trade relationships. It has been escalating: We have seen differences over synthetic fibres; we have threats of possible retaliation to our actions with regard to wool products imported into the United States; this question of steel has now arisen, and there are other subjects as well — food products, for example — and we cannot afford provocation and retaliation in these areas. These are processes which, unfortunately, are probably fuelled by the recession and economic difficulties which we face today, but we must beware of it and we must be sure that we have the ability to damp down a smouldering fire before it blazes up. This is not an unimportant subject: it is a vital, dangerous subject and well justifies urgent debate.

There is another major consideration which we must not overlook, because it has very serious implications for the future. How can we ever develop industrial policies which will combat recession and unemploy-

ment if we cannot depend on stable opportunities for international trade and exports and if we cannot even plan in these areas with our friends in an orderly way? In the past 5 years, the EEC's share of world steel production declined by approximately 15 % to some 19 %, while the USA's share only declined by 6 % to some 17 % of the world total. During the same period, EEC exports to the USA declined from 46 % to 37 % of their imports in the face of gains by other countries. But it is the EEC which has been attacked.

Now the complaints which have been made by the US Steel Corporation are excessive, as the Commission has already stated. Other United States steel manufacturers are not following their example and do not agree with the US Government's suspension of the price system as a result, a system which has resisted protectionist trends. We cannot isolate steel from overall trade and political relations just because one big company feels vulnerable and can use trade weapons without fear of direct retaliation because its exports are relatively small. Our exports to the USA have been subject to disruption and threats for the past 15 years. The suspension by the US Administration of the trigger-price system has de-stabilized a situation which had worked well for the past two years. We must therefore regard the attitude of this company, US Steel, as irresponsible and opportunistic. It is reputed to have the oldest equipment in the United States and thus to be hit the hardest by recent environmental legislation. Is this one reason for its actions? Or is it for financial reasons and tax adjustment hopes, because it has favoured modernization in non-steel areas? Is it in fact trying to pass its own failings on to us?

Well, we know that world steel capacity is under-utilized and that the problems for everyone concerned are traumatic; but in the first quarter of 1980, the US capacity utilized was 83 %, while the EEC capacity utilized was 65 %. Their industry, its capacity used and its return on capital are the envy of other steel producers, so that this action would seem to be hardly appropriate at this time. We do not want selfish unilateral action on either side: what we want is orderly marketing control, restraint and cooperation. We should respect the consensus which emerged at OECD level in 1977. It is no good attempting to restructure an industry by restrictive practices and threats of reprisals. As has already been stated, thousands of jobs are at stake. There are 700 000 workers in EEC steel industries and 100 000 jobs are at risk; another 100 000 jobs have already gone since 1974. The Davignon plan calls for the stabilization of prices and exports and the creation of new jobs, but it needs breathing-space and stability in the short term.

We have just heard of the hearing yesterday on this subject by the International Trade Commission in the USA. Information is not yet fully available, and the negotiations are at a delicate stage. I, for one, believe in the integrity of the United States Government and

Nicolson

will therefore say little more at this stage; but I do say, with the greatest respect, that I believe it is up to the United States now to approach the EEC and negotiate calmly in this vital area before harm is done to our alliance which would be to the damage of us all.

Mr President, the European Democratic Group supports this resolution as amended by Mr Donnez.

President. — I call Mr Martin to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Martin. — (*F*) Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, once again we see that nothing that has been said here, during this steel debate, comes close to the real concerns of the workers.

People speak of a trade war. They try to make us believe that Europe is protecting the steel industry of our countries — but how cynical that is! How cynical indeed when we know that tens of thousands of jobs have been cut or are about to be. One by one the blast furnaces in the north and in Lorraine are being extinguished. One by one the steel works in the regions are being closed down. It is life that is being extinguished by the foolish complacency of your restructuring plans.

The workers have had enough, and they are proving it by fighting. They have proved it so well that the French authorities, like the European Commission, have been forced to use social welfare alibis to hide their policy of demolition, a policy which reflects contempt for man, contempt for work, contempt for social and regional life on the part of those who are planning and implementing it.

At this point may I say to Mr Donnez that I do not think he is in any way qualified to set himself up, as he tries to do in his resolution, as the defender of steel. For, Mr Donnez, it is your friends who are in power in France. The policy of demolishing the French steel industry is theirs, and yours. Mr Donnez, your speech here in Strasbourg, a monumental example of political agitation, cannot hope to conceal the crushing responsibility you bear, together with the Giscardian party, the RPR and others, for destroying the steel industry of our country.

That policy is necessary, so we have been told, because of rivalry and competition. But on what principles is this competition based? France is the only country whose production capacity has fallen by 4.6 % since 1974, while that of the Federal Republic of Germany rose by 11.2 %.

After demolishing the heavy steel industry, plans are now being made to destroy the special steel industry. In France it is planned to cut 10 000 jobs in this sector over the next few years. In fact, as you well know,

French steel is competitive and sold at prices which will easily assure it sufficient outlets. Your real aim is to guarantee that the most powerful trusts, in particular the West German trusts, obtain the highest profits, at the price of destroying the French steel industry.

The American steel employers, the German steel employers and the heads of the French steelworks are now trying to share out between them a world market which their own policy of austerity is restricting and constantly weakening. That is what you call the trade war.

Well, we French Communists and Allies, standing between Carter's America and the Europe of Mr Schmidt and Giscard, we choose the economic independence of France, and of the workers: all those workers who are fighting, like those at Usinor, Sacilor and Denain, or like the 150 000 British steelworkers who went on strike last February, and many others too, who refuse to allow their jobs and their means of work to be sacrificed. We say no to the Davignon plan! No to all redundancies or dismantling! Yes to the resolute implementation of a genuine social policy which respects the real concerns of the workers!

That is the only policy which would create the right conditions for restoring the equilibrium in the Community steel trade, and putting an end to the unacceptable French deficit, and for relaunching steel consumption and production. Obviously this also means an end to the policies of austerity which restricted growth and incomes, which in France implies the democratic nationalization of the steel industry.

In short, what the workers expect is not speeches, here or elsewhere, on a commemorative stone which names then as the first victims but positive action. Once again we find that this is not the road being taken here.

President. — I call Mr Deleau to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Deleau. — (*F*) Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the announcement by the No 1 American steel producer, US Steel, that it is bringing anti-dumping proceedings against the Community steel producers, is a cause of grave concern, especially in the French and European steel regions.

As regards trade in steel products, it should be pointed out that traditionally the American market has been an important outlet for the European producers, and I will give you a few figures to show this. In 1973 the Community's share in total American steel imports was 47.40 %. In 1978 Community exports of steel products to the USA accounted for 22 % of total European exports to third countries. In the first nine

Deleau

months of 1979, they still accounted for 16 %. In the case of France specifically, nearly 25 % of our steel exports outside the European Community go to the USA.

Everything seems to indicate that US Steel's attitude is based on very bad premises. We know that the Americans excel in the use of instruments to protect their domestic market. The system of trigger prices imposed two years ago (minimum export prices) may have been acceptable in principle. But thanks to the periodical and often arbitrary revaluations, they almost reached the level of domestic American prices at the beginning of this year and thus gradually became an obstacle very difficult to surmount.

In 1979 total French steel deliveries to the USA fell by 17 % compared to 1978. But not content with this drop, the American steel firms who benefited from this in 1979 are, oddly enough, now blaming only the European producers. This is all the less justified when one finds that European sales to the American market have also fallen, from 6 million tonnes in 1978 to 5 million in 1979, while a marked increase was recorded in some third countries over the same period.

That is why, having exhausted all the possibilities of negotiation, we ask the Commission to consider retaliatory measures in order to protect the interests of European steelworkers, thousands of whom would be affected by the loss of the European market's traditional outlet.

This last suggestion which we are proposing is reflected in Amendment No 3 which I recommend to our Assembly in order to give clear proof of our resolve to put an end to these practices which adversely affect employment within the European Economic Community.

President. — I call Mr Welsh.

Mr Welsh. — Although the sentiments of Mr Donnez and the other movers of this resolution do them great credit, I think it is important, Mr President, for Members to keep one essential technical fact in mind, and that is that we are concerned with a dumping action. Now dumping is something that is defined quite precisely in the terms of the GATT agreement. The investigation which the United States' Department of Commerce is now undertaking is, in fact, a *quasi* judicial investigation. If there is dumping, then that is exactly what they will say, and then it will be a question of doing something about it. If there is no dumping, then equally there is nothing US Steel can do to keep European steel out and the old mechanism will reapply. Now it seems to me a great pity to try and anticipate this sort of investigation and turn what is a purely legal point into an emotional debate about the rights of the steel workers. The US

Government has a few problems with it. For one thing, unlike most European countries, the United States does not have a nationalized steel industry and therefore US Steel acts outside the purview and the remit of the United States Government, and it would be illegal for it to instruct US Steel not to bring an action.

The second thing is that we are telling the Commission that it has got to make an agreement with the United States over steel. Well, it is very difficult for the Americans to do this, because they happen to have a series of anti-trust laws which preclude the US Government from making that sort of restrictive agreement, because, like a great many of us here, they actually believe in free competition.

So I would say to the movers of this resolution that, although it is perfectly proper that Parliament's voice should be heard, we should not succumb to the hysterical antics of the French Communists, who talk about workers as if French workers were the only people on earth who matter, who show absolutely no concern or care, for instance, for the workers in the United States, who presumably have their rights as well. I think if we want to have a sensible world trading system, it would be a very good thing if the French Communists would just listen, learn something, study the facts and utter speeches that have a certain reason and balance, instead of posing for their own national television audiences.

(Cries from the extreme left)

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — *(F)* The Commission is grateful to Mr Donnez for having drawn Parliament's attention to this particular aspect of the steel problems.

I propose to set out the problem and indicate what the Commission has done, at the same time thanking Mr Donnez for his Amendment No 1 which notes that the Commission, on behalf of the Community, took immediate action, firstly to avoid this situation and then to protest when it evolved in the way you have seen.

Two types of decision are in question, on which two types of position must be taken.

First, US Steel has decided to bring anti-dumping proceedings against the Community suppliers; that is a legal action. It is an action which the European steel companies, the Commission and their governments do not consider well founded. I say this quite calmly and clearly. As regards the action US Steel has taken — and which moreover has been taken by the only US Steel firm which is losing money, which indicates that, as far as its management is concerned, it is not able to run and manage the firm in the interests of economy

Davignon

and its own workers and is seeking an outside pretext for its own errors — we shall combat it by the procedure provided for in American legislation, a legislation which complies with the GATT legislation, that being one of the concessions we have obtained from the Americans.

So between now and July we must dispute the anti-dumping proceedings with all the necessary firmness and precision. That is why Parliament's responsible committee must follow the development of these proceedings so that, if appropriate, we can decide whether new European measures will be necessary in July.

The second problem is the American administration's decision to suspend the trigger prices because of the anti-dumping proceedings. We must remember what the reference price system involves, for people have a tendency to forget it. The system of reference prices is not a customs barrier *vis-à-vis* imports from the United States but is a system we have negotiated with the Americans and the Japanese and which is compatible with the system of basic prices in the Community which ensures stable prices within the Community. Under this system exporters know that by selling at those prices they are ensured secure commercial transactions. The US administration, considering through the intermediary of United Steel that American steel needed further protection in the form of anti-dumping measures, decided that it was time to put an end to the system of reference prices as it stood.

We disagree with the American administration's arguments because they threaten the security of trade we have achieved between Europe and the United States. What we want to negotiate about with the United States is not the anti-dumping proceedings, where we do not feel the need to make any concessions in order for the proceedings to be withdrawn, but a return to stable trade by means of the reference prices. And I think that when Mr Donnez speaks of negotiations in his resolution he is not asking us to make concessions to the United States in connection with the complaints of US Steel but referring to the problem of restoring the consensus in order to ensure that stability of trade that is so essential if we are to overcome the crisis.

Finally, is it useful to speak of retaliatory measures so soon? May I say very clearly to Parliament that if the United States takes measures that do not comply with the commercial rules and takes discriminatory measures against European steel, the Commission will propose to the Council that we should react and in our turn take the necessary measures. I hope Parliament will take note of this. But should Parliament speak of retaliatory measures before we know all about the situation? My objective is the same as Mr Donnez's, but I do not want to create a bad impression in all those circles in the United States which are exerting pressure on the American administration to make it change its attitude and adopt a really protectionist

position. I do not want to enable them to use our attitude as a pretext. That would not be in the interests of our firms or our workers.

Perhaps the best solution would be for Parliament to take note that the Commission has declared that if the American administration violated the GATT legislation and took discriminatory measures against us and against the steel industry we would — and will — then make certain proposals to the Council, because that would be contrary to what we negotiated and obtained.

We can examine all this in July, in the framework of the proposed procedure.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the end of the sitting.

18. *Events in Tunisia*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Jaquet and others on events in Tunisia (Doc. 1-100/80).

I call Mr Sarre to speak on behalf of the authors of the motion.

Mr Sarre. — (*F*) Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, alas, the motion for a resolution which was accepted as urgent some forty-eight hours ago no longer has any meaning now. Unfortunately those condemned at Gafsa have been executed.

May I say briefly that the Socialists feel very strongly about it. We solemnly protest at the execution of those who, as a result of political commitment, took direct action in their country.

Mr President, I therefore find with regret today that Parliament need no longer discuss this motion for a resolution now that the men who had been judged are dead. On behalf of the Socialists, I express my great sorrow and withdraw the motion for a resolution.

President. — I am sure that many Members share the feelings of regret expressed by Mr Sarre.

19. *Parliament's electronic voting-system*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Boyes and others on Parliament's electronic voting-system (Doc. 1-109/80).

President

I call Mr Boyes.

Mr Boyes. — Mr President, I want to make only a very brief statement this morning, because the agenda is very long and contains some very important matters. It is in a spirit of disappointment and not anger that I have tabled this resolution, because, having worked in the computer industry at one time, I am certainly not against our advance into electronic voting-systems. I accept that occasionally errors take place with that machinery because of voting errors by Members; but above all, I am surprised that any company should install a system and find, after all this time on public view, that it is not working, and I take the vote from all parties that this matter should be debated urgently as an expression of support for this resolution, though it is not necessary to debate it in full this morning.

Let me say, finally, that my reason for wanting this thing to work is that I feel that in this Parliament all votes should be recorded electronically and that all names should be recorded each and every time we vote. This would be a simple matter with a working system, but it is impossible even to consider this item until we can be assured by the President that the system is working perfectly. I hope the Parliament will support my resolution asking for a report to tell us when and why we have had this number of failures.

President. — I can assure you that the Bureau is conscious of this problem.

I call Mr Seal.

Mr Seal. — Mr President, I would like to support Mr Boyes fully on this resolution, but one thing I should like to warn the House about is that if we have an investigation we must remember that it will not just be an investigation into the computer company that supplied this equipment, namely Olivetti; it will also be an investigation into the specification which was given to the computer company by the Parliament, and it may be — and I feel that to some extent this is so — that the Parliament is at fault in the specification they gave to Olivetti. I do agree that it should be working, that Olivetti ought to regard this as a showpiece and that for the amount of money it has cost the Parliament they ought to make every possible effort to get it working, particularly before the next budget. But do let us remember that the Parliament will probably be at fault as well.

President. — I call Mr Herman to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

Mr Herman. — (F) Mr President, like the previous speaker may I express the surprise and anxiety of this Assembly, and certainly of our group, about the oper-

ation of this system. We ask ourselves how Parliament came to choose it.

How is it possible when so many examples exist in the national parliaments of systems which work to the full satisfaction of everyone and which are easy to follow that this complicated system was chosen, which moreover works very badly? If my information is correct, those who drew up the specifications must have taken the trouble to study the systems in all the Community parliaments. So how did we end up with this lamentable system which is so expensive and works so badly?

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the end of the sitting.

20. Agenda

President. — I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

Sir Fred Catherwood. — Mr President, I leave myself entirely in your hands, but we did vote in Monday's plenary sitting to take the report on India during this part-session. We did this because the Council will begin to negotiate on India before the next part-session, and therefore it is very important, if the Parliament is going to have any say in our negotiations with this, the largest democracy in the world, that we should take this through during this part-session. Now, we are running out of time, and I would really earnestly ask the Chair to make absolutely certain in one way or another that we do vote, if necessary without debate, on India by the end of this part-session.

President. — Does the House wish to take the vote on the Seal report (Doc. 1-45/80), as suggested by Sir Fred Catherwood, after the end of the debate on the Seligman report?

Sir Fred's proposal is adopted.

21. EAEC research and development programme on plutonium

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Seligman (Doc. 1-813/79), on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 12/79) for a decision adopting a research and development programme for the European Atomic Energy Community on the plutonium cycle and its safety (1980-1984).

President

I call Mr Linkohr on a point of order.

Mr Linkohr. — (D) Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to request that Mr Seligman's report be referred back to committee and justify this briefly with reference to Rule 26 of the Rules of Procedure.

After all, we are dealing with a programme of 20 million EUA and a question on which not only Parliament but the general public too is divided. Meanwhile we have the results of the so-called INFCE report (International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation) which were not yet known when we debated the report. That is why I think the committee must now discuss the report in the context of this programme.

Secondly, the findings of the first five-year programme are still not available, and yet we want to decide on the second five-year programme today without knowing the results of the first. I do not think that is very logical, especially since we keep wondering how to assess research programmes at all. The simplest thing to do would surely be to make up one's mind first what the results of the first research programme were, and that we find this very difficult is clear from the 40 amendments before us. So I request the House to refer the report back to committee.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Seligman.

Mr Seligman. — This was already proposed four hours ago by Mr Coppieters, and on the points that I made it was rejected by the House, so it has been brought up again by Mr Linkohr and Mr Coppieters in defiance of what we decided only 4 hours ago. This report is already one year late, it was put out in March last year, and anyhow Mr Coppieters and Mr Linkohr had plenty of opportunity to discuss it in committee and they should not be bringing it forward again now. I do not know what their motives are, but I do not understand them. I oppose the idea of sending it back to committee.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

President. — Previously it was proposed to hold the report over until the May part-session. Now, however, it is being proposed to send it back to committee.

I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, Mr Seligman is mistaken if he thinks that the same proposal is being made twice today. My proposal, made earlier on in the proceedings, is not that the report be referred to

committee but that it should be carried over until the next part-sitting because of the pressure of time. I support Mr Linkohr's proposal, Mr President, because, as I said this morning, certain scientific data have not yet been received and this report is therefore premature. It is also incomplete and therefore misleading. It would be dangerous to expect this Assembly to consider one of the vital questions of our society, the plutonium cycle, on the basis of such a report. Therefore I support Mr Linkohr's proposal.

President. — I put to the vote the proposal to refer this report to committee. The proposal is rejected.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

I therefore call Mr Seligman.

Mr Seligman, rapporteur. — Mr President, this report concerns primarily the safety of workers and the public who may come in contact with plutonium during its recycling from the waste products of nuclear reactors back to its fabrication into useful fuel rods for fast-breeder reactors and thermal reactors, but it also raises fundamental matters of principle concerning Community research. If we reject this programme, we shall be virtually saying that the Community should not coordinate research into matters concerning the safety of workers and the public. If we reject this report, we shall be saying that research is better done by individual nations, each one duplicating the work of the others and each one keeping its own secrets and that is nonsense.

Mr President, every day quantities of plutonium are being produced as waste products from nuclear reactors working in the Community, and over 10 % of the electricity in this Community comes from nuclear reactors. Now environmentalists like Mr Coppieters think that if they stop this research into the development and safety of the plutonium cycle, they will stop nuclear reactors and nuclear power, but that is not true. They will not stop that. They will just reduce research into safety and thus add to the risk of nuclear war caused by energy shortages.

About 1 % of all waste fuel from nuclear reactors is in the form of plutonium. Plutonium is therefore accumulating steadily, and by the end of this century some 50 tonnes of plutonium will be accumulating every year. So we have a choice. Either we try to employ this plutonium usefully as fuel for reactors or we throw it away, with all the problems that that involves. By far the safest and most economical way to deal with plutonium waste is to burn it in reactors, as fast-breeder reactors which can burn plutonium waste are 60 times as efficient on fuel than pressure water reactors. If we do this, Europe can be independent of imported uranium in the next 10 or 15 years. Plutonium, after all, is the only indigenous nuclear fuel we

Seligman

have in the Community. So, Mr President, the plutonium cycle is here to stay. That being so, it is vital to make sure that it is safe for the workers and the public who come in contact with it.

I am astounded to learn that the Commission is having to fight for the very life of this programme. France and possibly Britain, who are admittedly leading the world in using fast-breeder reactors, do not think that the whole of this programme is necessary. Somehow this Parliament must bring these nations to their senses and persuade the French and British Governments that nuclear safety is a Community matter of the highest importance. It is not a matter where individual nations can act on their own. If there is any field where transparency is absolutely vital, it is in that of nuclear safety. It is a Community matter, and this programme must be coordinated by the Community for the peace of mind of the 260 million people in our Community.

The problem with this programme, unfortunately, is that Britain and France do not support all the five projects. All nations support the first project, which concerns the following up of the health statistics of people who have come into contact with plutonium. We all support the third project, which concerns the safety of transporting plutonium by land, sea, air and rail, and this is particularly important for the transport of plutonium by air. So we support that project.

Every nation except France and Britain supports the second project of the programme, which concerns the safety of workers involved in the fabrication of mixed oxide fuel rods. The problem is that France and Britain think they already have the knowledge: they don't lack it, and they don't want anyone else to have it.

Most of the Members are keen on the fourth project, which studies the safety of different methods of re-using waste plutonium as fuel in light-water and fast-breeder reactors. However, only some Members support the fifth project, which finishes off the work of the previous programme on the behaviour of plutonium and its safe use in light-water reactors. France and Britain do not intend at present to use plutonium in light-water reactors. They need it all for their fast-breeder reactors. That is why I have called, in one of the amendments to my report, for greater emphasis on fast-breeder use.

Here is the final point of principle. Is the whole safety programme going to be rejected because some Members do not need parts of it? This is not right and it is not *communautaire*. I am opposed to that way of thinking.

Concerning some of the 40 amendments which have been tabled, I want to emphasize that this is a programme of research and has nothing to do with nuclear proliferation. The INFCE report by 50 nations in Vienna emphasizes that proliferation is a political problem to which there is no technical solution. It is

not possible to tack on a debate on INFCE to the end of this research programme debate. INFCE needs a proper debate of its own. It is a most significant report. Secondly, the Socialists would like to wait, as they have just said, for the final report of the Commission to come through. We already have enough knowledge of that report and the progress of the previous programme to know that it was extremely successful. If we wait any more we shall be compounding the felony, as we are already a year late in reporting on this programme.

Mr President, I ask the French and British Governments to remember that they are members of the Community. I ask them to listen to the different needs of their fellow-members, some of whom may never have a fast-breeder reactor, but who will want to know how they can use plutonium safely in their light-water reactors. This will affect Spain and Greece and Portugal in due course. Let the French remember that there are other people with problems that they can help.

Finally, I am asking honourable Members to press their own governments to settle their differences on this matter in the Energy Council and reach a positive compromise as soon as possible in the interests of the safety of the plutonium cycle, which concerns us all.

President. — I call Mr Linkohr to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Linkohr. — (D) Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, this programme is not concerned with deciding on particular energy strategies or nuclear fuel cycles but is a research programme. And my objection a while ago was not directed at the matter as such but concerned a number of questions now facing us, which were not included in the programme but should also be discussed as part of the research programme. That was the reason for my intervention, and I should like to go into it more fully.

The results of this programme are intended to make future decisions easier. For instance, in the Federal Republic we have still not decided whether the fast-breeder reactor is really the best choice, even though a fast breeder is now being built in Kalkar under a research programme, or whether we should choose a different system. The Bundestag has set up a committee of enquiry which should present its findings by 1983 so that a decision can then be taken. I consider it rather presumptuous for us in Parliament to decide on the basis of our discussions and information to date that we can take a decision at this point while in the Federal Republic, for example, a committee of members of parliament from all parties is very carefully preparing for such a decision in 1983.

Linkohr

So we should give ourselves a little time for discussion, and for discussing proliferation, i.e. the spread of plutonium or nuclear fuels. In order to highlight the problem, may I give you a few figures, which may well be familiar to some people.

In 1978, as stated by the International Atomic Energy Agency, there were already 125 tonnes of commercial plutonium in the world as a whole. In 1985 the figure is likely to be 240 tonnes and in 1990, 580 tonnes. At present 21 countries have plutonium and in 1990 it is estimated that the figure will be 35 countries. Whether these 1990 figures will actually be reached or not is another question. At any rate these are large quantities of plutonium, which may endanger the environment and also lead to the construction of atom bombs. These are not fantasies I have dreamed up but literally urgent questions, as shown by the INFCE conference which met for more than two and a half years and has now submitted a report which has not been discussed at all in this Parliament, let alone in our committee; and, incidentally, I was not even able to find a copy of the INFCE report in Parliament's library.

In 1974 India set off an atom bomb, subject to certain control mechanisms — although India has not signed the non-proliferation treaty. Meanwhile we know that other countries such as Pakistan and South Africa to name only two are very probably building atom bombs. Recently the Dutch parliament discussed whether Dutch technological information had been passed on to Pakistan. In 1977 the American President therefore prohibited the export of sensitive material and in particular technology to countries which have not signed the non-proliferation treaty and this gave rise to the creation of INFCE, which nevertheless has not worked successfully. Switzerland wants to sell a heavy-water reactor to Argentina. Germany is selling a reconvertor to Brazil. Other countries are selling similar highly-sensitive material and technology elsewhere. We have no control over what is happening in this area and it is Parliament's duty to consider this. This is a political and not a technical duty. As INFCE showed, the problem can no longer be solved by technical means, because there is no system to prevent proliferation. That is why it is up to us to give an opinion and consider the matter, to talk with those concerned and to try — and this is urgent — to obtain an international agreement to halt the spread of the nuclear weapons which we are helping to produce with our technology. Time really is short, for technology is advancing apace and other countries are not standing idly by, no matter why they want to build bombs.

I shall deal with the second point very briefly, so as not to prolong the debate unnecessarily. A number of risks have arisen from accidents during the transport of fuel rods and plutonium. I think we need a research programme here. We must deal with this matter, since it is unlikely that some magician will make all the plutonium disappear overnight by a wave of his wand.

Such things exist only in fairytales and unfortunately not in real life.

I am referring to such incidents as the fault in a US enrichment plant in 1978 which we have only just found out about. Two years after the event we learned about it in the press. In India, in Tarapur, there is supposed to have been an accident in a major power station. There was a short report in the press and that is all we know. So the question of information is an urgent one and must be discussed, and this Parliament must certainly not avoid such discussion; we should also consider what must be done politically to reduce the risks to a minimum and perhaps even put a stop to the whole business. I do not exclude that either. But the answers to these questions should come from a research programme, which should also help us to decide on the political questions, over and above the technical ones, and I would be pleased if on some other occasion we could go into these matters in the committee and in this Parliament.

President. — I call Mr Sassano to speak on behalf of the European People's Party (CD).

Mr Sassano. — (I) Mr President, careful consideration must be given to a suitable policy for recycling plutonium.

The central problem regarding the use of plutonium produced in reactors using natural or enriched uranium and the policy to be followed on this plutonium concerns the question of whether to store it, in view of its future use in fast breeder reactors, or to use it either alone or in alloy as the core and for recycling in thermal reactors.

The prospect of using fast-breeder reactors was, formerly, a long-term one. Therefore, recycling in thermal reactors has been preferred, as storage was not an attractive possibility. Pending the introduction of the fast-breeder system, in an economy where only thermal reactors are used, as well as improving output from the basic material the recycling of plutonium can lead to a reduction in the cost of electricity. Everything, obviously, depends on the value of plutonium itself, which is linked to processing and manufacturing costs, and on the characteristics of the reactor in which it is used.

Instead of integrating fast-breeder reactors into the thermal reactor energy system, and leaving aside the direct and indirect advantages arising from the more profitable use of source material, this possibility has the effect of reducing the cost of electricity through the introduction of fast breeder reactors themselves. Consideration could therefore be given to a general plan which provides for a simultaneous recycling of thermal reactors and the use of fast-breeder reactors.

Sassano

The Commission's proposal to the Council for a resolution on a research and development programme into the plutonium cycle and its safety has provoked disagreement in the Council between representatives from the various Member States. In particular, some countries are opposed to any activity, in respect of the plutonium cycle, on thermal reactors, and suggest the alternative of bilateral agreements on various specific topics which should, naturally, be financed by the countries signing these agreements.

We, however, consider that activities of this kind should be undertaken, particularly in respect of problems connected with research and development into the safety of manufacturing fuel consisting of mixed uranium and plutonium oxides.

There would be technical reasons for this interest which would lead to a considerable lessening of the risk of nuclear proliferation, as in these working schedules plutonium always remains mixed with uranium. Moreover, this could lead to increased safety in the manufacturing plants, as if the amount of dust present is considerably reduced, there is a corresponding reduction in the risk of radioactive pollution.

It should be noted that research has reached the point where cooperation at the European level is only worthwhile if the finance allocated does not fall below 7 million EUA, as provided for in the first Commission proposal. Unfortunately, the views expressed in the Council have led to the formulation of new proposals under which provision is made for only 4 million EUA for the programme. This figure is very low indeed: If the amount were reduced further, there would be no point in doing the research.

I am saying this in support of what Mr Seligman has said, and I am in complete agreement with him on all the matters indicated.

President. — I call Mr Purvis to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Purvis. — Mr President, I think we all owe a debt of gratitude to Mr Seligman for taking on very bravely a subject that does provoke a lot of emotion around this House and around the Community and, I have no doubt, around the world. It is no use sweeping things under carpets and not being prepared to face the problems that are there. The urgency of this, I would have thought, would have been of particular importance to Mr Linkohr and Mr Coppieters, just as it is to me and my colleagues here. The immediate emotional reaction we get just to the word 'plutonium', in whatever context it may be placed, the almost hysterical reaction, is misplaced in this case. We may be for or against motorcars, but certainly we are all for safety in motorcars. In this case we have a fuel that is being used, and we are honour-bound to provide for our

electorate the safest possible environment in which it can be used. We need energy resources; we speak at great length about the need for our energy resources. We need these to be indigenous, if at all possible. Plutonium is one of these resources. It not only has considerable potential to meet our energy needs, it is already meeting them. The one major constraint on its use is the question-mark over safety and its safe disposal and, therefore, it must be a prime consideration to make sure that it is as safe as is practicable, as safe as is possible.

The objective of the Commission's programme is to deal with this constraint, so the research and development programme on the plutonium cycle and its safety is essential if plutonium fuel is to be exploited successfully and safely. Powerstations in six of our Member States are already creating plutonium, so action at Community and not just at national level is also fully justified.

Therefore this group, the European Democratic Group, fully supports the motion for a resolution in Mr Seligman's report and furthermore supports its view of the urgency of getting the research programme under way. I would appeal to all Members and particularly to my colleagues in the Socialist Group that they too should take it in this spirit: we have it; we have to deal with it; safety in the use of plutonium is of concern to all of us.

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, Mr Purvis was, as usual, very correct in his use of words in his reference to emotion. I hope, however, to make it clear that this matter is by no means emotional, and this will become clear when I discuss the only existing process, the 'purex process'.

Unlike the rapporteur, my colleagues and myself are, as we have repeatedly said, in favour of a nuclear moratorium. Today, however, we are opposing further measures to develop complicated and untested technology, in particular the reprocessing of irradiated fissile material and breeder reactors. Neither the rapporteur nor the Commission have thought of asking two simple questions: firstly, whether these new technologies are viable, and secondly, whether they are safe. Today, the answer to both questions is no. For this reason, the report by Mr Seligman is premature and of no value from the technological point of view. Such issues must be discussed on the basis of facts, Mr Seligman. We have a duty to our constituents, to the people of Europe, to provide them with a clear picture of the situation as it is today.

Two developments contained in the programme proposed by the Commission are the reprocessing of irradiated fissile material in order to obtain plutonium

Coppieters

and the use of plutonium in fast-breeder reactors. This involves a dual recycling process in order to obtain plutonium from used fissile material in existing water-cooled reactors and from the uranium to be used in future breeder reactors.

However, there are two major problems involved in recycling: it is not technically viable and it affects human health. First of all, I would like to mention the technological problems.

Mr Seligman cannot deny that throughout the world present developments in this area have been a total failure. No method for obtaining plutonium on an industrial scale from irradiated fissionable oxides has yet succeeded. The total quantity of reprocessed fissile material amounts at present to 10 % of the waste produced. At the same time, it is clear that the efficiency of the recycling plant diminishes as maximum capacity increases.

The reason for this is very simple and clearly illustrates how the nuclear industry works. Only one method of reprocessing used fissile material to produce plutonium has been developed on an industrial scale. This technique is called 'purex' — and I would urge Mr Seligman and Mr Purvis to listen attentively, since we are now leaving emotions behind us. This purex method, which was very expensive to develop, was part of a military nuclear programme, the object being to obtain plutonium with a very low degree of radiation from metallic fissionable material for the production of atomic bombs. In order to spread the cost, the same technique was also used for industrial reprocessing. Other possible methods were either abandoned early on or are still in an experimental stage.

None of the purex installations could be used for fissionable oxides from TWRs (thermal water reactors), the main reason being that the waste reduced has a much higher degree of radiation. The British, American, Belgian and Japanese plants were closed down. Only France refuses to adopt this course and is even concluding contracts for the reprocessing of nuclear waste from other countries. It may well be in this connection, Mr President, that the matter is regarded as urgent. I should also add that the purex method itself is even less suitable for the future reprocessing of highly irradiated fissile material from breeder reactors.

The second item which must be considered is the health and safety of those employed in the industry and that of the entire population. Reprocessing, together with the mining of uranium, is the most dangerous part of the whole nuclear cycle. According to French experts, the degree of radiation to which workers are exposed as a proportion of the electricity produced must be reduced by a factor of 100 if safety standards are to be respected. Temporary workers exposed to a single very large dose of radiation are not taken into account. Indeed, it is doubtful whether this

is possible. On the other hand, safety standards have been made more stringent. The American West Valley plant, which reprocessed a total of 240 tonnes of oxide waste, was closed in 1972 because the degree of radiation had become too high. In the United States, the reprocessing of fissile oxides has been halted and the waste is now stored in specially designed tanks. The danger involved was shown by a minor incident occurring in the Hague only four days ago. In view of this, blandly to talk about research into the plutonium cycle and its safety practically amounts to deceit. There is no plutonium cycle, only the production of the deadly element. Only irresponsible plans for its use exist.

I realize that certain colleagues will call this emotional. Those who refuse to listen to the experts who signed the appeal in Geneva will probably also refuse to listen to another emotional appeal made by Roger Garandy in his incomparable work *Appel aux vivants*:

To choose nuclear energy is to annihilate our grandchildren! To choose nuclear energy is to lay the foundations of the Gulag! To choose nuclear energy is to force the Third World to choose between extermination or revolt!

Mr President, you must read the many amendments we have tabled as an anti-Seligman report, and as an anti-resolution, since it is an amendment of the whole text. We consider, as can be seen from the amendments, that the only acceptable solution is to abandon all attempts to use plutonium. Secondly, every effort should be made to assess and counter the dangers arising from radioactive waste, including plutonium. For this reason, we solemnly request the Commission to withdraw its proposal and to replace it by another based on the objectives contained in our amendment.

President. — I call Mr Veronesi to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Veronesi. — (I) Mr President, I think it was a mistake to refuse to send the document back to the committee not only for the reasons given by Mr Linkohr, with which I agree, but especially because paragraph 10 of our resolution says that the programme must or can be revised in the light of the results of the International Commission which has studied the problems of the plutonium cycle. Therefore even if this resolution were approved today — and this will be difficult because there are 38 amendments — in 40 days' time we shall be faced with an oral question with debate which proposes that the problem should be examined again precisely in the light of paragraph 10 of today's resolution.

It would have been much more suitable to analyse the problem at a committee meeting in the near future, to give close consideration to the 38 amendments within the committee and to draw up a concise but complete report on the results of work on the fuel cycle. Members of Parliament will never have time to read

Veronesi

the different books on the matter; we need a summary of the results at a technical level in order to be able to give a political appraisal of the matter.

It is not true that urgent problems are raised. It has taken almost two years for the three-part programme to gain approval, with all the reservations on the part of some countries. We should not, therefore, imagine that the Council will give immediate approval to this programme.

I do not think that the method of approach has been a good one. There are three trains of thought on this matter, represented by those who think that this research will immediately open the way for the diffusion of fast-breeder reactors. There are those who consider — and Mr Seligman himself touched on the matter — that this interpretation is the valid one. We do not agree. There are others, however, who think that it is absolutely necessary to abandon this research, professing, as did that famous mother, to allow the child to go into the water only after it has learnt to swim. Now some of those who want to prevent the research for reasons of safety have taken up positions which are clearly contradictory.

We think, however, that this programme should be assessed at its proper value: it is a research programme which should give a technical, political, economic and social appraisal of the problems connected with the plutonium cycle. Why are we raising this problem? Because, within the framework of safety guarantees, it is our duty not to neglect any source of energy. The term safety must be defined, Mr Coppieters: the term 'safety' must be defined rigorously in order to understand what we intend to include in it. Now, we cannot abandon any energy source, precisely because it is our duty in respect of future generations not to leave them just with radioactive waste but also alternatives and energy reserves which can be put to use, we should not forget that plutonium can guarantee energy for modern society for a millenium. We should only abandon this source after a rigorous and precise appraisal. I know that the problem of proliferation exists, and this we find deeply distressing and requiring a careful appraisal.

Moreover, the critical mass of plutonium is one-fifth of the critical mass of uranium, so that it is much easier to have the carriers for launching nuclear devices. It is much easier to build a small-scale bomb than a large-scale bomb. These are all matters which we must consider. At the moment we are only talking about the availability of a research programme which will allow us, deliberately and responsibly with regard to our countries, our people and future generations, to take a decision on a matter of extreme importance.

President. — I call Mr Muntingh.

Mr Muntingh. — (NL) Mr President, on behalf of the Dutch Socialist Members I would like to say a few words about Mr Seligman's report. It is well known that we are against plutonium, as I have said several times. I do not need to explain the reasons for this, since I have done so on earlier occasions. Mr Coppieters has given a particularly eloquent explanation this morning, with which I fully agree.

We are by no means against research and fully realize that this is a research programme. However, the money spent on it can be better used. Much more serious is the fact that this programme is used by advocates of the plutonium cycle, which, as Mr Coppieters has said, does not in fact exist, and by the advocates of nuclear energy to prove that they can continue with extremely dangerous processes to the particular detriment of public health.

What they are saying is: while we realize that there are problems with nuclear energy, we are doing all we can to solve these problems and will succeed. In the meantime, they are able to continue their work, which, Mr Seligman, I am sorry to say, is so unbelievably dangerous and may have such an enormous effect on the health of entire nations, on our surroundings and on the natural environment that I consider it extremely irresponsible to write what you have written.

There is indeed an energy problem which we must solve. To this end we must direct all our energies, money, resources, intellect and every opportunity we have to develop alternative sources of energy. I do not need to say what these alternatives are, because there are so many and have such potential! We should concentrate entirely on these and forget all ideas of a plutonium-based economy! Mr Seligman, the lights are red, a much brighter red than you have at this moment on your lapel.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) I think the Commission's position is quite clear and it is true, as I heard here this morning, that the basic debate can be re-opened whenever a question with nuclear aspects arises. Is it sensible, though, to choose that option?

I have the greatest respect for those who hold opinions different from mine. But it is not a question here of re-opening the debate, and there was something that surprised me in what the last speaker said. He said that we are faced with a situation in which plutonium is used on a number of occasions and in a number of industrial activities. Therefore, without making pronouncements — which this programme does not do either — on what one should think of the plutonium cycle, action should be taken on five precise points in order to ensure safety, and if that was not possible, we should take no further action.

Davignon

Then one has to establish, as the rapporteur showed very clearly, whether the safety measures can be taken more usefully under Community research programmes or by individual States, which is a poor way of looking at European cooperation. I realize that a procedural problem is involved here: when should one express one's first opinion? What further arguments and information should one wait for before giving an opinion? A variety of factors come into this issue, including non-Community activities (e.g. the INFCE). I think it would be right to accept these research programmes at a given point in time. Then they can be adjusted on the basis of scientific, political and other developments. On behalf of the Commission I will undertake to ensure that the responsible committees will be kept informed of the progress of work on this subject; but I also believe that at a certain point Parliament must give its opinion on the programmes the Commission has proposed, which do not concern the usefulness of the plutonium cycle and are not conceived from the point of view of energy resources. Our discussion today centres on finding out whether it is possible to ensure safety in five areas by means of common programmes. If Parliament does not give its opinion today, it will have no influence on the proceedings which will start again next week in the Council of Ministers. May I say, as a Member of the Commission who has great respect for Parliament, that whatever Parliament's opinion is, I would prefer to hear it than to hear nothing.

President. — I call Mr Seligman.

Mr Seligman, rapporteur. — I would like just to make one or two points in reply to Mr Linkohr and the other speakers. Mr Linkohr and Mr Veronesi regard it as important to incorporate the INFCE report into the work of this programme. I would like to say that I have read the nine volumes of INFCE. They are very useful, very detailed and, in my opinion, they will not change our programme in any way: they virtually endorse the use of plutonium in fast-breeder reactors. In any case, if they do change our programme, there is provision in clause 9 to review this programme after one year and at that time we would bring in the INFCE recommendations if we needed to.

Mr Coppieters says that there are a lot of technical problems, and I admire the detail in which he has studied the matter. But all that he says stresses the need for the thing to be examined in greater detail, and to my mind the Community is the most unbiased and most neutral place in which this sort of research could be carried on. As far as purex is concerned, there is, of course, an alternative system which I believe is very safe and that is the soljol process, which avoids the powder phase in the reprocessing of plutonium.

I agree with Mr Veronesi that the programme is important socially and economically, and I welcome his statement that we cannot neglect any source of power.

Mr Muntingh does say quite rightly that plutonium can be dangerous, but again it is ignorance that breeds fear and the object of this programme is to find out facts. Do you realize that if I had a piece of plutonium on this table wrapped up in *Le Monde* I could have it there for all the time that I am speaking and not suffer at all? Plutonium is only dangerous in certain conditions. So it is ignorance that breeds fear, and this fear that Mr Muntingh has will be to some extent mitigated by this programme.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the end of this sitting.

22. EEC-India cooperation agreement

President. — As you will remember, the House decided, before the debate on the Seligman report, to take the vote on the Seal report (Doc. 1-45/80) without debate.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the Seal interim report on a cooperation agreement between the EEC and India.

The motion for a resolution is adopted.

23. Agenda

President. — I call Mr von Wogau.

Mr von Wogau. — (D) Mr President, may I point out that the report on turnover tax and excise duty in international travel on today's agenda cannot be discussed today. The report calls for increasing the duty-free allowances for travellers from 1 July and for the Council of Ministers to take action beforehand. As a result, the citizens of Europe would feel that this Parliament and the Council of Ministers were really doing something for them during their travel time. But since we shall not be able to discuss it today, although the report was not disputed in committee and the Commission agreed on it too, I would suggest that a vote without debate be held on it, today if possible.

(Applause)

President. — The rapporteur proposes that a vote be taken on his report (Doc. 1-43/80) without debate.

President

Are there any objections?

This proposal is adopted.

24. *World Conservation Strategy (WCS)*

President. — The next item is the oral question (Doc. 1-31/80), with debate, tabled by Mr Muntingh on behalf of the Socialist Group to the Commission, on the 'World Conservation Strategy' (WCS):

On 5 March 1980, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources will launch its World Conservation Strategy in various parts of the world.

1. Does the Commission consider that this document contains important guidelines and recommendations on the rational exploitation of natural resources without disruption of essential ecological processes?
2. Does it consider that these guidelines and recommendations deserve closer study from the point of view of their applicability in the Community and elsewhere, notably as regards development aid policy?

I call Mr Muntingh.

Mr Muntingh. — (NL) Mr President, first of all I would like to say how gratified I am that Parliament is prepared to debate such matters despite the late hour. It is quite possible that the European Parliament is the first parliament ever to discuss the World Conservation Strategy, the lamentable situation of our natural environment and measures which can be taken to prevent the frightening increase in the destruction of nature throughout the world.

Since I am speaking on behalf of my group, if perchance you should glance at the clock, Mr President, and note that I am going beyond the time allotted to me as questioner I will continue as spokesman. My group has high hopes concerning the outcome of this debate. We expect that the Europe of the Nine will, as a result, take steps to conserve nature and prevent its destruction. Such action is essential. The situation is desperate.

Those who have read 'World Conservation Strategy' and who have any knowledge of the situation will wholeheartedly agree. I will briefly explain the situation in order to ensure that matters are clear. The basic problem is the rapid dwindling of plant and animal species and the danger that they will disappear even more rapidly in the future. I specify plant and animal species, not plants and animals, which is a totally different matter. It is normal that plants, animals and people die. It is a simple question of birth, life and death. However, the problem is that entire species of plants and animals totally disappear from the face of the earth, never to return. This may be better under-

stood if it is considered that human beings are also a species.

What would we think if a species of living being attempted to exterminate mankind? I am convinced that this species exists — mankind itself: That is the length and breadth of the problem. Mankind is slowly but surely destroying and exterminating all living beings, including itself. I am firmly convinced that mankind as a species has no chance of survival if it continues to destroy the world ecological system of which it is a part. It's not a matter of a single flower or animal; the entire ecological system is involved, including the last tropical rain-forests, the last tropical deserts, the entire ocean, the Antarctica, enormous flourishing river networks, deltas, estuaries, the last mangrove forests, an entire army of valuable genetic systems. The aesthetic, ethical and moral values involved can never be fully appreciated. Finally, Mr President, the continued existence of mankind is at stake.

To express myself in more specific terms, according to Professor Eckholm, before the end of this century unique and irreplaceable living beings will have disappeared, not in their tens, not in their hundreds, but in their hundreds of thousands. On extrapolating from a development of the population today, the use of land and the pollution of air and water, Thomas Lovejoy, of the American World Nature Fund, has concluded that towards the year 2000 the total number of species in the world will have been reduced by at least one-sixth. Please take note that this means that at least 500 000 species will have disappeared.

There are those who laugh incredulously, saying that it is impossible and ridiculous. I stress, however, that this is true and will give an example. A single volcano in the Philippines has more species of tree and shrub on its slopes than the whole of the United States, and slopes such as these are being stripped or burned with depressing regularity. According to the World Conservation Society, tropical rain-forests are being felled and burned at a rate of 110 000 square kilometres a year. At the same time as these woods and shrubs, a large number of unknown plants, insects, fungi, birds, amphibians, reptiles and mammals disappear. They are unknown because nobody has listed the constituents of such an ecological system. While we have taken stock of the moon, we have scarcely done so with the plant and animal life of this planet, which we have nevertheless begun to destroy.

The problem does not stop with the destruction of nature, far from it, but leads to the inevitable and deplorable cases of poverty, hunger, social injustice and the exploitation of poor by rich. According to 'World Conservation Strategy', 500 million adults and children are undernourished, while 800 million are destitute and are forced to destroy the natural resources necessary to alleviate their most urgent needs and their extreme poverty. The result is erosion,

Muntingh

devastation, salination, silting, all of which lead to further impoverishment. Thousands of millions of tons of soil are lost each year as a result of deforestation and bad land management. Ever-increasing areas of land around villages are being deprived of their vegetation, which is needed to provide fuel for the inhabitants. The poor and hungry of the world are forced to burn 400 million tons of manure and husks which are necessary for the regeneration of the soil.

As a result of the deforestation and erosion, water reservoirs silt up behind their dams, with an adverse effect on the efficiency of hydroelectric power-stations. The Aswan Dam, a tremendous project developed by Russia, the United States and Egypt, is a case in point. Only two of the twelve turbines are still working. Flooding is another consequence, costing between \$ 140 million and \$ 170 million per year in India alone. Damage is caused by Western companies anxious for the profits and advantages to be obtained from the great demand in our countries for hardwood and other products.

Mr President, my group considers that this worldwide destruction of nature can no longer be allowed to continue and that for the sake of the poor people in developing countries, of all other people and of nature itself, it must be halted. Our group is extremely gratified that, for the first time, a proposal has now been made for joint action to be taken effectively and objectively at international level concerning these problems. In our opinion, this plan of action, the World Conservation Strategy, will score the first success. It must succeed in order to avoid the entire foundations of life on earth being irrevocably altered. Failing this, the long-term survival of mankind is in danger.

For this reason, we are particularly gratified at the resolution tabled by all the groups, including our own. In this resolution, the European Parliament is requested to approve the World Conservation Strategy and to accept the consequences of so doing. In our opinion, it is essential that Europe give much greater priority to nature conservation for the sake of nature itself and for the sake of the population of developing countries.

In the resolution, the second paragraph refers to trade policy. Fortunately, all agree that, in view of the exceptionally serious danger to the natural environment, the conservation of plants and animals must be given priority over trade in products derived from them.

I now come to my last and most important point. We consider that the Community's aid policy must be fundamentally restructured. We must realize, as Professor Eckholm has pointed out, that the deprived will be desperate for land, trees and animals which are protected by the law and will not leave them unmolested. The instinct for immediate survival will always prevail over the conservation of nature, and even the

best methods of nature conservation will be undermined where such social neglect exists.

For this reason, the objectives of the World Conservation Strategy must be a part of international development strategy in the framework of the United Nations Third Development Decade. Therefore, we must also make efforts along these lines within the framework of the Lomé Convention and the European Development Fund.

Finally, Mr President, I refer once more to Professor Eckholm and the World Conservation Strategy. According to Professor Eckholm, one thing is clear: if we look at the increase in human poverty, the increased pressure from populations and the growing number of threatened species, we must realize that certain species will inevitably become extinct, particularly in the tropics. The World Conservation Strategy states that we have not inherited the earth from our parents but have borrowed it from our children. We in this House must therefore make every effort to limit the damage predicted by Professor Eckholm and, in the spirit of the World Conservation Strategy, to repay our debt to our children in full and, if possible, with interest.

President — I call Mr Johnson to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Johnson. — Mr President, I think at this late hour on a Friday morning, with only a few minutes left, it is inevitable that the things I want to say will have to be said very briefly indeed. We need people like Mr Muntingh to remind us that Parliament has vastly important issues to discuss, and that they are in fact very germane to the European Community. We may only have a few minutes, but it is worth using those few minutes. I only want to say two things really. First, on behalf of the European Democrats, we welcome this World Conservation Strategy, as well as the fact that, as far as I know, the European Parliament is the first Parliament to debate it.

Secondly, I want to say that we in Europe must look very closely at our own responsibilities here. We are talking about world conservation, and there are things we can do in Europe which can have a very real impact on the realization of conservation policy in the broadest sense. We have, I think, to put our own house in order. The Federal Republic of Germany alone accounts for approximately 60 % of the world's fur imports, and for a proportionately high share of trade in spotted catskins. It is likely that Western Europe as a whole accounts for 80 % of the market for all endangered species of wild felines — in other words, about half-a-million fur skins a year.

Western Europe's official import of ivory each year represents 10 000 dead elephants. In addition, a large

Johnson

amount of ivory passes through Belgium and France in transit, and is not recorded in statistics. Europe remains a major consumer of whale products, especially sperm oil, of which more than 11 000 tonnes were used in the EEC countries in 1978 alone. Now that is equivalent to 2 000 dead whales a year. Two million crocodile hides are traded each year throughout the world, and 60 % are consumed by tanners in Western Europe. The European share of snakeskins and other reptilian and turtle products is equally high.

What I am trying to say, Mr President, is that when we talk in general terms about world conservation strategy, the EEC countries have a very real part to play and the EEC institutions in particular, because if there is one area where competence is indisputably with the European Communities, it is that of trade. We may question other items which this House debates, and we have questioned them, but nobody questions the competence of the Community in the field of trade, and it is up to the Community to regulate international trade in products from endangered species.

We welcome on this side of the House the moves by the Commission to translate into Community law the provisions of the international convention of trade in endangered species. But let me be quite clear: loopholes must be closed. Germany, France and Italy for example, have entered a reservation to the convention on the salt-water crocodile on the grounds that this is of use to the leather industry. Just an example, Mr President, of action which the Community must take.

I conclude, Mr President, by saying that in the field of trade and also in the field of development assistance, we have a major and primary responsibility. Mr Muntingh has mentioned one or two examples. I myself am well aware of areas throughout the world where the Community's own efforts in development assistance have substantially contributed to the deterioration of the environment. We have to take more account of these problems, because if we do not, not only the countries themselves who are receiving assistance will suffer, but eventually the consequences will rebound more widely. We welcome the resolution, and the initiatives.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, as the honourable Members who spoke know, the Commission took part in the meeting which launched the world conservation strategy. We regard that as an essential activity which we will support fervently and resolutely. Quite apart from all the reasons given here, that initiative is absolutely indispensable because it will give the leaders precise and succinct information. It will have an impact on public

opinion which is much needed to ensure that the leaders take account of the serious situation now facing us.

For our part, we are prepared to adapt the objectives of our own strategy, in the context of our proposals and environmental action programmes, to this more global and world-wide strategy which has been advocated.

A more specific question was put about our activities *vis à vis* the developing countries. May I say that we are prepared to take these problems into account when we give opinions, either in the context of the funds we grant to the developing countries under the Lomé Convention or that of the opinions we give to the European Investment Bank on the loans it grants.

In practical terms, that is how the Commission supports the basic initiative and the political initiative Parliament has taken today.

President. — To wind up this debate, I have received from Mr Muntingh on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Alber and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), Mr Sherlock on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Ceravolo on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, Mr Berkhouwer on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, a motion for a resolution with request for an early vote pursuant to Rule 47 (5) of the Rules of Procedure.

I will consult the House on this request at the beginning of the next sitting.

The debate is closed.

25. Public supply contracts

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Nyborg (Doc. 1-814/79), on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-572/79) for a directive amending Directive 77/62/EEC, coordinating procedures for the award of public supply contracts.

Mr Nyborg has informed me that he cannot be here this afternoon. He has proposed that the report be held over until the May part-session. I leave it to the House to decide.

I call Miss Forster.

Miss Forster. — Mr President, I would ask that this matter should be taken. I do not see why we should

Forster

not consider it merely because Mr Nyborg cannot be here. It is a technical matter, it has to be completed by the end of the year and I think we should debate it very briefly now and vote on it today.

President. — I put to the vote the proposal that this report be held over.

The proposal is rejected.

I call Mr von Wogau to speak on behalf of the European People's Party (CD).

Mr von Wogau. — (D) Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, may I inform you that on behalf of my group I can accept Mr Nyborg's report. There was no dispute about the report in our committee either. I would only like to point briefly to the significance of the Europe-wide invitation to tender and say that it will lead to lower costs and improved quality; those are the objectives. We call on the Commission to urge more strongly that these aims really are achieved and that more public contracts are awarded on the basis of Europe-wide invitations to tender. I would also like to mention a second equally important point. These invitations to tender concern very large contracts. So often only large undertakings can carry them out. That is why we call on the Commission also to consider how one could organize the procedure and split up the contracts in such a way as to give small and medium-sized undertakings more chance of taking part.

I will conclude by proposing that Mr Nyborg's report be adopted.

President. — I call Miss Forster to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Miss Forster. — Mr President, the European Democratic Group would also like to support Mr Nyborg's report. The motion for a resolution and the Legal Affairs Committee's amendment both refer to a technical directive for bringing an EEC directive into line with the new procedure under GATT relating to the award of public supply contracts. The object of both is to achieve greater fairness and openness in the tendering and award of these contracts and to establish methods for providing information on the tenders and the reasons for the choice of the winning bid. The regulation is of interest, Mr President, because the Community has led the way in liberalizing purchasing by governments and other public bodies and ensuring that suppliers from different countries receive equal and fair treatment by those awarding contracts. Hence the new GATT proposal closely follows what we have already had in the EEC.

The wording of the directive is important, but the crucial factor is how it is put into effect and how closely governments and commercial undertakings comply with the directive. We therefore insist that the Commission monitor this and ensure that there is reciprocity on all sides. Those in the Community must not be at a disadvantage *vis-à-vis* others in GATT, while within the Community all the Member States — and I do mean all of them — must comply equally with the directive. My colleague, Lord Bethell, has already asked the Commission for information on the numbers of public contracts advertised by Member States. The figures show that up to the middle of last year not all Member States were complying equally with the directive. The Commission figures, however, were incomplete in that they did not show the value of contracts. Neither did they show the total numbers and value of contracts exceeding the minimum value for which advertisement is obligatory, as opposed to those below this value. We ask the Commission therefore to ensure that these figures are collected in future so that compliance with the directive can be measured.

Finally, Mr President, in the motion for a resolution we ask the Commission to extend the directive to include public transport, energy and telecommunications. I have also been told that the Commission is already preparing certain other amendments to the directive. Because of this, and because of the complexity of the directive and its implementation, we would like the Commission to seek this House's opinion again before the regulation comes into effect, and preferably within the next 3 months.

President. — I call Mr Baillot to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Baillot. — (F) Mr President, the Nyborg report does not only give the French Communists and Allies cause for reflection on the coordination of procedures for awarding public contracts. It also induces us to repeat our basic opposition to opening these contracts to international competition.

It seems evident to us that opening public contracts to the competition of the multinationals, especially the American multinationals, within the framework of a policy of austerity that applies generally to all the Member States of the Community, can only accentuate the dependence of our country's economy in particular and the stagnation of growth that is apparent now. So it would be a further element of crisis.

We can only escape this crisis by ensuring balanced and sustained growth by means of productive and job-creating investments and by restoring popular consumption. Now, to be precise, this balanced growth can only be based, as it is in France, on the activity of a large public sector. It is indisputable that faced with an overall stagnation of investment, that is

Baillot

the sector which literally attracts growth and it is only thanks to that sector that the recession is not even more serious. So it is easy to foretell what would happen if one left the public sector, especially the French one, to the mercy of the savage competition of the multinationals. The whole sector would be at risk, since the motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs calls for extending the directive to public transport, the production and distribution of energy and to telecommunications.

That is why, when it was decided during the last GATT negotiations to award public contracts, the French Communists and Allies and they alone, were against the Catherwood report which approved these agreements. One cannot try to defend the public sector while in Paris and then, in Strasbourg or Brussels, abandon public contracts, to the piracy of the multinationals.

The workers involved are bound to condemn this double talk. From experience it seems that the public sector has represented a powerful force in the achievement of many social rights. The workers intend to preserve and above all to defend these. On the other hand they know the familiar refrain: Tomorrow they will be told, even more emphatically, that international competition calls for other sacrifices, especially as regards wages, the right to strike and a variety of individual rights. It also seems clear to them that the attacks on the public sector and the statutory rights of employees are in fact preparing the ground for new supranational advances. The budgetary policies of austerity, both in France and elsewhere, and the massive transfers of public funds to the private companies and multinationals are making it increasingly difficult for the public sector to carry out its task. The continuous increase in public tariffs and the progressive withdrawal of the State from financing collective and social needs tend towards the same result. The credits intended for financing civilian facilities have been cut severely, especially as regards education, health, transport, research, youth and sports. So public contracts are being reduced more and more, and opening them to international competition will restrict them even further.

But that is not all. We are in fact being asked to reserve trade and public contracts to the most powerful companies. In the current crisis, that means restricting trade and producing new ravages in the national economies, with the result of reducing the workers' standard of living. So we are resolutely opposed to this new offensive; in our opinion the only solution lies in an economic and commercial cooperation which favours the development of everyone and respects the mutual interests and independence of every country.

President. — I call Mr Turner.

Mr Turner. — Mr President, I must just say a word or two because Mr Nyborg is not here. He accepted, and so did the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, one of the major proposals of the Committee on Legal Affairs, on whose behalf I speak, to ensure that not only national but also local government contracts were covered in the same way to avoid a discrimination which would otherwise exist within the EEC itself.

Now there is one other matter on which the Committee on Legal Affairs had very considerable discussions and came to the conclusion that the proposal of the Commission must be amended. That is in Article 25 (b), which provides a method of enquiry and explanation from governments who have refused to grant a contract to one tenderer and have granted it to another, so that the tenderer who is complaining can find out the reasons why. This comes under the GATT arrangements but was not in the original EEC directive which is being modified. The directive proposed by the Commission provided that the national government of a tenderer who had a complaint could enquire of the government giving the contract what the reasons were for granting the contract to a particular party. We in the Committee on Legal Affairs considered that this was an inappropriate procedure for contracts within the EEC and that for internal market transactions between undertakings it was more appropriate that the undertaking within the EEC should go to the Commission and the Commission should enquire of the Member State concerned the reasons for the granting of the contract, and we therefore put that proposal forward. I think it is a matter of very considerable constitutional significance, and certainly it is in accord with normal EEC procedures that the Commission itself rather than the national governments should deal with matters like this where a harmonized sector of the economy has been set up. This is the case here, and so we put this forward. Now, I understand that the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs considered the first point put forward by the Committee on Legal Affairs and accepted it, but did not consider the second point.

I have had discussions with Mr Nyborg and, as I mentioned before, he accepts the Legal Affairs Committee's point of view. Had that been realized at the time, I have no doubt the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs would have accepted this point as well. Therefore there is an amendment put forward on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee: this is Amendment No 1, which amends the opening words of Article 25 (b) to provide that the Commission shall act in cases of complaint within the EEC rather than a national government itself. So I would ask this House please to accept this amendment, which I believe is in accord with what the rapporteur would have wanted.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, this is a difficult technical question which the Commission is being asked to deal with in three minutes, in the absence of the rapporteur and at a time when the Council has begun to discuss the proposal to implement the Commission directive. Although it is not my custom I cannot, in the time available, go into detail on the various points raised.

As a rule I like to go into a subject in depth, whether the debate is a political or a technical one. But the way in which this one is organized does not allow me to do so.

So I shall confine myself to two remarks.

First of all, let Mrs Foster have no fears: the Commission will exercise and assume its responsibilities to ensure that the existing directives on public contracts are implemented in all the Community countries in the spirit in which they were adopted. Procedures are being drafted on this matter.

It is indeed essential that the law should be applied in the same manner everywhere, if we want to have a genuine Community.

Secondly, it is not the object of this directive to reopen the question of public contracts but to harmonize the internal directive that already exists with the provisions negotiated within the GATT so as to give us a legal instrument compatible with the international legal instrument, while at the same time adhering to what we have already decided and adding the best points derived from the GATT directive.

The amendment tabled by Mr Turner is directed not at ensuring that the two texts are compatible in the near future, but at improving the way in which the question of public contracts is handled as such. We cannot pursue these two aims together. Why not? Because we must complete our Community legislation by the end of the year so that the directive is compatible with our commitments to the GATT. At the same time, we can try to improve all the rules on public contracts.

I am quite prepared to go into the matter at a later date, both with the Legal Affairs Committee and with the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, since we cannot do so now.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the end of the sitting.

26. Agenda

President. — Since the proceedings cannot continue after 2 p.m., we shall now proceed to the vote on

those items on which the debate has been closed. Those items on the agenda which could not be dealt with today are postponed until the May part-session.

I call Mr Luster.

Mr Luster. — (D) Mr President, that means, and I do not want to interfere with your arrangements, that item 50 of the agenda, the oral question by the Legal Affairs Committee, will not be dealt with today. In that case may I on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee request that a matter which has been awaiting discussion since November last year and concerns relations between Parliament and the Commission — which is not evident from its description in the agenda — will be placed on the agenda of the next part-session at a time when it has a chance of really being discussed.

President. — Mr Luster, your proposal that this item be included in the agenda for the May part-session will be laid before the Bureau.

27. Votes

President. — The next item is the vote on those items on which the debate has been closed.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *von Wogau report (Doc. 1-818/79): Binary textile fibre mixtures.*

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Luster report (Doc. 1-811/79): Health problems in connection with the importation of animals.*

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *von Wogau report (Doc. 1-43/80): Excise duty applicable in international travel.*

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — We proceed to the *Donnez et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-92/80): EEC-US relations in the field of steel.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble).

On paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Donnez on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and rewording this paragraph as follows:

1. Notes that the Commission has protested, on behalf of the Community, at this failure to observe the consensus adopted in 1977 in the OECD in the interests of all the steel-producing countries;

I put Amendment No 1 to the vote. Amendment No 1 is adopted.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 2)

After paragraph 2, I have two amendments, each inserting a new paragraph:

— Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr Donnez on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group:

- 2a. Instructs the committee responsible to draw up an exhaustive report on this subject before July 1980;

— Amendment No 3, tabled by Mr Deleau on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats:

- 2a. Requests that, should the negotiations fail, consideration be given to possible retaliatory measures in other sectors and how they could be applied.

What is the rapporteur's position on Amendment No 3?

Mr Donnez. — (F) In the light of what Mr Davignon has just told us, I think Amendment No 3 might well be rejected.

President. — I put Amendment No 3 to the vote.

Amendment No 3 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 2 to the vote.

Amendment No 2 is adopted.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 3)

I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the *Boyes et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-109/80): Parliament's electronic voting-system.*

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — We proceed to the *Seligman report (Doc. 1-813/79): EAEC research and development programme on plutonium.*

I call Mrs Van den Heuvel.

Mrs Van den Heuvel. — (NL) Mr President, may I ask you to ascertain, pursuant to Rule 33(3), whether or not a quorum is present? By way of explanation, I do not intend to pursue party politics or to ensure that Parliament takes our ideas into account — to be honest, I am afraid that on this and subsequent occasions it will not do so — but, I have no intention of allowing such an important report to be put to the vote in such scandalous fashion as would now be the case. My criticism is directed at least as much at my own political colleagues as at others who are now absent. I am really concerned with the matter itself.

(Applause)

President. — At the request of more than ten Members, I note that the requisite number of Members present is not attained. This item is therefore removed from the agenda.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Mr President, it is not removed from the agenda, it is merely postponed, and the vote will take place first thing on Monday afternoon, I assume. I regret that we have to go through these charades of calling for quorums when obviously one is not going to get one's way and it means postponing it. I can only say that on Monday I hope that both the honourable lady and her friends will be here, as I can assure her that mine will be and all those who support this. I regret that we have had to go through these proceedings, but I can understand the reasons why she has done it.

President: — The vote on this item is, of course, pursuant to the Rules of Procedure placed on the agenda of the next part-session.

*
* *

President. — We proceed to the *Nyborg report (Doc. 1-814/79): Public supply contracts.*

On the proposal for a directive, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Turner on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee and rewording Article 25b as follows:

In the case of contracts awarded by contracting authorities within the EEC, the Commission shall at the request of an unsuccessful tenderer from a Member State, and without prejudice to the Council Decision of 26 July 1971 setting up an Advisory Committee for Public Contracts, as amended by Council Decision 77/63/EEC of 21 December 1976, request any further information concerning the award of the contract which may be necessary to enable it to ascertain whether the contract has been awarded justly and fairly. The Member State of the contracting authority in question shall, to this end, furnish information on both the comparative characteristics and advantages of the successful tender and the contract price. This latter information may be disclosed by the Commission provided such right is exercised with discretion. Where such disclosure would prejudice competition on the occasion of subsequent invitations to tender, such information shall be disclosed only following consultation and with the consent of the Member State by which it was notified;

— Available information concerning the award of a contract shall be notified to any Member State who so requests;

— Confidential information furnished pursuant to this Article which would impede the application of statutory provisions or which would be contrary in any other way to the public interest or would prejudice the legitimate commercial interests of specific public or private undertakings, or which could prejudice fair competition between suppliers shall be disclosed only with the formal authorization of the Member State which furnished it.

I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is adopted.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

28. *Membership of committees*

President. — I have received from the European Democratic Group a request for the appointment of Sir Peter Vanneck to the Committee on Energy and Research.

Are there any objections?

This appointment is ratified.

29. *Dates of the next part-session*

President. — There are no other items on the agenda.

I thank the representatives of both Council and Commission for their contributions to our work.

The enlarged Bureau proposes that our next sittings be held at Strasbourg during the week from 19 to 23 May 1980.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

30. *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.

31. *Adjournment of the session*

President. — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting closed at 1.40 p.m.)

Price

	United Kingdom	Ireland	Belgium and Luxembourg	Denmark	Germany	France	Italy	Netherlands	Other countries
	UKL	IRL	BFR/LFR	DKR	DM	FF	LIT	HFL	BFR
Annual subscription 1980—1981	21.25	23.25	1 400,—	252,—	87,50	204,—	39 100	96,—	1 400,—
Single copies:									
up to 32 pages	0.60	0.70	40,—	7,20	2,50	5,80	1 120	2,80	40,—
up to 80 pages	1.20	1.40	80,—	14,40	5,—	11,60	2 240	5,60	80,—

more than 80 pages : price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

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

- report of proceedings,
- annual indexes.

Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Secretariat of the European Parliament or the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Secretariat of the European Parliament

Centre européen

Plateau du Kirchberg

Boîte postale 1601 — Luxembourg

Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

Boîte postale 1003 — Luxembourg
and 5, rue du Commerce — Luxembourg

Postal cheque account : 19 190-81

Bank current account : B.I.L. 8-109/6003/300

Price: UKL 7.20 / IRL 8.40



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

ISSN 0378-5041

Boîte postale 1003 — Luxembourg

Catalogue number: AX-AA-80-003-EN-C