

Annex

# Official Journal

## of the

### European Communities

No 1-259

English edition

## Debates of the European Parliament

1980-1981 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 7 to 11 July 1980

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

<b>Monday, 7 July 1980</b> . . . . .	1
Resumption of session, p. 2 — Membership of Parliament — Credentials, p. 2 — Committees, p. 2 — Petitions, p. 2 — Documents, p. 2 — Texts of treaties, p. 2 — Withdrawal of a motion for a resolution, p. 2 — Urgent procedure, p. 2 — Order of business, p. 3 — Speaking time, p. 7 — Tabling of amendments, p. 7 — Procedure without report, p. 8 — Electronic vote, p. 8 — Urgent procedure, p. 8 — Action taken on Parliament's opinions, p. 9 — Question-time, p. 11 — Air-traffic control, p. 25 — Next sitting, p. 28 — Annex, p. 28	
<b>Tuesday, 8 July 1980</b> . . . . .	38
Minutes, p. 40 — Committees, p. 40 — Statement, p. 40 — Urgent procedure, p. 40 — Parliament's first anniversary, p. 41 — Tabling of motions to reject the budget, p. 43 — Luxembourg presidency, p. 43 — Urgent procedure, p. 73 — Agenda, p. 73 — Luxembourg presidency (contd), p. 73 — Rules of Procedure, p. 78 — Urgent procedure, p. 92 — Question time, p. 93 — Next sitting, p. 106 — Annex, p. 107	
<b>Wednesday, 9 July 1980</b> . . . . .	113
Minutes, p. 114 — Documents, p. 114 — Membership of Parliament, p. 114 — Urgent procedure, p. 114 — Motions to reject the budget, p. 117 — Agenda, p. 123 — Economic development, p. 123 — Urgent procedure, p. 146 — Voting time, p. 147 — Urgent procedure, p. 164 — Next sitting, p. 164 — Annex, p. 165	
<b>Thursday, 10 July 1980</b> . . . . .	212
Minutes, p. 213 — Documents, p. 213 — Committees, p. 213 — Urgent procedure, p. 214 — Agenda, p. 220 — Preliminary draft budget for 1981, p. 221 — Air-traffic control (contd), p. 226 — Credentials, p. 237 — Urgent procedure, p. 237 — Voting time, p. 237 — Steel industry, p. 238 — Industrial products from third countries — Motor vehicles, etc. — Biodegradability — Powered industrial trucks, p. 267 — Integration of railway undertakings, p. 277 — Transport infra-	

(Continued overleaf)

NOTE TO READER

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

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

Contents (continued)

structure, p. 283 — Implementation of 1979 budget, p. 289 — Budgetary control of Data-Processing Centre, p. 295 — Refugees in Horn of Africa, p. 299 — Membership of Parliament, p. 304 — Next sitting, p. 304

Friday, 11 July 1980 . . . . . 305

Minutes, p. 307 — Documents, p. 307 — Texts of treaties, p. 307 — Petitions, p. 307 — Membership of Parliament, p. 307 — Committees, p. 307 — Procedure without report, p. 307 — Decision on early vote, p. 308 — Urgent procedure, p. 308 — Refugees in South China Sea — Kampuchea — Incident between Vietnamese and Thai troops, p. 308 — Human rights in Argentina, p. 315 — Fresh lemons, p. 316 — Fish stocks, p. 316 — Areas under vines, p. 320 — Voting time, p. 321 — Committees, p. 337 — Membership of Parliament, p. 337 — ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly, p. 337 — Next part-session, p. 337 — Minutes, p. 337 — Adjournment, p. 337

*Resolutions adopted at sittings of 7 to 11 July 1980 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 197 of 4. 8. 1980*

## SITTING OF MONDAY, 7 JULY 1980

1. Resumption of the session . . . . .	2	<i>Mr Davignon; Mr Seal; Mr Davignon</i> . . . . .	14
2. Membership of Parliament — Verification of credentials . . . . .	2	<i>Procedural motion: Mr Spicer</i> . . . . .	15
3. Membership of committees . . . . .	2	<i>Mr Beazley; Mr Davignon; Mr Key; Mr Davignon; Mr Martin; Mr Pannella; Mr Davignon</i> . . . . .	15
4. Petitions . . . . .	2	<i>Procedural motions: Mr Hume; Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	16
5. Documents received . . . . .	2	<i>Question No 5 by Mr Capanna: Use of the EEC appropriations for the earthquake area in Friuli, Italy:</i>	
6. Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council . . . . .	2	<i>Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Capanna; Mr Natali</i> . . . . .	17
7. Withdrawal of a motion for a resolution . . . . .	2	<i>Question No 6 by Mrs Cinciari Rodano: Meeting of the Council of Education Ministers:</i>	
8. Urgent procedure . . . . .	2	<i>Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission; Mrs Nielsen; Mr Jenkins; Mr Normanton; Mr Jenkins; Mr Megahy; Mr Jenkins; Mr Bøgh; Mr Jenkins; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Jenkins, Mr Van Aerssen; Mr Jenkins</i> . . . . .	18
9. Order of business: <i>Mr Pannella; Mr Blaney; Mr Fanti (COM); Mr D'Angelosante; Mr Pannella; Mr von der Vring; Mr Pannella; Mr Glinne</i> . . . . .	3	<i>Question No 7 Mr Newton Dunn: Fishing: Mr Jenkins; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Jenkins; Mrs Ewing; Mr Jenkins; Mr Spicer; Mr Jenkins; Mr Harris; Mr Jenkins</i> . . . . .	20
10. Speaking time . . . . .	7	<i>Question No 8 by Mr Boyes: Spanish steel: Mr Davignon; Mr Boyes; Mr Davignon; Mr Bonde; Mr Davignon</i> . . . . .	21
11. Deadline for tabling amendments; <i>Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	7	<i>Procedural motion: Mr Normanton</i> . . . . .	22
12. Procedure without report . . . . .	8	<i>Question No 9 by Mr Patterson: Year of the disabled:</i>	
13. Electronic voting system . . . . .	8	<i>Mr Vredeling; Mr Patterson; Mr Vredeling; Mr Enright; Mr Vredeling; Mr Hume; Mr Vredeling; Miss Brookes; Mr Vredeling; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Vredeling</i> . . . . .	22
14. Decision on urgency: <i>Mr Hänsch; Mr Johnson; Mr Klepsch (EPP)</i> . . . . .	8	<i>Question No 10 by Mr Romualdi: Attacks on Libyan refugees in Community countries: Mr Jenkins</i> . . . . .	24
15. Action taken on the opinions and proposals of Parliament <i>Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Kirk; Mr Adams; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Natali; Mr Sherlock; Mr Natali; Mr Kirk; Mr Natali; Mr Patterson; Mr Kirk; Mr Natali, Mr Kirk; Mr Scott-Hopkins</i> . . . . .	9	<i>Question No 11 by Mr Tyrrell: Exports of butter to Russia:</i>	
16. Question time (Doc. 1-287/80): <i>Questions to the Commission of the European Communities:</i> . . . . .	11	<i>Mr Jenkins; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Jenkins; Mr Hord; Mr Jenkins; Mr Seligman; Mr Jenkins; Mr Harris; Mr Jenkins; Mr Norman-ton</i> . . . . .	24
<i>Question No 1 by Lord Douro: VAT on bloodstock:</i> <i>Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission; Lord Douro; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Turner; Mr Tugendhat</i> . . . . .	11	18. <i>Development of a coordinated air traffic control system — Report by Mr Janssen van Raay on behalf of the Committee on Transport (Doc. 1-274/80)</i>	
17. <i>Question No 2 Mr Seligman: Arab Telecommunications Satellite Project (ARAB-SAT):</i> <i>Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mr Seligman; Mr Davignon</i> . . . . .	12	<i>Procedural motion: Mr Pannella; Mr Moreland; Mr Moorhouse; Mr Seefeld; Mr Berkhouwer; Mr Janssen van Raay, rapporteur; Mr Cottrell; Mr Pannella; Mr Herman; Mr Cardia</i> . . . . .	25
<i>Question No 3 by Mrs Ewing: Forecasting and assessment in the field of science and technology (FAST):</i> <i>Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission; Mrs Ewing; Mr Vredeling; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Vredeling; Mr Hutton; Mr Vredeling; Mr Seligman; Mr Vredeling; Mr Seal; Mr Vredeling</i> . . . . .	13	19. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i> . . . . .	27
<i>Question No 4 by Mr Seal: The EEC textile industry:</i>		<i>Annex</i> . . . . .	28

IN THE CHAIR: Mrs VEIL

4. *Petitions*

*President*

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

**President.** — The sitting is open

1. *Resumption of the session*

**President.** — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 27 June 1980.

2. *Membership of Parliament — Verification of credentials*

**President.** — The French authorities have informed me of the appointment on 1 July 1980 of Mr Doublet as a Member of the European Parliament to replace Mr Messmer.

I welcome our new colleague and remind the House that, pursuant to Rule 3(3) of the Rules of Procedure, a Member whose credentials have not yet been verified takes his seat provisionally in Parliament and on its committees with the same right as other Members.

At its meeting of 7 July 1980 the Bureau verified the credentials of Mr Vitale and Mr Fanton whose appointments have already been announced.

Pursuant to Rule 3(1) of the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau has established that these appointments comply with the provisions of the Treaties.

It therefore asks the House to ratify these appointments.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

3. *Membership of committees*

**President.** — I have received from the Communist and Allies Group a request for the appointment of Mr Vitale to the Committee on Agriculture, to replace Mr Papapietro.

Are there any objections?

The appointment is ratified.

**President.** — I have received ten petitions whose titles, together with the names of their authors, are set out in the minutes of this sitting.

These petitions have been entered under Nos. 34/80 to 43/80 in the General Register provided for in Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure and have been referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

The minutes also contain various decisions concerning these petitions.

5. *Documents received*

**President.** — Since the session was adjourned I have received from the Council, the Commission, the parliamentary committees and Members, various documents which are listed in the minutes of this sitting.

6. *Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council*

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

7. *Withdrawal of a motion for a resolution*

**President.** — Mr Pisani has informed me that he has withdrawn the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-800/79) which he and other colleagues had tabled on a new common agricultural policy.

8. *Urgent procedure*

**President.** — I have received from the Council a request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure in respect of a proposal for a regulation on the contribution of the United Kingdom to the general budget and of a proposal for a regulation concerning the financial mechanisms (Doc. 1-273/80).

The request is supported by the fact that the Council is due to discuss these proposals at its meeting on 22 July 1980.

**President**

I have also received from Mr Schieler and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Wawrzik and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group) and Mrs Agnelli and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, a motion for a resolution with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on aid to refugees in the South China Sea (Doc. 1-284/80).

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

I shall put these requests to the vote at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

**9. Order of business**

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

At its meeting of 19 June 1980 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda (PE 66.047/rev.), which has been distributed.

Having noted the various problems relating to the present part-session, the enlarged Bureau decided at its meeting this morning to propose the following changes in the agenda.

The deadline for tabling proposals for outright rejection of the new draft general budget of the European Communities for the 1980 financial year has been fixed at 10 a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday, 8 July.

The enlarged Bureau wishes to remind the House in this connection that requests to amend the proposals for outright rejection cannot be submitted in the form of amendments to these proposals and that they should take the form of a proposal for outright rejection.

Statements on the proposal for outright rejection will be made at 9 a.m. on Wednesday, 9 July and the vote will be taken at 3 p.m. on the same day.

Speaking Time for these statements has been allocated as follows:

- three minutes for the authors of the proposals (one author for each proposal)
- five minutes for each political group
- a total of five minutes for non-attached Members.

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Madam President, on which Rule did you base that decision: on Rule 28 or on some other provision of the Rules of Procedure?

**President.** — On the basis of Rule 28. As this case is not provided for in the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau decided to make this proposal to Parliament which may, of course, reject it.

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Madam President, if I have understood correctly, these documents are to be tabled on Tuesday, discussed at 9 a. m. on Wednesday and the vote then taken at 3 p. m. on the same day.

Since the length of speeches for items placed on the agenda for Tuesday and Wednesday is governed by Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure, I would draw your attention to the superfluous nature of your announcement and to the infringement of the Rules of Procedure which you are condoning.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, your statement has been noted. However, I should like to point out, that your group, which was represented at this morning's meeting, did not comment on the proposal.

Are there any further remarks?

That is agreed.

Secondly, at the request of the Committee on Transport, the enlarged Bureau proposes that the vote on Mr Janssen van Raay's report on aerial navigation (Doc. 1-274/80) be taken this evening. It would therefore be the last item on the agenda. If the vote cannot be taken this evening it will be taken at the normal time, i.e. during voting time on Wednesday.

Are there any remarks?

That is agreed.

Thirdly, the enlarged Bureau proposes that the debate on the Luster report (Doc. 1-448/80/corr.) on the amendments to the Rules of Procedure, scheduled for Wednesday, be placed on Tuesday's agenda after the statement by the Council.

I remind the House that the rapporteur already introduced his report in May and that the speaking time proposed for Tuesday's sitting should be divided by those concerned between the debate on the Council's statement and the debate on the Luster report since, as Mr Pannella has just pointed out, speaking time for Tuesday is governed by Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure.

I have received from Mr Blaney, Mr Pannella and Mr Bonde, on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members, a proposal pursuant to Rule 12 (2) of the Rules of Procedure, to amend the agenda, by

**President**

deleting the debate on the Luster report scheduled for Wednesday or, if this proposal is rejected, not to apply Rule 28 to the debate on the Luster report.

I call Mr Blaney.

**Mr Blaney.** — Madam President, my amendment consists of two proposals, the second of which depends on the outcome of the first. The first proposal is that the Luster report should be withdrawn. The reason why I feel this should be done is that we in the Technical Coordination Group and indeed many others over the last 12 months have been of the opinion, and indeed have said so time and again, that the Rules require a general rather than a piecemeal revision. This is in fact the third or fourth time that a great deal of our time has been taken up with this sort of piecemeal discussion. The present report is, if anything, less progressive than those that went before it and the 171 amendments from all parts of the House provide a clear indication of the general attitude of the House to that particular document. Furthermore, the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions has already embarked upon an overall revision. Consequently, there is little point in our tackling a series of minor points, if we only have to revise our decisions in the light of that Committee's proposals at a later date. If the House agrees that this item should be deleted then we shall be delighted. Strict application of Rule 28 as regards Wednesday's agenda would, indeed, be carrying things too far since the very size of the agenda, with the important programme speech of the President of the Council and the Luster report, would mean that the smaller groups would be obliged to devote what little speaking time they have to one single item. I feel that the bigger groups should not have it all their own way and that the backbenchers are being blackmailed by this procedure into keeping quiet on the Luster report if they want to speak on the more important topic of the economic situation to be dealt with in the speech by the President of the Council. I would therefore suggest that we delete the Luster report, in which event the second part of my amendment will fall.

However, if the Luster Report is to be debated, then my second proposal is that application of Rule 28 be waived in respect of Wednesday's agenda and another arrangement be adopted whereby time allocated would not be divided between the two issues.

**President.** — I call Mr Fanti.

**Mr Fanti.** — (*I*) Madam President, I wish to remind you of the position expressed by me on behalf of my Group at the Bureau meeting this morning. We consider it necessary to use all the time available to our Group for the discussion of the statement by the new President-in-Office of the Council, since we

consider that debate to be of great political importance. We have therefore indicated our opposition to a reduction of speaking time.

Other groups, for their part, have decided to give up some of the time available to them in order to enable the Luster report to be debated in the afternoon. We obviously have no objection to that. However, we should like the time allocated to the political groups to be divided up between all of them. We also need more speaking time because Mr D'Angelosante and Mr Chambeiron will need to speak in support of certain amendments which would otherwise lapse.

I am therefore asking that, in the case of our Group, the 25 minutes made available to it should be maintained and that a further 10 minutes should be allowed in order to enable our Group to indicate its position on the Luster report. This is what we requested earlier this morning at the Bureau meeting and I urge the group chairmen to agree accordingly.

**President.** — Mr Fanti, it was the need to find time for the motion to reject the budget and the explanations of vote which forced us this morning to make certain adjustments in the draft agenda. At the end of a long discussion a very large majority felt, even though they realised that the formula was not perfect, that the best course of action would be to wind up the debate on the Luster report — which was already debated in May — at the end of Tuesday's sitting.

I think what I have said accurately reflects what was said this morning. Those who do not agree with the enlarged Bureau's decision can support the request to delete the debate on the Luster report.

I call Mr Fanti.

**Mr Fanti.** — (*I*) Madam President, I am sorry to insist on this point but what you have just said corresponds exactly to what was said in the Bureau; but it is also true — and you must recognize this fact — that the position expressed by me has not been denied and that the time set aside for the Luster report is a result of the agreement by the other political groups not to speak on the statement by the President of the Council, thus allowing two hours speaking time for a debate on the Luster report in the afternoon.

Madam President, I am specifically asking — if this was not made clear enough this morning — for these two hours not to be divided up merely between the groups which agree not to speak in the morning but to be used for all the groups together; otherwise I should have to conclude that the Bureau has not adopted a correct position — and I cannot believe that this is the case.

Fanti

I therefore ask — and I insist on this point — that during the two and one half hours of the debate on the Luster report my Group should be allowed to speak in support of the amendments moved by us, failing which they are liable to lapse under the provisions of the Rules of Procedure. I therefore ask that a few more minutes be allowed to us to make our statements.

**President.** — Mr Fanti, there appears to be some misunderstanding. I do not think that the chairmen of the political groups intended to give up their speaking time in order to allow more time for the other groups. They simply felt that each group had sufficient time to discuss the Presidency's programme and the Luster report. Most of them indicated that they did not intend to keep much time for the Luster report and that most of their speaking time would be devoted to the debate on the new Presidency. The views you have expressed are those of the minority. However the majority clearly does not agree with you. In fact, Mr Fanti, you were the only one who expressed reservations — and indeed more than reservations — since you stated that you wished to use all your speaking time to discuss the Presidency's programme. If you object to the arrangements adopted by the majority, all you have to do is support Mr Blaney's proposal.

I call Mr D'Angelosante.

**Mr D'Angelosante.** — (I) Madam President, I think it right to say that no majority in the Bureau is entitled to require political groups in this Parliament to remain silent on amendments which would in effect prevent this Parliament from discussing important matters for ever. I think this is a delicate matter of principle and one which is vital to the very existence of a Parliament. I cannot understand how the Bureau, after itself establishing the length of speeches for tomorrow's sitting, because of the importance of the matters at issue, can then have seen fit to add, with no change in the speaking time, a subject of such central importance as the amendment of our Rules of Procedure in regard to decisive points relating to the independence of Members of this Parliament.

I therefore urge you, Madam President, and the group chairmen, to give serious thought to ways of preventing it from being said that certain decisive elements of parliamentary democracy have been eliminated from this Parliament and from our Rules of Procedure and that this end has been attained by preventing Members from speaking or by reducing their participation in the debate to nothing at all.

**President.** — On the contrary I believe that it is an expression of democracy to submit to Parliament for its approval a draft agenda drawn up by the Bureau after long discussion.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

The enlarged Bureau has not taken any decision, it has simply amended its earlier proposals. For the moment we are still dealing with proposals on which Parliament has yet to vote.

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Madam President, I want to point out for my own benefit — since there is no need to remind you — and for that of those colleagues who applauded your statement a moment ago that no majority is entitled to go against the fundamental rules of this Parliament. Just as this Parliament cannot violate the Treaties by virtue of which it has been established, so it cannot infringe its own constitution in the shape of its Rules of Procedure. To do so, as I myself habitually do, does not imply that we ourselves condone such violations.

Madam President, there is an old tenet of law which says: *ad impossibilia nemo tenetur*: or no-one is bound to do the impossible. You would like us tomorrow to adopt or explain in a few minutes, 117 amendments whereas in reality it would not even be possible to read out the titles of those amendments in the time allotted to us. If they cannot be explained they will merely lapse, and then we might just as well not even have tabled them.

That brings me to my first point: the enlarged Bureau has proposed a violation of the Rules and in doing so has taken a decision. A further remark: it is not true, I am sorry to say, that we have already debated the Luster report. It has merely been introduced by the rapporteur. Allow me to correct your statement: the report has merely been introduced, it has not been debated.

Madam President, a further important political point: tomorrow you are trying to make us choose between two essential institutional matters: the debate on the Council's policy which is a matter of central interest to us all, and the debate and vote on our own constitution. You are trying to make us participate in a truncated debate and above all — I say this for the benefit of those colleagues who prefer not to listen — in such a way that no member of the majority groups will be allowed to speak. I would ask my colleagues in this House to mark my words carefully: through this Luster report your own political groups are trying to gag you so that in future no Member of the Socialist Group, the Liberal Group, the Christian-Democratic Group or the Conservative Group will be able to get up and speak as they have in the past to explain their votes.

Madam President, quite apart from this set of juridical aberrances, we are being asked to discuss a report, the Luster report, which states that certain votes can in future only be taken by using the electronic voting system. Well, Madam President, if there is a mistake, a

**Pannella**

technical incident, what then? This position, whose underlying principle is totally unacceptable, can only result in technically aberrant proposals.

Madam President, I would stress that in any Assembly which took care to safeguard its rights, your proposal would be inadmissible and the majority in this House is now surpassing its authority and acting illegally. In practical and political terms you cannot require us to take part tomorrow in a debate on the Rules of Procedure during which it will not be possible to speak in support of 100 amendments, as the Rules require, because to do so we should need four times the number of minutes allocated to us. By using the Luster report as an excuse, you are seeking to prevent a debate on President Thorn's statement. I have made my points and I think they were important. Even if you have a numerical majority, no majority — as my colleague, Mr D'Angelosante, rightly said — is entitled to do violence to our rules as you are constantly calling on them to do.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, you have greatly exceeded your speaking time.

I put to the vote the first proposal by Mr Blaney to delete the debate on the Luster report.

The proposal is rejected.

I put to the vote the second proposal by Mr Blaney not to apply Rule 28 to the debate on the Luster report.

The proposal is rejected.

The enlarged Bureau proposes the following agenda for Wednesday:

- **Morning:**
- Statements on the proposals to reject outright the 1980 budget
- von Bismarck report on the economic situation (Doc. 1-228/80)

We have 2 ½ hours for this debate, allocated as follows:

- rapporteurs: ten minutes
- Commission: ten minutes
- Members: 120 minutes allocated as follows:
  - Socialist Group: 25 minutes
  - Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group): 24 minutes
  - Communist and Allies Group: 13 minutes
  - Liberal and Democratic Group: 12 minutes
  - Group of the European Progressive Democrats: 9 minutes

- Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members: 7 minutes

- Non-attached Members: 14 minutes

**3 p.m. to 7 p.m.:**

- Vote on the proposals to reject outright the 1980 budget and motions for resolutions on which the debate has closed.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

The enlarged Bureau also proposes to enter on Thursday's agenda a joint debate on the Peters report (Doc. 1-215/80) and Hoff report (Doc. 1-266/80) on the steel industry and an oral question with debate by the Committee on External Economic Relations to the Commission on relations between the EEC and the USA in the iron and steel sector (Doc. 1-296/80).

The author of the question will not be given priority in the debate and his speaking time will be included in the time allocated to his political group.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

Finally, in view of the fact that Thursday's agenda is overloaded, the enlarged Bureau proposes that only the chairman of the Committee on Budgets should make a statement in reply to the Commission's statement on the 1981 preliminary draft budget.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I call Mr von der Vring.

**Mr von der Vring.** — (D) Madam President, there is a tradition in this House that certain rules, even if they are unwritten, apply to the implementation of the agenda. Hitherto, at the end of each Friday's sitting in this Chamber we have fixed the time and place of the next part-session. At the June part-session we were irritated to find that this particular point had been advanced by several hours and the Members who wanted to speak on this matter were misled by this change. I therefore expressly request the Bureau to place the 'Dates of the next part-session' as the last item on Friday's sitting and to adhere to that arrangement in future; a fixed place should also be provided on the agenda for some other traditional points. For today's sitting I would find it sufficient for you to give an assurance that no such routine item will suddenly be moved to a different place on the agenda without good reason.



**President.** — Mr von der Vring, the question will be put to the enlarged Bureau at its meeting on Thursday.

Are there any further comments?

The order of business is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Madam President, I just wanted to add a comment and an objection. The agenda resulting from the joint exercise of responsibility by the enlarged Bureau and by our Assembly, is an agenda which prevents us from exercising our parliamentary rights — rights which we undertook to exercise when we stood as candidates.

Consequently I believe that I have been deprived of my rights and duties as a parliamentarian and I shall seek, during this part-session, to make it clear by every possible means to public opinion that we have been gagged. We as Members of Parliament have been gagged and I shall try to bring home to everyone that this gag exists.

I think that this agenda is creating a situation, Madam President, which is making our Parliament resemble a medieval court: what was not possible for a prime minister was possible for the court jester; ministers could do one thing and jesters something quite different: if necessary, we shall now ourselves be the jesters!

**President.** — Mr Pannella, I must point out that the draft agenda was drawn up by the enlarged Bureau in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, which you are so fond of quoting. The enlarged Bureau considered this draft agenda on two occasions, 19 June and again this morning. Even though he was present, the representative of the group to which you belong made no comment or put forward a precise and workable proposal for drawing up the draft agenda in a different way. We are bound by a certain number of constraints: to vote on the budget, to consider a certain number of urgent reports, to hold a political debate on the Council's statement and finally to consider the Luster report.

If your group had put forward a miracle proposal, we would have been most happy to hear it. It did not do so. We held a long discussion in accordance with democratic principles and we have proposed what, in view of the various constraints on us, is the best solution. The plenary sitting has just adopted it in accordance with the best democratic traditions.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the centre and on the right)*

I call Mr Glinne.

**Mr Glinne.** — (F) Excuse us, Madam President, if we have not followed you correctly but could you tell us whether the Prout report on consumer credit still stands on Thursday's agenda?

**President.** — I did not mention the report in view of the fact that, since it is on the agenda, there has been no modification. If the rapporteur or the chairman of the committee asks that it be withdrawn, it will have to be withdrawn. But for the moment, since I have no precise information on the matter, I did not mention the possibility.

#### 10. *Speaking Time*

**President.** — With the agreement of the enlarged Bureau, I propose to allocate speaking time — except for Wednesday — as set out in the draft agenda.

Are there any comments?

That is agreed.<sup>1</sup>

\*  
\* \*

#### 11. *Deadline for tabling amendments*

**President.** — I propose to fix the deadlines for tabling amendments for the present part-session at the times shown in the draft agenda.

Are there any objections?

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) One question, Madam President: it is now 5.45 p.m. Would it be too much to ask you to fix 6.30 or 7 p.m. today as the time limit for tabling amendments to the items entered on the agenda for Tuesday and Wednesday? Would that be a dangerous step to take, Madam President?

**President.** — All right, Mr Pannella, 7 p.m. today for items entered on the agenda for 7, 8 and 9 July.

<sup>1</sup>cf. Minutes

12. *Procedure without report*

**President.** — You will find in the minutes the title of the proposal from the Commission to the Council entered on the agenda of the present part-session for consideration without report, pursuant to Rule 27A of the Rules of Procedure. Unless a Member asks leave to speak or amendments are tabled to it before the opening of the sitting on Friday, 11 July 1980, I shall declare this proposal approved.

13. *Electronic voting system*

**President.** — I remind the House that voting cards have been distributed. In order to enable the voting to be conducted without difficulty this week, I ask Members who have not yet done so to collect their cards from Room 1138.

14. *Decision on urgency*

**President.** — The next item is the decision on the urgency of the motion for a resolution by *Mr Collins and others (Doc. 1-282/80): Development of better cooperation between Parliament and Council.*

I call Mr Hänsch to speak against the request for urgent debate.

**Mr Hänsch.** — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the motion tabled by Mr Collins, Mr Johnson and others, raises a number of important matters pertaining to relations between two institutions of the European Community. The subject of this motion, namely the development of improved cooperation between Parliament and the Council, is, however, also the subject of a report now being prepared by the Political Affairs Committee. I am myself the rapporteur and the report will be placed before Parliament later this year. Ladies and gentlemen, I believe that the limited time available for the work of the plenary session should not be taken up today by debates which will be taken very thoroughly only a few weeks later.

(Applause)

It is surely not the proper style for our parliamentary work to deal separately today with one item from a general report. This is an important motion, but surely not so urgent as to warrant rapid attention on Friday. Ladies and gentlemen, I appeal to you not to support this request for urgent procedure.

**President.** — I call Mr Johnson to speak in favour of the motion.

**Mr Johnson.** — Madam President, this motion calls on the Bureau and the enlarged Bureau to enter into immediate discussions with the Council with a view to improving the conciliation procedure. It calls upon the President of Parliament to report back to the House before or during the December part-session.

Now, of course, there will always be those — and they may even be on my own side of the House too — who, like the last speaker, say, let this matter be referred back to the appropriate committee. Of course, in the fullness of time the appropriate committee will refer it to the appropriate subcommittee and other committees will be asked for their advice. And a year or two from now, Madam President, we might have a chance of debating the matter. Sometime after that negotiations with the Council might get under way. Now, I believe the matter is much too important for that. Certainly it is more important and more germane than many other matters which this House has treated on Friday mornings over the last year.

This motion is signed — I think it is important to mention this — by the chairmen of no less than eight committees of this House and by the chairwoman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Women. It is signed by the chairman of the institutional subcommittee of the Political Affairs Committee, by the rapporteur of the Committee on Budgets and by a former Secretary-General of this Parliament.

What I am saying is this: after one year many of us feel that there is one major limitation on the work of this House, namely, that apart from the budget and certain trade matters many of the amendments passed in this Chamber are not even considered by the Council, let alone adopted. I can say quite frankly that in my own particular sphere — the environment field — many of our amendments do not receive so much as the time of day. This state of affairs, Madam President, cannot be allowed to continue. We need a better conciliation procedure; we need a better dialogue with the Council and the moment for the authorities of this Parliament to begin the dialogue with the Council is this year, not next. That is why, even though I recognize, as many of us do, I think, the limitations of Friday morning debates, it is worth entering this matter on the agenda for this week.

**President.** — I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group).

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) Madam President, I shall be very brief. I agree with Mr Hänsch.

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

The request for urgent debate is rejected.