

Annex

Official Journal of the European Communities

No 2-322

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1984-1985 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 11 to 15 February 1985

Europe House, Strasbourg

LIBRARY

Contents

Monday, 11 February 1985	1
Resumption, p. 1 — Agenda, p. 1 — Welcome, p. 4 — Hydrocarbons, p. 4	
Tuesday, 12 February 1985	11
Decision on urgency, p. 12 — Social Fund, p. 12 — Agricultural prices 1985/86, p. 23 — Formal sitting, p. 38 — Welcome, p. 43 — Question Time, p. 44 — Agricultural prices 1985/86 (continuation), p. 56 — Supplementary budget 1984 (Agricultural sector 1985), p. 60 — Votes, p. 65 — Supplementary budget 1984 (Agricultural sector 1985) (continuation), p. 66 — Annex, p. 71	
Wednesday, 13 February 1985	76
Decision on urgency, p. 77 — Supplementary budget 1984 (Agricultural sector 1985) (continuation), p. 78 — ERDF, p. 84 — Welcome, p. 90 — Integrated Mediterranean programmes, p. 91 — Welcome, p. 112 — Question Time (continuation), p. 112 — Provisional twelfths, p. 126 — Combating terrorism, p. 128 — Votes, p. 136 — Combating terrorism (continuation), p. 138 — Annex 'Question Time', p. 144	
Thursday, 14 February 1985	182
Minutes, p. 183 — Decision on urgency, p. 183 — Topical and urgent debate, p. 184 — Market in wine, p. 202 — Customs debate, p. 215 — Protocol extending to Brunei-Darussalam the Cooperation Agreement between the EEC, Indonesia and other members of ASEAN, p. 215 — Ratification of Torremolinos, p. 219 — Milk and milk products, p. 223 — Votes, p. 227 — Milk and milk products (continuation), p. 233 — Protection of workers, p. 234	
Friday, 15 February 1985	240
Votes, p. 240 — Food aid, p. 242 — Dairy sector, p. 247 — Mediterranean regions, p. 247 — Goods contained in travellers' personal luggage, p. 248 — Adjournment, p. 251	

NOTE TO READER

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

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

SITTING OF MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 1985

Contents

1. <i>Resumption of the session</i>	1	4. <i>Hydrocarbons — Report (Doc. 2-1331/84) by Mr Ippolito:</i>	
2. <i>Agenda:</i> <i>Mr Paisley; Mr Arndt; Mr Cottrell; Mrs Veil; Mr de la Malène; Mr Klepsch; Mr von der Vring; Mr Seal; Mr Arndt</i>	1	<i>Mr Ippolito; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Sälzer; Mr Turner; Mr Alavanos; Mr Fitzsimons; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mr Romualdi; Mr Tortora; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mrs Viehoff; Mr Narjes; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Kuijpers</i>	4
3. <i>Welcome</i>	4		

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

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

1. *Resumption of the session*

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 18 January 1985.¹

2. *Agenda*

President. — At its meeting of 15 January 1985 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed to Members.

At this morning's meeting the chairmen of the political groups asked me to propose a number of amendments to the House.

Tuesday:

¹ *Approval of Minutes — Membership of Parliament — Setting up of two committees of enquiry — Petitions — Written declarations (Rule 49) — Referral to committees — Documents received — Texts of Treaties forwarded by the Council — Membership of committees: see Minutes.*

After the report (Doc. 2-1333/84) by Mr Raggio, there will be a joint debate on a statement by Mr Andriessen on agricultural prices, the oral question (Doc. 2-1456/84) by Mr Pranchère on the same subject and the oral question (Doc. 2-1455/84) by Mr Woltjer on the superlevy.

However, I have received from Mr Dalsass and 22 other signatories a request that Mr Pranchère's oral question be withdrawn from the agenda on the grounds that this question has lapsed as a result of the fact that the Commission has presented its proposals on 31 January 1985.

Mr Paisley (NI). — Mr President, I wonder if we could have some light in these back rows of the Chamber?

President. — I shall have that attended to by the administration, Mr Paisley, and I hope that they will come up quickly with some way of throwing light on everything for us.

(Laughter)

I shall put Mr Dalsass's request therefore to the vote.

(Parliament agreed to the request)

Added on to the oral question (Doc. 2-1304/84) tabled by six political groups on expenditure in the agricultural sector will be an oral question by the Group of the European Right on the same subject.

President

We have also received from the European Democratic Group a request that an oral question by Mr Elles and others to the Commission on the net cost of enlargement be included in the aforementioned joint debate.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, under our Rules of Procedure we have a fixed rule concerning oral questions with debate, and that rule has not been adhered to. The whole thing does not hang together at all. The oral question by the Committee on Budgets concerns the 1984 supplementary budget and expected expenditure for 1985, whilst Mr Elles's oral question asks about the net cost or benefit to the European Community of accession by the two Iberian countries. The two things have nothing to do with each other. Combining the two would mean changing the proposal by the Budgets Committee on an extremely important subject. Furthermore, we in the House have not yet been provided with a translation of this oral question, and the enlarged Bureau has not had it in writing either. According to our Rules, therefore, you can only include it on the agenda if there are compelling reasons which explain why it has not previously been forthcoming. There were no such reasons!

I therefore resolutely voice my opposition to the inclusion of this oral question, in contravention of our Rules of Procedure, on today's agenda.

I also understood the Commission spokesman to say that the Commission will not be replying to the oral question until March. If this is so, then it cannot under the Rules of Procedure feature on the agenda for the February part-session! Consequently I agree with my Group that we ought to vote against including this oral question with debate on the agenda.

Mr Cottrell (ED). — Mr President, I speak in favour of having this matter dealt with. It strikes me as an extraordinary thing that Mr Arndt should suggest to this House that we should not — at what is, after all, an opportune moment — discuss what the costs of enlargement will be. Since so much of the Community's budget is consumed by agriculture, the burden of these costs will fall mainly upon the common agricultural policy. Mr Arndt may be specifically right in suggesting that the rule has not been strictly adhered to. However, Mr Arndt is always willing to see the rules in a slightly different way when it gives him an advantage.

The truth about this is that it does provide a very suitable opportunity indeed for this Parliament to discuss the costs of enlargement to include the two Iberian countries. This event — if we are to believe the fates — is no more than one year away. We have never discussed this subject so far. I am even more appalled to hear from Mr Arndt that the Commission does not propose to discuss it until March, by which time, of course, it will be extremely late in the day for Parli-

ment to have any influence on the matter at all. I do urge Mr Arndt therefore to change his mind and see the wisdom of having a preliminary discussion at this early opportunity on one of the most important topics to face the Community in this decade.

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* I too endorse the proposal. On many occasions we have considered the prospect of enlargement and each time, on behalf of my group, I have asked what the cost of enlargement would be. We have never had an answer, either from the Commission or from the Council. And yet it seems risky to me to go further without knowing what the cost is to be, especially now when everyone is talking about budgetary discipline and about limiting Community spending, particularly in the agricultural sector.

Parliament must know where we are going. Not because we want to veto enlargement, but because we need to plan for the costs it will entail. Let us not put the cart before the horse, as we are doing at present.

As regards procedure, I would point out that under our Rules the President of Parliament is perfectly at liberty to submit a resolution which has not been included on the agenda, as he has in fact done. It is then up to the plenary sitting to decide whether it shall feature on the agenda or not.

President. — It is not for me obviously to give any view on the substance of the matter. However, since Mr Arndt has taken his stand on the principle of respect for the Rules of Procedure, I must point out to him by way of reply that Rule 42(2) provides as follows:

In urgent cases, the President may propose directly to Parliament that a question which could not be placed before the enlarged Bureau under the foregoing conditions be placed on the agenda.

I felt that it was my duty to do this.

(Parliament rejected the request)

Mr de la Malène (RDE). — *(FR)* Mr President, we have just done two things. At the request of the Group of the European People's Party we have voted to withdraw Mr Pranchère's question on farm prices, and we have rejected the European Democratic Group's proposal to add a question on the cost of enlargement. Do you think the agenda proposed for Tuesday will be full enough to allow intelligent use to be made of the day?

President. — As you know, Mr de la Malène, we shall be hearing the statement by Mr Andriessen on agricultural prices, which is normally followed by questions for half an hour. The questions could even go on for a little longer.

President

After that we shall have the oral question with debate by Mr Woltjer and others on the statement by the Ministers for Agriculture of Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom on the date of collection of the superlevy.

Then we shall have the oral question with debate, tabled by virtually all the political groups and addressed to the Commission, on actual expenditure under the 1984 supplementary budget and prospects for actual expenditure in the agricultural section in 1985, and do not forget that all these matters come after the Raggio report, which keeps its place at the head of the agenda.

I feel therefore, Mr de la Malène, that you need have no fear that our agenda will turn out to be too light. Having said that, however, I do appreciate the zeal that prompted your remarks.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, on behalf of my Group I should like to propose a motion under Rule 40(2). We are talking here of Commissioner Andriessen's statement and the half-hour provided for any questions arising out of it. Because of it, and my Group voted in favour, we have withdrawn Mr Pranchère's question from the agenda. But with reference to Rule 40(2) we believe it would be desirable and feasible to add a further half-hour to the existing half-hour, so that the groups can have a chance of stating their positions briefly on the broad lines of Commissioner Andriessen's statement. I thus request that we add to the 30-minute question period a further half-hour for initial general reactions by the groups.

President. — Mr Klepsch, after Mr Andriessen's statement there will be a joint debate which will include the oral question with debate by Mr Woltjer and others on the superlevy. In this joint debate there is no limitation on speaking time, so that this will give the groups an opportunity to state their views.

Wednesday:

Added to the agenda would be an oral question with debate by the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning to the Commission on integrated Mediterranean programmes and a report by Mr Curry and Mr Fich, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on provisional twelfths.

The Newman report on the ERDF, which was not adopted in committee, has been withdrawn from the agenda.

In order to enable Mr Delors, President of the Commission, to speak in the debate on integrated Mediterranean programmes, it is proposed to organize the agenda as follows:

— possibly, continuation of Tuesday's agenda,

- De Pasquale report on the ERDF (Doc. 2-1544/84),
- joint debate on three oral questions on integrated Mediterranean programmes (Docs. 2-1457/84, 2-1591/84 and 2-1458/84),
- report by Mr Curry and Mr Fich on provisional twelfths (Doc. 2-1550/84),
- oral questions on combating terrorism (Docs. 2-1451/84/rev. II and 2-1452/84/rev.).

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, I have heard that the Commission President proposes to make a statement on the integrated Mediterranean programmes in connection with this oral question, but that this is scheduled for Wednesday afternoon. Has the order been changed?

President. — It will be towards the end of the morning sitting, Mr von der Vring.

Thursday:

The report by Mr Wolff on the Community loan mechanism, which was not adopted in committee, has been withdrawn from the agenda.

Added to the end of the agenda is the report (Doc. 2-1568/84) by Mr Cassidy, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, on goods in travellers' personal luggage.

(The President read the list of requests for urgent procedure)¹

Mr Seal (S). — Mr President, you have just announced that the report by Mr Wolff on Community loans has been taken off the agenda. As I understand it, you are now saying that the Council is asking that this same item should be considered for urgent procedure and that we will be voting on the request tomorrow. Is that correct?

President. — Parliament will be asked to decide on this request at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, I would ask you at least to consider this question. The Committee on Budgets is to examine the provisional twelfths at its meeting today. We propose that the committee's report be placed on the agenda for Wednesday so that we can, if appropriate, vote on it that same evening at 6 p.m., for if I am not mistaken we need 218 votes for

¹ See Minutes.

Arndt

it to be approved, and the groups will have to see to it that we can get these 218 votes together.

President. — Mr Arndt, I shall repeat what I have already said; perhaps I did not make myself quite clear. It is proposed to add the report by Mr Curry and Mr Fich on provisional twelfths to Wednesday's agenda immediately after the oral question on integrated Mediterranean programmes.

(Parliament adopted the draft agenda thus amended)¹

3. Welcome

President. — I now have the very pleasant duty of welcoming, on behalf of Parliament, a delegation from the Irish Parliament who have just taken their seats in the Official Gallery.

(Applause)

4. Hydrocarbons

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 2-1331/84) by Mr Ippolito, on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-340/84 — COM(84) 273 final) for a decision adopting a research and development programme for the optimization of the production and utilization of hydrocarbons 1984-1987.

Mr Ippolito (COM), rapporteur. — *(IT)* Mr President, the research and development programme for the optimization and utilization of hydrocarbons 1984-1987 is of considerable scientific interest, even though it was not possible to include it as an urgent and priority programme because of the Community's financial circumstances which meant that adequate funds could not be earmarked for the purpose. The state-owned and private oil companies, however, are already devoting sizeable resources to this matter.

To my mind the value of the programme lies in the fact that, whilst the oil companies are all operating in their own individual interest here and keeping their findings quiet, a research programme financed even partly by the Community would enable all the companies to learn the findings of the others and thus achieve a significant improvement in the production of hydrocarbons and in research in the field.

Personally, I have indicated my own doubts in comparing this programme with the financial circumstances of our Community, which I have already alluded to. But since the Energy Committee voted by a large majority to adopt the proposal, I have, as rapporteur for the committee, accepted their vote, subject to just one or two conditions: specifically, I have pressed for sizeable cooperation by the oil companies and industries concerned to ensure that the Community's contribution should represent only a small part of the total cost of the research; I would also urge that no priority be given to that part of the programme which concerns the utilization of heavy oil fractions and the adaptation of engines, since this lies outside the scope of the research and exploitation of resources for which this programme was designed. In fact, having a programme as vast as this with very little money to back it would simply make those funds inadequate.

Nevertheless I have drawn up the report and the resolution, incorporating a number of these reservations in the explanatory statement, and in the text of the resolution we are to vote on I have called on the Commission to make use of the financial means provided by the major oil companies and to involve the national organizations in the sector. I have also asked that use should be made not only of the management committees provided for in the rules currently in force but also of the opinions of advisers who are experts on the various specific subjects of this programme. I have also asked that the approval of this programme should not lead to the cutting back of funds for other research and development programmes which should, in my view, take priority.

With these reservations, and with the proviso that no priority should be given to that part I have mentioned, I believe that the Commission's programme may be approved and that this research ought to be carried out so that, I repeat, the findings currently available only to a small number of oil companies can be shared by a wider international community. This would certainly improve research on and use of hydrocarbons throughout the sector.

A number of amendments have been tabled by members of the Socialist Group, amendments which could more usefully have been put forward at the committee stage rather than at this late stage before the Chamber. These amendments are aimed essentially at destroying the programme, and I am thus obliged to reject them *en bloc*. If there are political groups which do not wish to approve the programme, they can vote against the resolution — full stop — without trying to render it meaningless by all these amendments which waste voting time and do not help to clarify the matter.

Having said this, Mr President, I have nothing more to add. I shall, however, be happy to answer any queries anyone may wish to put to me on the matter.

Mrs Viehoff (S). — *(NL)* Mr President, in recent years the European Community has made considera-

¹ *Deadline for tabling amendments — Speaking time: see Minutes.*

Viehoff

ble progress in the field of research and development. We have managed to bring about true European programmes.

Two years ago we devoted much energy to implementing the pluriannual action programme. This was very necessary because up to that time nothing but *ad hoc* decisions had constantly been taken. This pluriannual programme specifically included criteria for the evaluation of programmes at European level. This action programme and the criteria contained in it came into being at the initiative of the Socialists and was already approved by Parliament in 1983. It will certainly make for a greater diversification of energy sources so that dependence on one specific energy provider can be reduced and, in addition, energy savings and more rational use of energy can be encouraged.

The criteria for the proposed programme are, essentially, that it must cover new topics which are large in scope, can only be covered on a Community basis and which have a European dimension. This Commission proposal is, however, the very antithesis of these criteria as set out in the pluriannual programme. The European Parliament and the Council are of one mind as regards these criteria, and the Commission is having the greatest difficulty in justifying the proposal.

Why then add this programme? One may wonder whether a research programme totalling 35 million ECU, since cut by the Council on 19 December last to 15 million ECU, can do anything useful. Especially as the research programme is superfluous in that the big companies are perfectly able to finance and carry out such programmes themselves. There is no reason at all for the Community to finance one.

If I measure the Commission's proposals against the criteria in the action programme, I have to say that they do not meet them. The research programme offers nothing new; it covers no topic which is large in scope and it has no European dimension. I must also point out that such programmes are also already being carried out at national level, and we should investigate whether it is not better for these programmes to be financed by the industry itself. The bigger companies are certainly in a position to. In the Netherlands Shell and Esso make extra profits totalling thousands of millions simply because the gas price is linked to the oil price, and I should think those companies are laughing themselves silly at a programme valued at 15 million. The Community should be able to play a purely coordinating role here, for national programmes need to be coordinated, as Mr Ippolito himself has said.

I should like to remind the House, furthermore, that this programme is to be part of the non-nuclear research programme. As I have just said, the European Parliament approved this programme in 1983. In the meantime the funds for this non-nuclear research programme have been slashed by half as a result of the

current passion for thrift. This programme concentrates on research to develop energy from biomasses, sun and wind, energy saving and new methods for the use of coal. We want to be consistent and not support research which is superfluous and already being done, at the expense of the important non-nuclear research programme which has suffered too many cutbacks.

You will find these arguments reflected in our amendments, and if you read Mr Ippolito's report you will find, in the resolution and in the explanatory statement, the same reasoning that I have just outlined. Nevertheless, we come to a different conclusion. And it is no secret that a number of Member States share the views of my Group. Whilst paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution feels that the Commission proposal may be approved, we reject it in its present form because the whole approach is wrong. And I can say that my Group will be voting against the report unless our amendments are adopted.

Another word in reply to Mr Ippolito, who said that the Socialist Group should have tabled its amendments earlier, at the committee meeting. I find that an unfair reproach. Mr Ippolito also knows that last month it was requested that this Commission proposal should be treated as a matter of urgency, so that as a result the matter went through the committee very fast without any opportunity for amendments at the committee stage.

I trust that my arguments will also convince the other Members of the House.

Mr Sälzer (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. Mr Ippolito, the rapporteur, has already made clear, and Mrs Viehoff has further made clear, that this Commission proposal is one which certainly raises a variety of critical questions. I should like emphatically to endorse Mr Ippolito's position in viewing this project initially extremely critically, to the point of rejecting it, but then deciding to approve it after weighing the various pros and cons of such a programme. I would like to assure him that my Group has weighed the pros and cons with him and will vote in favour of his report.

No one would contend that the sums made available here by the Commission are in any way comparable to the considerable funds which the oil companies themselves have to spend on exploration and exploitation. I also believe — and there I disagree slightly with Mrs Viehoff — that this programme never aspired or intended to compete with them in this way. This programme can only be meaningful if it is seen as an honest broker, available to the individual national and sometimes state-owned oil companies at Community level for the purpose of better coordination. This is all that a programme of this kind can do and all this programme seeks to do.

Sälzer

I believe that an attempt of this kind to provide a little more coordination between the various companies should at all events be made, especially as the funds to be made available are in no way generous enough to threaten other projects to be funded out of our research budget. To this extent Mrs Viehoff's reservations are doubtless correct in principle, but not necessarily justified as regards the scope of this programme.

I should like to comment on two more points in Mr Ippolito's report. Firstly, we agree with him that it is a good idea to draw on the expertise of as many independent research organizations as possible. But we do not agree that it would be desirable to form a further committee at Community level.

I would remind Parliament that last year in a very wide-ranging report we managed to prune this proliferation of research and technology committees and that the Commission is now — I trust — gradually cutting them back. It will be reporting to us on its progress.

So if we now call for an additional committee, this would be counter-productive in terms of our own position of principle, because we started from the premise that the number of committees should be kept as small as possible if they were to be effective.

To sum up, I would repeat that we agree with and shall vote in support of Mr Ippolito's appraisal of the pros and cons of a programme of this kind and that we shall endorse his position by rejecting all the amendments, with the exception of Mr Turner's amendment and Amendment No 10 by Mr Adam and Mrs Viehoff on which we have no opinion. But for the reasons I have just given — of wishing to avoid the creation of further administrative committees — we shall also vote against paragraph 2 of Mr Ippolito's motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

Mr Turner (ED). — Mr President, I very largely agree with both the last speakers in only being able to raise half a cheer for this programme. It is, of course, always important to bring in industry, as is done here, with a shared cost programme. It is most important, and we must always emphasize the need, to cooperate with the experts in industry rather than to rely upon management committees which are simply the tools of the 10 Member States. Therefore, I tend to agree with what Mr Sälzer said about paragraph 2 of the resolution — I had read it slightly differently. I think he is probably right in saying that it is giving approval to the present system of management committees, and I could not agree with that. When Mr Sälzer says he does not want another layer of committees, I entirely agree. Nonetheless, we do need to have a mechanism for selecting the actual projects which uses the expertise of industry and not simply of management com-

mittees. I do not say that would result in an extra layer, it can be done without it very successfully — in ESPRIT, for instance, where you bring in industry without setting up an enormous bureaucracy.

Now as to priority for this proposal, we all agree it is of low priority in view of the great shortage of money when one compares it with ESPRIT, for instance, or with BI-ESPRIT, which is not yet off the ground. This is of low priority and the reason for it is this: the oil industry is already well geared to its problems. It is not a European industry which is lagging behind that in America and Japan, and therefore we do not have the same incentive to bring European industry together.

I am very glad that Mr Sälzer will support my amendment concerning the work on engines and oil, because it is, I think, very important. It is the one area perhaps where industry will not rise to the occasion and do the necessary research. It is not the oil companies' side of the job, but the users' side. It is they who probably need bringing together by the EEC so that they can cooperate to find ways of using the heavier fractions and the vacuum bottoms. I look forward to seeing the producers' solution to that problem. But the people who will benefit from the solution to vacuum bottoms, heavy fractions and better engines are not already at this present time working together to find a solution — and I do not believe the oil companies are doing it for them. That is where we need guidance. I very much agree with what Mr Sälzer said: in certain respects the Commission can act as the guide for industry — and this is one of them. I must confess that when one talks about looking for catalysts and geological formations and about work on them and on the mechanics of fluids and that sort of thing, which are very much the concern of the oil companies themselves, there, I think, the need is much less great.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, in our country too it is felt in certain quarters that the Community should support non-nuclear energy programmes for the reason that they give better results and give them more quickly, not to mention the fact that they can be of benefit to all the Community's Member States.

Nevertheless, we cannot help feeling serious misgivings with regard to the Commission's proposal concerning a research and development programme for the optimization of the production and utilization of hydrocarbons. We share the view expressed just now by Mrs Viehoff on behalf of the Socialist Group. Programmes of this kind only subsidize the large monopolistic oil companies. We also feel that the Commission's proposal is not sufficiently clear about the kind of programmes it has in mind or the conditions under which they will be carried out. It does not provide the necessary guarantees nor does it face up to the question — an important one to our way of thinking — of how the Member States are to reap the benefits of the

Alavanos

programmes. For these reasons the Greek Communist Party Members will not support this proposal, especially if the amendments tabled by Mrs Viehoff are not adopted.

Mr Fitzsimons (RDE). — Mr President, the increased production and utilization of hydrocarbons has proved to be a highly scientific and technical matter of great interest in itself, especially for the Community which suffers from a too heavy dependency on imports of hydrocarbons.

The Commission's programme has to be comprehensive and long-term. Its efficiency cannot be measured in the short term. That is why, in my opinion, the research and development programme on hydrocarbons must be kept as such because of the special nature of the programme itself.

The idea behind this research programmes lies in the fact that hardly 30 or 40% of the sources of oil and gas in the Community and in the world are exploited. Up to now it has not been possible to extract the major part of the existing quantities of hydrocarbons.

The example of Ireland is important here. Both parts of Ireland are heavily dependent on imported fuels and particularly on oil. The provision of Kinsale gas to Northern Ireland would have ensured a future for its 13 gas undertakings and avoided the public expenditure incurred in closing down the gas industry at a cost of some 100 million pounds sterling and the loss of some 100 000 jobs. A second source of natural gas would, if discovered, create a more secure supply situation for the country as a whole. The Community could assist the development of the lignite deposits at Lough Neagh in County Antrim where there is an exploitable reserve of 100 million tonnes or the equivalent of a medium-sized oil field.

Our particular concern is the development of offshore resources, the exploitation of many fields. The Community can greatly assist our efforts at a technical level in the area of oil and gas. This is essential if we are to have a commercial proposition. We will find small pockets of oil and gas, and it is in the interests of the Community to help us exploit these finds. We cannot afford the enormous capital needed for the use of multi-million pound rigs. The Community's research programme must help us to devise inexpensive methods of extracting oil and gas. The use of computer techniques and specially designed ships equipped to be stationed over small fields is one proposal. Another is the use of a template system. We must also have Irish people who are technically qualified; otherwise the multinationals will take us to the cleaners. They will try to convince us that the costs are enormous. We must be able to monitor the multinationals and be more than capable of working with them.

The EEC is the catalyst, but the funds for non-nuclear research are paltry. There will be no optimization of

production and utilization of hydrocarbons with an increase in available funds or a rearrangement of the shares. It is plain, therefore, that something must be done. We must improve our technologies and we have to know how best to use them. The large-scale research programme proposed by the Commission responds to this demand.

Of course, the oil companies and the refining industries are constantly dealing with these problems, but in the short term only to ensure a good return for their investment. Basically the research programme and the activities of the industries are complementary. The Community programme will give a scientific and long-term basis to the programme of the industries concerned. I would like to point out too that national research programmes are scarce, insufficient and piecemeal. Some Member States of the Community carry on such programmes, others do not. A Community programme will coordinate better all these separate programmes and strengthen the European scientific potential. If we achieve the objectives of the proposed programme, there is no doubt that the Community as a whole will profit from it, leading to a more efficient exploitation and better use of hydrocarbons which will enable the Community to reduce significantly its heavy dependency on imports. The EDA Group therefore approves of the Commission's programme and will vote for the Ippolito report.

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC). — (DE) Programmes and the implementation of programmes to improve our knowledge of hydrocarbon deposits, as well as the refining of procedures for the better exploitation of deposits, must in principle be regarded as desirable, but only if enough money is available without taking any from the already meagre funds earmarked for the non-nuclear programme. This is a most important point.

The improvement and further development of secondary and tertiary processes for better exploitation of known hydrocarbon deposits may be particularly valuable in helping the European Community to cover more of its own needs. Research into the utilization of heavy oil fractions, which will be playing a more significant role in future, would only appear to be desirable if such work were to concentrate on the reduction of pollutant emissions.

Extreme caution should also be brought to bear on efforts to use tar sands and oil shale as sources of hydrocarbons. We have as yet no comprehensive view of the environmental damage caused by the mining and processing of these substances. We should therefore insist that any industrial mining of these formations is always preceded by an estimate of the technical implications. We must also insist — especially as our funds really are low — that a breakdown of costs is drawn up which shows clearly beforehand the proposed percentage involvement of the industrial companies.