

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 2-321

LIBRARY

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1984-1985 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 14 to 18 January 1985

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Sitting of Monday, 14 January 1985	1
Resumption of the session, p. 1 — European Music Year, p. 1 — Agenda, p. 2 — Introduction of the new Commission, p. 3	
Sitting of Tuesday, 15 January 1985	12
Minutes, p. 13 — Decision on urgency, p. 13 — Introduction of the new Commission (Debate), p. 14 — Votes, p. 40 — Radioactive waste, p. 44 — Controlled thermonuclear fusion, p. 55 — Action taken on the opinions of Parliament, p. 57 — Question Time, p. 58 — Annex, p. 73	
Sitting of Wednesday 16 January 1985	78
Minutes, p. 80 — Decision on urgency, p. 81 — Controlled thermonuclear fusion (continuation), p. 82 — Tax and excise duty, p. 88 — Raising of capital, p. 92 — Tax arrangements for undertakings, p. 97 — Italian Presidency, p. 104 — Topical and urgent debate (motions), p. 114 — Italian Presidency (continuation), p. 115 — Question Time, p. 141 — Annex 'Question Time', p. 156	
Sitting of Thursday 17 January 1985	182
Minutes, p. 183 — Verification of credentials, p. 184 — Topical and urgent debate, p. 184 — Dairy quotas, p. 206 — Accession of Spain and Portugal, p. 216 — Provisional twelfths, p. 222 — Tax arrangements for undertakings (continuation), p. 226 — Votes, p. 228 — Foodstuffs, p. 231 — Aid to non-associated developing countries, p. 233 — Management of food aid, p. 236 — Termination of the service of officials of the Communities, p. 239	
Sitting of Friday 18 January 1985	246
Minutes, p. 246 — Votes, p. 246 — Adjournment, p. 248	

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, 14 JANUARY 1985

Contents

1. <i>Resumption of the session</i>	1	<i>Mr Bocklet; Mr Sutra; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Gatti; Mr Gautier; Mr Tuckman; Mr Welsh</i>	2
2. <i>European Music Year</i>	1		
3. <i>Order of business</i>		4. <i>Introduction of the new Commission</i>	3

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 14 December 1984.¹

2. *European Music Year*

President. — Before approaching the subjects entered in the agenda, I should like to say a word about the European Music Year, which begins this month.

As we advance together along the road leading to the unification of Europe, we come across numerous obstacles of an economic or political nature. We can strengthen our convictions and our resolve by turning our minds to the sources of European unity that are to be found in the realms of the mind, the realm of cul-

ture. We are the heirs of a common civilization which, in the course of centuries, has found expression in works of art and scientific discoveries which have enriched the heritage of humanity as a whole.

Among our common resources, one of the most authentic and most viable is undoubtedly that of music. This has prompted our Parliament, on the basis of a report by Mr Hahn, and in conjunction with the Council of Europe, to proclaim the year 1985, during which the third centenary of the birth of three great European composers, Bach, Handel and Scarlatti, will be celebrated, European Music Year.

The fact that a thousand or so different activities have already been envisaged to mark this occasion augurs well of its success. On Wednesday next, the European Parliament itself, on the initiative of Lady Elles, is organizing a concert at the Pavillion Joséphine in which not only Strasbourg musicians but also the Youth Orchestra of the Community will be taking part.

It is my hope that, through the mediums of music, our fellow-citizens will become more profoundly aware of the possibility of communicating with one another over and above national differences. With this hope in mind, and on behalf of this Parliament, whose vocation it is to incarnate the European spirit, I officially open European Music Year.

(Applause)

¹ For items concerning approval of the Minutes, petitions, written declarations under Rule 49, reference to committee, withdrawal of a motion for a resolution, authorization of reports, documents received and membership of Parliament, see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

3. Order of business

President. — At its meeting of 11 and 12 December 1984, the enlarged Bureau drew up a draft order of business, and this has been distributed.

At this morning's meeting, the chairmen of the political groups authorized me to put to the House a number of proposed modifications.

(The President read out the modifications proposed to the agendas of Monday, Wednesday and Thursday)¹

I have received a request, bearing 21 signatures, that the report on the wine market, drawn up by Mr Gatti on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, listed as Item 315, be withdrawn from the agenda and sent back to committee.

Mr Bocklet (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, the Gatti report deals with the proposals on the wine market put forward by the Commission before the Dublin Summit. Consequently, the results of the Dublin Summit were not taken into account in this document. The Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food feels that Parliament would be giving up its right to be heard on the decisions of the Dublin Summit if we were to deliver our opinion on what the Commission submitted before the Dublin Summit. We are therefore asking that this report be sent back to the committee to enable it to present to Parliament a report taking account of the Dublin decision so that Parliament in turn can deliver its opinion on the current situation of the organization of the wine market.

Mr Sutra (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, I am somewhat surprised by what Mr Bocklet has just said, since this is something which we have already debated in the Committee on Agriculture. The Committee on Agriculture took a decision and a vote. It decided to examine Mr Gatti's report; which it has done. Mr Bocklet was present. Moreover, Mr Gatti is in a position to deliver his report on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, which adopted it.

I do not understand why this procedural debate is being reopened now. All the arguments were put to the Committee on Agriculture. We decided that this report should be taken now so that we can deliver our opinion, after the Dublin compromise, on the wine market and the position and the wishes of Parliament can be communicated to the Council of Agriculture Ministers.

The Committee on Agriculture voted in favour of this. Mr Gatti is the committee rapporteur. I do not understand why we are reopening in plenary session, using

the same arguments, a debate which has already taken place in the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr d'Ormesson (DR). — *(FR)* Mr President, on behalf of the Group of the European Right, I support Mr Bocklet's proposal. The Dublin Summit profoundly affected decisions taken earlier, and it would not be appropriate to discuss proposals overtaken by the text adopted in Dublin. I therefore support Mr Bocklet's proposal, and as soon as we have received the conclusions of the Dublin Summit on wine-growing, they will, I hope, be immediately referred to the Committee on Agriculture and to the Committee on Budgets for its opinion and we shall be able to debate them without delay on the floor of the House, since the Dublin decisions have had such a serious effect on the wine-growing situation, both in Italy and France.

Mr Gatti (COM), rapporteur. — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think it must be pointed out that the subject the House will have to debate concerns not only, as might seem from what Mr Bocklet and Mr d'Ormesson have said, the question of distillation, already discussed in Dublin. The Committee on Agriculture and, indeed, the Parliament, are called upon to express an opinion on other regulations which also form part of the measures the Community will have to take to deal with the difficulties besetting the wine market.

It has already been pointed out that the Committee on Agriculture has expressed itself in favour of Parliament's debating the matter precisely because it concerns not just one aspect of the problem but a whole number of measures. Above all, it is important, ladies and gentlemen, that the Parliament should express its views without delay: it is enough to remember that the only Community institution not to have had an opportunity so far of discussing the difficulties in the wine sector is precisely this Parliament. It is the only institution that has yet to express its views, and this it must do if the Council is not to take decisions without receiving Parliament's opinion — a procedure which various colleagues in the past have often justly deplored. It is really absurd, if I may say so, to ask that the matter be sent back to committee and to wait for the Council's decision. I think these arguments should persuade the Parliament to proceed to a debate during this part-session and to resume it during the part-session of February, by which time we shall have the other regulation on distillation. I am therefore clearly opposed to sending the matter back to committee.

(Parliament approved the request for reference to committee)

President. — I have received from the Council the following requests for the application of urgent procedure pursuant to Rule 57 of the Rules of Procedure.

(The President read out these requests)¹

¹ See Minutes.

¹ See Minutes.

Mr Gautier (S). — (DE) Mr President, if, as the agenda states, we are to vote tomorrow morning on the urgencies, it would clearly be advisable for the Commission to make a statement before we vote on the Beumer report on the VAT directive. At the December part-session, the Commission was requested to give its opinion in the light of the vote.

If the Commission does not tell us, until tomorrow afternoon, what it intends to do as a result of the vote in December, we shall not be able to vote on the request for urgent procedure tomorrow morning.

President. — We shall see tomorrow what can be done. We shall get in touch with the Commission on this matter.

Mr Tuckman (ED). — Mr President, in all you have said I have missed hearing about the Raggio report on the statistical basis for the Social Fund. This was something the committee to which I belong was very anxious to have debated this month. We had understood that this would be so. Could you let me know why it seems to be missing from the agenda?

President. — We have not received a formal request to include this report in the order of business. The matter was discussed this morning at the meeting of group chairmen, who considered that it should be entered on the agenda for February.

It so happens that during the February part-session we shall have to consider a number of reports concerning economic and social matters, including questions of regional policy, which form a coherent whole.

I think it would be better for the organization of our work to enter the Raggio report to which you are referring on the agenda for the February part-session.

Mr Welsh (ED), Chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. — Mr President, I would just like to point out that there was a formal request that the Raggio report be taken today. On behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, I must say that I find the reasons the chairmen gave pretty unconvincing.

President. — I really think, Mr Welsh, that the group chairmen's proposal is a reasonable one and that you will have more time to consider this report next month.

(Parliament adopted the order of business thus modified)¹

4. Introduction of the new Commission

The next item is the introduction of the new Commission of the European Communities.

We now come, ladies and gentlemen, to the essential item on today's agenda. I have the privilege of welcoming Mr Jacques Delors, President, and all the other Members of the new Commission.

(Prolonged applause)

We are deeply grateful to the Commission President for having agreed to put before this House the main lines of action envisaged by the body over which he now presides.

Mr Delors, President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in introducing itself at the beginning of its mandate, as you expressly desired it should, the Commission is fully aware of the importance of these two days. In this way it wishes to mark its political responsibility to the Parliament and engage with it in a frank dialogue and in a period of work that shall bring us nearer to that Europe that we all long to see.

As we see it, this collective act before the representatives of the citizen's Europe goes hand in hand with the individual act of loyalty performed by each Commissioner before the Court of Justice as symbolizing the Community as an entity in law.

Ladies and gentlemen, one Commission has gone, another has come. One four-year term has finished, another is about to begin. But neither the history of European integration, nor the Commission's rôle in it, can be appraised in terms of four-year cycles, particularly since the Commission, though essential, is not the only Community institution, and particularly since, as I will illustrate later, the institutional framework put in place by the Treaty of Rome has, to put it mildly, been operating less and less satisfactorily.

As I take over the baton from Gaston Thorn, as a new year begins, may I say that his Commission has left us a message of hope. Yes, a message of hope. Firstly, because it, and Gaston Thorn in particular, never relaxed their efforts to promote healthy awareness and remind us of 'what we are fighting for', or rather, 'why we must live and work together'. And there is no doubt that there is a new feeling abroad. Disenchantment with Europe is receding. Secondly, because Europe is, I hope, on the point of settling the family feuds which have literally paralysed it in recent years. It is not for me to say who deserves the credit for this, but I feel that the proposals put forward by the outgoing Commission, its constant reaffirmation of the original contract uniting us, did much to settle these disputes, which future historians will find laughable in the harsh light of contemporary challenges.

¹ For items concerning time-limits for tabling amendments and speaking-time, see Minutes.

Delors

So it is that a new Commission appears before you, imbued with intellectual humility and great political resolve. Personally, I am more aware of the humility. I have often wondered why the Community, with its committed and talented leadership, has never got off the ground; why it has failed to achieve the aims enshrined in the Treaty, aims on which there was a modicum of consensus; in short, why it has failed to bring about the economic, social and monetary integration which is vital to the advancement of our ten nations. Forgive me if I come up with a rather trite thought, born of experience: I believe that the engineers of European integration are fumbling not over what has to be done but rather over *how* to get about it. We can no longer blame the crippling weight of the crisis, the absence of political will or the inertia of national officialdom. We need to look further and, here again, there is a glimmer of hope: the European Council is now as anxious as this House to improve the performance of the institutions.

I know only too well that it is easier to raise applause by talking about exciting goals than about ways of achieving them. But 'there's the rub'. Empty talk is not enough.

How can we make the most of the new break in the clouds? I hesitate to go too far, for my exploratory talks in the capitals have revealed fundamental differences of opinion, mental reservations and varying interpretations of existing rules. But when all is said and done, the opportunity is there for the Community to take advantage of the favourable winds or, once again, let a opportunity slip by.

Make no mistake about it. While the world around us is in a state of flux, the powers of today regathering their strength and the powers of tomorrow flexing their muscles, Europe's credit is at stake, in the eyes of our own people, in the eyes of the superpowers, and in the eyes of the Third World.

Tell me, ladies and gentlemen, decide for yourselves: does Europe want to exist? Does it want to win respect?

Each of you here knows full well that it does. You have been elected by universal suffrage and are accountable for your actions to the people of Europe. But Europe's credit will have to be earned the hard way. It will depend on Europe's strength, on Europe's economic and financial power, on the example set by European society. I propose to outline an approach to you now, but I will return — if your enlarged Bureau agrees — to present to your March part-session the Commission's programme for the coming year. You will appreciate that this must be prepared by the Commission as a body and therefore will take a little time.

One may ask what I have in mind since I have been talking so much, and shall be talking, about ways and means. It is an approach to achieving consensus and

convergence of will, to acting and succeeding. This, and the search for greater credibility, are the essentials. It also means I shall have something to say about the functioning of the institutions and the decision-making process. In so doing I shall endeavour to clarify matters in a field where debate has been ambiguous and controversial, although everyone agrees that reform is urgently needed.

Europe's credibility.

The Members of this House have always been among the most active in our endeavours to make the Community a People's Europe. As a Member myself and chairman of the committee whose remit included the free movement of persons, goods, services and capital, I supported the efforts of all those who, quite rightly, took exception to the continued existence of substantial obstacles. To them, private individuals and businesses alike, Europe appeared — and still appears — like some kind of feudal state where barriers, customs posts, formalities and red tape proliferate. But now that the Heads of State or Government have decided to set an example, to throw their weight into the balance, to clear away all obstacles to free movement, whether hidden or visible, it may not be over-optimistic to announce a decision to eliminate all frontiers within Europe by 1992 and to implement it. That gives us eight years, the term of office of two Commissions.

(Applause)

We, for our part, are prepared to work towards that goal, in association with the Committee on a People's Europe, chaired by Mr Adonino.

If I may go into details at this early stage, the Council and Parliament have approved the programme for consolidating the internal market presented by the outgoing Commission. It must be put into effect as quickly as possible. It is up to us, now, to do it and to make our proposals for the next stage, together with the appropriate time-limits.

This, I believe, will meet a prime, indeed a vital, concern of yours, of which you have spoken. We should both like to see the people of Europe, your electors, enjoying the daily experience of a tangible Europe, a real Community where travel, communication and trade are possible without any hindrance, by the end of this Parliament in 1988.

(Applause)

If we can achieve this, the European elections of 1989 will mark a renewal, the birth of citizenship in effect, a boost to democracy.

But faced with the uncertainties and worries of the future, what people are looking for above all else is not freedom of movement. They are concerned with living, with finding a place in society — and that

Delors

means finding work — with the balance between career and private life, with the post-industrial society and their environment. Pulling down the frontiers will not convince them of our resolve to do away with large-scale unemployment. Here, too, the credibility of the European venture is at stake, at both national and Community level: at national level since nothing will absolve us from the need to reforge competitive structures and rediscover the path to economic growth; and at Community level since it is the Community which must act as the multiplier of national efforts. Economic convergence will be meaningless to people if we have not reversed the terrible rise of unemployment within the next two years. It depends on us. It depends on our strength and our ability to adapt our structures and stimulate an economic upturn at the same time.

Nor should we of the older generation forget the aspirations born in the 'golden sixties', in the 'affluent society'. They are many and varied, I know, sometimes confused and often full of contradictions. But surely that has always been the way? It is impossible to imagine that Europe should not be involved in this great cultural debate when we remember that, besides its shameful past and fratricidal wars, it has provided mankind with models of thought in which society, the individual and nature tended towards a harmonious equilibrium.

It is in this spirit that we will celebrate 1985 as International Youth Year, reflecting the questions, hopes and fears of the younger generation. In this spirit we will defend and affirm our identity and cultural diversity in a world being transformed by information technology.

The aspiration is for a cultural Europe. And rightly so. But culture as a living experience also means enabling everyone to develop in a society in which he has a say and in an environment, man-made or natural, which favours human development. That is why we are being called upon to combat so many different ills — to improve working conditions, to redesign our cities and rethink our ways of living, to preserve the irreplaceable revitalizing force of nature. Many of these things are the concerns of environment policy, and here the Community must set an example by realistic action, stimulating and crowning the creative effort, encouraging and disseminating innovation in order to create the basis for the renewal that is needed.

That is where the great European dream lies, rooted in a history of creative effort in the service of mankind. We must nurture this dream on our ideals and our achievements. Jean Monnet's comment on the beginnings of the Community remains remarkably apt today. 'The beginning of Europe was a political conception, but, even more, it was a moral idea. Europeans had gradually lost the ability to live together and combine their creative strength. There seemed to be decline in their contribution to progress and to the civilization which they themselves had created . . .'

Recalling the words of Jean Monnet, I would urge you to resist mere fashion, to rediscover confidence in yourselves and in this Community, which is soon to be enlarged to twelve members encompassing, from North to South, almost every current of European humanism.

These cultural considerations will not divorce us from the realities of the world we live in. We are all aware of the harshness of the present time. But it would be useless for the Community to proclaim noble-sounding messages if nobody were to listen to it, if it were to pass into history. And let us not delude ourselves, that is the danger we are facing. There are those who regard Europe as ageing and infirm and who treat us accordingly, while others deplore our lack of initiative and generosity.

Where, then, is the message of hope I spoke of just now? It lies in our ability to speak with a single voice and act in concert.

(Applause)

Can we do it? To be perfectly frank, our record in recent years is not very encouraging. The Community has, it is true, fought for its various interests, but too often it has been on the defensive, at best limiting the damage. Most of the time there have been no forceful statements of a common position but merely vague intentions, with varying shifts of emphasis from one Member State to another. The result: the Community has been unable to persuade its two major partners and friends — the United States and Japan — to act in concert to remedy the glaring ills of the world economy, such as monetary instability, prohibitive interest-rates, hidden protectionism and the reduction in aid of all kinds to the poorest countries.

Those who look on the bright side will tell me that the worst has been avoided: the problems of indebtedness have been resolved one by one; international trade has picked up once more. But the sickness has not been cured, nor the danger removed. I do not claim to have all the answers. I am simply asking the central question: are the Member States agreed on their diagnosis of the major problems of the world economy? Are they capable, once they have ascertained what their differences are and gone some way towards overcoming them, of working out a set of proposals which are acceptable to all and likely to improve its operation? That is the most important question Europe has to answer.

It is my responsibility to stimulate discussions, first within the Commission and then in Parliament and the Council, to rescue us from what must be seen as Europe's lethargy in this field. I shall do this with the deep-seated conviction that we can reach dynamic agreement among ourselves which will lead to proposals and joint action. And the aim is not just to protect our own legitimate industrial, agricultural and finan-

Delors

cial interests: we also have to cooperate in a world economic order very different from the fable of the fox and the chickens. We must show by the quality of our proposals and the exemplary nature of our actions that efficacy and justice can go together — yes, in Europe that is possible — and that the emerging countries — 'Les nations en voie de se faire', as François Perroux called them — must be treated on equal terms. It will then be up to them to show that they can make a positive contribution to the development of the world economy.

This is the significance of Lomé III, which is an example of continuity on the part of the Community and should encourage us to pursue our efforts to establish a fairer, more effectual economic order.

We must, therefore, get things clear — and quickly! We are being challenged: to maintain Europe as an agricultural power, to take our place in the forefront of the new technologies, to invest in our own development rather than see part of our resources go to sustain the growth of the strongest; we must share world responsibilities on monetary matters and defend our trading interests, as well as playing our full part in widening the exchange of goods and services.

In short, Europe must find its imagination again and return to the attack. Those who have nothing to propose are soon forgotten or held in contempt. Those who lack the means to match their ambitions are rapidly reduced to tagging along behind or engaging in slanging-matches.

We Europeans must tell ourselves each and every day: yes, we know how to do it, and yes, we can do it.

(Applause)

If I stress our economic and financial capacities, it is not my intention to leave political action as such out of account. Satisfaction can be drawn from the fact that political cooperation has intensified and joint initiatives have been taken in that field.

Moral strength must be displayed, particularly wherever human rights are threatened or flouted and wherever peace is endangered or destroyed. Here you in this House have often shown the way.

While I have no wish to go into this at any great length, I cannot but underline the importance of the talks that have been held in Geneva between representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union. Europeans must not relax their vigilance, the controversies are not yet over, but the talks do hold out a message of hope — hope for our ideal of peace, naturally, but also for our ideal of solidarity, for, as you yourselves, ladies and gentlemen, have said, the world has better things to do than prolong the arms race

when there is so much unemployment to be overcome and so much distress to be relieved.

(Applause)

Europe's credibility by all means, but also its strength.

But let us return to our initial priority. We need to endow ourselves with economic, technological, financial and monetary strength, but this strength will never realize its full potential unless it is based on democracy and justice. Democracy does not just make for Europe's daily credibility; it also means vitality in industrial relations and maximum participation. Justice means more than a fair reward for initiative and risk-taking; it also means the kind of community that makes all its members welcome and is mindful of the need to provide equal opportunities for all. Democracy and justice! Let me ask this: when shall we have the first European collective bargaining agreement?

(Applause)

I would insist on this point. The European collective agreement is not just an empty slogan. It would provide a dynamic framework, one that respected differing views — a spur to initiative, not a source of paralysing uniformity.

I draw attention to this need for a balance between justice and efficiency, all too often forgotten nowadays, not to affirm that any one political doctrine is better than another but because it points to what is truly our common democratic and European heritage: the foundation on which Europe achieved its post-war recovery and the remarkable growth which followed.

Let us beware of those who would gladly throw away the baby with the bath-water. Let us beware of fashions, moods and impulses and, above all, opportunism and the desire to please. The Commission will not be taken in by them.

European industrial society used to be a model of efficiency. It is less so today — there can be no doubt about it. It is fighting for its life — that is quite clear. Reforms are needed — nobody denies it. But the principles still hold good, because they are based on the idea of a balanced relationship between society and the individual.

What we lack, apart from a certain degree of self-confidence, is the benefit of scale and the multiplier effect. This can only result from a more united and more integrated Europe. In its four years in office, the Commission proposes that we take decisive steps in three directions:

- (1) a Community-wide market and industrial cooperation;
- (2) the strengthening of the European Monetary System;

Delors

(3) the convergence of economies as leading to higher growth and more employment.

We have to do this if we are to exist in a world where large entities dominate and where toughness is the principal characteristic of all kinds of relations. We have to start without delay; I must insist on this. In taking this action, we shall be saying 'no' to scepticism, 'no' to defeatism and 'no' to all excuses for doing nothing, no matter how cleverly presented they are to public opinion. European affairs often give the impression of being a contest between Member States instead of presenting the picture of a united team, a party of climbers scaling greater heights.

(Applause)

There is no better illustration of the effects of scale than the triptych of a Community-wide market, harmonization of rules and industrial cooperation. We have heard more than enough about the disjointedness of our efforts, the obstacles to healthy competition, the rigid barriers around public contracts, the absence of structures to encourage cooperation between European firms and the need for common standards to promote innovation. In the final analysis, as the example of research shows, it is not manpower and capital that we lack. These are comparable with what the United States and Japan employ. No, what we lack is a single economic and social *espace européen* in which all the protagonists of scientific and economic progress can engage more easily in exchanges and cooperation.

This has been demonstrated in two sectors — the Esprit programme and telecommunications. The Commission has been able to show all those concerned the advantages of exchanges and cooperation and has succeeded in persuading them quite naturally to combine their research efforts, open up the road to common standards and take the initiative on a number of sunrise projects. This has demonstrated the value of extending the market in general and, in this specific sector, of throwing open public contracts. Thus the excellence of a method which we intend to follow has been underlined.

We must be guided by this persuasive approach. You know the saying, 'You can take horse to water, but you can't make it drink'. This has been applied by an economist to the question of investment, and it can be extended to action on a European scale. It will not be possible to mobilize firms, researchers and workers unless they are aware of the vital interest of the European dimension and themselves become the instruments of change.

(Applause)

Of course, there have been setbacks; of course, there are obstacles, and major ones at that. Achievement of the internal market has been held up by the rule of unanimity, deriving either from the Treaty itself —

and I am thinking in particular of Article 100 — or from the misuse of the concept of vital interests.

(Applause)

You may rest assured that the new Commission will make full use of all the possibilities offered by the Treaty to overcome these obstacles and to ensure that there is no shirking of responsibilities. A programme, a timetable and a method will be proposed to Council and Parliament.

(Applause)

As guardian of the European public interest, the Commission will take strong action on these problems, which affect both everyday life — the citizen's Europe — and the world of business and commerce, firms and workers.

(Applause)

For this reason I will confine myself for the time being to what I regard as fundamental for the internal balance of Europe and for the success of the venture.

First of all, the three elements of the proposition cannot be separated. There can be no fair and healthy competition without a harmonization of rules. Remember that competition can kill competition if the market does not permit a fair contest between the different rivals. Hence the need to ensure, as happens in many of the Member States, that national measures do not lead to unbalanced competition. I would point out that this did not escape the authors of the Treaty of Rome, as Article 102 shows. The Commission will make use of this Article wherever necessary.

But Europe will not modernize its production structures just because a large market exists. The search for the larger scale will require the promotion of cooperation between European firms, the creation of a suitable framework, tax concessions to encourage business cooperation and financial incentives at Community level instead of the costly and ineffectual escalation of national aids and incentives.

People tend to forget that one of the factors which has helped to start the harmonization process — since I am on the subject — is the European Monetary System. With regard to the supranational market, the EMS, by stopping, in effect, monetary dumping, has helped increase trade within the Community. So there is no monetary dumping, but that is not enough. There should be no social dumping either.

(Applause)

Here, too, we must try to harmonize the rules. This, with regard to the supranational market that we all want to see set up, is the significance to the social *espace européen*, which has still to be created. Other-