

Annex

# Official Journal

of the

## European Communities

No 2-315

English edition

### Debates of the European Parliament

---

1984-1985 Session  
Report of Proceedings  
from 24 to 27 July 1984  
Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

<b>Tuesday, 24 July 1984</b> .....	1
Opening of session, p. 1 — Address by oldest Member, p. 3 — Election of President, p. 6 — Address by President, p. 12 — Agenda, p. 18	
<b>Wednesday, 25 July 1984</b> .....	20
Approval of Minutes, p. 20 — Tribute, p. 21 — Election of Vice-Presidents, p. 22 — Urgent procedure, p. 23 — Time-limit for tabling amendments, p. 24 — European Council of Fontainebleau, p. 24 — Election of Vice-Presidents (contd), p. 35 — European Council of Fontainebleau (contd), p. 36 — Election of Vice-Presidents (contd), p. 38 — Tabling of motion for a resolution, p. 39 — Number and membership of committees (vote), p. 41 — European Council of Fontainebleau (contd), p. 41 — Election of Vice-Presidents (contd), p. 44 — European Council of Fontainebleau (contd), p. 45	
<b>Thursday, 26 July 1984</b> .....	68
Approval of Minutes, p. 68 — Urgent procedure, p. 70 — Election of Quaestors, p. 71 — Irish Presidency: Council statement, p. 71 — Election of Quaestors (contd), p. 76 — Irish Presidency: Council statement (contd), p. 76 — Sakharov, p. 109	
<b>Friday, 27 July 1984</b> .....	116
Membership of Parliament, p. 116 — Votes, p. 116 — Adjournment, p. 124	

## 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 TUESDAY, 24 JULY 1984

### Contents

1. <i>Resumption of the session (First sitting of newly elected Parliament):</i> <i>Mr Pannella; Mr Chambeiron</i> . . . . .	1	<i>Sir Henry Plumb; Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf; Mr de la Malène; Mr Cervetti; Mr Le Pen; Mr Pannella; Mr Klepsch</i> . . . . .	6
2. <i>Address by the oldest Member, Mrs Thome-Patenotre</i> . . . . .	3	4. <i>Address by the President of the European Parliament, Mr Pierre Pflimlin:</i> <i>Mr Andriessen (Commission)</i> . . . . .	12
3. <i>Election of the President:</i> <i>Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mr Le Pen; Lady Elles; Mrs Castle; Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf; Mr Klepsch; Mr Le Pen; Mr Arndt; Mrs Veil;</i>		5. <i>Agenda:</i> <i>Mr Arndt; Mr Fich; Mr von der Vring; Mr Arndt; Mr Fich; Mr Klepsch</i> . . . . .	18

IN THE CHAIR: MRS THOME-PATENOTRE

*Oldest Member*

*(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)*

#### 1. *Resumption of the session*

*(First sitting of newly elected Parliament)*

**President.** — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 25 May 1984.

I should like to remind Members that the seats allocated to them in the Chamber are merely provisional.

For the purpose of preparing electronic votes, seats had to be allocated before the political groups were definitively set up.

Furthermore, the outgoing Bureau of the European Parliament felt that it was for the newly elected Bureau to decide on the definitive seating arrangements in the Chamber, having consulted all the political groups.

I would stress therefore the provisional nature of the seating arrangements in the Chamber.

All the documents relating to the election of Members will be forwarded to the Committee on the Verification of Credentials, which will be set up pursuant to Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure.

Pursuant to Rule 6 (3), until such time as a Member's credentials have been verified or ruling has been given on any dispute, the Member shall take his seat in Parliament and on its committees and shall enjoy all the rights attaching thereto.

In accordance with Article 11 of the Act of 20 September 1976 concerning the election of the representatives of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage, I have received from the competent authorities of all the Member States official notification of the election of 432 Members, the Netherlands having declared 24 Members elected and Luxembourg 5.

**Mr Pannella.** — (FR) Madam President, I wish to speak on a procedural motion.

*(Mixed reactions)*

In accordance with Rule 11 of our Rules of Procedure and Article 11 of the Act concerning the election of

**Pannella**

the representatives of the Assembly, I feel that we must make use of the provisions of Article 11 by referring this question as a matter of urgency to our Committee on the Verification of Credentials, because the Parliament of the Netherlands seems to me to be gravely at fault. This is a precedent which our Parliament must tackle, because if it comes to the worst, we could see certain national parliaments committing carefully considered political actions having a bearing on our Assembly. It is on the basis of Article 11 that I ask that this matter should be referred to the Committee on the Verification of Credentials.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, I have taken note of your remarks.

As you have pointed out, pursuant to Article 11 of the Act concerning the election by direct universal suffrage of the Members of the European Parliament, the Assembly can only take note of the results declared officially by the Member States.

Unfortunately, both the Netherlands and Luxembourg have officially declared elected 24 Members and 5 Members respectively and have postponed to a later date the announcement of the names of the 25th elected Member for the Netherlands and the 6th elected Member for Luxembourg. When it has been set up, the Committee on the Verification of Credentials will certainly examine this situation.

The political groups have informed me of their names and of the composition of their respective Bureaus. This information will be forwarded to the newly elected Bureau and will be recorded in the minutes of today's sitting.

The agenda for this part-session will be established after the election of the President.

In accordance with decisions taken by the political group chairmen on 19 July last, a *revised* draft order of business has been distributed.

In agreement with the political group chairmen, the sitting will be suspended for at least two hours between the official declaration of the election of the new President and the first ballot for the election of the Vice-Presidents.

In agreement with the political group chairmen, the deadline for tabling any motions for resolutions with request for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 57, has been fixed for 8 p.m. this evening. When the President has been elected, the House will decide on the deadlines for tabling amendments to these motions.

I have received from the Council, pursuant to Rule 57, a request for urgent debate on a proposal for a regulation concerning measures to cover the requirements of the 1984 financial year (Doc. 1-362/84).

The vote on whether this request for urgent procedure is to be agreed to or rejected will be held after the election of the President, in principle therefore tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. I must, however, warn the House that if urgent procedure is agreed to, the debate on this matter cannot be held until Thursday and consequently the proceedings of our Parliament could be prolonged until Friday at 2 p.m.

Pursuant to Rule 12, nominations for the office of President must be submitted, with the consent of the candidates, by a political group or at least 10 Members.

I propose that the deadline for submitting nominations for the first ballot be fixed at 10.15 a.m. Nominations are to be submitted to the oldest Member. As soon as the names of the candidates are known, I shall proceed to draw lots to choose the four tellers.

**Mr Chambeiron.** — (FR) Madam President, under your august chairmanship this second European Parliament elected by direct universal suffrage enters upon a new period of office at a time when many countries, particularly in the Community, are celebrating with particular solemnity the events of 40 years ago which were to liberate the peoples of Europe from the Nazi tyranny and pave the way for an era of freedom, democracy and peace.

(Mixed reactions)

The Community institutions have set themselves the objectives of strengthening democracy, promoting cooperation between the peoples and defending human rights.

As far as the European Parliament is concerned, its membership has been decided by universal suffrage, our common electoral system, and it is quite obvious that we must accept its verdict. However, that does not oblige us to remain indifferent to certain opinions that we heard expressed during the election campaign and which, having been given a certain measure of institutional validity in our Chamber, could nurture in the minds of our citizens some doubt as to Parliament's resolve to remain the vigilant defender of the values on which this Community is based.

That is why I venture to suggest that this House, by observing one minute of silent recollection, should express its resolve — at a moment when we are entering on the second term of office of the Parliament elected by the peoples of the Community — to be faithful to the ideals of democracy and liberty for which 40 years ago Europeans fought, suffered and died...

(Prolonged applause from the left)

**President.** — Mr Chambeiron, I have taken note of your statement, but the election of the President, to



**President**

which we are now about to proceed, obliges me to withdraw the floor from you.

*2. Address by the oldest Member*

**President.** — Bonjour, Guten Tag, Good morning, Buongiorno, Goedendag, Goddag, Kalimera,

Ladies and gentlemen of the European Parliament, Dear colleagues,

I am well aware of the extent of the honour which is not mine by rights. Our Greek colleague, Mr Nikolaos Gazis, is unfortunately ill and has had to decline to give the inaugural speech which is the prerogative of the oldest of our number.

I am however very proud to have this opportunity to impart to you without constraint a little of my experience and some of my hopes.

But first I would like to pay homage to all our colleagues who worked, from 1979 to 1984, in the first directly elected European Parliament and to its two Presidents, Mrs Simone Veil and Mr Pieter Dankert. I would also like to greet President Gaston Thorn and his colleagues and the President of the European Council, Mr FitzGerald.

I would also like to pay tribute to the memory of Mrs Louise Weiss, a great and famous European, who gave this inaugural speech in 1979 and 1982.

*(Applause)*

She is no longer with us but it is impossible to forget her action and commitment on behalf of Europe. Notice that women, whether they are in the chair for one day or for a much longer period, do not hold back when it comes to the construction of Europe. Through them I would like to salute with gratitude all the women of Europe, particularly the large number of them who play an active part.

*(Applause)*

In my capacity as International Vice-President of the European Movement I would like, finally, to thank from the bottom of my heart all the European activists of our respective countries. Often working in difficult and humble conditions, theirs has been a long and selfless fight for the Europe in which they believe. The election of our European Parliament by universal suffrage, a fundamental stage in the construction of Europe, is something which we largely owe to them. Let us not forget this. Let us listen to them. Let us associate them with our work.

I referred just now to my personal history: although my long career in Parliament and constant commit-

ment as a European activist are inseparable, I will attempt to avoid over-indulgence in my memories. I have always been a European. I was ten years old when my father fell at Verdun in 1916. As member of parliament for Rambouillet, he was one of those parliamentarians who had decided that their place was in active service. As an adult, whenever I saw these lines of crosses on which names of various origins were engraved, I felt the need to do everything I could to help build a united Europe which would prevent a return to fratricidal confrontations of this kind.

I was in contact with, or knew well, those we call the pioneers of Europe: Jean Monnet, Konrad Adenauer, Robert Schuman, Paul-Henri Spaak, Alcide De Gasperi, Carlo Sforza, Jean Rey, René Mayer, Joseph Bech, Guy Mollet, Walter Hallstein, to mention only those who are no more.

In May 1948 I attended the historic Congress of the European Movement in the Ridderzaal in The Hague. There I sat and looked at the backs of necks so well described by Denis de Rougemont 'this very wide red neck is Ramadier, this placid blond neck is van Zeeland, and this non-existent neck is Paul Reynaud (...) a white plump neck sticking out of a black dress coat, Winston Churchill ...'.

Anecdotes aside, three years after the Second World War, the Europeans had at last met to lay the foundations of a real European construction. And I remember the proposal by Paul Reynaud that there should be a European Assembly elected by universal suffrage with one representative for each million inhabitants.

In the same year the Marshall plan created the necessity for *entente* between the European countries. The first step was the creation of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation whose first Secretary-General was Robert Marjolin. But the imagination and energy of Jean Monnet gave birth to bolder and very original projects which were crystallized in the Treaty of Paris establishing the European Coal and Steel Community in 1951, followed four years later by the Messina Conference and subsequently by the Rome Treaties.

How many meetings did we hold in the 1950s in the four corners of our regions, in school playgrounds and little halls which were not always full, followed by long waits in draughty stations?

We had to talk about Europe.

We had to show a divided Europe was nothing in the face of the power of the continent States, the one reaching from the Nemen to the Island of Sakhalin, and the other from the Pacific to the Atlantic.

We had to convince public opinion of the need for people who had hardly finished tearing each other to pieces to seek reconciliation and unity. One of my

## President

greatest joys was the signature of the Franco-German Treaty which sprang from the joint volition of Chancellor Adenauer and General de Gaulle.

In 1958, as a member of the European Assembly in Strasbourg, I remember animated discussions within the Liberal and Allies Group chaired by René Pleven and attended by Gaetano Martino, the instigator and organizer of the Messina Conference, Walter Scheel, who was to become the President of the Federal Republic of Germany, Maurice Faure, who was so active in the formulation of the Rome Treaties and — a still very young — Gaston Thorn, whose European future was already discernible. It was the time when the European Community was becoming aware of the need to give the developing countries the cooperation of industrialized Europe and was drawing up the policy which was to lead to the Yaoundé and Lomé Treaties. At that time the Community was going through a period of particularly strong expansion which made it a leader in world trade and enabled it to attain a considerable improvement in its standards of living with a very high employment level. But this expansion was threatened: the first sign of alarm was the removal of the gold convertibility of the dollar and consequently the oil price rises. The question at the time was whether Europe would be solid enough to resist the enormous economic upheaval which was disrupting our society and was aggravated by the sudden discovery of Japan's industrial power and competition from new industries, particularly in the Asian countries.

The radical technological changes dating from hardly ten years ago and Europe's vulnerability as regards energy supplies and the monetary problem are the causes of unemployment and inflation, which are dramatic problems that Europe must overcome. Here I would like to interpose rapidly that the classical solution of deflation, which generates a drop in purchasing power and thus social troubles, is not necessarily the best and only way of fighting inflation.

And is it not a strange and ominous paradox to see our Europe on the one hand full to overflowing with millions of unemployed and the developing countries on the other hand being encouraged to cherish hopes which only too often prove empty? On the one hand once prosperous factories which are now shut down and the destruction of agricultural produce and on the other impoverished countries without resources where hunger is rife.

In the future, and perhaps earlier than we think, there will have to be a review of the world monetary system if we are to allow everyone legitimate access to the benefits accruing from this new technological revolution.

At the same time, despite the seriousness of the difficulties involved, which make European construction

more urgent than ever, the ship of Europe has kept on course and withstood the storms.

Of course there are still many acute problems. There are blockages but some of them were very recently removed at Fontainebleau and we should congratulate the European Council and its President on this. There is the temptation to take protectionist measures, which no State has, however, really succumbed to so far. On the contrary, in each of our countries the politicians in power reaffirm that it is only with a united Europe that we have any chance of overcoming the crisis.

Let us remember the Horatii and Curiatii families and let us not repeat the successive single combats which deprived the Curiatii family of a victory which they should not have allowed to slip out of their hands. None of our countries can battle along on its own, either in the economic sphere or in that of defence.

In reality there has even been some progress. Our Europe has grown. It will grow even more. And I welcome the idea that our Assembly will soon be opening its doors to members from Spain and Portugal.

*(Applause)*

Their presence will be a sign of the solidarity and understanding between the family of free and democratic countries which is unfortunately not so large in our contemporary world.

On the other hand Europe must never forget that on the other side of the Iron Curtain there are nations which share the same culture and same traditions and with which it has historical links. We must not forget them. Europe cannot be a closed, forbidden world; it must be a vast symbol of hope.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

However, the progress of Europe has by no means been confined to enlargement.

The present European Monetary System, though incomplete, has made it possible, in many cases, for sudden and serious currency fluctuations to be avoided.

Moreover, the institutions, created thanks to the inspiration of Jean Monnet, for whom obstacles were an incitement to greater effort, have made much progress:

- the Court of Justice, strengthened by its own wisdom, now enforces Community law in each of our countries,
- our Parliament itself is elected by direct universal suffrage, though the demand for a *uniform* electoral system has not yet been met. Thanks to the firm line taken by Simone Veil on the Community budget when she was

## President

President of our Parliament, each of our national governments was given clearly to understand that Parliament intended to make full use of its rights and that it was a force to be reckoned with in the future.

Furthermore, increasing numbers of people in positions of authority have been calling for a common defence policy. What sweet music this is in the ears of one who still has painful memories of the failure of the plan for a European army which I continue to believe would have changed many things.

One day in August 1954, when I was a member of the Senate, I was sitting with the late Raymond Cartier in a café opposite the headquarters of a leading Parisian daily newspaper. When it was announced that the National Assembly had declared this issue inadmissible for debate, I remember bursting into tears. I was still a young woman and had yet to lose my illusions!

Today, I would go further and say that the security of Europe must be internal as well as external. The internal security of the individual and the external security of our peoples are indissociably linked and there can be no doubt that a certain form of terrorism is now seeking to destabilize democratic Europe. The European Parliament has asserted this several times, but I would again urge that such terrorism must be our number one enemy for it is Europe's number one enemy.

*(Applause)*

At the risk of shocking some of you, I feel unable to refrain from mentioning a problem which is one of the most important of our time. I refer to pacificism and the peace movements which are active in each of our countries. Of course we are all pacifists, but there is a certain form of pacificism which failing to place the defence of peace and the defence of liberty on the same footing, is likely to play into the hands of a power which forbids any form of criticism both within its own boundaries and within those of the countries it controls.

*(Loud applause from the centre and right)*

While there is no doubting the sincerity of many of these pacifists, a large number of whom are young people, other individuals are secretly pursuing far less worthy ends, playing on fear and anxiety, which have never been wise counsellors.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

Despite the progress Europe has achieved, the people in our countries do not have sufficient practical awareness of the complexity of its problems or of its usefulness. The European Community has too often been the scapegoat for our difficulties, even those which are directly due to the domestic policies of our countries.

But if the European message has too often been misunderstood, we must also take some share of the blame ourselves, because a purely economic Europe which concerns itself exclusively with commercial interests — tomatoes, wine etc. — can secure the commitment only of those directly concerned by such matters but not that of the general public. How can we expect to have the support of our peoples, and our young people in particular, when all they are offered is a commercial Europe which seems to have abandoned its role as a force for equilibrium and peace in the world?

We must take great care to ensure that a chasm does not open up between Europe and the peoples of which it is composed, for their support is essential if we are to progress further.

The conquerors' Europe, that of sovereigns and dictators, is a thing of the past; the Europe now emerging is one of free and truly democratic peoples but it is still vital that they should want it and not sink into complacency, as long as they still have the economic and social resources for action.

In this context I firmly believe that one of the common policies needed is a policy on communications, for example by television and satellite, as a means of spreading the idea of European identity more effectively.

And one of the ideals I would particularly like to see attained is the introduction of thorough and systematic teaching from the earliest age, of the languages spoken within the European Community; this would help overcome the language barrier and facilitate exchanges between the new generations and also the twinning of towns. Much has already been done in this latter regard, but there is still room for an improvement in mutual understanding.

Generally speaking, any move that will help make European citizenship a reality must be encouraged. When I was mayoress of Rambouillet I used to have a little plaque hanging up in my office bearing the words 'Just do your job and let them say what they like'. Well that was wrong, it is better to do your job and make sure they know about it.

Let us make sure that the people of Europe know about the practical measures that have been taken to change their everyday lives.

Let us help them to realize all the things that would not have been possible without Europe. That is all too often forgotten!

We must look the facts in the face and take a long cold look at the situation. The turnout at the election of 17 June 1984 was, on the whole, rather poor and reflects a certain disappointment among the general

**President**

public in Europe. We have five years before us in which to restore its faith.

For we all have an historic role to assume. To fulfil it we must pursue clear objectives and show unrelenting determination.

As for clear objectives, in my capacity today as oldest Member and, for these brief moments, your President, I would like to make a few suggestions. Modesty forbids me to speak in the affirmative so I shall put them to you in question form.

- Do you not think that it is time for Europe's leading nations to reach genuine agreement, for the sake of greater efficiency and lower expenditure, on a common defence policy?

*(Cries from the left)*

- Do you not think that new European research policies should be introduced, especially in the field of advanced technologies (data processing, energy, communications, the conquest of space, etc.)?
- Will we have to go through another scandal like that of the Mont Blanc tunnel before we make up our minds to get rid of the red tape which hampers the free movement of persons, goods, services and capital?

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

- How long will we have to wait before Europe's internal frontiers are abolished for European citizens, who will all soon have the same passport? This very morning I saw a long line of cars and trucks on the bridge at Kehl.
- Is it not time for the ECU to become a proper European currency?

*(Applause)*

- Do you not consider that many major issues such as wage levels and shorter working hours can only be settled at European level?
- Is not the harmonization of social security systems in fact one of the preconditions for attaining a genuine internal market and a greater degree of justice?
- Do you not conceive of the possibility of a common foreign policy, for which so many of the peoples of the world are hoping? Should not this policy be an independent policy, provided that it safeguards the special relationship we have with the United States of America?

The time has come for a *political Europe*, a Europe of equal peoples. This means a return to the still too fragile rule of majority voting, the setting up of a permanent secretariat for the European Council and practical action to implement not only the Colombo-

Genscher plan, but also the important idea of a treaty on European Union adopted in February of this year by our Parliament. This treaty constitutes real progress. We are convinced that only a political Europe can get us out of our present rut, with day-to-day business being dominated by horse-trading and a narrow view of short-term advantage and economic profitability. Our Parliament, with its draft treaty for European Union, has given Europe new hope and must for that reason be closely involved in the Member States' exercise of their power to propose and take decisions, for example by taking part in the two *ad hoc* committees set up at Fontainebleau and also in the appointment of the next Commission of the European Communities.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that it is high time that the role of our Parliament, which now has the experience of a first term behind it, was expanded. It is incumbent upon the oldest Member to speak with restraint. But there can be no doubt that one day the European Parliament will be called upon to pass legislation in certain areas where solutions can be found only at European level. It is by its dedication to its task, by the respect it is able to inspire and, by the imaginative approach it is able to adopt, that our Parliament will convince each of our governments that a wider role is both necessary and justified.

I hope our British friends won't take it amiss if I take the old saying 'wait and see' and change it to 'see and act', a motto which we Europeans must now make our own if there is to be effective and swift progress towards European Union; we no longer have the time to wait.

The more international tension deteriorates, the more important it is for Europeans to unite. Even if there is disagreement on matters of secondary importance, this cannot be allowed to prevent or hamper the attainment of the principal aims I have just outlined, whether it be political union, the common foreign policy, security or agreement in the field of social affairs.

The cause of Europe has indeed many aspects, many of them indissociably linked. In conclusion, therefore, I would urge that we might be guided in our action by this counsel of Jean Monnet:

'Do not dissipate your energies, do not allow too many ideals to occupy your minds. Choose one cause for yourselves and devote your lives to it. It is the only way you will be able to move mountains'.

*(Loud applause)*

### 3. Election of the President

**President.** — The next item is the election of the President of the European Parliament.

**Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz.** — (DE) Madam President, I should like to confirm personally that I am a candidate for election.

**President.** — I shall take note of that, Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz.

I have received, in accordance with the conditions laid down in the Rules of Procedure, the following nominations which I shall announce in alphabetical order:

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz, Mr Dankert, Lady Elles, Mr Le Pen, Mr Pajetta, Mr Pflimlin and Mr Spinelli.

We shall now draw lots to choose four tellers.

They are: Mr Staes, Mrs Peus, Sir Fred Catherwood and Mr Pitt.

The ballot is open.

*(The vote was taken)*

The ballot is closed.

I would ask the tellers to proceed to count the votes.

*(The sitting was suspended at 11.20 a.m. and resumed at 12.20 p.m.)*

**President.** — These are the results of the ballot:

Members voting: 421

Blank or spoiled ballot papers: 8

Votes cast: 413

Absolute majority: 207

Votes received were as follows:

Mr Pflimlin: 165

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

Mr Dankert: 123

Lady Elles: 44

Mr Pajetta: 37

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz: 17

Mr Le Pen: 16

Mr Spinelli: 11

Since no candidate has received an absolute majority of the votes cast, we shall hold a second ballot.

**Mr Le Pen.** — (FR) With your permission I should like to make a statement on the results of this first ballot. First of all, however, as a newcomer in this House,

I wish to convey my greetings to the House both on my own behalf and on behalf of the group of which I am chairman, the European Right Wing Group.

The time has come to make a choice, and politics is after all the art of making reasoned choices. For us there can be no question of seeing this Assembly presided over by a Marxist. On the contrary, it must be presided over by a President who stands for the defence of liberty. I am therefore withdrawing my candidature in favour of Mr Pflimlin.

*(Mixed reactions)*

Indeed I was a colleague of Mr Pflimlin in the French National Assembly, both under the Fourth and Fifth Republics.

One final word, Madam President. I believe that this morning wreaths were laid to mark the 50th anniversary of the assassination of Chancellor Dollfuss. This was one of the events that led to the Second World War, which ended, as everyone knows, in the Soviet occupation of half of Europe.

As far as we are concerned, we had no wish to be missing when these political bouquets were being handed out, so we brought along our floral emblem, the thistle. And you know how it is with the thistle — he who grasps it gets stung for his pains.

**President.** — Mr Le Pen, this is not the time for political statements. We are now trying to elect a President. I must therefore withdraw the floor from you, while taking note of the statement you have just made.

*(The sitting was suspended at 12.25 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)*

**Lady Elles.** — Madam President, recalling that the people of Europe in the majority voted for moderate centre representatives in this Parliament, I wish to say that it is in their interest that we have a moderate centre President. I am therefore standing down for the election of President of this Parliament, and I ask and urge my group to give their vote to the one centre party candidate, Mr Pflimlin.

*(Loud applause from the centre and from the right)*

**Mrs Castle.** — On a point of order, Madam President. Before we vote we must get one thing clear. This morning, Mr Le Pen announced that he was withdrawing his own candidature and that instead he was endorsing the candidature of Mr Pflimlin. May we therefore, through you, ask Mr Pflimlin whether he accepts this support and this endorsement by Mr Le Pen?

*(Applause from the left)*

**President.** — Mrs Castle, that is not my business today: I am just the *doyen d'âge*. You will discuss political matters afterwards.

*(Applause)*

For the second ballot I have the following nominations: Mr Dankert, Mr Pflimlin and Mr Spinelli.

*(Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf asked for the floor to speak on a point of order)*

The ballot is open.

*(The vote was taken)*

The ballot is closed.

I have four requests for the floor on points of order. I should like to point out, however, that we cannot enter into a debate at this point on the election of the President. It is perfectly in order for the political group chairmen to make political statements, but there can be no question of initiating a debate. I must remind the House therefore that I shall be obliged to interrupt any speaker whose speech does not comply with the Rules.

I must also remind the House that no speech may last longer than three minutes.

**Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf.** — (DE) First of all I should like to protest . . .

*(Interruption: Bravo!)*

at the fact that you noted my request to speak on a point of order, which was made in good time before the beginning of the vote, but did not do anything about it. This is a manner of proceeding which I feel should not become customary in any Parliament. I say this, even though this is the first time that I have ever been in a Parliament.

*(Applause from the left)*

I shall now repeat my request, and there is still time enough for it to be dealt with before the votes are counted. What I am asking on behalf of the Green-Alternative European Federation is that the President should ask Mr Pflimlin whether he is prepared to state that he will not accept election to the Presidency if he is elected by a majority of less than 17 votes, that is to say, that he will not allow himself to be elected with the 16 votes of the Le Pen Group.

I would ask you to take action on this point of order.

*(Applause from the left)*

**President.** — I must point out to the speaker that that was not a point of order. Furthermore, it is not the

business of the oldest Member occupying the chair to ask any one of the candidates what he thinks about this or that person.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Klepsch.** — (DE) Madam President, I am sorry that I was not here in time earlier on to make the statement that I am now about to make. The vice-chairman of my group, Mr Vergeer, asked for the floor but did not get it, and perhaps rightly so under the terms of the Rules of Procedure.

This morning a newly constituted group declared that it would vote for our candidate, Mr Pflimlin. On behalf of my group I should like to make it quite clear that this group was neither asked for its vote by the Group of the European People's Party or its candidate, Mr Pflimlin, nor did we conduct any negotiations with regard to the delivery of this vote.

Furthermore, we are convinced that a majority of this House will support our candidate in any case.

*(Applause from the centre)*

I am quite convinced that the result of the vote will bear me out beyond any shadow of doubt. There is one further thing, however, that I should like to say. We take this matter very seriously, Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf, but various groups in this House do not have the same fastidious approach to the whole question. I should like to make that quite clear, because on other occasions in this House votes have been gladly accepted which we would not have welcomed! However, all I really want to do is to make it quite clear to you that on this matter our group takes the position I have just outlined.

*(Applause from the centre)*

**President.** — I would now ask the tellers to proceed with the counting of the votes.

*(The sitting was suspended at 3.40 p.m. and resumed at 4.30 p.m.)*

**Mr Le Pen.** — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to raise a matter relating to the Rules of Procedure, and let me remind you that I have a perfect right to do so. Members have had distributed to them in their official letter-boxes . . .

*(Violent protests from the left)*

. . . a tract issued by a parliamentary group in this House which includes a number of terrorists recently freed from prison. This is a defamatory tract, which I formally repudiate. Furthermore, I would ask the Chair to condemn this action.

**Le Pen**

I would also ask the House to note what democracy means to the Marxists: they hurl insults while sheltering behind their parliamentary immunity. And, just as is done in Moscow, they do not allow the accused to defend themselves!

*(Applause from the right)*

**President.** — Mr Le Pen, your statement has been noted. It will be put before the Bureau.

These are the results of the second ballot:

Members voting: 421

Blank or spoiled ballot papers: 18

Votes cast: 403

Absolute majority: 202

Votes received were as follows:

Mr Pflimlin: 221

*(Loud and prolonged applause)*

Mr Dankert: 133

Mr Spinelli: 49

As Mr Pflimlin has obtained an absolute majority of the votes cast, I declare him President of the European Parliament.

*(Sustained applause)*

**Mr Arndt.** — *(DE)* President Pflimlin, on behalf of the Socialist Group may I congratulate you on having been chosen by Parliament to be its President. We Socialists have every confidence that, as would be in line with your manner of acting up to this point, you will be the President of all the Members and not just of one group within this Parliament.

We look forward to a fruitful cooperation between your good self and all of us Members. Whatever our political differences may be, it is essential that this Parliament should function smoothly.

We should also like to thank you very sincerely, Madam Thome-Patenotre, for the way in which you have presided here today, even if certain people have made things rather difficult for you!

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I should also like to congratulate Mr Pflimlin, to whom I convey my best wishes for his presidency. I do so naturally on my own behalf, but also on behalf of the House. I would also thank Mr Arndt for his remarks.

I should not like to leave the Chair without thanking you one and all for your kind welcome and for your courtesy. During the coming months I shall have an opportunity to meet all the Members of this Parliament, and we shall get to know one another better.

**Mrs Veil.** — *(FR)* Madam President, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group I should like to add my thanks to those just expressed by the chairman of the Socialist Group and to say how much we appreciated your chairmanship, even if it was marred by some disturbances. I should also like to take this opportunity to congratulate you once again on your address.

Of course, it is not only as chairman of the Liberal Group that I convey my thanks to you but also, I must confess, on my own personal behalf, and all the more so in that you were on the list that I headed.

Even before Mr Pflimlin takes up his duties as President, I should like in my turn to extend to him my warmest congratulations, both on my own behalf and on behalf of the Liberal Group. I should like to assure him that throughout his entire presidency the Liberal Group will do everything possible to help him in his task, just as we have done our utmost to contribute to his victory today, which we regard as a victory for ourselves. We are enormously pleased at his election, which is a guarantee that the work of building up Europe will proceed apace. All those who know him particularly well realize the vast parliamentary experience that Mr Pflimlin has behind him. This alone ensures that he will give this Parliament the prestige of a major parliament, since Mr Pflimlin has always been a parliamentarian of great stature. We have been able to appreciate this for ourselves here during Parliament's last term of office. All who have known Mr Pflimlin in the French Parliament are delighted to know that he is now going to preside over our Parliament.

Speaking on a more personal note, I would add that I regard his election as a particular joy and honour, since, like our oldest Member, he was also on the list that I headed.

Finally, we wish to extend our sincerest good wishes to Mr Pflimlin, because in so doing we know that we are also extending our good wishes to this Parliament and to Europe.

*(Applause)*

**Sir Henry Plumb.** — Madam President, may I, on behalf of the European Democratic Group and on behalf of myself too, convey our congratulations to Mr Pflimlin and say how delighted we are with the result today. May I at the same time say 'Thank you' to Mr Dankert for the way he has conducted affairs during the last two-and-a-half years.

*(Applause)*

**Plumb**

I think, Madam President, it is very healthy that we here in this House — over 420 of us representing 270 million people in Europe and conducting our affairs today — should be uniting in electing one man, a senior citizen in this city, a senior citizen in France, a man with a tremendous political record who commands immense respect not only in this House but throughout Europe. Together we are here to wish him good health and good fortune in the office which he is now going to command. We pledge our loyal support to him in the hope that we can make this institution, this Parliament, the mother of parliaments in Europe.

*(Applause)*

Madam President, it is well known in this House that I am a linguist. I only learned today that Pflimlin means 'little plum'...

*(Laughter)*

... so may I, as a big Plumb, say to a little plum that we should hang together or else we shall hang separately!

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Sir Henry, I am sure that all this Assembly has appreciated your kind words and also your wit, your... plumbmanship!

*(Laughter)*

**Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf.** — *(DE)* Mr President, we also congratulate you on your election, although we regret that you were given the votes of the Le Pen Group.

*(Applause and laughter)*

We shall measure your success by the degree to which you make it possible for small groups to enjoy their rights and by the degree to which you attempt to stand by us and see to it that we are not ground down in the mills of this Parliament's Rules of Procedure.

However, we shall also measure your success by the degree to which you help to bring about a change in this Europe of ours and to introduce a new European policy that will put an end to the destruction of the environment, the destruction of whole regions and the elimination of jobs, particularly — and I am a farmer myself — on small and medium-sized farms, both here and in the Third World. We shall measure your success by whether and how you help to put an end to the exploitation of the Third World by this economic power that is Europe. We shall measure your success by the degree to which you oppose the movement towards a third economic superpower and concomitantly a military superpower in Europe that can only

be anathema to those of us who want a friendly peaceful Europe of the regions.

These then are the criteria by which we shall measure your success! If you promote these policies, you will have our support. If you do not pursue these policies, you will have to face implacable opposition from us.

**Mr de la Malène.** — *(FR)* Madam President, President Pflimlin, I hardly need to tell you how delighted my group is with your election. We rallied unanimously around your candidature from the very moment it was announced. We are delighted both for personal reasons and also, perhaps more important, for political reasons.

We are delighted for personal reasons because we know you far too long not to be aware that you possess all the attributes required to preside over the proceedings of this Assembly with the necessary impartiality and authority, something that is not always easy.

On the political level, what was our reason for rallying behind you? We did so because our Parliament is taking its first steps at a time that is fraught with much difficulty for the construction of Europe. It is also a moment that is by no means easy for our Parliament. At difficult times such as these our Parliament has an important role to play in making progress towards the true European Community that is so badly needed.

In playing this role, which is first and foremost a political one, it is essential that this House should concern itself with politics in the most exalted sense of that term. And we have chosen you, Mr Pflimlin, as the spokesman for the political majority in this House.

*(Applause from the right)*

In rallying around your person, for the reasons we indicated yesterday, we have made a clear political statement. Both at the personal level, as I have explained, and in the perspective of the political importance attaching to your election and your own political stature, we are delighted to see you now taking over this prestigious but difficult position.

We are putting our trust in you.

Madam President, I should not like to conclude these few remarks without associating myself with all the previous speakers who have thanked you for the way in which you have presided over our debates here today. You realize how a new Assembly, which is just 'getting off the ground', needs to adjust to new customs and procedures and how much need there is for a mixture of flexibility and authority. We thank you for all those qualities which we always knew you possessed but which you have demonstrated today once again.

*(Applause from the right)*



**President.** — Mr de la Malène, I have been very moved by your remarks and I thank you very sincerely.

**Mr Cervetti.** — *(IT)* The elected President is the President of this Parliament. He is the President of all the points of the political spectrum represented in it, and therefore also of our part of the House. However, this need not deter me from pointing out that there are serious political overtones to his election, brought about as it was with the assistance of the vote of the Fascist and racist group. Other democratic forces must also take responsibility for this. Their responsibility is all the greater in that a different solution, a truly democratic solution, could have been found — and that was the reason for our very outspoken appeal.

Now we shall have to set to work to realize the expectations of the workers, of our peoples, of Europe. We shall have to work for the prestige of this our Parliament. We shall bend all our energies to this task and to the attainment of these objectives.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Le Pen.** — *(FR)* The European Right Wing Group is happy to have helped, by its unanimous support, to give you a large majority. I would note, however, that there is an element of contradiction in the remarks of Mr Arndt and Mr Cervetti, who ask you to be the President of all the Members of this House with the exception of those who elected you. I find that quaint, to say the least of it.

Having known you, as I said already this morning, Mr President, as a colleague in the French National Assembly under the Fourth and Fifth Republics, I should like to assure you of our confidence in your ability to preside over the destinies of this Parliament, whose responsibilities are enormous in a Europe threatened by different hegemonies, a Europe half of whose territory is occupied by a foreign power and a Europe that is ravaged by falling birthrates, unemployment, economic recession and terrorism. It is our hope and prayer that you will inspire this House with the vigorous enthusiasm and the moral courage that it will need if it is to lead and to save Europe.

*(Applause from the extreme right — Prolonged noise from the left and the extreme left)*

Just let me speak. We are not in Moscow now!

I should like in my turn to pay tribute to the oldest Member presiding over this House, whom I also . . .

**President.** — Could we have a little silence, please? Everyone has the right to state this views. We must be

tolerant. I know that you do not agree with him, but after all we have the right to speak our minds!

*(Applause)*

**Mr Le Pen.** — *(FR)* I only wanted to say, Madam President, having known you also on the benches of our French National Assembly, how much we have appreciated the courteous and efficient way in which you have chaired this new Parliament on a first day when it has not been possible to prevent the sparks from flying on some occasions.

I am sure that we will all do our best in the future and I hope that this House will function as smoothly under the new presidency as it showed it could do under yours.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(FR)* Madam President, President Pflimlin, Emma Bonino, Enzo Tortora and I voted for Altiero Spinelli and we are proud of that. In doing so we voted for a man who, in Fascist gaols, raised the flag of the United States of Europe and of the federalist cause. This man does us honour and inspires us. And it is because of our loyalty to these causes and our unflinching opposition to Fascism that we are here, to pay tribute not only to our President but to the entire House. If there is any course of action that is dictated to us by this same unflinching opposition to Fascism, it is that, unlike the Fascists themselves, we fight to ensure that the rights of even our most implacable opponents, their views and their words are respected at all times.

That means therefore, Madam President, President Pflimlin, that today, as befits true democrats, we gladly and trustingly welcome the hope symbolized by your election. We recognize your tolerance and your honesty. Today we stand in need of your political vigour and it will be your duty to share it with us. We sincerely hope, President Pflimlin, that you will do so.

By voting for Altiero Spinelli, we have indicated not only the sense in which we will, as always, be loyal to the Community's institutions, provided they show mutual respect for each other, but also the political direction we can be counted upon to take.

Thank you, Madam President, thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Let me say just once again that Altiero Spinelli was and is the representative of a Europe opposed to Fascism, who regards it as a point of honour to defend the rights of those who are opposed to him and those who differ from him. This is why I cannot associate myself with the words of our colleagues Mr Cervetti and Mr Arndt. Neither can I associate myself with the attempt made during this sitting to condemn, in the light of our various opinions, our presence and that of our colleagues.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Klepsch.** — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by thanking you, Madam President, for the firm and confident manner in which you have chaired this sitting and also for your excellent address to this House.

(Applause)

Your tenure of the Chair has brought it home to us that you are a truly dedicated European, and we hope that we can say the same of the President that we have elected today. My group is proud and happy at having been able to nominate him as a candidate. He is vastly experienced in every aspect of politics, he is widely esteemed and respected and he knows this House and its problems — after all, he was the senior Vice-President in Parliament's last term of office. Furthermore, everyone in this House knows and values his firmness in making decisions, a firmness that is at the same time tempered by a great fund of calm wisdom.

Like the entire House, we expect that over the next two and a half years he will help this Parliament to accomplish the tasks that it is called upon to accomplish on behalf of the citizens of Europe. That is what we have been elected here for, to take the decisions that will advance the cause of Europe. We have been elected here to advance the political unification of Europe, and we have been elected here to defend the interests of the citizens of the European Community. We hope that under the leadership of this President we will stand up manfully to the Commission and the Council, all the while working together with them in close cooperation.

This Parliament will be successful only if we all, however much our views may differ, work together to find solutions that will be good for the Community.

Today we had quite an unprecedented experience, about which I will say only one very brief sentence. All who are here in this House know that my previous statement was fully borne out by the result of the vote. Mr Pflimlin got the majority that I predicted.

(Cries)

We can, if we like, begin now to cover the whole ground of who else voted for the President that we have just elected, but, without labouring the matter any further, I should like to warn many of those who are most vocal that it might be quite embarrassing for them if we were to go into the question of how all this kind of thing was done in the past!

(Applause from the right)

We are very pleased today to have this opportunity, in the second term of office of this directly elected Parliament, to make a fresh start in our efforts to give this Parliament the role that befits it. My group will work

in close cooperation with all who support this President.

(Applause)

**President.** — Mr Klepsch, I have been very moved by your remarks and I thank you.

I would now invite Mr Pflimlin, whom I congratulate once again, to take the Chair.

(Loud applause)

## IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*President*

### 4. Address by the President

**President.** — (FR) Ladies and gentlemen, let me start by paying tribute to our oldest member, Jacqueline Thome-Patenôtre, who has performed her temporary duties with her well-known authority and skill and made a speech that showed me, if indeed any proof were needed, that she has remained faithful to the ideas she has defended throughout her long political career — attachment to liberal democracy and commitment to unity in Europe.

I should like to thank the group chairmen for congratulating me and, in some cases, for making recommendations. I assure them — and I am speaking to Mr Arndt and Mr Cervetti here — that I shall do my utmost to do my job objectively.

But everyone will understand that my gratitude goes first to all to those who displayed their confidence and voted for me in the first or second ballot. The meaning of their vote was fully expressed by the chairman of my group, Mr Egon Klepsch, to whom I am, as you will all understand, particularly grateful.

(Applause)

Sir Henry Plumb also expressed his confidence. Yes, it cannot be denied that, beside Sir Henry, I am only a little plum.

(Applause)

This is a discovery that the *chansonniers* in Montmartre made many years back when I was just starting my parliamentary career in Paris.

My thanks go to Mr de la Malène, who gave an accurate description of why people rallied to my cause.

## President

You will understand that I was particularly touched by Simone Veil's congratulations. It was a great honour for me once more to join the electoral battle, as I did in 1979, under her leadership, on her list, and I thank her for the confidence she has placed in me once more. I should add that she, the first President of a European Parliament elected by direct universal suffrage, will be an example to me, for none of the veterans will ever forget that it is thanks to her and to her authority and personal influence that the first European Parliament to be directly elected by universal suffrage acquired the prestige that the European cause so sorely needed. I thank her.

*(Applause)*

I should like to pay tribute, first of all, to my distant predecessors. I cannot mention them all. But I knew them all. They were all remarkable men who were attached to the European cause. Take the first President of the European Parliament, Robert Schuman,

*(Applause)*

my friend, whose disciple I still consider myself to be. He, as we all remember, opened the way for the building of the European Communities with his historic declaration of 9 May 1950.

He was my earliest predecessor.

But I cannot forget the most recent of them, Piet Dankert. He was my colleague on the Bureau and this gave me the opportunity to appreciate his qualities — his courtesy and his devotion to duty.

*(Applause)*

Honourable Members, in this House the election that has just taken place is further proof that we cannot have unanimity. Certain régimes in fact show that unanimous votes are often suspect. The mark of a really democratic assembly is the existence of a majority and a minority — and clashes between the two by no means rule out either courtesy or respect for other people's opinions.

*(Applause)*

This was the case yesterday and it will still be the case tomorrow. But may I make one wish? That, beyond any extremes that may divide majority from minority, there will, in most cases, be lines of convergence. For in the battle we must wage to get the European Community to survive and develop — and within this development, for the European Parliament to play its rightful part — we will often have to join forces and the will we express must undeniably appear to the States and governments as the expression of a broad democratic majority. Indeed, I am convinced that, in spite of what divides us, the vast majority of us here speak for people who, notwithstanding their disap-

pointments, still believe in Europe. Our people have sometimes understood better than the governments that we cannot break the crisis we are going through nor overcome the obstacles on our path unless we display solidarity and unless from our national interests, which, if legitimate, must of course be defended, there emerges a search for the common European good, which is, ultimately, the flag around which we should all rally.

*(Applause)*

I am well aware that this common European good — and this is a much-used phrase — is hard to define in practical terms. It is a matter for discussion. But I am sure that this common interest does exist and, as has often been said, that the only alternatives are the survival and development of the European Community on the one hand and disintegration and disastrous consequences on the other.

So you see, for a man of my generation, there are some memories that stand out. Between the wars, there was a world economic crisis — it started in 1929 — that was worse, perhaps, than the one we are going through now. A few years afterwards, there were seven million unemployed in Germany alone. And how did the European countries react? With protectionism and autarchy. And so there were tensions that led to the catastrophe we all still remember so well. That is something we should reflect on! And if some of us were tempted to turn to protectionist methods — often involving getting the neighbours to cope with problems we should ourselves be handling — you must realize that this is the wrong way and that we must, on the contrary, stick firmly to the rules which govern our European Community and which are based essentially on free trade and, beyond that, on a strengthening of the solidarity that must unite us all.

When I mention these memories, there is no question of being tempted to sink into what some people call Euro-pessimism, the disease that is currently rife, if the press is to be believed.

I think that, in spite of our serious difficulties, Europe still has a good chance. First, because of our economic potential, as we are the biggest trading power in the world.

Second — and most importantly, I should say — because of Europe's pool of intelligence and its ability to invent and to innovate. Those are our great assets.

Look back over the history of this Europe of ours — not to the flood, but to the beginning of the last century, say — and it is easy to see that Europe had a privileged place in the world and its influence extended to the far corners of the planet, largely because of the achievements and the intelligence of our inventors, our scientists and our technicians, who put the European

**President**

economy well ahead of the rest of the world and opened our industries to markets on all the continents.

This advance — this has been said often and I shall not spend a great deal of time on it — has been lost and one of our first aims should be to get it back again. Which is why none of the new policies we are forever talking about seems more important than to make a joint effort with scientific and technological research. Our aim, at a time when all techniques are evolving with such dizzy speed, should be to get back among the leading nations of the world.

Ladies and gentlemen, when I say this, I am not trying to suggest that we should replace what is still very powerful national egoism by some kind of European egoism that would lead to us opposing development in other parts of the world, particularly industrial development in the Third World. On the contrary, I believe that, although there are certain problems of competition that need careful examination, we should see the development of the Third World economies as something favourable, because it raises standards of living and creates purchasing power. More markets can be opened for our industries, so, all in all, Europe's true interest accords perfectly with the generosity and humanity that should lead us to encourage the development of the Third World, particularly its poorest nations. The Europe we want is a Europe that is concerned with its own interests, of course, but which is also aware of its responsibility towards other parts of the world.

Honourable Members, I shall not spend any more time on this idea, which is one that I believe to be of fundamental importance. I am convinced that it is by looking at our problems from an international standpoint that we will give ourselves a chance to solve the problems — unemployment and inflation, for example — with which we are concerned at the present time.

There is something else that bothers some of us every bit as much as the economic and social issues, and that is security. I am well aware that not all the people in this House have exactly the same opinions on this. But we do, I think, have the same ambition, which is to enable our peoples to live in peace and security. I am one of those who feel there are probably several different ways of going about this, but that we have no choice other than to see that Europe is in a position to defend itself, whether through defence of Europe or European defence. I am well aware that the two are not completely synonymous. Something has to be done, together with the allies of the free peoples of Europe, to ensure that we can guarantee this generation and generations to come a future of peace and liberty and respect for all freedoms.

*(Applause)*

In the immediate future, we have financial problems to solve. To my mind, the Council of Ministers has not

yet managed to solve the most urgent of them — the 1984 budget shortfall and the preparation of the 1985 budget, that is to say. Our Parliament must of course be involved in the search for solutions and I am sure that it will contribute to this with a view to effectiveness and conciliation.

Let me just say this. As a former French finance minister, I am not inclined to underestimate the importance of the financial problems. But if you look at the figures for the difference between the positions of the various parties and compare them with the figures for our national budgets, for the gross domestic product of our nations, say, they are very low. Someone in the government recently said they were insignificant even. They are insignificant, above all, compared to the risks that would be run by those who failed to find the requisite spirit of conciliation or compromise in time and led the Community to a break-up.

*(Prolonged applause)*

This would not just have political consequences or economic consequences properly speaking. There would be financial consequences too. I should like all the financial specialists to realize this.

When I talk about the participation of the European Parliament, it quite naturally leads to me to talk about its powers. This is a major topic and it was widely discussed in 1979, during the first campaign, when some people feared that the House, once elected by universal suffrage, would obtain powers that were too great, while others wondered what the point was of voting for a House with no power.

I think we can pay tribute to our predecessors — and I am thinking here particularly of the two previous Presidents, Simone Veil and Piet Dankert — because everything was done during their terms of office in this very area of the budget, within the framework of the texts and regulations, to ensure that Parliament can have some influence in the only area in which it has powers of decision. We are sometimes told we have abused our powers and that we are to some extent to blame for certain financial difficulties.

Anyone who knows the question will realize that this accusation is without any foundation. I call on all those who are not convinced of this to be so kind as to look at the budgets for previous years and measure the contribution Parliament has very legitimately made to the final definition of expenditure. The cause will gain rapid ground.

We hope these powers will be extended, of course. I think I can say that we can and we must — without being presumptuous, certainly, but with a sense of responsibility to those who elected us — try and extend our powers. Not, ladies and gentlemen, that I believe that the MEPs are necessarily more intelligent and more competent than people in government or the top

## President

officials — technocrats, I was going to say — who run the Community, just because they have been blessed with election by universal suffrage. No, I do not think that at all. I have been an MP for 30 years now and I have no such illusions. But what gives us particular strength in face of those who are, quite naturally, concerned with the problems of immediate management and developing the national interests with which they have been entrusted — and they cannot be blamed for this — is that we are representatives and we should state the people's wishes for greater solidarity and progress towards European unification, the only thing, as we well know, that will, in the final analysis, enable us to solve together the problems that the individual States cannot solve if they act alone (sometimes even without consulting their neighbours). That is our great mission.

(Applause)

Some of you said just now that we have serious responsibilities to shoulder. I am convinced this is right. May I say that the satisfaction I feel at my election is tempered by a certain amount of apprehension. The task we all face is a difficult one. The task the man you have made your President faces is a difficult one. Yet we have to try and perform it and do so, I repeat, with a feeling of solidarity and with a revival of that Community spirit which, I think, is so rarely apparent in government meetings. And what is a Community with no community spirit? Our main responsibilities are not technical ones, although we have some excellent technicians among us. They are not even legal ones. They are spiritual ones. Where should the spirit of the European Community lie today if not in the Parliament elected by direct universal suffrage by the peoples of Europe?

(Loud applause)

But I do not believe we should see our relations with the other organs of the Community — the Commission and the Council of Ministers, that is to say — in terms of conflict. By no means.

There has often been a considerable convergence between the Commission and Parliament, complicity even, I was going to say. And although, in recent times, the Commission has not had the authority or the influence the authors of the Treaty intended, we are well aware that it is not its fault. Those who can remember what has happened over the past 15 years know what this is all about. Here I should also like to pay tribute to the present Members of the Commission. I cannot mention them all by name. I should like to pay tribute to Gaston Thorn, the President, and to Vice-President Etienne Davignon, both of whom have often spoken with lucidity and sometimes with courage in this House. We heard from the press that one of our former colleagues has been proposed as next President of the Commission. It is someone we know well — Jacques Delors, who brought great authority

to the chairmanship of our Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and whose ability is well-known to us. May I just say that, on this first occasion, we expect a certain promise made at the Stuttgart summit — for the European Parliament to be consulted before any final decision is taken — to be respected.

(Loud applause)

Convergence with the Council of Ministers has been rarer, it has to be admitted. My personal experience, I repeat, enables me to understand how members of governments who are weighed down with cares find it difficult to see a higher European interest. May I remind you, without being accused of being nostalgic, of the 1950s?

Statesmen in the 1950s, barely two years after the war, worked in economic, financial and political conditions that were at least as difficult as those we have today. Yet, in their desire to build a new Europe and avoid the dangers to which Europe had succumbed, they found the energy and the courage to embark upon the building of the European Community. Yes, we should pay tribute to the men we call the fathers of Europe, to the Schumans, the Adenauers, the de Gasperis, the Paul-Henri Spaaks, the van Zeelands and, of course, the Jean Monnets of this world. They came from different political parties and they had the courage to undertake to guide Europe into a new phase of its history. The problems we have today are of a different nature, of course, and if these men came back among us now, they would no doubt suggest different solutions from, say, the creation of an Iron and Steel Community. But the spirit that moved them should also move their successors.

So, no wariness, *a priori*, about the Council of Ministers. Understanding as to its difficulties. But a desire to help it with the stimulus we give it to overcome obstacles and to find, within itself, the intelligence and the will to do as its great forerunners did.

This House must be dynamic. Unless we are a dynamic House and unless we can feel the wind blowing strongly from the depths of our peoples who want to get the Community out of its trammels and prepare for our young people a future of prosperity, peace and security, we shall not be worthy of the mandate with which we have been entrusted. Argument and the occasional dispute are inevitable, often necessary even. But we must, at times of great moment, be able to join together so that the fresh impulse Europe needs will go forth from this House.

This leads me to speak very briefly on institutional problems. I think a lot can be done within the framework of the Treaties. This is what is sometimes called the policy of little steps. In reality, the steps may be big ones. I could give you many examples — technical standards, the extension of the internal market, the removal of barriers to trade and the movement of peo-

**President**

ple and goods. May I say that I am particularly pleased that a start has already been made on reducing the controls at a frontier just near here.

Never fear, Honourable Members, that is the only reference I shall be making to the town I live in.

*(Applause)*

The strengthening of Europe's cultural identity is one of the areas in which progress can be made. This is a vast subject and I cannot deal with it today. We can, I think, make an effort to help Europe delve into its treasures and cultural heritage and find an awareness of its profound, ancient and indestructible unity once more. We can, I think, undertake work — further work, I should say — in this direction. The committee that deals with these matters has already done so most effectively, in conjunction with the Council of Europe, which attaches great importance to cultural affairs.

Culture brings me to a word on communications. The sometimes disappointing results of the last elections have shown, essentially, that our citizens are inadequately informed about the work of the European Community and particularly the work of the European Parliament.

*(Applause)*

I really do not believe that the high rate of abstention in some — not all — countries is due to congenital indifference toward Europe. Yet I have seen it in meetings I have held. I have found abysmal ignorance everywhere! But that is our fault. One of our prime objectives, I think, should be to make a big effort in information and communications — failing which we shall be going to the polls in five years' time in even more difficult conditions than we have had in the past.

Another step forward we can make without changing the Treaties, a subject that has often cropped up here, is the majority vote in the Council of Ministers.

*(Applause)*

I have reason to remember the conditions in which we reached what has (wrongly) been called the Luxembourg compromise in 1966. There was no compromise. General de Gaulle made a speech at the time, being rightly concerned about the risk a country would run if its fundamental national interests had to be sacrificed. But we know what has happened in practice to the rule drawn up at that stage. It has led to deadlock — not just at the level of Heads of State or Government or the ministers, but at the level of the officials and technicians too — whenever there was a risk of one of the Member States using its veto. We recently received copies of the nomenclature of the Commission proposals on which our Parliament had given opinions and which were still being dealt with by the Council of Ministers on 1 February this year. I

counted these proposals. Honourable Members, there were 392 of them. So, what I say is this. Without, of course, lacking the respect due to the really fundamental interests of certain countries, it is vital to return to the only way of taking effective democratic decisions — majority voting.

*(Applause)*

When it comes to enlargement, the accession of Spain and Portugal — which I personally feel to be a good thing, although it does pose many problems of a different order — I think the demand for this is even greater. The difficulties of the Ten will be even greater when there are Twelve. I would be worried about enlargement if we failed to give the Community, especially the Council of Ministers, back the ability to desire, to decide on and to apply decisions. That, I think, is a problem of considerable importance.

I am well aware that there are people who say there are ways out. They talk about a multi-speed Europe and a variable geometry Europe and one eminent Member of the Commission, a British one in fact, talked about concentric circles recently. There are a number of initiatives which have already been taken, projects which have been run, with the involvement of only some of the Member States — the European Monetary System, the JET thermo-nuclear research centre and more. It would be wrong to rule out the possibility of initiatives of this kind. Let me tell you my personal thoughts on the matter. If all creativity and all initiatives gradually came to take place outside the framework of the Community institutions, the Community's substance would gradually drain away, leaving an empty shell destined to disappear.

*(Applause)*

Our Parliament has taken an important decision on the institutions. It has approved a project on European Union. Not unanimously. By a majority. May I, on this occasion, pay tribute to Mr Spinelli, who was behind this initiative and who followed it up in this House with a great deal of patience, devotion and skill as well. We have a debt of gratitude to Mr Spinelli and I admire him because he managed to turn that dangerous animal, the crocodile, into a symbol of peace and unity.

*(Applause)*

I do not know what the fate of this draft Treaty will be, but we will certainly have to follow its progress closely. And it is not for me to say what direction the House will take on this.

Something new happened recently. It was the Fontainebleau summit, which I mentioned just now. Contrary to what you might expect, it did not solve all the most urgent financial problems and we could well find ourselves facing them. It took a rather remarkable step

## President

when it decided to set up a committee to explore all the avenues that might lead to an improvement in the way our institutions work, to an institutional reform, that is to say.

This committee was called the Spaak Committee. The choice is a good one. I knew Paul-Henri Spaak. He was a great European of his time. If, after the Messina Conference, the relaunching of Europe, then under way led to the signing of the Treaties of Rome, it is largely thanks to him and the people who worked with him. So the choice of name is propitious — but it may not suffice. There is one thing that we should be concerned about — that it would be difficult to agree to a committee composed of personal representatives of the Heads of State or Government drawing up institutional reforms without involving the European Parliament in any way.

(Loud applause)

That would be inconceivable. For if the idea is to shape our institutional future, how is it possible to conceive of the task being done in an undemocratic manner, without the participation of our elected representatives? This is not, to my mind, just a question of prestige. It is a question of effectiveness. It is easy to see that, however well-intentioned the 10 Heads of State or Government may be when it comes to the new direction they have wanted to take since Fontainebleau, they will meet obstacles and they will perhaps have great need of the European Parliament's help in overcoming them and achieving the aims they have set themselves.

Those, honourable Members, are one or two thoughts on one or two of the subjects we shall be dealing with over the coming years. But may I say that, to my mind, our essential mission is not to help find solutions to such and such a technical, financial, economic or social problem, nor to problems of development or aid to the Third World. For years I have been struck by the disappointment of young people who no longer believe in Europe and I was struck again during the last election campaign. What has happened to the time when they chopped down the frontier posts near here? I have often received young people and talked to them and they always ask the same question: Old European — yes, I am — do you still believe in Europe? Aren't you disappointed? I always start by convincing them that, contrary to what they might think, Europe's record, the Community's record, is very positive, in spite of some disagreement and failure. But this is not enough. What they want is to be given prospects for the future. Their ambition is not just to get the Community out of the mire. It is to see us moving along the path to a genuinely united Europe, one which is able to play the historic role for which it has been cast, for the good of its people and for its greater influence in the world.

Yes, honourable Members, we must beware a certain realism! It is false realism if it is confused with immo-

bilism and if it is confused with resigned acceptance of the *status quo*. In his posthumous book *Pour l'Europe* Robert Schuman, that modest, moderate and reasonable man — those who knew him will certainly remember this — nevertheless wrote the astonishing words: 'The European idea is a revolutionary idea'. Yes, ladies and gentlemen, the European idea is a revolutionary idea because it is anxious to make a genuinely Community feeling take precedence over national egoism. It is a bold idea and it should still inspire us today.

Once again, as I take up the Presidency with which you have entrusted me, my main concern is for our young people. Can we convince them that European unity is a great and a fine idea? Not just because it will enable us to solve our problems, but because, in the difficult world we have to live in, where all the continents are threatened by the existing systems, where millions of people seek a *raison d'être* and justification for the values they are offered, we should show that we know how to build this Europe of ours, this area of peace and freedom and social justice, which, going beyond the confines of Europe itself, will be a model, an example and a source of encouragement to the other peoples of the world and which, because of its moral authority, can help re-establish peace in the world. It is this faith in Europe that we must rekindle in our young people. It is a faith that I, God be thanked, have never lost. I hope it will inspire us in all we do.

(Loud and prolonged applause)

**Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission.** — (NL) Mr President, it is a special privilege and honour for me as the Commissioner responsible for relations with the European Parliament to be the first person from outside this Assembly to congratulate you on your election to the office of President of the newly elected European Parliament.

After the rousing statement you have just made, Mr President, there is really no further need to refer to your great career as a European and a politician of stature. We can but ask ourselves how anyone but a man of your authority could be elected at this time to lead the institution which above all others — I repeat, above all others — is destined in the Community's present difficult position to give fresh inspiration to the citizens of Europe and more particularly its young people. At this difficult time, I believe that under your leadership the European Parliament has a role to play that is unprecedented in the history of the European Communities, and it is therefore extremely important, Mr President, that someone of your standing and ability should be able to give this Parliament guidance in its activities, someone with the experience and wisdom and also the inspiration and authority that was reflected in the impressive speech you have just made.

**Andriessen**

Mr President, after what you have said, I do not intend to discuss the problems Europe now faces. They are many and serious, and this at a time when many people seem to have lost their faith in the future of Europe. May your inspiring leadership, Mr President, enable this Parliament to restore the confidence in Europe that is needed if the decisions that Europe awaits are to be taken.

Mr President, this is also a suitable occasion for a word of sincere appreciation for the efforts of the outgoing president, my compatriot Piet Dankert. He guided and presided over Parliament at an extremely difficult time. As a Member of the Commission, I should like to emphasize once again that he has always stood up for the powers, prerogatives, authority and influence of this Parliament and, I might add, not infrequently with success. In the Commission we have learnt to appreciate him as a convinced European, as a good friend and as a difficult ally, and that is how it should be. I hope, Mr President, that these three qualifications will also apply to the cooperation between the Commission and Parliament under your leadership in the years to come.

*(Applause)*

### 5. Agenda

**President.** — The next item is the first ballot for the election of the Vice-Presidents at 8 p.m.

However, since the political group chairmen have asked that the sitting be suspended for at least two hours, perhaps it might be best to postpone this first ballot for the election of the Vice-Presidents until tomorrow morning at 10 a.m.

Does the House agree with this proposal?

**Mr Arndt.** — *(DE)* Mr President, the political group chairmen have agreed that we need at least three hours between the election of the President and the election of the Vice-Presidents, because in this time we also have to arrive at some decision on the distribution of committee chairmanships.

I would propose therefore — and I think that I am speaking also for the other groups — that the group meetings take place at 6 p.m. The Christian-Democratic Group would like to meet at 6 p.m., the Socialists also. The group chairmen can then meet at 7 p.m. to take their decisions on the Vice-Presidents and also on the committee chairmen. That would mean that at 9 a.m. tomorrow morning the groups would have a further opportunity to meet and the plenary sitting could then begin at 10 a.m., as you have proposed.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Fich.** — *(DA)* Mr President, it is about the finalizing of the agenda for this week. I should like to know when we are to decide on the final agenda. The provisional agenda specifies certain deadlines for 8 p.m. this evening, and they will of course have to be postponed, since we have not yet decided on the final agenda. I should like to ask now, and I think broadly speaking on behalf of all the groups, that some of the deadlines for motions for resolutions be altered. Can we assume that the deadlines for tabling motions for resolutions and amendments will only be fixed when we have adopted the final agenda for the week's sittings?

**President.** — Mr Fich, the deadline expires at 8 p.m. this evening, and the agenda must be adopted tomorrow morning after the vote for the Vice-Presidents.

**Mr Fich.** — *(DA)* Mr President, now that I have had confirmation that the deadlines expire at 8 p.m. this evening, I do not see any alternative to presenting the following request: on behalf of the Liberal Group, the European Democratic Group, the Christian-Democratic Group, the Communist Group and the Socialist Group, I should like to say that there are certain budgetary matters which have to be dealt with this week, and we cannot see that it will be possible at the present time, when Parliament is not constituted, to debate them fully in the various political groups, which is why we are asking for the deadline for the tabling of motions for resolutions on these budgetary matters to be extended to 8 p.m. tomorrow. To begin with, we have to make sure that the documents are properly prepared so that we do not get into technical difficulties.

**President.** — I am sorry, Mr Fich, but I have been informed that for technical reasons it is not possible to comply with your request. The problem is that the documents in question have to be translated. We must therefore abide by this deadline of 8 p.m. if the discussion on this matter is to take place tomorrow.

**Mr Fich.** — *(DA)* Mr President, I can inform you that the documents in question have already been prepared in several languages, and there is therefore no major problem. Should there be any doubts on purely technical aspects, I suggest that we hold a vote, since I know that the Liberal, Conservative, Christian-Democratic, Communist and Socialist Groups are all in favour of extending the deadline to 8 p.m. tomorrow. I see no reason for arguing about it. If need be, let us vote on it.

**President.** — Until what time exactly do you propose that the deadline be extended, Mr Fich?

**Mr Fich.** — *(DA)* Mr President, it is only on these matters that I want the deadline to be extended, and I would like it to be extended to 8 p.m. tomorrow.



**President.** — That is absolutely out of the question. I am sorry.

**Mr von der Vring.** — (DE) Mr President, may I point out that as yet we have adopted no agenda, nor have we adopted any deadlines for today or tomorrow. Unless we vote on the matter now, we cannot simply state that any deadline expires at 8 p.m., since Parliament has not actually fixed any deadline. Mr Fich has requested that a deadline be fixed for tomorrow at 8 p.m. You have rejected this and said that you want to abide by the deadline of 8 p.m. today. We cannot break up now without coming to some agreement on this point, and I would ask that the groups should be allowed to state their views on the matter.

**President.** — Mr von der Vring, the fact of the matter is that the decision was taken some time ago when the oldest Member was in the Chair. We did have a decision.

I have here in front of me the agenda which fixes the deadline for tabling any motions for resolutions, pursuant to Rule 57, at 8 p.m.

Another arrangement that we could possibly make has been suggested to me. Mr Arndt, could we postpone this deadline until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning?

**Mr Arndt.** — (DE) I was about to propose that we now extend the deadline for this motion, which comes from the budget experts, until tomorrow morning at the beginning of the sitting. If they still required further time at that point, we would then have to have a further discussion on the matter. If my proposal is accepted, we would have at least an initial extension until tomorrow morning and we could then discuss within our groups how we should proceed further in the matter.

**Mr Fich.** — (DA) Mr President, I am sorry, but we have inquired with the administration of Parliament when we adopt the agenda. The agenda is adopted after we have elected the President.

We cannot be bound by anything before that time. It is quite clear. We adopt the agenda and determine the deadlines either now or tomorrow. It cannot be otherwise.

Let me explain why it is necessary to extend the deadline, because it must be unclear to many colleagues. Representatives of all the groups I have mentioned, who were concerned with budgetary matters in the old Parliament, have discussed the question of the repayment to Great Britain. Everyone knows that there have been a number of meetings: Fontainebleau, meetings of Finance Ministers and Foreign Ministers, which we have to take account of. First of all we want to listen to the debate tomorrow on the Fontainebleau meeting; against that background it may be necessary for the representatives of the Conservative, Christian-Democratic, Communist and Socialist groups to table a motion for a resolution on the repayment, but we cannot know that today, Mr President. I therefore propose that we reschedule the deadline for 8 p.m. tomorrow.

But clearly, if we can wait to finalize this matter till 10 a.m. tomorrow — if the deadline is extended to then — I will repeat my request tomorrow, just as long as we have a guarantee that the matter will be taken up again when that time comes.

**President.** — I think that there is no objection to that.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (DE) Mr President, I should like to support Mr Arndt's proposal that the deadline be extended until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning. We can then see whether that is enough. I think that it will be.

**President.** — Since there are no objections, the deadline is extended until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Nominations for the election of the Vice-Presidents must be submitted before 9.30 a.m. tomorrow morning.<sup>1</sup>

*(The sitting was closed at 5.55 p.m.)*

<sup>1</sup> *Petitions — Transfers of appropriations — Written declarations (Rule 49) — Documents received — Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes 1.*

## SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 25 JULY 1984

### Contents

1. <i>Approval of the Minutes:</i> <i>Mr Schwalba-Hoth; Mr Fich; Mr Pannella;</i> <i>Mr Cottrell; Mr Adam . . . . .</i>	20	9. <i>Election of Vice-Presidents (continuation):</i> <i>Mr Cervetti; Mr Panella; Mr Galland; Mr</i> <i>Klepsch; Mr Arndt; Mr Le Pen; Mr Van der</i> <i>Lek; Mr Pannella; Mrs Flesch; Mr Saby . . .</i>	38
2. <i>Tribute:</i> <i>Mr Pajetta . . . . .</i>	21	10. <i>Tabling of a motion for a resolution:</i> <i>Mr de la Malène; Mr Chambeiron; Mr de la</i> <i>Malène; Mr Fich . . . . .</i>	39
3. <i>Election of Vice-Presidents:</i> <i>Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Van der Lek; Mr Arndt</i>	22	11. <i>Number and membership of committees</i> <i>(vote):</i> <i>Mr Brøndlund Nielsen; Mrs Bonino; Mr</i> <i>Pannella; Mr Sherlock . . . . .</i>	41
4. <i>Decision on urgency:</i> <i>Mr Fich; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Langes; Mr</i> <i>Barry (Council); Mr Pranchère; Mr de la</i> <i>Malène . . . . .</i>	23	12. <i>European Council of Fontainebleau (contin-</i> <i>uation):</i> <i>Mr Klepsch; Sir Henry Plumb . . . . .</i>	41
5. <i>Deadline for tabling amendments:</i> <i>Mr Fich . . . . .</i>	24	13. <i>Election of Vice-Presidents (continuation)</i>	44
6. <i>European Council of Fontainebleau:</i> <i>Mr FitzGerald (Council); Mr Thorn (Com-</i> <i>mission) . . . . .</i>	24	14. <i>European Council of Fontainebleau (contin-</i> <i>uation):</i> <i>Mr Natta; Mrs Veil; Mr de la Malène; Mr</i> <i>Fanton; Mr Bøgh; Mr Romualdi; Mr Pan-</i> <i>nella; Mr Glinne; Mr Croux; Mr Møller;</i> <i>Mrs De March; Mr Maher; Mr Graefe zu</i> <i>Baringdorf; Mr Woltjer; Mr Ryan; Mr Prag;</i> <i>Mr Ephremidis; Mr Fich; Mr Averof-Tossit-</i> <i>sas; Mrs Castle; Mr Welsh; Mr Antoniozzi;</i> <i>Mr Narjes (Commission) . . . . .</i>	45
7. <i>Election of Vice-Presidents (continuation):</i> <i>Mr Arndt . . . . .</i>	35		
8. <i>European Council of Fontainebleau (contin-</i> <i>uation):</i> <i>Mr Arndt . . . . .</i>	36		

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*President*

*(The sitting opened at 10.30 a.m.)*

#### 1. *Approval of the Minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

**Mr Schwalba-Hoth.** — (DE) Mr President, there is a mistake in the minutes as regards the Rainbow Group. The names of the four equal co-chairmen of our group have been listed wrongly as Else Hammerich, Jaak Vandemeulebroucke, Bram van der Lek and Friedrich Wilhelm Graefe zu Baringdorf. Could this please be rectified in the minutes.

**President.** — Mr Schwalba-Hoth, your observation will be recorded in the Minutes.

**Mr Fich.** — (DA) There is a mistake in item 11 of the minutes. It says that I proposed yesterday that the deadline for the tabling of motions for resolutions be set at 8 p.m. today. That is something we shall return to when we finalize the agenda, but that is not what I proposed. I merely said that the deadline for tabling motions on budget questions should be extended. I should like to have that made clear.

**President.** — Mr Fich, the Minutes will be corrected accordingly.

**Mr Pannella.** — (IT) Mr President, in paragraph 3 of the minutes it states that I requested that the 'matter' be referred to the Committee on the Verification of Credentials. I think that this form of words does not accurately reflect what happened, and makes it impossible to understand what is meant by the term 'the matter'. I therefore propose that that expression be replaced by the words 'the failure of the national parliaments to respect their obligations under article 11 of the European Treaty of 1976 concerning the election of Parliament...'. The 'matter' does not relate to the announcement of the President, but the failure on the part of one Parliament to act as required.

May I also be permitted to express the hope, Mr President, that when delays occur in the opening of the sitting this should not be announced on the television screen, which is not the normal instrument. The President should have the courtesy to open the sitting of the Assembly at the time laid down, and then announce its immediate suspension. You must excuse me, Mr President, but as a Member of Parliament I do not like being notified by television.

**President.** — Your point will be spelled out more clearly in the Minutes.

As regards the delay in opening the sitting, I apologise to the Assembly. In view of the special circumstances, notably the arrival of the President-in-Office of the Council, the half-hour delay was necessary.

But I recognize that everything must be done to ensure that all the Members of the Assembly are notified as soon as possible.

**Mr Cottrell.** — Mr President, in view of the decision of the Commission with regard to going ahead with supplementary spending in defiance of the Council, is it your intention to ensure that Parliament will be able to express its view on this subject during the joint debate tomorrow after the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council?

**President.** — Yes, Parliament will be able to express its view in the course of tomorrow's debate.

**Mr Adam.** — Mr President, with regard to Items 9 and 10, there is no reference in the Minutes of yesterday's sitting to the services rendered to the Parliament by the outgoing President, Mr Dankert. You yourself, Mr President, made some reference to it in your speech and so did the leader of the Conservative Group. I think it is most unfortunate that there is no reference at all to this in the Minutes of yesterday's proceedings, and I would ask that this be corrected.

**President.** — Fine. In any case I think that there will at least be a summary of my speech in the Minutes, including the observations you have just mentioned.

*(Parliament approved the Minutes)*

## 2. Tribute

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, before dealing with the agenda, it is my sad duty to recall the memory of a colleague who died during the last part-session of Parliament, in the course of the election campaign to retain his seat. I refer to Mr Enrico Berlinguer.

Elected by 700 000 votes in Italy, he is now no longer with us. He passed away in Padua on 11 June, and two days later over a million people were gathered in Rome to pay him a final tribute, a tribute in which they were joined by a great number of his fellow citizens all political boundaries. The President of our Parliament, Mr Dankert, was present at the funeral and gave a speech.

Enrico Berlinguer was born in Sardinia in 1922. In 1943 he joined the Communist Party. He devoted his whole life to his political activities, always faithful to the ideas he espoused. From 1972 he was Secretary-General of his party.

He arrived at the European Parliament in 1979, and Members of the previous Assembly remember how, on all the important occasions, he never failed to speak, and his interventions were always followed closely, even by his political opponents. He undoubtedly opened up new perspectives. And his ability to create and innovate, as well as the great moral strength that emanated from this reserved man, made him a respected leader and a colleague admired by all.

To his party comrades, to the Communist Group of this Parliament, and to the members of his family, I express on behalf of all the Assembly our feelings of sorrow and our most sincere condolences.

In memory of our late colleague, I ask you to observe a minute's silence.

*(The Assembly rose and observed a minute's silence)*

**Mr Pajetta.** — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the European Parliament has wished to honour the memory of our comrade, the colleague of us all, Enrico Berlinguer. President Dankert has already paid a tribute, with a very intelligent speech rich with passion, in Rome, before one-and-a-half million workers, citizens; and we thank him for this once again. And now we have just heard the words of tribute, heavy with emotion, with which President Pflimlin has opened our proceedings today.

We are honouring the memory of the member of the European Parliament, Enrico Berlinguer, who, as the President reminded us, was elected by the votes of 700 thousand electors. Yesterday, President Pflimlin also reminded us of the weakness inherent in the public's scant knowledge of the results of our work and of the subjects that we deal with together, and the poor voting turnout that is the result. Enrico Berlinguer fought to the last to prevent this. Enrico Berlinguer shouted his last words when illness struck inexorably, and he still managed to say: 'Work for Europe, turn your attention to it, debate it.' I think that it is due in great part to his work that our party obtained 11 million votes, which makes it the party with the most votes in Europe, and furthermore helped our country to achieve the highest percentage of voters in the Community — which I think reflects the interest of our country as a whole.

We are therefore remembering a member of this Parliament, a man who fully understood, and made others fully understand, that the grave problems which beset every one of our countries can only be tackled today — and must be so tackled — in the new dimension of the Continent which, for the moment, is that of the Community. His crucial commitment at times of success and difficulty alike, has been recalled. He spoke of peace, bravely tackling some subjects that others might have thought it better to avoid. He spoke of missiles, Poland, Afghanistan, not forgetting our duty in regard to the North-South dialogue, the development of the Third World, nor the problems of employment, youth and women. He wanted the commitment of our entire party to European Union to be evident in the country, and he himself wanted to emphasize here, with his presence, his words and his vote, our support for the project that carried and still carries — for those who do not want to forget — the name of Altiero Spinelli, and which is to so great an extent the fruit also of Comrade Berlinguer's tenacious work.

The President very rightly reminded us of the 'European Fathers'. We remember here, today, a man who worked to make it really the Europe of peace, of détente, of work and progress. That is why, when I say 'Thank you' to Enrico Berlinguer, and when I remind us of what he did, I think I can do this not only on behalf of our party, not only on behalf of the Italians who shared that grief and that mourning and then voted in such strength for the Communist Party. I

think you will allow me to say that this 'Thank you' — quite apart from our group — is something that should be said, in some way, on behalf of this Assembly, that has seen him as a tenacious advocate and a worthy member.

In thanking once more President Dankert and President Pflimlin, we also thank the Assembly for the homage it has paid. We confirm our promise to work with the same spirit, the same commitment and the same energy and, so far as it is possible, to complete the work that Comrade Enrico Berlinguer has so intelligently set out for us, for Italy and for Europe.

*(Loud applause)*

### 3. Election of the Vice-Presidents

**President.** — The next item is the election of the Vice-Presidents of the European Parliament.

**Mr d'Ormesson.** — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like confirmation that the ballot papers that are going to be distributed do indeed state the political affiliations of the candidates, as they should do, since the number of candidates is more than the twelve seats to be filled.

**President.** — No, Mr d'Ormesson, that indication is not given on the ballot paper. This has never been the practice. But I don't think there is any great mystery about the political affiliations of the various candidates...

**Mr Van der Lek.** — *(NL)* Mr President, on behalf of the Rainbow Group I should like to tell Parliament why we have proposed Mrs Brigitte Heinrich as candidate for the vice-presidency: it was to protest at the way minorities in this Parliament are treated and the major parties share out the posts of Vice-President among themselves...

**President.** — Mr Van der Lek, it is not the custom to present candidates. There are a lot of them, which is only natural. If we had to sit through a whole string of presentation speeches, that would only draw out the proceedings.

**Mr Arndt.** — *(DE)* Mr President, on behalf of the group chairmen may I say that in the proposal on the attribution of vice-presidents to the various groups we have adhered to the well-tried principle of the d'Hondt procedure and have followed the custom of the previous Parliament by attributing two extra seats to the group to which the President belongs.

The group chairmen have therefore agreed on the following distribution: five vice-presidents from the

**Arndt**

Socialist Group, two vice-presidents from the Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democratic Group), two vice-presidents from the Group of European Democrats, one vice-president from the Communist and Allies Group, one vice-president from the Liberal and Democratic Group and one from the Group of the European Democratic Alliance. That is in line with the d'Hondt procedure.

It is my duty to inform you of this proposal from the group chairmen.

**President.** — Mr Arndt, we take note of your statement. I have received the nominations for the posts of Vice-President of the European Parliament. They comply with the provisions of the Rules of Procedure. The number of candidates exceeds the number of seats to be filled. The names are as follows: Mr Alber, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Dido, Lady Elles, Mr Estgen, Mr Fanti, Mr Griffiths, Mrs Heinrich, Mr Lalor, Mr Le Pen, Mr Møller, Mr Nord, Mrs Pery, Mr Plaskovitis and Mr Seefeld.

Pursuant to Rule 14(1) of the Rules of Procedure:

Those who on the first ballot, up to the number of twelve, obtain an absolute majority of the votes cast shall be declared elected in the numerical order of their votes. Should the number of candidates elected be less than the number of seats to be filled, a second ballot shall be held under the same conditions to fill the remaining seats. Should a third ballot be necessary, a relative majority shall suffice for election to the remaining seats. In the event of a tie the oldest candidates shall be declared elected.

Voting will now begin.

*(The vote was held)*

Voting is closed.

I now ask the tellers to count the votes.

#### 4. Decision on urgency

PROPOSAL FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL (COM(84) 399 FINAL — DOC. 1-362/84) 'COVERING THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE 1984 FINANCIAL YEAR'

**Mr Fich.** — (DA) Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group — and I get the impression that I speak on behalf of other groups as well, but they must say so for themselves — I oppose urgency concerning the question of measures to make good the shortfall on the budget for 1984, on the following grounds:

It is our understanding that we shall not know the extent of the deficit before we debate the supplementary budget. We know that the Council of Finance Ministers last week did not adopt a supplementary budget for 1984. We take this situation in the Council to mean that there is no need for urgency on this matter. If the Council cannot reach a decision on a supplementary budget, we do not see any reason why we should take a decision on measures to cover a deficit of which we do not know the extent before we have had the supplementary budget on which the Council cannot reach a decision.

The second argument is as follows: I have inquired, and have been told that there are no grounds for urgency as far as the Council is concerned. It is our view that we should have grounds for urgency in debating this question. We do not have them, and that is why I speak on behalf of my own and no doubt several other groups in opposing urgency.

**Mrs Scrivener.** — (FR) On a procedural motion, Mr President, I should like to ask the Council whether it still wishes to proceed with its request for urgent procedure, since this request is totally illogical given that the Council itself is in no position, according to all the information at our disposal, and has no plans to deal with this problem by any means other than finding economies.

**President.** — Mrs Scrivener, what you are saying is important, but it is not a point of order.

**Mrs Scrivener.** — (FR) It is a question to the Council. I should like to have an answer.

**Mr Langes.** — (DE) Mr President, I would like to speak in favour and at the same time take over Mrs Scrivener's question. We Christian Democrats believe that in principle we should approve urgent procedure simply because Parliament must be consulted *beforehand*, so that the Council can then decide.

This is different from the budget. There the Council decides *first* and we are consulted afterwards. I am saying this to my colleagues so that they will be aware of the legal differences involved. We as the Parliament should not make any legal mistakes. If we are consulted, we are in favour of urgent procedure. But I would also like to take up Mrs Scrivener's question and ask the Council the following: we are in favour of urgent procedure — but is the Council also still in favour of urgent procedure? Will the Council please answer that question!

**President.** — Mr President of the Council, do you wish to make a statement? You have heard the question put by Mrs Scrivener, taken up by Mr Langes.

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council.** — Just to repeat, Mr President, that we are in favour of urgent procedure and we do need Parliament's opinion for a meeting on 6 September.

**Mr Pranchère.** — (FR) Mr President, I should like to ask you whether you, as the new President of our Parliament, consider that the Council's request for urgent procedure is compatible with the Parliament's prerogatives in budgetary matters. We find that the Council is asking to be given *carte blanche* in seeking a decision on a proceeding which today offers none of the means of breaking the budgetary deadlock. My own view, bearing in mind the resolutions that have been voted in this Chamber, is that the request for urgent procedure is not compatible with the prerogatives of our Parliament.

**President.** — Mr Pranchère, I have already heard one speaker for and one speaker against. We shall now proceed to the vote.

(Parliament rejected urgent procedure)<sup>1</sup>

**Mr de la Malène.** — (FR) Mr President, I believe that I have the right to present a very brief explanation of vote.

I should like to say that my group voted in favour of urgent procedure. In doing so, it was fully conscious of the Council's poor conduct. However, my group does not want the Council's poor conduct to become a possible cause of further aggravation of the difficulties confronting European farmers. We were thinking of the sums needed by farmers in the Community when voting in favour of urgent procedure, and had no intention of exonerating the Council for its display of impotence.

#### 5. Deadline for tabling amendments

**President.** — I propose that the deadline for tabling amendments to all the texts covered by the agenda be set at 8 p.m. this evening.

**Mr Fich.** — (DA) Mr President, yesterday we had something of an argument about deadlines for resolutions. The deadline was provisionally extended to 10.00 hours today as regards resolutions concerning the budgetary problem. I already said yesterday that we wanted an extension to 20.00 hours today. Now however I think that, after Mrs Hoff and others have tabled a motion for a resolution, we can after all table

amendments to it, and basically therefore we are covered.

What I should really like to know — it is possible that I have not kept track of what has been happening — is: what is the deadline for tabling amendments to the resolutions we are to debate on Thursday? I should very much like to know that, so as to guard against making any mistake there.

**President.** — Mr Fich, as I pointed out just a moment ago, the deadline for amendments is 8 p.m. this evening.

#### 6. European Council of Fontainebleau

**President.** — The next item is the statements by the President-in-Office of the European Council and the President of the Commission on the European Council meeting of 25 and 26 June 1984 at Fontainebleau.

Before asking him to speak, I should like to extend a welcome to Mr FitzGerald, President-in-Office and Prime Minister of Ireland.

(Applause)

**Mr FitzGerald, President-in-Office of the European Council.** — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, at the outset I should like to take this first opportunity to congratulate you, Mr President, on your election to the distinguished office of President of this Parliament. The whole Community and all of its institutions will be beneficiaries of the decision to entrust the fortunes of the Parliament to your distinguished and experienced hands.

(Applause)

This is the second occasion on which an Irish Prime Minister has had the honour of addressing an inaugural sitting of the Parliament of the directlyelected representatives of the people of Europe. I think many of you will appreciate what a special pleasure this is for me. Ten years ago, I had the honour to be present at the Paris Summit which considered the proposal of the Parliament that direct elections be initiated in 1980. It was in fact the Irish Prime Minister of that time, Mr Cosgrave, and myself who proposed a more ambitious target for an earlier date — a proposal whose partial implementation brought forward the timing of those elections to 1979.

(Applause)

As President of the General Council of Foreign Ministers in the first half of 1975, I had the responsibility of negotiating on behalf of the Council with the Parlia-

<sup>1</sup> Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council — Agenda: see Minutes.

### FitzGerald

ment a conciliation procedure which gave the Parliament an important additional function in the budgetary process — albeit one which requires further refinement today in the interests of the Community's effective operation.

Later in my address I shall be reporting to you on the outcome of the European Council held in Fontainebleau on 25-26 June last. Before that, I wish to share some thoughts with you on the Community as it is today, on the Community as it might develop, and on Parliament's rôle in its affairs.

One cannot, one must not, ignore the fact that for many of its citizens the Community in recent years has been a disappointment, a fact reflected in the smaller number of people who voted in the second election in many of the Member States. But the sense of disappointment, even of disillusionment, amongst many of our citizens is not so much because the Community has failed to play a useful, indeed often a very effective, rôle in improving the conditions of life of its citizens. It is rather, because for various reasons many of the beneficial effects of the Community have become scarcely visible to its citizens. In some cases this has happened because of the indirect nature of these benefits, such as the massive impact upon internal trade of the creation of a single market. Other, direct, benefits have come to be taken for granted, as in the case of agricultural policy. Still others have been obscured by their absorption in domestic national budgets, as in the case of much of the benefit of regional and social policies.

Moreover, while many of the benefits of the Community have become opaque or invisible to its citizens, the cumbersome process of intergovernmental bargaining has become only too evident. One should not be surprised, therefore, at the exasperation of our citizens when they contemplate the endless and tiresome wrangles which stem from the operation of the Council of Ministers at every level.

The progress achieved has been obscured; the conflicts inherent in achieving further progress have been highlighted. We have been our own worst enemies in presenting the human face of the Community to its 270 million citizens.

*(Applause)*

It is clear, I think, however, from some of the results of the Fontainebleau European Council that the disadvantages and the inherent dangers of this situation are now appreciated by governments as well as by parliamentarians. Nonetheless, it will require a considerable effort by the Council, by this new Parliament and by the Commission, to change radically the current perception of the Community by its citizens. We are embarking here today on that effort. I offer to you my own commitment and that of my government, not just during the months of our Presidency, but in the years

ahead, to the achievement of a transformation in the way in which the Community is seen by its citizens.

As politicians we are all endowed with, or have developed, a special sensitivity to the aspirations and frustrations of those who elect us; if we were not so endowed or had not developed this, we should not, in our different capacities, be here today! We must use that sensitivity not merely to identify the frustrations and the hopes of the people whom we serve but also to find means of alleviating these frustrations and realizing these hopes through the more effective operation of this Community, this unique creation of midtwentieth-century European civilization.

I believe there are few in this Assembly who would contest that the principal preoccupation of many of our people, in all our countries today, is the intolerably high level of unemployment. This is the outcome both of a prolonged recession and of technological developments which we have not yet learnt to exploit to the economic and social benefit of our people. Unemployment, however, also stems in part from disorders in the World Monetary System. These, of course, affect us directly in the developed world, but they affect even more grievously many developing countries whose economic and financial stability and capacity for growth are necessarily bound up with our own.

However, the question we must address ourselves to as a priority, if we are to demonstrate to our people our relevance to their most fundamental concern — unemployment — is whether and how the Community can play an effective rôle in tackling this problem. It must be said in fairness that already a certain amount has been done. The European Monetary System provides its own stability in a world of wildly fluctuating currencies. Moreover, inspired by each other's experience, and having due regard to the guidance of the Commission, Member States have secured in recent years a certain convergence in inflation rates. This is removing — has perhaps in some States already removed — a serious obstacle to their capacity for sustained growth.

The question remains, however, as to whether the individual efforts of our Member States to tackle this immense social problem might not be rendered far more effective if they were to utilize more fully the capacity and purchasing power of a community of 270 million people, of a common market nearly the size of the United States.

*(Applause)*

This could provide a basis for a return to levels of economic growth far higher than could be achieved by individual States following, as they have largely done hitherto, economic policies of their own. In a sure and reliable way, such an approach could dramatically reduce the level of unemployment in our countries.

**FitzGerald**

If we look at the United States, we cannot fail to be impressed — but also, I am afraid, depressed — by the extraordinary contrast between the achievements of that economy in providing additional employment for 15 million more of its people in the last ten years and our apparent incapacity in Europe to provide additional employment for our increasing labour force. For in this same period employment in the Community declined by two million.

This failure on our part clearly reflects structural deficiencies, rigidities and inflexibilities, some of which are no doubt problems in the first instance for the governments of the Member States, but others could undoubtedly be tackled more effectively in common, by us as a Community. In certain instances, at least, our governments are inhibited from attempting to change some of these structures and to soften some of these rigidities because of fears that such action taken at national level would prove disadvantageous in relation to competition with other Member States. This fear could be resolved by intensified common action. Must we not also review the scale of the resources available to the Social Fund, and the degree to which these resources are now concentrated upon training people for jobs that in some cases do not exist, rather than upon the creation of actual employment opportunities?

At another level, have we made anything like full use of the potential for concerted economic policy, designed to stimulate growth in a region of 270 million people? This is a potential which, of its very nature, is far greater than that open to any single Member State, constrained as each State must be by the leakage outside its boundaries of the benefits of any national stimulatory action. It is a truism, but one which to a remarkable degree our governments have hitherto succeeded in ignoring, that joint concerted action, taken in a manner appropriate to the particular economic situation of each Member State, could provide a stimulus for growth far greater than anything that is within the capacity of any one Member State, even one of the larger Member States, acting on its own.

Again, must we not ask ourselves whether we are yet securing the full benefits of the participation of nine Member States in the European Monetary System? One thing is certain: we have by no means achieved all the objectives for which that system was set up.

Must we not also recognize that the economic health of the Third World, its capacity to sustain, to service and to repay debts owed to the industrialized countries is of vital importance to the health of our Community? Should we not recall that during the first oil crisis a very significant part of our recovery was due to the maintenance of and growth of demand from the Third World, which came to the rescue of a First World whose economy had been weakened and destabilized by a huge increase in oil prices?

When we reflect upon these possibilities, these challenges — as many of our citizens do reflect — must we not be struck, alarmed and even ashamed by the contrast between the potential of this Community which we are failing to realize and the reality of the disputes about money and milk, through which we have been dragging ourselves painfully, and irrelevantly, during these years of world economic crisis?

*(Applause)*

Let us be frank. Our peoples do not understand, and cannot be expected to understand, that we, their political leaders, should devote so much energy within this Community to disputing such issues amongst ourselves, apparently endlessly, while they are weighed down by the burden of unemployment and discouraged by the stagnation of real incomes. These ills are the result of forces that could at least partially be brought within our control if we had the will to rise to the task of mastering them.

I make no apology for having dwelt at some length upon this issue. The opening sitting of this new Parliament, which will have a crucial rôle to play in the lives of our peoples for the next five years, *must* be an occasion for mental, and moral, stocktaking. We must use this opportunity to stand back from our day-to-day concerns and to reflect together upon the gulf between the potentialities of our Community and the all-too-limited use that we, as its political leaders, have made of these potentialities.

Of course I do not wish to confine these reflections narrowly to the economic sphere of unemployment, growth rates and changes in real income. These are only part, though at the present time to many of our people an all-absorbing part, of the life of our citizens. There are other questions also that are posing themselves.

How real, our people want to know, is an economic community, a common market, within which the free movement of people and of goods is still impeded by controls, many of which are seen by them as bureaucratic and superfluous? What kind of a single market is it within which, at each national frontier-post, long queues of lorries are seen awaiting clearance of a complex documentation that is an unhappy inheritance from a fragmented continent of nation-States? Our citizens may understand that there must still be police checks at frontier points, but they find it less easy to understand why it is that in a single market, akin to the United States, so much time and effort must be put into customs controls which do not exist within that vast continental State.

*(Applause)*

Nor can we be happy that after almost three decades there still remain serious obstacles to the right of



## FitzGerald

establishment and the right to provide services across the frontiers of the Community.

These are the kind of issues which are seen by our citizens as evidence that we are not really serious about creating a genuine European Community, although we seem to them intensely serious about disputing amongst ourselves *who* will pay *what* share of the — let us face it — miserable 1% of Community output that we allocate to the financing of this Community of Europe.

Let me at this stage say, without exonerating any of our European institutions, that the primary responsibility for most of these failures falls on Member State governments, in the manner in which we as governments have conducted ourselves in the Council of Ministers in its various forms. There is, indeed, it seems to me, a certain injustice in the fact that as governments we have escaped some of our share of the blame for the deficiencies of our Community, and that a disproportionate share of that blame has been visited by our people upon the European Parliament.

*(Applause)*

Parliament must, of course, take its own share of the responsibility, but it ought to be said plainly to our citizens that, on any objective assessment, Parliament in its activities has justified the faith which those who voted in 1979 placed in it. This has been most clearly demonstrated in the work of Parliament, inspired by Mr Spinelli, in preparing a draft treaty to establish a European Union. In its intent, and in its inspiration, this draft treaty is a document which merits the full attention of governments. It is perhaps inevitable that there will at this stage be some reticence on the part of governments with respect to certain aspects of the draft treaty. But the draft treaty does point the way ahead, and places on governments the onus of seeking a real consensus for action that can be taken now to advance the process envisaged by this draft.

The draft treaty is perhaps the most obvious manifestation of the will of Parliament, representing the peoples of our continent, to progress towards a European Union. The actions of Parliament in many other spheres have sought to maintain, and have significantly succeeded in maintaining, the impetus of the Community during a period of stagnation, both in the economic sphere and in the development of the institutions of the Community. Parliament has given to every aspect of Community affairs an attention that deserves a better response from governments, and at times perhaps also from the Commission, than it has received. Because many of the reports of Parliament have necessarily been highly technical, responding to the need to overcome many technical difficulties in advancing the affairs of the Community, they have received neither from the Council of Ministers nor from public opinion the recognition that they clearly deserve. But the Parliament has in many instances

gone beyond these more technical areas to express itself on matters of concern to the Community as a whole — as, for example, the need to institute a uniform electoral procedure for its elections — and also on matters of concern to individual countries — such as, in the case of my own country, the conflict in Northern Ireland, the subject of the excellent Haagerup report adopted by the Parliament several months ago.

*(Interjection by Mr Paisley: 'Extradite the IRA murderers!')*

Moreover, in the broader arena of world affairs, Mr President, the European Parliament speaks with a single, measured and powerful voice in defence of the fundamental human liberties in which our democracies are grounded. Although Parliament represents a very wide range of opinion indeed, drawn from all corners of our Community and from the whole ideological spectrum, it has nevertheless succeeded in achieving a remarkable degree of consensus on the complex international issues which confront us today. It has in particular shown itself responsive to the challenges posed for democratic values and institutions by the growth of unrest and tension in many parts of our world. By its resolute pursuit of more humane codes of behaviour in international relations, and by the attention it has drawn to individual instances of intolerance and discrimination, Parliament has earned widespread respect, and has at the same time enhanced Europe's moral authority and, by extension, the ability of Europeans to shape, or to help to shape, the course of world events in a constructive manner.

In recent months the Parliament has, for example, taken a firm stand on topics as varied as the continuing conflicts in the Gulf and in Lebanon, the situations in Kampuchea and southern Africa, the violation and abridgment of human rights and basic freedoms in Latin America and in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. In a world fraught with unrest and conflict, the European Parliament has been an important forum for the articulation of European concerns, highlighting in a specifically European perspective the dangers which exist for global peace and security.

May I add that in this area the actions of governments, through the mechanism of Political Cooperation, have in a notable way reflected the same concern. They have also contributed to the development of a European attitude, a European policy, in many areas and on many issues where a decade ago our individual Member States were still relatively far apart. I can attest to that from my own experience as Minister of Foreign Affairs between 1973 and 1977. At the outset of that period, there were widespread divergences of attitude between Member States on many issues, but during those four years I could see these points of view coming together as we learned from each other in the process of political cooperation. As a result, Europe has been able to speak in latter years on many

**FitzGerald**

issues with a single voice, where ten years ago it would have found it impossible to do so.

I now turn to the recent Fontainebleau European Council. It is my duty to report to you on the outcome of that meeting. A series of important meetings which began in Stuttgart over 12 months ago, continued at Athens last December and in Brussels last March, reached their culmination at Fontainebleau. The process of decision-making at these European Councils was, in the early stages at least, hesitant and even faltering. But firm foundations had been laid at Stuttgart by Chancellor Kohl; the critical issues were identified and brought to an advanced stage for decision-making at Athens by Prime Minister Papandreu; the problems surrounding the effective operation of the Common Agricultural Policy were resolved at Brussels; and at Fontainebleau the crucial decision about the increase in the Community's own resources was taken, and the associated problem of what are described as budgetary imbalances, finally resolved.

It is my special task — one which I undertake with enthusiasm — to pay tribute to the extraordinarily dedicated and skilful diplomacy of the French Presidency, which at Brussels and at Fontainebleau achieved the success that had eluded us for so long.

*(Applause)*

I know that all Members of this Parliament, and the Commission, will wish to join with me, representing the Council, in paying the warmest tribute to President Mitterrand. His skill and patience — which I personally deeply admire, but cannot hope to match — and his willingness, at all times, to place first the interests of the Community, combined with his deep-rooted sense of the destiny of this Community, were never so acutely needed in a Presidency, and seldom so generously and comprehensively available.

*(Applause)*

It is only fair to add that the success achieved by the French Presidency owed much to the other Institutions of the Community. The Commission played its full part in all the stages of the negotiations and was a constant source of advice and ideas and, where necessary, proposals. The Parliament, too, played its part. Its insistence over the years on the need for a definitive resolution of the budgetary imbalances issue sent us back to the table on a number of occasions when we might perhaps otherwise have taken an easier but considerably less satisfactory option.

I need not here recall all the details of the agreement reached in Fontainebleau. These will be familiar to you. Its principal provisions settled both the amount of the refund to be paid to the United Kingdom in 1984, and the method to be employed in 1985 and for so long thereafter as the Community VAT limit is maintained at the new higher rate of 1.4%, in order to

adjust the United Kingdom's contributions through VAT payments to the Community budget. The decision at Fontainebleau also contemplates a further increase in the VAT limit to 1.6% on 1 January 1988. This is to be secured by unanimous decision of the Council and subject to national procedures.

The raising of the limit on the Community's own resources has paved the way for confirmation that negotiations for the accession of Spain and Portugal should be concluded by 30 September next. The Irish Presidency will take all necessary steps to meet this time-table. In the past week the Irish Foreign Minister, as President of the Council, has visited both Lisbon and Madrid. This visit by my colleague, Peter Barry, at such an early stage of our Presidency is clear and positive evidence of the political priority that we attach to an early conclusion of the enlargement negotiations.

*(Applause)*

Moreover, I shall myself be meeting the Prime Ministers of both countries within the next two months to ensure that this matter is pressed ahead with the utmost urgency and to a successful conclusion in good time in accordance with the hopes and expectations of the applicant countries and the commitment of the Member States of the Community.

The Fontainebleau meeting also reached agreement on a temporary waiver of the restrictions on national aid in the case of German agriculture for a period of just over four years — a decision which is substituted for that taken at Brussels in respect of a smaller amount but one without limit as to duration.

The agreement reached on the financial side at Fontainebleau has enabled the Council of Ministers to adopt the legal basis that underpins the United Kingdom rebate for 1983, which was agreed at Stuttgart and extensively discussed in Parliament in the Spring. Parliament's object in placing the sums concerned in reserve was to guarantee the integral link established at Stuttgart between the different parts of the overall negotiations. This link was entirely respected at Fontainebleau, and your Budgets Committee has recognized this in its decision to release the sum set aside for the rebate to the United Kingdom for 1983.

The decision on the new 'own resources' does not, of course, of itself resolve the problem of meeting the shortfall that most certainly exists in the current year, and will most certainly exist next year, in respect of the financing of existing Community policies. The Irish Presidency therefore attaches very great importance to the section of the Presidency Conclusions that deals with the financing of the 1984 budget. This section records the fact that, on my proposal as incoming President of the European Council, there was a political agreement in principle that the necessary steps should be taken at the next Budget Council meeting to

## FitzGerald

provide for the interim financing needs of the Community. You will be aware that, in the event, Budget Council and the subsequent Foreign Affairs Council have failed to agree on this issue, although nine Member States adopted a common position on the need for additional financing, and have come near to agreement on the method to be adopted.

The time available in which to resolve this problem, so as to ensure that the Community will not find itself unable to fulfil its obligations in the closing months of the year, is extremely short. Moreover, the procedure involves collaboration between the Council of Ministers and the Parliament. For the necessary resources to be available by October, the Budget Council will have to establish a draft budget early in September to enable the Parliament to consider and vote on the draft at its mid-September budgetary part-session. We are arranging that there will be a Budget Council early in September in order that such necessary proposals would be available for the September part-session of Parliament.

I need not here underline the gravity of this issue. It is, of course, right that the Member States in the Budget Council should seek to satisfy themselves that all possible savings will be made in the Community Budget on the basis of the policies that have been laid down for 1984 by the Council, with the concurrence of Parliament. But, this having been done, whatever remaining shortfall emerges *must be provided for*. The Irish Presidency will make all efforts necessary to ensure that this decision is taken in time, in accordance with the will which the European Council expressed, following the proposal on this matter which I made to it after the settlement of the 'own resources' and budgetary imbalances issues.

Fontainebleau, however, was not just about budgetary issues. Perhaps more than was the case at any other European Council in the recent past, the Heads of State and Government at this Fontainebleau meeting took a conscious decision to raise their eyes from day-to-day issues and to focus instead on the larger question of the Community's rôle and place in the world; on how to make Europe fully relevant and responsive to the daily lives of its peoples; on how to make progress — meaningful progress — towards European Union. In the decisions that were taken to initiate action in these areas, the European Council was very conscious of the many concrete and important proposals which had come from this Parliament over the years in respect of the matters to which we were directing our attention.

You will be aware that the Council decided to set up an *ad hoc* committee on Institutional Affairs consisting of personal representatives of the Heads of State and Government, on the lines of the Spaak Committee. Its functions as defined at Fontainebleau will be to make suggestions for the improvement of European co-operation in both the Community's field and in

that of political or any other co-operation. For my part, I shall be proposing to this committee that in particular it should examine the functions and decision-making arrangements on the Institutions and the inter-relationships between them; the effectiveness of the Community in the social and economic sphere (including the European Monetary System) and in that of technology; the possibility of strengthening European cooperation and common action in, for example, the fields of education, health, justice and the fight against terrorism; and finally, progress towards European Union.

Since the Fontainebleau meeting, I have consulted all the Heads of State and Government on the establishment of this committee and have secured their agreement that it should comprise political figures from Member States. This committee is to report to the European Council — I shall ask them to make an interim report to the Council next December — so that the Council may have the necessary material upon which to base concrete decisions in relation to progress towards European Union.

It has been agreed that the chairman of the committee will be Senator Dooge, Leader of the Irish Senate, former Foreign Minister and an active member of the European movement for several decades past.

(Applause)

You will also be aware of the decision to set up an *ad hoc* committee to prepare and co-ordinate action to strengthen and promote the identity of Europe and its image both for its citizens and for the rest of the world. This second committee, which I also propose to establish in the immediate future, will examine a wide range of issues both of a practical and of a symbolic character, all of them directed towards making the Community a reality in the eyes of its citizens, for many of whom it remains today still a somewhat remote conception.

It has also been agreed to adopt my proposal that the arrangements for the provision of a secretariat for these two committees should be undertaken by the Council Secretariat. Moreover, needless to say, the European Commission will be an active participant in the work of these two committees, and as President of the Council it will be my responsibility to ensure that contact is maintained with Parliament in respect of their activities, and I shall fulfil my obligations in that respect.

(Applause)

Finally, the Fontainebleau European Council gave me the mandate to seek a consensus amongst Member States on the appointment of a new President of the European Commission, to take office next January. I undertook these consultations immediately and was very pleased to have been able to announce on Thurs-

FitzGerald

day last, 19 July, that following these consultations the Heads of State or Government of the ten Member States of the Community had agreed to the appointment of Mr Jacques Delors to the office of President of the Commission.

*(Applause)*

In making this announcement, I added that I would avail myself of the opportunity to seek the opinion of the enlarged Bureau of the European Parliament on the agreement reached by the Heads of State or Government on the appointment of Mr Delors, a procedure which I proposed in order to demonstrate the respect in which I hold the rôle of Parliament in relation to a matter of this kind. The procedure outlined will be given effect later today as soon as the enlarged Bureau of Parliament comes into existence, following the election of the Vice-Presidents.

May I add, on a purely personal note, that I am particularly glad to have had this opportunity of giving at least partial effect to the proposals put forward by the government in which I was Foreign Minister to the European Council in Rome on 1 and 2 December 1975. On that occasion, my government proposed that the procedure to be adopted in respect of the appointment of the Commission should be that Member Governments would first agree by common accord on a President-designate; that he would propose the other members of the Commission; that Parliament would be invited to approve the proposed membership of the Commission; and that Member Governments would consider the proposed membership with a view to reaching common accord on the appointment of those concerned, *only after the Parliament had given its approval.*

*(Applause)*

I emphasize that this was an Irish proposal, which was not in fact debated by that European Council, and I recognize that it has no other status. Nevertheless, I feel it appropriate to mention it on this occasion, speaking so far as this matter is concerned in a personal capacity and not as President-in-Office of the Council, as an indication of the commitment of my government to the Parliament's having as full as possible a rôle in matters of this kind.

*(Applause)*

There is one other aspect of the Fontainebleau deliberations to which I would wish to draw your attention. This is the discussion that took place centring on relations between East and West. Amongst the very many problem areas of a political character in our present-day world to the solution of which the Ten, through European Political Cooperation, seek to make a contribution, none is more important than that of the East-West relationship, for on that relationship

depends not only the peace of our world but in a special way the future of our own continent.

The power of the United States and the Soviet Union places a special responsibility for peace and stability on those two countries. We have to recognize that few actions or initiatives of our ten countries can take the place of those of the two great powers. Nonetheless, there are periods when other actors can have a rôle to play in preserving and promoting a more stable relationship, a sober and realistic dialogue and constructive co-operation between East and West. I believe that the present is one such period. For a variety of reasons, relations between the Soviet Union and the United States are at the moment particularly difficult. Vital negotiations between them on the control and reduction of nuclear weapons are suspended. Like the other countries of Europe, Ireland looks forward to an early resumption of the crucial negotiations between Moscow and Washington particularly on nuclear arms. In this connection we were glad to hear from President Reagan, during his visit to Ireland some weeks ago, of his readiness to resume bilateral negotiations aimed at the reduction of armaments as well as wider discussions on the non-use of force.

In the coming months the Irish Presidency, together with its partners in European Political Cooperation, will continue to promote and encourage the vital dialogue between East and West.

Other specific responsibilities arising out of the Conclusions of the Fontainebleau European Council have been placed on the Irish Presidency; these we accept gladly and proudly, as our duty to Europe. Tomorrow the President of the General Council of Foreign Affairs, my colleague, Foreign Minister Peter Barry, will share with you in more detail the ideas we have for the work of the Council of Ministers during the rest of the year. Both he and I will be most anxious to hear your views on that programme.

It is my hope that when I come to report to you next December upon the work undertaken during the second half of this year, and on the Dublin European Council of next December, I shall be able to describe solid progress in respect of the matters which we now have the responsibility to advance during our Presidency. I hope above all that the work of these six months will not be impeded by any failure on the part of the Council of Ministers to agree in good time on the provision of the necessary additional resources for 1984, and on the presentation to you of a budget for 1985, thus respecting the deadlines imposed by the relationship between Council and Parliament.

Mr President, may I conclude by assuring you of the total commitment of the Irish Presidency, of all the Ministers in my government who have responsibilities to undertake in the next six months, as well as of the hundreds of Irish civil servants who will be involved in the work of the Presidency. I believe that on previous

**FitzGerald**

occasions we have demonstrated a degree of commitment to this task that has merited the respect of our partners in this great Community. We will not fail you on this occasion.

*(Loud applause)*

**President.** — Mr President-in-Office of the Council, on behalf of the whole Assembly I should like to thank you most sincerely for the statement you have just made which has shed light on many aspects of our Community as it now stands, notably after the Fontainebleau Summit. Thanks to you, we are now better informed.

The Assembly has of course noted the interest you take in the work of the European Parliament. Replying to certain criticisms, you paid tribute to the quality of its work in the past.

But more important still, you stated the firm intention of the Irish presidency to seek the cooperation of the European Parliament in studying the serious problems confronting us and in finding solutions in the interests of Europe. This gives us an added confidence, for which we thank you.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Thorn, President of the Commission.** — (FR) Mr President, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, my first and most pleasant duty this morning is to welcome the new Assembly on behalf of the Commission, to congratulate Honourable Members on their election and to wish them success and above all courage, which will be much needed in the Assembly, just as Community Europe will have great need of the Assembly, and then to salute the man whom the Assembly has now elected to be its President.

In welcoming your election, Mr President, I should like first of all to pay tribute to the constancy of your European commitment. For all of us here, your name is synonymous with fidelity to the Community cause.

You will now be carrying on your campaign for Europe as President of her Parliament. As one who has followed only the past 30 years of your career, I recall that there have been occasions when you have taken the risk of compromising your prospects in what is called a political career for the sake of Europe. Such sacrifice is rare enough nowadays for it to augur well for the future.

Mr President, this new Parliament faces a severe test in that it will probably be during the course of your term, ladies and gentlemen, that the incipient exhaustion of the European enterprise will either be succeeded by a resurgence of dynamism or assume terminal proportions.

If the Parliament can play a significant role in a recovery of dynamism, it will have helped to bring Europe closer to her citizens, and, as the elections have demonstrated, that objective is both necessary and urgent.

The President-in-Office dwelt on this at length when expressing the hope that our Community can now come to grips with the substantive problems confronting the people of Europe.

I shall have other opportunities to return to this theme and shall therefore confine myself today to discussing the "Fontainebleau agreement" and its direct consequences, since this is urgent business and, in my view, today is none too soon to be clearing up a number of points.

Should I be saying that the second elected Parliament is fortunate to be commencing its term just when the Fontainebleau agreement has opened up such a prospect of a fresh stimulus to the construction of Europe? I should dearly love to, but such optimism would still be premature at this stage. The Community may have got itself out of a rut, but it is not yet on its way. As has just been demonstrated to us by the President-in-Office of the Council, much still depends on the decisions which have to be taken during the coming weeks by the Council and by the Parliament, which, in exercising its budgetary powers, is very soon going to have to shoulder heavy responsibilities.

*(Applause)*

Before coming to this, I should like, with your leave, to take stock of what has been achieved.

The Fontainebleau agreement marks the end of a long and tedious dispute within the Community — or at least, I hope it does. This dispute started, as the President-in-Office will remember, at the Dublin Summit in 1979, at the beginning of the first elected Parliament's term. The considerations involved in the British problem, to adopt the epithet consistently applied to it, were then such that it could not be settled without a complete re-examination of the Community's policies and the structure of its budget. In 1980 the European Council, having got itself involved in *ad hoc* compensation and annual payments (which have never been to your liking), called upon the Commission to undertake such a re-examination. This was the mandate of May 1980 inherited by the Commission under my presidency.

That mandate had only the slenderest prospects of success, ladies and gentlemen. It called for the elimination of budgetary imbalances through the development of non-agricultural policies and rationalization of the CAP, this without exceeding the own resources ceiling fixed ten years earlier at 1% of VAT.

The Commission accepted the challenge, as you know, and brought forward its proposals for putting the

### Thorn

budget back on a sound footing and reforming the CAP, adoption of which was manifestly a prerequisite for an increase in own resources and development of new policies. These proposals were in fact used as the basis for the vital decisions taken in May this year by the Council of Ministers for Agriculture. However, at the time when they were submitted, in 1981, it quickly became clear that the Council was not yet psychologically or politically ready to accept them. The Council's indecision led to the failure of the mandate of 30 May at Lancaster House, and the Community found itself in a state of crisis, its doubts growing as the hopes for a renewal of political impetus aroused by the Genscher/Colombo initiative began to fade.

It was to be another two years before the constituent parts of the mandate of 30 May were brought together again in what was called the Stuttgart mandate (the use of this word was becoming rather obsessive).

In Stuttgart, however, the European Council did no more than set in train "important negotiations to deal with the Community's most pressing problems". Having failed to reach a decision in Stuttgart, it once again put the ball back in the Commission's court, looking to it to unravel the inconsistencies.

Mr FitzGerald has run through the successive stages of these negotiations: the failure at Athens, then the partial success in Brussels and finally the agreement reached in Fontainebleau.

Whatever one's reservations about some parts of this agreement, whatever one's doubts for the future at the thought of the omissions and ambiguities that it contains, we are to be thankful that this long and debilitating crisis has at last been brought to an end and should pay tribute to the successive presidencies which have made this possible, especially to President Mitterrand, whose personal commitment has been a key factor in this successful outcome.

Let us now consider what has been established under the terms of this Fontainebleau agreement.

First of all — and there is no escaping this — it marks the end of an era for the CAP, the era of unlimited guarantees regardless of budgetary constraints and the balance of supply and demand. Like it or not, a new basis must now be found for the pursuance of the objectives assigned to the CAP by the Treaty. This work remains to be done, but the break with the past trend has been made. This, it seems to me, has now been established, I am happy to say, even though the Commission finds it regrettable that the European Council should have considered it necessary, at this selfsame Fontainebleau meeting, to authorize the granting of national aids.

Another achievement at Fontainebleau was the consensus reached on the priority guidelines to be laid down for development of the Community's structural

policies, even though there is a lot of ground to be covered before theoretical guidelines can be turned into budget decisions. The Council will not cover this ground unless the Commission and Parliament oblige it to do so by making full use of their prerogatives.

Another step forward at Fontainebleau, subject to the same caveat, is the agreement reached by the European Council on the priorities for Community action in the field of research and new technology. Instead of being a happy exception, the Esprit programme must now become the starting-point, the exemplar for a continuing, expanding process.

Another development which I think can be counted among the achievements of the period brought to a close at Fontainebleau is the strong encouragement given by successive presidencies, especially the German presidency in this case, to the unification of the internal market, the reduction of obstacles to trade, the simplification of border checks, and the promotion of common standards. Much remains to be done, ladies and gentlemen, but it is clear that the impatience of the public is the main driving force behind the efforts in this field, as in the case of protection of the environment, so that you will be paying very close attention to developments.

Finally, the most precarious but perhaps also the most promising feature of the Fontainebleau agreement is the decision to set up a procedure — the Spaak committee procedure — to examine ways and means of lending fresh impetus to the political development of Europe. I welcome this, having called for such a procedure on numerous occasions, notably on the 25th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome. The potential outcome of this decision is precarious because the setting-up of the procedure is not underpinned by any substantive agreement and because everything will ultimately depend on the calibre and standing of the members of this committee. It is nevertheless a promising decision because nothing can prevent the draft treaty establishing the Union being the cornerstone of the terms of reference for this exercise. This stands massively to the credit of the first elected Parliament and it will be your primary responsibility to keep up the momentum of this political project and to safeguard it from the danger of being blown off course, which is even now already present. And I do not believe that the formulas for contact with the Parliament and involvement of the Commission are sufficient to ensure the outcome that you and we want to see.

I now come to the budgetary agreement. It introduces into the constitution of the Community a new principle according to which no Member State can be required to bear a share of the budget which is excessive in comparison to its relative prosperity without an adjustment being made.

For the time being, this principle applies to the United Kingdom only. The specific arrangements for the

## Thorn

adjustment in favour of this Member State will be renegotiated — *ex novo*, according to the European Council — as soon as the new own resources approach the point of exhaustion, and no-one can predict whether or not these arrangements will be renewed as they stand. On the other hand, the general principle which has been adopted now enters into established Community practice and its application in the enlarged Community is likely to have a profound influence on the administration of common policies and on the structure of the budget.

However, ladies and gentlemen, the Community will have only the briefest of respites in which to make up its mind about how it is to develop in the medium to long term.

The European Council limited the increase in own resources to a ceiling of only 1.4%, whereas we had asked it, if was not prepared simply to remove the ceiling, at least to provide the Community with the means to secure its development for a longer period.

The ceiling of 1.4% will carry us through only until 1986, when negotiations on own resources will have to start all over again.

With your leave, Mr President, I can bear this out by briefly quoting some irrefutable figures. The budget that the Commission is proposing for 1985 — which takes no account of any decisions which may be taken in the spring on agricultural prices — already corresponds to a VAT call-up rate of 1.12% (not 1.14% as I have said on a number of occasions). The net cost of enlargement bringing in Portugal and Spain will be an absolute minimum of 0.1% in a full year. By 1987, therefore, assuming that enlargement is completed in 1986 as intended, the VAT call-up rate cannot be less than 0.22%.

Now it has to be appreciated that the effect of the arrangements adopted for the adjustment in favour of the United Kingdom will be that the average rate of 1.22% will in fact mean a rate of at least 1.35% for those Member States which will have to meet the full cost of this adjustment, and that means all Member States apart from the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany. Since the Commission was asked at the same time to prepare a report at least one year before the exhaustion of the new own resources, it is already time for us to start writing it, Mr President.

Within a year of ratification of the present increase by our national Parliaments, we shall be within 0.05% of the ceiling for own resources.

The point that I was anxious and duty bound to stress, therefore, is that, after the years of crisis that it has come through, our Community has no more than two years at the outside in which to create the political and budgetary conditions under which it will be possible to

translate the important guidelines approved at Fontainebleau into reality.

If the commitments entered into for the immediate term under the Fontainebleau agreement are to be honoured, the Council must lose no time in reaching decisions on a number of matters which will test its commitment to the reinvigoration of the Community which the citizens of Europe are entitled to believe was declared in the Fontainebleau agreement.

It will therefore be necessary, Mr President, to complete the negotiations on enlargement before the end of the year. Yesterday's Council meeting gives us no cause for optimism on this front. And, don't forget, it has been decided that ratification of enlargement should coincide with ratification of the increase in own resources. It does not take very much imagination to envisage how problems could arise there.

Secondly, we have to conclude the negotiations on renewal of the Lomé Convention before the end of the year. Thirdly, practical arrangements will have to be found for implementing the Council's guidelines on budgetary discipline, thus clearing the procedural path to ratification of the new own resources.

Last but not means least, since it is about this that the citizens of Europe are concerned, we must secure normal conditions for the life of the Community and continuity of its policies and commitments by providing it with the financial resources that it needs for 1984 and 1985.

Allow me, Mr President, to say a few words on this last point, which is a matter calling for our urgent attention, in view of the Parliament's special budgetary responsibilities and the Commission's responsibilities for administration.

Given the approach that the Council's bodies are taking to the problem of budgeting for 1984 and 1985, there is a danger of disruption to the normal life of the Community, which would be quite contrary to the thinking outlined by the European Council itself. This is something that had to be said, and it was on account of this problem that I arrived here too late, coming back from a disappointing Council meeting. If its life is to be conducted on a normal basis, the Community must honour the financial commitments stemming from its own legislation, many of which were adopted unanimously by the Council; it is such unanimity that lends credibility to its declared resolve to launch new projects in industries of the future and to strive to ensure that its actions are guided by real solidarity.

It is clear, however, that the normal conduct of Community business is conditioned by the limitations imposed by the own resources ceiling fixed in 1970. Arrangements therefore have to be made for the transition between 1983, the year during which the 1% ceiling was reached, and 1986, which will be the first

## Thorn

year of the new own resources, assuming that everything goes according to plan. Were I in a malevolent mood, I would add the next landmark year: 1987, which will be the first year of renegotiation.

Some governments are now hoping — and they are making no secret of the fact — that they will be able to duck the legal obligation incumbent upon the budgetary authorities to provide appropriate resources to maintain normal conduct of the full range of Community policies during 1984. Others — or to be more precise, the same ones — are thinking in terms of cash-flow devices and artificial carry-overs of expenditure to the following year, even though the finance for that year is not assured either. If any such course were taken, the Council would be in breach of its own agricultural rules and, don't forget, it would also be introducing an element of national financing into the functioning of the CAP which would make for discrimination between individual operators and between Member States. When we have only just called upon our farmers to make such great sacrifices, this would considerably heighten the mood of anxiety in the farming world, and the Council's inconsistency could very well be seen as a provocation.

The Commission therefore considers that approval of a supplementary budget for 1984 is not pointless and unacceptable, as the Government of one Member State has recently maintained, but an absolute priority. In common with the Parliament, the Commission wants this supplementary budget to be financed on a Community basis, not on an intergovernmental basis.

Only when this matter has been settled do we come to the problem of the budget for 1985. The Member States want this budget to be kept within the 1% ceiling, Mr President, although some are already acknowledging that, at this level, it could not provide enough finance for the whole range of Community policies and would need to be supplemented during the course of the year.

The Commission for its part is of the opinion that the Community needs a proper budget for 1985, a budget compatible with the financial obligations flowing from the CAP, a budget taking due account of the guidelines laid down by the European Council for the development of non-agricultural policies, a budget in the preparation of which the Parliament will have fully exercised its prerogatives. Mr President, mindful of the seriousness of the situation if the Council were to reject our proposals or fail to make up its mind, I recently wrote personally to all the Heads of State or Government drawing their attention to the importance of what is at stake and the risks to the Community in the event of a failure to follow up the Fontainebleau agreement.

The situation is extremely serious, ladies and gentlemen, and I now make the same appeal to you, calling upon you to use all your influence and all your budg-

etary powers to ensure that our Community is not refused the means with which to secure its continuity in the immediate term and its development thereafter.

The Commission can only propose. The allocation of powers in the Community is such that you, not us, are one of the budgetary authorities. Only the Parliament, as a branch of the budgetary authority, can therefore prevent the Council from totally discrediting not only the worth of agreements concluded by the European Council but also the entire Community enterprise.

*(Applause)*

The immediate problems of 1984 and 1985 are assuredly of great importance to our survival, Mr President, but the outcome of the budgetary debate will be determined by the Council's decisions on how to go about implementing the conclusions of the European Council on budgetary discipline.

The Community budget must be the result of a rational apportionment of policies and public action between the national and Community levels. It must therefore cover both ongoing commitments — such as the CAP, structural policy, development policy and policy on research — and others which are more temporary, whether the restructuring of certain declining industries or, to take the other side of the coin, the promotion of new technologies.

What, then, does this mean? That the 'budgetary discipline', with which some people are obsessed, must be an exercise in joint definition of objectives and priorities, not what we are seeing now, which is the blind, mechanical imposition of financial constraints without any regard for desirable developments in the activities of the Community.

At this stage, to make the claim that one is dedicated to building Europe, even to political union, and at the same time to refuse to allow the European Parliament to join with the Council and Commission in defining the objectives and priorities would be an intolerable contradiction.

*(Applause)*

This brings me to the longer-term effects of the Fontainebleau agreement, those which should set the scene for the birth of the second-generation Europe. In the process that they will set in train, either our institutional system will prove its capacity for maintaining the cohesion of the Community while adjusting to new developments or alternatively other competing institutions will develop, gradually pushing the existing institutional system to the margins. This, in my view, is what will be at stake over the coming months, in the work to be done by the Spaak committee — which I hope will live up to that great man's name, otherwise it would be better to call it an *ad hoc* committee — and in connection with the draft treaty



**Thorn**

for the establishment of the European Union drawn up by the previous Parliament.

Much is at stake, therefore, and your Assembly will have an essential part to play. This is why we at the Commission are anxious that it should be involved. It is mistaken to think that the immediate budgetary difficulties are one thing and the apparently more abstract problems of the future construction of Europe another. They are two indissociable and extremely important aspects of the same reality and, above all, of the same political scheme of things.

It is of course in the weaknesses of the institutional system and in the compromising with the disciplines of the Treaty that we must look for the underlying causes of the shortcomings of the Community to which Mr FitzGerald drew attention at the beginning of his speech. I share his belief that the Community must once again become the driving force of economic expansion and job creation that it was in its early days.

I do not believe that this is possible as long as it is paralyzed institutionally, hamstrung by the use of the veto, lapsing gradually into 'à la carte' intergovernmental cooperation. And this is still what we are seeing, especially at Fontainebleau.

The true realists are not those who want to postpone the institutional debate until after the substantive problems have been resolved. This has been done for too long. The differences of opinion and disagreements among Europeans are not confined to the matter of where we want to go. Perhaps worse than that, the real stumbling-block is the question: 'How do we propose to work together, when we do not yet have a tradition of doing so, what system are we to adopt; in other words, on what basis are we to allocate powers between our national governments and the various Community institutions?'

We have you to thank, or rather the previous Parliament, for at least putting this question in the clearest of terms. An equally clear answer, whatever it may be, is needed soon. Then and only then, Mr President, will it be possible to claim that the Fontainebleau agreement marked the start of a new lease of life for the Community and progress towards political union in Europe.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Thank you, Mr President of the Commission. Once again, you have set out with great clarity and with courage the problems we shall have to tackle. It has not all been good news. But we appreciate your helping us to grasp the full seriousness of the delicate situation in which the Community now finds itself.

Our thanks once again.

### 7. Election of Vice-Presidents (continuation)

**President.** — Here are the results of the first ballot to elect the Vice-presidents:

Members voting: 415

Blank or spoiled ballot papers: 2

Votes cast: 413

Absolute majority: 207

Votes received were as follows:

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti: 270 votes

Mr Alber: 251 votes

Lady Elles: 246 votes

Mr Nord: 234 votes

Mr Lalor: 212 votes

Mr Estgen: 192 votes

Mr Seefeld: 186 votes

Mr Møller: 184 votes

Mr Plaskovitis: 175 votes

Mr Didò: 174 votes

Mr Griffiths: 168 votes

Mr Fanti: 162 votes

Mrs Pery: 159 votes

Mrs Heinrich: 118 votes

Mr Le Pen: 37 votes

The following members have obtained the absolute majority of votes cast:

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Alber, Lady Elles; Mr Nord and Mr Lalor.

I congratulate them on their election.

Seven posts of Vice-President remain to be filled; we now have to proceed to a second ballot.

**Mr Arndt.** — *(DE)* On a point of order, Mr President. I have noticed that the arrangement between the group chairmen has not been adhered to and that after the first ballot no representative of the largest group in this House, the Socialists, is in the Bureau. For us that means that a majority of the House obviously thinks there is no point in having the Socialists with them in the joint attempt to promote Europe.

I therefore ask for the sitting to be suspended for an hour before we start on the second ballot so that we can discuss this again with the other group chairmen,

**Arndt**

for otherwise we Socialists would not be prepared to nominate any further candidates to the Bureau. Then those responsible for this decision would also be responsible if no agreement could be reached in future in this Parliament.

*(Applause from the left)*

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, you have heard the proposal by Mr Arndt, chairman of the Socialist Group, for a suspension of the sitting.

I propose that we continue the debate on the European Council until 1 p.m. and at 3 p.m. proceed to the second ballot.

*(Parliament agreed the proposal)*

I propose that the deadline for tabling nominations for the second ballot be set at 2.45 p.m.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

#### 8. *European Council of Fontainebleau* (continuation)

**Mr Arndt.** — *(DE)* Mr Presidents, honourable Members, after the failure of the London, Copenhagen, Brussels, Stuttgart and Athens Summits, the Fontainebleau Summit can help get Europe moving again. That offers the hope that after years of stagnation, policies are once again being made in Europe.

In this first debate after the second direct election, I want to turn to the fundamental idea which served as the strongest political motive for the integration of the peoples of Europe: the fight for democracy and peace and against lack of freedom and war. I want to emphasise this so strongly because during the European election campaign extreme right-wing politicians agitated against foreigners and minorities and regarded force as a legitimate political tool, because at their meetings politicians once again used the vocabulary of the Nazis and Fascists and racists. It must stand as a warning to all democrats that in some countries the extreme right wing achieved some successes with this.

The desire for the integration of the peoples of Europe grew out of the common resistance and fight by European democrats against National Socialism and Fascism and out of the fight for peace.

*(Applause)*

It was the men and women in the concentration camps, in the Resistance, in opposition, who understood that freedom and democracy, that peace can be

achieved only through cooperation between nations. That is why I, together with all those Members who share my view, want to commemorate those who sacrificed their freedom, health or lives in the fight against National Socialism and Fascism, in the fight against the dictatorships in Greece and Spain and Portugal. It is our duty to honour the legacy of these people in this European Parliament too. We must always remember this basic consensus, for the history of the summits of the past years proves that some governments were considering only their own profit — whether in the form of money or votes — when they blocked agreements.

I draw hope from two things, and these two things belong together: first, the great speech by the French President at our May part-session, and secondly the fact that agreement was at last reached again in Fontainebleau. We thank the French President.

But if we look carefully at the results of Fontainebleau and consider the new quarrels in the Council of Finance Ministers, the delicate flower of hope already begins to look withered. It looks as though everybody were interpreting the agreement only in such a way as to derive an advantage for themselves and make others carry the burden.

A frank word on the attitude of the British Prime Minister. For years my group has supported the demand for a just budgetary settlement and a fair and long-term solution for the United Kingdom. But if the British Prime Minister pretends it is a question of money from her own privy purse, with which she can do what she — and she alone — wants, she will damage the United Kingdom's interests.

*(Applause)*

It is quite simply wrong for people to say and write again and again that this stubbornness bred success. A sensible, fair attitude, trust in this Parliament's good will, would have brought a much earlier solution and that solution would have given the British people more than they have got now.

*(Applause)*

The majority in this House has made it clear again and again that the money the UK is to receive in compensation is to be used to improve its infrastructure and economic strength and to combat unemployment — and is not simply at the disposal of the Prime Minister. We will not allow the necessary budgetary compensation to be produced as if by magic, simply by some minor manipulation on the revenue side, bypassing one of the two budgetary authorities.

*(Applause)*

That is a clear infringement of the Treaties of Rome. I am deeply shocked that the present Commission has

Arndt

not objected loudly and clearly. Mr President of the Commission, let that be put down on your record. It is also as guardian of the Treaties of Rome that the Commission has failed here.

*(Applause)*

My group maintains the view it expressed at the adoption of the regulations on the payments to the United Kingdom and the release of the money at the last meeting of the Committee on Budgets.

And now I come to the saddest chapter in the European Community's history: the budget. It has been established since autumn 1983 that the Commission's and the Council's budget estimates for 1984 are wrong. What my group and many other Members of this Parliament warned you against has happened: the revenue is no longer enough to pay for the explosive rise in expenditure on surplus production in agriculture, on the storage and destruction of the surplus food produced. I can only hope that all those who spent years dodging any decision-taking — here in Parliament too but mainly in the Commission and the Council — will now at last act. Unfortunately, that does not seem likely at present.

It is true that the Heads of Government agreed in principle in Fontainebleau that the VAT rate would be raised to 1.4% by 1 January 1986 at the latest, but we still do not have any procedural rules for this. We do however have the declaration by national parliaments that they will only begin the ratification procedure once practical decisions have been reached on controlling agricultural expenditure, on the reform of the budget and on budgetary discipline. When I look at the real trend of expenditure for 1984 or at the irresponsible subsidies decided on in my own country, the Federal Republic of Germany, I see that people have still not learned from their mistakes.

*(Applause)*

In the Federal Republic of Germany more than one thousand million extra European units of account are being spent annually in compensation for the monetary compensatory amounts that are to be reduced. The MCAs will be phased out from 1 January 1985. Yet these subsidies, which benefit the farmers in the form of tax exemptions, are being granted as from 1 July 1984. Moreover, these tax reliefs are designed in such a way that even the 45% of farmers who suffer no losses because they are not affected by the phasing out of the MCAs receive subsidies. All this is not only going against reason, but clearly also against Community law.

*(Applause)*

It is bad enough that my country wanted this breach of the law to be sanctioned in Fontainebleau. What is even worse is that all the other Member States agreed

to it. But what is worst of all is that the Commission, which had previously adopted a definite stance, once again capitulated and swallowed its objection, against its better judgment.

*(Applause)*

You will see: even more surpluses will be produced because the German subsidies mainly benefit those who pay high turnover tax, i.e. those who produce most.

With the setting up of an ad hoc committee, we can at least assume that the governments have noticed what a bad impression the Community is making on the citizens of Europe. Not surprising after this second direct election! The result is usually described as a lesson for the leadership, of whatever political tendency, in the ten Member States. That may be so — but above all the election was a lesson to the European citizens about the political failure of the European Community.

*(Applause)*

What the citizens want is that not they but the Seveso containers are checked at the borders. They want measures to combat unemployment to be the main theme of the summits, and not haggling about national egoisms and subsidies.

*(Applause)*

The citizens have nothing against a European flag, a European badge or a European sports team, but they would prefer to see a European team that puts an end to the arms race of the superpowers and ensures that we have fewer and fewer rather than more and more missiles in Europe.

*(Applause)*

The citizens do not want to see huge amounts of money spent on the storage and destruction of food while more than half the population of the world is starving. The citizens do not want to see powerless Members of the European Parliament who are continually being disregarded by the Commission and the Council, and who can do no more than receive travel expenses. The citizens want a Parliament that can put across their very own interests, even if this means conflict with the Council, even if it means dismissing the Commission, even if it means rejecting the budget!

*(Applause)*

That will be the mainspring of my group's activities. What we are concerned with is tackling our citizens' immediate problems, unemployment, the threat to peace of inhuman and increasingly numerous weapons, the destruction of nature by unconditional economic growth, the infringement of human rights

**Arndt**

by dictators. Only when we resolve these problems will our citizens identify with Europe.

*(Applause)*

*(The sitting was suspended at 1 p.m. and resumed at 3.30 p.m.)*

#### 9. Election of Vice-Presidents (continuation)

**President.** — The next item is the second ballot to elect the Vice-Presidents.

**Mr Cervetti.** — *(IT)* Mr President, this morning, before the sitting was adjourned, Mr Arndt was critical of what had occurred in the previous voting session — a view that I fully share.

Mr Arndt also asked for a meeting to be called of group chairmen. For various reasons, it did not prove possible to hold this meeting. We now ask for the sitting to be suspended for a quarter-of-an-hour to enable this meeting to be held: we ask this pursuant to Rule 88 of the Rules of Procedure, and we think that our request may be supported by all of the other group chairmen, as well as the Assembly itself. The reasons for such a request are obvious: it is necessary to check what had been agreed, and the attitudes of the individual groups.

*(Parliament agreed the request — the sitting was suspended at 3.35 p.m. and resumed at 3.55 p.m.)*

**Mr Pannella.** — *(FR)* Mr President, I am very sorry to be asking to speak on the same subject for the second time in a single day.

This morning I asked, politely but firmly, that when Honourable Members have been called to a sitting at a specified time, they should be informed of any extension of the suspension at the time when the sitting is opened. I do not consider notification by television to be either a very honourable or a very proper proceeding.

This afternoon we were called for 3 o'clock. We were told by television that the time had been put back to 3.30.

I would therefore ask you, Mr President, to ensure in future that the House is advised of the reasons for any delays and given an opportunity to accept or reject them.

**President.** — I think this problem will be more easily solved when your President is no longer alone . . . but attended by 12 Vice-Presidents, one of whom might

address the Assembly and make the statement you wish.

*(Laughter)*

**Mr Galland.** — *(FR)* Mr President, before we proceed to the second ballot, I need your clarification of one of the Rules of Procedure. This is Rule 14, the first paragraph of which, if I may remind you, contains the following provision:

Those who on the first ballot ( . . . ) obtain an absolute majority of the votes cast shall be declared elected ( . . . ). Should the number of candidates elected be less than the number of seats to be filled, a second ballot shall be held under the same conditions to fill the remaining seats.

I repeat: to fill the remaining seats.

We then come to the second paragraph, which stipulates, subject to the provisions of the paragraph from which I have just quoted, that

the Vice-Presidents shall take precedence in the order in which they were elected . . .

Since the first paragraph refers specifically to the remaining seats, can we take it to be absolutely clear that the candidates elected in the first ballot, the four Vice-Presidents whom we elected this morning will be the first, second, third and fourth Vice-Presidents, according to the order in which they were elected, and that we are now voting for the remaining Vice-Presidents, in other words the sixth and remaining Vice-Presidents, however many votes are cast for them in the second ballot?

**President.** — You refer to the text of Rule 14. You will certainly appreciate that it does not solve the problem you have raised, not at any rate explicitly. You interpret it, or show a preference for an interpretation which, personally, I consider logical. But I should not like to adopt a final position on this point without consultation. I have asked for an investigation to be made of the precedents.

Where written law is not sufficiently explicit, you will be aware that it is augmented or made more explicit by case law or practice. I think that before finally settling this question, we should first see if there are any precedents, and to what effect.

At all events, I take note both of your statement and of your suggestion.

**Mr Klepsch.** — *(DE)* Mr President, may I make a brief, two-point statement. Firstly, according to current practice under the d'Hondt procedure, now that the President has been elected and the conference of

**Klepsch**

group chairmen has decided that two seats should be attributed to his group, our group should be attributed two vice-presidencies. You have already elected the two candidates put forward by my group.

Secondly, since no-one else was proposed from his country, the name of Mr Estgen from my group, who was supported by most of my group at the first ballot, was also put forward. I say emphatically and I repeat: the House has elected the two candidates due to us under the d'Hondt procedure.

**Mr Arndt.** — (DE) Mr President, on behalf of the group chairmen — that is, also of Mrs Veil and Sir Henry Plumb, Mr de la Malène, Mr Cervetti and myself — may I say that we have just had another meeting and that we all appeal to this House to adhere to the agreement reached under the d'Hondt procedure, so that the candidates still to be appointed to the Bureau really are elected by those who are trying to work together sensibly! So we have five candidates from the Socialists, one from the Conservatives and one from the Communists, i.e. Mr. Didò, Mr Fanti, Mr Griffiths, Mr Møller, Mr Péry, Mr Plaskovitis and Mr Seefeld.

The group chairmen have no intention of putting pressure or force on anyone; but they are assuming that reason will make the normal democratic principles prevail, and the d'Hondt system is such a one. May I ask you to take note of this statement.

**President.** — We have indeed take note of your statement, Mr Arndt.

**Mr Le Pen.** — (FR) Mr President, I wish to draw attention to the Rules of Procedure, following the statement made by Mr Arndt, who was speaking on behalf of the majority of group chairmen.

I solemnly remind all Honourable Members of the terms of Rule 2, which reads as follows:

Members of the European Parliament shall vote on an individual and personal basis. They shall not be bound by any instructions and shall not receive a binding mandate.

Consequently, any agreement quite obviously constitutes an attempt at collusion and monopoly, and is contrary to competition, which is the fundamental rule of democracy.

**Mr Van der Lek.** — (NL) Mr President, I believe it is clear that the large groups have in no way changed their minds during the brief suspension we have just had, and we therefore maintain our candidate, Mrs Brigitte Heinrich, to represent the rights of small groups and minorities in Parliament.

**Mr Pannella.** — (FR) Mr President, I think that the issue here is not the rights of Honourable Members belonging to the small groups. I think that we should begin by concerning ourselves with the rights of those who belong to the numerically strong groups, who are being deprived by a certain arrogance on the part of their leaders from the full range of choice that should be available to them. In the spirit of Rule 2, therefore, I wish to state, following the words that we have heard from Mr Arndt, that I shall certainly be voting for Mr Heinrich — which I would perhaps have done in any event — to demonstrate that we have not been called here to vote according to orders, to obey and hold our tongues.

**Mrs Flesch.** — (FR) Mr President, referring to the contribution from Mr Arndt, I consider that it is normal, proper and desirable that the various political strands represented in this House should be expressed and reflected in the Bureau.

At the same time, it has always been the practice of this House to take account of the geographical diversity of the Community. In this context, I took note — as did the House, I imagine — of the comments made by Mr Klepsch, which will be much quoted in the future.

**Mr Saby.** — (FR) Mr President, I appreciate that some Honourable Members new to the House will not yet have absorbed our Rules of Procedure. I in turn should therefore like to quote one of the general provisions of the Rules of Procedure, the third paragraph of Rule 12:

In the election of the President, Vice-Presidents and Quaestors, account should be taken of the need to ensure an overall fair representation of Member States and political view.

**President.** — After this series of interventions, we shall now proceed to elect the Vice-Presidents.

The voting is open.

*(The vote took place)*

The voting is closed.

I now ask the tellers to count the votes.

#### 10. *Tabling of a motion for a resolution*

**President.** — I have received from Mr Le Pen, on behalf of the Group of the European Right, a motion for a resolution tabled pursuant to Rule 48 on free zones (Doc. 1-388/84).

**President**

The vote on this request for urgent procedure will take place at 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

**Mr de la Malène.** — (FR) Mr President, I am having some difficulty in following the procedure that you are proposing. It was understood that there would be no debate on topical or urgent matters during this part-session. The urgency procedure was to be used only for motions for resolutions which were pegged to the debates either this afternoon or tomorrow morning.

**President.** — No, the announcement made, Mr de la Malène, was that given there is indeed no time set aside on the agenda for topical and urgent debates, the Assembly would be invited to vote on requests for urgency.

**Mr de la Malène.** — (FR) When was that decided, Mr President?

**President.** — Before 10 o'clock this morning, it being understood that the Assembly can accept or refuse urgent procedure. The decision rests with the Assembly. But you cannot rule out votes on urgent procedure simply because the agenda has not scheduled certain times for the topical and urgent debates.

**Mr de la Malène.** — (FR) Mr President, I follow you perfectly, but I am not entirely happy about the time limit that you have just indicated, given that we had not yet settled our agenda by 10 o'clock this morning. Since we had not yet settled the agenda, I am at a loss to know under which provisions we could have set a time limit. There is a contradiction here. I would therefore ask you to extend the time limit, because Honourable Members could not have been aware of the situation.

**President.** — I am sorry, Mr de la Malène, but the matter was decided yesterday. Please refer to the Minutes, which you approved.

**Mr de la Malène.** — (FR) It could not have been decided then, Mr President.

**President.** — Not so; I shall refer to the Minutes myself. We will discuss the matter further, if you wish. If you are right and I am wrong, I shall acknowledge the fact. But that would surprise me.

**Mr de la Malène.** — (FR) I have no particular wish to prove you wrong, on the contrary. But I am concerned that Honourable Members who were not aware of the situation should be able to avail themselves of an extension. I ask that they be allowed to table motions

for resolutions this afternoon and evening until 10 o'clock.

**President.** — No, we are bound to adhere to the deadlines, as you know very well. And there are technical difficulties involved. We have to print, distribute and translate the documents. I don't think we should overload the boat at the last minute.

Yesterday, for instance, I announced the proposal on Sakharov and several others — two, at least.

**Mr Chambeiron.** — (FR) Mr President, forgive me, but I in common with Mr de la Malène had understood that there would be no urgent debates this week.

If you allow an urgent debate on one text, you will be penalizing the other groups, which have not tabled any since they had understood that there would be no urgent debates. Alternatively, you should extend the time limit to give us an opportunity to table requests for urgent debate.

**President.** — Mr Chambeiron, I remember distinctly what I said. I said that our agenda did not set aside, as it does for ordinary part-sessions, a particular period for topical and urgent questions, but that nonetheless if urgency requests were tabled, I would ask the Assembly to pronounce on urgency, that is to say to accept or refuse it.

**Mr Chambeiron.** — (FR) Can I take it then, Mr President, that we can continue to table motions for resolutions requesting urgent debate?

**President.** — No, the deadline has passed.

**Mr Chambeiron.** — (FR) Why should we be deprived of this right? That is my question.

**President.** — Because there always is a deadline, which was made known and expired this morning at 10 a.m.

**Mr de la Malène.** — (FR) Mr President, I am doing my best to follow you, although with some difficulty. We have a right of amendment, and that is inviolable. If by a happy or unhappy chance — I do not know which — the request for urgency were accepted, what would become of our right of amendment, when will it expire, Mr President?

**President.** — The right of amendment remains.

**Mr de la Malène.** — (FR) But when will it expire?

**President.** — When urgent procedure is decided, if it is decided, a deadline will be fixed for tabling amendments. I think that is clear.

**Mr Fich (S).** — (DA) Mr President, I am bound to support Mr de la Malène on the matter which has just been referred to. According to the Rules of Procedure, the agenda is finalized when we have elected the President and in that context we decide what deadlines should be imposed. We did not adopt the agenda until today, and so there cannot be any deadline for 10 o'clock this morning. In point of fact, we are obliged to reopen the possibility of tabling motions. I know that there are technical problems, but when we constitute a Parliament, we have to adhere both to the Rules of Procedure and to a number of other things in that connection.

**President.** — Mr Fich, you will remember the important observations you made yesterday. And the Chair took due account of them, since the deadlines were extended. Deadlines were fixed with your assistance and in the light of your suggestions. This is all perfectly clear.

#### 11. *Number and membership of committees (vote)*

#### PROPOSAL FOR A DECISION (DOC. 2-386/84)

##### *Point 2 — After the rejection of Amendment No 3*

**Mr Brøndlund Nielsen (L).** — (DA) Mr President, I was a vice-chairman of the working party on fisheries questions in the last Parliament. I abstained from voting on this matter, even though I readily saw that we could devote more attention to this question here. I should like to take this opportunity to say that precisely the fisheries policy, in which new developments are needed, is a field in which Parliament has been virtually ignored, and I wish to call upon you, Mr President, now that we are gathering together in the new Parliament, to do something to make the Commission and the Council pay more attention to Parliament and involve it more in the fisheries policy.

**President.** — Mr Nielsen, the vote has now gone through in any case.

*(Parliament adopted the decision)*

**Mrs Bonino.** — (IT) Mr President, I have before me the Italian and French versions of the text of the resolution signed by seven group chairmen. The two texts do not tally and, for example, with regard to the Committee on Development the Italian version shows 40 as

the number of members, whereas the French version shows 42! In the same way, subsequently, with regard to the Committee on Energy, the number of members is shown as 33 in the Italian version, and 30 in the French version. I should like to know which text we have voted on. If I had been able to say this earlier, Mr President, it might perhaps have been better from the point of view of clarity in the voting.

**President.** — I am sorry, Mrs Bonino, but there is this discrepancy between two linguistic versions. I am told the practice is to consider the basic text, the original text, as authoritative. As it happens, the original text is the French text.

**Mr Pannella.** — (FR) Mr President, the Italian Members received one text and voted on it. The French Members received another text and voted on that. There were therefore two absolutely different votes. I therefore believe that a fresh vote should be taken. You have told us that the basic text is the French text. I accept that, but it has to be appreciated that the two texts do not tally with each other. We voted for the Italian text which we thought was valid. There should therefore be another vote.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, I am really sorry there is a discrepancy; unfortunately, it happens from time to time. I say this for the benefit of our new colleagues. But I must say, with five years' experience behind me, that it happens very rarely.

I am sorry that at this constituent session there has been a slight substantive error due to the overload of work on our officials but I cannot take the vote a second time. It was held on the basis of a given text. It so happens that the original text was in French. That is the one that counts, and its translation into the other languages, notably Italian, must be corrected.

**Mr Sherlock.** — Mr President, much as we adore being in the limelight as politicians, it is a little tedious when the camera is pointing the other way. Could we have it switched off?

**President.** — Would the television technicians quickly finish what they have to do so that the projectors can be switched off, as they do indeed cause discomfort.<sup>1</sup>

#### 12. *European Council of Fontainebleau (continuation)*

**Mr Klepsch.** — (DE) Mr President, honourable Members, a year after the Stuttgart package of most

<sup>1</sup> Decision on urgency: see Minutes.

**Klepsch**

urgent Community tasks was put together and six months after the failed Athens Summit, Fontainebleau seemed to offer a tiny ray of hope on the at times somewhat gloomy European horizon. Thanks are due to the French Presidency of the Council for concentrating on overcoming the deadlock in the Community and achieving progress. Whether Fontainebleau really will live up to its promise remains to be seen — especially after the recent failure at Brussels. I do not deny that we feel some anxiety and reservations about certain major points.

Let us start with the positive aspects. We welcome the fact that Fontainebleau gave the green light for the accession of Spain and Portugal and fixed a specific timetable. From the outset the EPP Group has called for enlargement to the south. We expect that at last the remaining obstacles will be removed rapidly and in a spirit of partnership. We want Political Union and not a Europe of shopkeepers. Under the advertising slogan of 'Europe of the citizens', the Heads of State and Government have announced practical measures to give the people of the Community a stronger sense of community. The sense of European identity is to become everyday reality for each individual.

The incipient phasing out of police and customs formalities in passenger travel at some of the Community's internal frontiers is a first practical result. That means something to the citizens. They can feel what it means to live in an open Community of democratic peoples in which freedom of movement is a matter of course. And may I add with satisfaction and pride that without the constant pressure from the European Parliament, without our call for a Europe without frontier posts, we would not have got nearly so far. In coming years we shall not rest until the expensive customs barriers in goods traffic also come down. Point by point we will measure the practical results against the declarations of good intent made at Fontainebleau. We expect the specially set up *ad hoc* committee to move ahead as quickly and unbureaucratically as France and Germany did when they agreed to adopt the Benelux model of open frontiers for passenger travel in their frontier rules.

In that respect, Fontainebleau pointed in the right direction. But, there will be no Europe of the citizens without a strong European Parliament. To try to bring progress to the Community through intergovernmental committees, *ad hoc* working parties or suchlike in which only the national bureaucrats call the tune again, is to build Europe on sandy ground. That is why the Group of the European People's Party objects to the fact that the whole Fontainebleau communiqué does not once mention the constituent importance of the European Parliament for the 'Europe of the citizens'.

That has particularly damaging effects in the field of the budget. The solution of the budget questions for 1984 and the coming years has become a crucial test of

the viability of the Community. We need solutions useful to the Community at last, so that we are free again to focus on progressive, forward-looking policies for Europe. According to the Treaties of Rome, the management of the budget — and it should be superfluous to remind you of this — is shared equally between Parliament and the Council as joint budget authorities. That is why we should not toy with the idea of a kind of interministerial budgetary superintendence which would impose a revenue limit on Parliament and allow it no more than token powers to play with the budget within that limit.

To put it bluntly: the EPP Group honours the attempt made at Fontainebleau to find a real solution to the question of the British contribution and to get away from the undignified haggling. If it adopts a final regulation, the Council will have our full support in that endeavour; we can also understand that the level of contribution is to be ascertained on the basis of a common formula based on the share of VAT. But this system will not work either if we try to resolve the problems purely in revenue terms, for then we would be back more or less to a kind of *juste retour* which — and our position has not changed and will not change — the EPP Group rejects. In that respect we also see signs of regression in comparison with what Parliament and the Council between them had already achieved in 1983.

Our view is that the imbalance cannot be resolved simply via revenue and can perhaps be settled only on the basis of the interplay of the gross social product of a country with its expenditure, as we do for the fiscal adjustment between Bund and Länder in Germany. It would be advisable for the Council sometimes to take note of the proposals of the European Parliament and its budgetary experts. In following this road we also want to ensure that new Community policies are formulated on a rational basis and agricultural expenditure is kept within acceptable limits.

May I briefly go into a further point raised at the Fontainebleau Summit and make a criticism as regards the aspect of parliamentary involvement: in the longer term, this is our impression, the newly set up 'Spaak II' *ad hoc* committee is to bring about improvements in the institutional field, a difficult aim which we welcome in principle. The group which I chair and, I believe, the European Parliament as a whole, can only accept this committee if it is based on the idea that the further institutional development of the Community in the crucial questions of legislation, budget, enlargement and EPC, including a common European security policy, can be achieved only by cooperation between Parliament, Commission and Council. Intergovernmental action on its own will achieve nothing! The Spaak II committee will have a chance of success only if it is willing to enter into constant dialogue with the European Parliament and if its activities are mainly based on the proposal adopted by Parliament. I do not deny that we feel rather sceptical about another new



**Klepsch**

committee, which will probably be dominated by officials again. We might feel less sceptical if we find knowledgeable, experienced European politicians on it who are willing to take over special Community tasks and make progress on the road to European integration working in cooperation with the elected representatives of the peoples of the Community. At any rate we will watch extremely vigilantly over any initiatives, checking whether and in what way the European Parliament has a say in the decision-making process.

May I confirm that my group is willing to engage in constructive dialogue with the Council. Of course the precondition is that it is able to act and decide. The way in which President FitzGerald described its intentions today leads me to expect positive cooperation with it.

I have noted with interest what you, President FitzGerald, said about the responsibility of the Member States' governments for European failures and the structural deficits, and the spirit in which you evaluated and recognized the activities of the European Parliament. May I thank you warmly for those kind words.

We want close cooperation, because nothing but conflicts between the Community institutions will get us nowhere. If we only have conflicts we will harm Europe as a whole. But there is one thing we must realize. This Parliament will not be content to play the part of a patient looker-on in the wings of the European stage. In the second direct election the people have given us credit which we must not now waste. Let everyone take note: we will not disappoint our voters, the citizens of Europe.

We are critical of the results of Fontainebleau insofar as they relate to Parliament and the development of democratic cooperation in the European Community and we hope to see signs of greater willingness to improve the cooperation with Parliament. My group has no intention of accepting any fundamental losses of the rights Parliament has struggled to acquire and which are guaranteed to it. We shall exercise our rights and we feel that as the elected representatives of the citizens of Europe we are responsible for promoting European integration, preserving and developing the Community and not changing it into a mere inter-governmental structure.

*(Applause from the centre and from the right)*

**Sir Henry Plumb.** — Mr President, colleagues, first of all I should like to join with others in thanking the President-in-Office of the Council, Dr FitzGerald, who has been among us today, and to wish him, his colleagues and his country the best of luck in its presidency which now begins. They have, as we all know, an excellent example to follow in the French presidency. Dr FitzGerald has remarked that President

Mitterrand and Mr Cheysson have performed great services to the Community over the past six months. Their crowning achievements were described to us by Dr FitzGerald when he spoke to us earlier of the meeting of Heads of State or Government at Fontainebleau.

Mr President, we are gathered here today at the first session of the new Parliament. Some may believe that that is an act which concerns only us parliamentarians and not the representatives of the Council or the Commission. I shall try to draw a parallel between the new start provided for this Parliament by the elections of June and the new start which has been provided for our Community by the successful resolution at Fontainebleau of the Community's most pressing problems.

Mr President, it is not possible for long and complicated negotiations on financial matters to take place over three or four years without any bad feeling being created. For reasons we all understand the British Government was that government most directly concerned by the failings and inadequacies of the Community's budget. I repeat that these failings are general failings and that the problems of the Community's budget, by chance, have borne upon the United Kingdom. It has sometimes seemed, even to our friends, that the British Government was interested in nothing other than the financial contribution of the United Kingdom to the European Community. I know that that was a mistaken impression, and it has been painful to me to listen to honest colleagues speaking and acting under that misapprehension. The agreement of Fontainebleau removes the problem which was blocking the Community's progress. We in the European Democratic Group are happy that this problem has now been largely resolved.

We are happy because we want to see the Community grow and we want to see it develop. We want to consider all areas of economic, political, industrial, technological and scientific integration. We profoundly believe that more and more European problems can best be approached on a European scale. We are not minimalists. We believe that the existing areas of Community action can and should be widely extended. We are not inhibited by an outmoded concept of sovereignty which has often until now ensured that European nations did separately and badly things which they could do well together.

Mr President, yesterday you rightly reminded us that the peoples of Europe, particularly the young people of Europe, need to be convinced and need to be filled with enthusiasm for Europe. We must certainly never confine our European integration to the purely economic or even purely material level. We peoples of Europe share a history and we share a culture which differs comparatively little from one region of the Community to another. Of course, there are differences between a Scotsman and a Sardinian, but the differences are trivial when compared with the points

**Plumb**

of identity. I welcome the spirit which underlines the two *ad hoc* committees referred to by Dr FitzGerald this morning and set up by the Fontainebleau Summit. Of course there can and should be such a thing as European identity. Young people often understand this better than we older people can. It is their future to which we are contributing in this Parliament, and we should be wrong to impose upon them our old-fashioned nationalistic prejudices.

Europe has achieved an inconceivable amount since the signing of the Treaty of Rome less than 30 years ago. We now, as the world emerges from recession and faces the political and economic challenges of tomorrow, have a chance after the Fontainebleau Summit to proceed on a reaffirmed basis of equity within our Community.

Mr President, no one in my group has ever believed that financial matters were the be-all and end-all of our Community. An unbalanced financial system could, however, have undermined the foundations of the Community. I am glad that the Fontainebleau agreement has gone a long way to right an unstable and deteriorating position. Naturally there are many things left to be done, but we are on the right route and in politics, of course, that is a great deal.

I wish before leaving the results of Fontainebleau to reassert my group's commitment to the accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community. Important developments have taken place over the past months in the common agricultural policy and in the Community's budget. These changes obviously bear heavily upon the negotiations with Spain and Portugal. Parliament must have an opportunity to discuss the negotiations again in this light. If the negotiations are to be concluded, as we hear, by October, then only September remains and I hope, Mr President, that the Commission will make a statement on the negotiations in September and thus give this House an opportunity to discuss the matter thoroughly.

Mr President, I spoke earlier of new starts. We in Parliament are also making a new start to our second legislative period. I believe that the two new starts are intimately connected. Europe will only prosper if it is firmly anchored in the hearts and minds of people. It is the very essence of our Community's political culture that it is made up of democracies. The democracy of the Community finds its highest expression in our European Parliament. Democracy in France is expressed in the *Assemblée Nationale*, in Germany in the *Bundestag* and in the national parliaments of other countries, but on a European level it is we, the directly-elected European Parliament, who are the element of democratic scrutiny and control over the Community's activities. If, over the next five years, we are able to bring this home to more of the electors, we shall have done a great service to the Community. Similarly, if the next five years prove a time of progress and advance in the Community, then our task in

Parliament will be that much easier. Our second five-year period in Parliament has got off to a good beginning, Mr President of the Parliament, particularly with your election. Our first five years were a time of trial and perhaps, yes, a time of error. I am sad to say that we are sometimes careless, we are sometimes inconsistent or over-ambitious in the use of our powers. These powers exist and they need to be more fully exploited. I believe the next five years of work will be even more interesting and fulfilling than the first five. I believe that our Parliament will develop more fully the possibility its powers and its status as the democratically elected representatives of the people of Europe give it. This can only be to the advantage of the Community as a whole. My group does not seek any confrontation or competition with other institutions of the Community. We have our rôle to play, and we serve the common cause by playing our own rôle to the fullest extent possible.

Today, the European Community is in a period of change. Our problems are not identical with the problems of twenty or even ten years ago. Equally, our possibilities are greater than those of twenty years ago, and our directly-elected Parliament is the major building-block in the European Community which we wish to see developed.

This year has recalled to us many anniversaries of Europe's recent history. These anniversaries have been times of mixed feelings. Our Community and our Parliament provide a link between the often unhappy past of Europe and its uncertain future. One may fear the uncertainty of the future, but for optimists like myself, the future's uncertainty is a ground for hope. The future, Europe's future, is still to be shaped. Let us shape it tomorrow, let us shape it for the future and let us follow the lead that has been given from Fontainebleau: let us give the lead, Mr President, through this institution, the Parliament!

(Applause)

### 13. Election of Vice-Presidents (continuation)

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, I shall now read out the results of the vote to elect the Vice-Presidents.

Members voting: 408  
Blank or spoiled ballot papers: 4  
Votes cast: 404  
Absolute majority: 203

*Votes received were as follows:*

Mr Seefeld: 295 votes  
Mr Didò: 282 votes  
Mr Griffiths: 275 votes  
Mr Fanti: 264 votes  
Mr Plaskovitis: 255 votes  
Mrs Péry: 250 votes

**President**

Mr Møller: 214 votes  
 Mr Estgen: 94 votes  
 Mrs Heinrich: 73 votes  
 Mr le Pen: 34 votes

Since Mr Seefeld, Mr Didò, Mr Griffiths, Mr Fanti, Mr Plaskovitis, Mr Møller and Mrs Péry have received an absolute majority of the votes cast, they are declared Vice-Presidents of the European Parliament. I congratulate them on their election.

(Loud applause)

At the request of the political groups, the election of the quaestors will take place at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

#### 14. *European Council of Fontainebleau* (continuation)

**Mr Natta.** — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is not I, who have the honour to address you, that should be speaking on our behalf in the first debate in this new Assembly elected by popular suffrage.

Another person should have been here in my place.

But, in their confidence, my comrades have called upon me to do what should, alas! have been done by Enrico Berlinguer.

Allow me therefore to put forward very briefly some of the views of the Italian Communist Group, after the statements made by President FitzGerald and President Thorn, to whom we extend our welcome, and offer our thanks.

I should like today to emphasize once again our appreciation of many of the ideas upheld by François Mitterand, and the efforts made by him — on behalf of France — during the six months of his presidency of the Council.

I refer in particular to his patient endeavours to get away from the paralysing disputes within the Community that have accumulated over past years and, above all, I would mention the proposals put forward for the political relaunching of the Community, in explicit acceptance of the spirit of the draft Treaty that is identified — as you, Mr President, rightly recalled yesterday, and as President FitzGerald has recalled again today — with the name of Altiero Spinelli.

Just as sincerely, however, I have to say that, already, the Fontainebleau Summit seemed to us to have been a step backwards, as regards the proposals of the six-months' period of which it marked the end.

In our view, that Summit showed once again the contradiction between the great importance of the tasks — the imperatives even — that await the attention of

the Community, and which have already been emphasized by the chairman of the Socialist Group, Mr Arndt, and the lack of drive that is so characteristic of the real life of the Community.

It is certainly not enough to make a declaration of intent, in order to sweep the obstacles that lie ahead. However, it seems to us to be even more true that the deterministic concept — which is perhaps implicit in the Treaty of Rome — according to which the Community was to progress from economic integration to political Union in a natural, automatic process, through the very force of things — this concept — as I was saying — seems increasingly wrong and belied by reality. Reality shows that, without a clear-cut political will, not only is there no progress towards Union, but economic integration itself ends up in decline, threatened with growing regression. And new proof of that has been given to us here, today, by the Presidents of the Council and the Commission.

In a word, the whole of the experience of the Community, down to the subject of this present debate, emphasizes — in our view — to this Assembly how great is the need for the utmost realism: a realism that is the very opposite of sceptical laziness, a realism that means far-seeing strength and determination where the objectives are concerned, coupled with a tenacious gradualism in the pursuit of those objectives. The aim must be — and for us it is unflinchingly — the construction of a Community, finally enlarged to include Spain and Portugal, and with firmly-rooted, integrated supranational institutions and common policies.

With this in view, the decisive factor in our opinion is the participation of the people in Community life; and one of the fundamental forms of expression of this participation must be this Parliament.

For this reason we should not want the decision of the Fontainebleau Summit to leave the study on the political relaunching of the Community solely to an *ad hoc* committee, to be a reflection of the old way of thinking, and we consider that it has no chance of success without the active participation of the European Parliament and the national parliaments. We consider that the initiatives outlined by President FitzGerald for the formation of the Committee and the consultation of Parliament and the political parties that it contains are significant. We take the Council, as represented by President FitzGerald, at its word.

In face of the fearful challenges coming from the other side of the Atlantic, Brussels, after Fontainebleau, presents only the picture of an administration that cannot any longer even meet the cost of the common agricultural policy: a picture of refusals interwoven between States, of breathless last-minute transactions, of drift.

The truth is that, if things continue in this way, the Community will indeed be federated; but it will be federated by the yoke of growing unemployment, the

Natta

constant rise in the dollar that is the thorn in our flesh, and the domination of its market by the Japanese and American giants.

In expressing dissatisfaction as regards this subject, also, we feel it our duty — and not our duty alone — to call for the gradual but dynamic introduction, on that Community basis that is indispensable, of policies of cooperation based on programmes, resources and aims that are capable of putting to good use the scientific, economic, and human potential of this part of the Continent — a potential that is immense but which, whilst it is split up, cannot hope to stand up to world competition. In our view, the heart-rending problem of physical and intellectual unemployment must be central to any programme for the economic recovery of the Community. The struggles of the European workers show that, in the long run, the only road to a positive solution lies in combining economic recovery with social justice.

May I be allowed one final observation, Mr President. No effort for the institutional, economic and political recovery of the Community will become anything but a mere rhetorical exercise unless it is indivisibly linked to a commitment to a far-reaching change in the present state of international relations, which is a threat to world peace and, at the same time, constitutes the stumbling block barring the way to all projects for the identity, independence and unity of the European Community.

For this reason also we are not satisfied with the conclusions reached by the Fontainebleau Summit. We believe in fact that, in a more clear-cut way, the European Community must have opinions to be expressed, proposals to be supported, initiatives to be taken — first of all, for the inescapable resumption of direct negotiations for disarmament in Europe and the world and, at the same time, for the solution of the crises that are tearing people apart from Central America to Afghanistan, from South Africa to the Middle East, and subjecting world equilibrium to pressures that threaten its total destabilization.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we represent here a party that, on those very ideas that I have attempted very briefly to summarize, has won a limited majority in Italy, and the highest number of votes of any party in the 10 countries of the Community.

There is no self-conceit nor arrogance in us — simply humility in face of the enormous difficulties confronting us in the world and in the European Community, in our endeavours to be equal to the responsibilities which the electors have conferred upon us. They — and I do not mean our own electors alone — ask that, in overcoming the bitter tension between the Superpowers, the Community should take part in building an international system based on the respect of the rights of everyone and, first of all, on the right of the weakest and most needy people to raise their stan-

dards, so that — in the North, South, East and West — the universal values of peace and democracy may assert themselves in the world.

What an arduous task!

In conclusion, I should like to recall something that Voltaire said:

‘l’industrie a réparé les torts que la nature et la négligence faisaient à nos climats’.

As we look at the present state of affairs, that declaration might seem an ingenuous, illuministic Utopia; but in peacetime industry — that is to say, the sum of man’s knowledge and production — can save life and the environment from degradation. It can open up new, higher prospects for the civilization of mankind.

We are here to make our modest contribution and, therefore, to listen and be heard.

In thanking you, Mr President, and honourable Members, as well as the Council and the Commission, for the courtesy with which you have heard me, I should like to assure you that you will find us as open in our intentions as we are committed where the political battle is concerned.

*(Applause from the benches of the Communist Group)*

**Mrs Veil.** — (FR) Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the European calendar has happened to give our Parliament, newly elected for a second term, the opportunity to devote its first debate to a stocktaking of the European Council meeting held in Fontainebleau, on the subject of which we heard a statement this morning from the Irish President-in-Office, whom I take this opportunity to welcome.

I find this a very convenient coincidence of dates, since the Fontainebleau Summit was a highly significant moment in the life of the Community. Unfortunately, however, when I describe it as highly significant, I mean that the things that it is symbolic of are to a large extent the difficulties of the Community, its hesitations and the hopes that it has aroused and failed to realize.

This European Council was seen in many respects as the last-chance Summit. With the Community budget threatened by bankruptcy during the course of this year, urgent solutions were called for. With the latent crisis between Member States and the gradual weakening of Europe, both within and without, there were grounds for hoping that the dangers would be borne in upon the Heads of State or Government and that they would at last produce the decisive initiatives that they have so often led us to believe are just around the corner.

## Veil

It could in fact be said that Europe had reached a crossroads, at which the future could take one of three possible courses.

The first was that no solution would be found to the budgetary problem, so that the Community would no longer be able to function. The second was that there could be a real new lease of life, with new opportunities and new prospects opening up for Europe. The third was that there would be yet another rehash, although a new, rather overspiced sauce would be added to the old recipe to give the impression that it was a new dish.

It has to be admitted that what we saw in the event was the third of these possibilities, because the European Council consciously adopted an aura of ambiguity. It was deliberately planned to take place a few days after the European elections. Its members therefore consciously left us all in doubt over the real state of the Community and the action that they intended to take to settle outstanding problems or even to breathe fresh life into Europe.

It was therefore in a climate of uncertainty and ambivalence that those elections took place: uncertainty over the future of the Community, and ambivalence regarding the stance of the French Presidency and how the other governments might react to it.

It should not have come as any surprise in the circumstances that so many voters in most of our countries either abstained or voted in ways betraying a degree of distrust or disappointment in their attitudes to Europe.

I am nevertheless convinced — and in this respect I am completely at one with the point of view expressed yesterday by our President — that the citizens of our countries are more keenly aware than ever of the need to press on with the construction of Europe. But they have yet to be persuaded that the Community is dealing with the problems which are of concern to them. As I have often had occasion to say in this Chamber, the Parliament's public image is subsumed by that of the European institutions in general. When the Community has such a negative image, why should Europeans be disposed to vote for a Parliament whose powers are in any event so limited?

When speaking in this Chamber on 24 May, the President of the European Council thought it would be clever to flatter the House a little by giving it the impression that he was taking account of its proposals, especially our cherished draft treaty, adopted by a large majority. In doing so, he raised false hopes, not to put too fine a point on it, and created great confusion. Some people were left expecting major initiatives, although they were unclear as to what these might be. There was talk of the possibility of a fresh conference. On what type of Europe, and how many countries would feel that it concerned them? There was a good deal of speculation along these lines. Some

people were delighted, others were already getting worried. It was all to no avail.

In the event, the European Council confirmed our apprehensions: not a word on the draft treaty that we had adopted, nothing either about the powers of Parliament.

What we have been seeing has tended in quite the opposite direction: the budgetary arrangements already made for this year and the decisions concerning future years amply demonstrate that the few powers that our Parliament has hitherto enjoyed in this one field are at risk of being severely limited in the future, since the amounts in respect of which we have a say on the margin for manoeuvre are clearly going to be limited.

Once again, I can only say that this attitude of our governments towards the Parliament is both regrettable and dangerous. It is regrettable in that it fails to use the dynamic potential of the European Parliament to strengthen Europe. It is dangerous for Europe's image to call out the electorate to vote for a Parliament when the Council is concerned only to limit its powers.

As we settle into the start of a second term, we have a duty to press this point home and to serve notice of our intentions on the Council, which has just given yet another demonstration of the low regard in which it holds the Parliament.

I refer here of course to the office of President of the Commission, on the subject of which, despite the undertakings given, we were not consulted at all. I am well aware that the timetable has perhaps been disrupted somewhat, but I should have thought that if the will had been there, an opportunity to do this would have been found before today.

As for our efforts to revitalize the institutions, I would say that lofty aspirations have come down to very little: we have been told that an *ad hoc* committee is being set up, but of whom is it composed? Of 'personal representatives of the Heads of State or Government'. Naturally, two interpretations are possible. One is that the composition of this committee reflects a wish to maintain control, to prevent things going too far. That, of course, is the more pessimistic of the two, and I prefer to reject it. I would rather believe that the correct interpretation is that the Heads of State or Government are determined to demonstrate their interest in these matters.

I can only express surprise, just as our President did yesterday, at the failure to involve the Parliament in the proceedings of this *ad hoc* committee; indeed, this is a quite amazing aberration since the committee is specifically charged with proposing measures aimed at promoting the 'Europe of the citizen'.

## Veil

In this connection, it is right and proper that things should be seen as they are. Among the tasks entrusted to this *ad hoc* committee, many have already been carried out by our Parliament, so that the European Council would need only to follow up our proposals. I do not wish to enumerate them now, but I can tell you that they seem to me to cover just about the full range of the *ad hoc* committee's terms of reference. We have not hitherto seen much interest shown by the Council in our proposals on these matters, but I welcome the news that we shall in future be getting answers to the questions that we put to the Council or the Commission, instead of the stonewalling that we have had in the past.

I would add that, should the Council decide to take action, we would ask it to begin by honouring the undertakings given to us. In November 1981, it will be remembered, an undertaking was given by the Council of Foreign Ministers, meeting here, on the procedure for conciliation on legislative matters. Very clearly defined commitments were entered into on the progress that was to be made in this field. They came to nothing. The same was true, more recently, of the undertakings given in Stuttgart on the subject of consultation of Parliament prior to appointment of a new President of the Commission. While on the subject of Stuttgart, it is worth mentioning that the solemn declaration contained many decisions which have yet to be acted upon.

There is perhaps another of the things which should have been occupying the attention of the European Council in Fontainebleau, instead of the creation of yet more new structures, a process which always arouses fresh hopes which are always followed by disappointment. This has now become a well-known technique, especially favoured during an election period or when the time comes to make a speech before the European Parliament.

It is true that the immediate problems were both serious and urgent, and there was a time when there was reason to fear that the Council would take the option of pressing ahead regardless in an effort to compensate for its inability to agree on solutions to the problems of the budget and the British contribution.

A compromise was found. We in the Liberal Group welcome this, having always maintained in the past, through our former chairman, Martin Bangemann, that compromises were necessary in the Community, being the other side of the coin of *communautaire* life and a prerequisite of progress in the construction of Europe.

It is still necessary, however, for compromises to meet certain criteria.

The sacrifices that they entail must be shared fairly, not only among the Member States but also among the various sections of society. This is not the case here,

since it is basically the farmers who are having to pay the price of this agreement.

Compromises must adhere to the essential principles of the Community. Again, this is not the case when the path taken leads to renationalization of the common agricultural policy, by leaving governments to adopt national measures to compensate for what they consider to be losses at Community level.

Finally, compromises must fit into a clearly defined scheme offering real prospects for the future. When people refer to European Union, what do they mean by Europe? No-one knows. And what can we make of the outlook for the future when, as the President of the Commission was stressing this morning, we have absolutely no idea what is going to be done about the budget? Or, to be more accurate, we know perfectly well that we shall be unable to honour commitments already entered into.

The worst of it all is the present budgetary situation. I cannot go into details now. We shall have an opportunity to discuss this tomorrow. But I must register my anxiety on this score.

At the bedside of an anaemic Europe, our gloomy band of doctors have been unable to agree either on the diagnosis or on the treatment. For all their efforts to reassure the patient and her family, they have administered nothing but placebos. But the time for placebos is long past in Europe's case. What she needs is a will to survive and the means of survival. She must display her will to survive by renouncing double-talk and setting herself objectives based on an ambitious scheme. She must be provided with the means in the form of a budget corresponding to these ambitions.

If we fail in this, we shall no longer have any credibility among our citizens and if, five years from now, we ask them to vote for us again, we shall be wasting their time and ours.

Worse still, if we fail in this, Europe too will have lost all credibility in the outside world. In other words, our independence and status as a force in the world are under threat.

Today, we are meeting our responsibility as parliamentarians by alerting the Council. But the responsibility for taking action lies with the Council.

(Applause)

**Mr de la Malène.** — (FR) Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, in common with all sincere Europeans, we were gratified to learn that the meeting of the European Council held in Fontainebleau ended in an agreement among the 10 participants.

We welcomed this news. But we welcomed it, so to speak, subject to sight. And on our first sight of the

## de la Malène

details of the decisions reached, we found that this consensus had been bought at what we found to be a very high price, to be paid not by each of our nations but by the Community as a whole. A price which seemed so high, in fact, that it prompted justified speculation as to the true motives underlying this compromise agreement. Were they to do with Europe, or with something quite different?

Certainly, Fontainebleau produced a positive agreement, a plus point. And this we welcome. A plus point in the necessary increase in the Community's own resources. But there is already reason to doubt that this increase, regrettably limited to 0.4% of VAT revenues, will be enough. All, or nearly all, the decisions which made it possible to reach this agreement, this compromise, are going to cost money: whether it be the acceptance of the limited solidarity of the United Kingdom as of now, and of other net debtors in the future, or the acceleration of enlargement and the essential accompanying measures, or yet the reversion to distortion of the market in agricultural products. When we take account of the costs that should normally be involved in maintaining the Community and its policies, we can and must ask whether these additional items of expenditure that have just been approved or initiated are not going to be enough in themselves to simply cancel out or absorb the 0.4% of new revenues.

This would mean, when all is said and done, that the Community would be back at square one. In getting there, however, it would once again have lost an appreciable measure of the distinctive *communautaire* character which has been its strength and originality over the years. It would have abandoned financial solidarity in what had become a sort of 'limited liability' Community, it would have succumbed to the emergence of the '*juste retour*' notion, it would have allowed a lasting rift to develop in its only real single, common market, the agricultural market, it would have rushed into an enlargement conducted under lamentable conditions, the consequence of which would be further dilution of policies established to date.

Behind this overall agreement, there could of course have been something more, something which outweighed by far these perhaps rather narrow reasonings and calculations. To compensate for the sacrifices accepted, there could have been a commitment, unreserved and free from ulterior motives at last, albeit not in black and white, on the part of all concerned — and I mean all — to the Community concepts which are the cement of the unification enterprise. In particular, there could have been a commitment to the principles of the common agricultural policy, the first concrete achievement, the mainstay of the Community. Time and again we had been told: 'Our intentions as members have been sincere, we want to play a full part. But experience has shown that the costs are shared too unfairly. Let us get that right, and all will be well'. For months and months, dragging into years,

this demand has nullified all efforts and brought the machine to a standstill. Now that it had been met, we were entitled to expect that the path to real progress had been cleared of all obstacles. That may not have wholly justified the sacrifices, but it would at least have explained them.

What of our hopes now, barely a month on from this Summit? And what of our anxieties? Alas, it has taken less than a month for our hopes to be dashed and our anxieties to become more acute than ever! Despite last March's deplorable agricultural agreement, the revenues are still almost 10% short of what is needed to meet the commitments contained in the budget voted for 1984. And, as we know, the outlook for 1985 is exactly the same. Solutions have been proposed by the Commission, and then by the Parliament. But the Fontainebleau Summit, presumably considering this a minor matter or one which would resolve itself, referred it to the Council of Ministers. But there, to the surprise and disappointment of all, the position once again became deadlocked, first in the Agriculture Council, then in the Budget Council and finally in the General Affairs Council. This morning we had a request for urgency. Thinking of the farmers, we voted for it. But it was a completely unrealistic request. I still live in hope that other Councils will unravel this situation in time, thus avoiding the scandal of the Community being incapable of honouring its commitments.

That is not the essential point, however. What is of most concern is the fact that, now that Fontainebleau is behind us, that the sharing of contributions has been reviewed, that advantages have been granted to those farmers who were already too well off, that enlargement has more or less been accepted, we still find the same attitude, the same inclination to run down the common agricultural policy. The budget is 10% short? No matter, Europe's farmers can bear the cost of saving that.

When matters are seen in this light, it is to be feared that we shall not be returning to the *status quo*, but that the strangulation of the common agricultural policy through the pressure of financial procedures will continue, that the inadequacy of the new resources, which will be swallowed up by the cost of enlargement, will be conducive to this, and that the upshot will be the renationalization of part of the agricultural sector.

Ladies and Gentlemen, President Pflimlin referred yesterday in his inaugural speech to the risks of deviation 'which would quickly reduce our Community to an empty shell'. Following the Fontainebleau Summit, especially in the light of what the recent Councils of Ministers have taught us about its significance, this must now be our primary concern. We are witnessing a twofold trend. Internally, the Community is gradually, day by day, Council after Council, becoming less *communautaire* and the common policies are being

**de la Malène**

voided of meaning. Externally, it is going to be enlarged before the comprehensive range of preliminary measures, which are absolutely essential, have been put into effect. If this twofold trend continues, if we do not pull ourselves together, we shall eventually find that we have a European organization of some sort, but certainly not one that deserves to be called a Community! But since it will have been voided of all substance, and given that nature abhors a vacuum, it will fall to our nations — and who will be able to blame them? — to fill the role which will by then, sadly have been abandoned by Europe.

*(Applause from the Centre and Right)*

**Mr Fanton.** — (FR) Mr President, my eyes may deceive me, but I have the impression that all representatives of the Council of Ministers have disappeared. Are they not interested in this debate, have they already left the Chamber when we have barely started the first session of the new Parliament? I find it quite lamentable that the Council of Ministers should already have lost interest, no more than a few hours after the beginning of our debate.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I fear that the President-in-Office of the Council has had to leave us, at least for the time being.

**Mr Fanton.** — (FR) Mr President, he was not alone. This simultaneous disappearance shows how little interest the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers and his colleagues take in this debate. That is the point I wanted to make.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I do not think that interpretation is correct. Nevertheless, I shall pass on your observation to those concerned.

**Mr Bøgh.** — (DA) Mr President, I wish to concentrate in my intervention on two things in the speech of the President-in-Office of the Council, namely the two *ad hoc* committees: that concerned with identity and the Spaak committee on institutions.

The President-in-Office of the Council made no secret of the fact that it is general apathy among the electorate, manifested in the June elections to Parliament, which is the real reason for the setting up of the identity committee. Its task would be 'to prepare and coordinate action to strengthen and promote the identity of Europe and its image both for its citizens and for the rest of the world'. It is the very special EEC jargon contained in that pronouncement which harbours immense contradictions and opens up

momentous prospects. Personally I think that we should have done better to devote our energies to analysing this election and to gaining an insight into the reasons why, not least, many citizens in the northern part of the Community stayed at home or voted 'no' — I am thinking of Great Britain, Ireland and Denmark. Why is it that precisely this group of cultures within the Community see the whole thing as something remote, alien and alienating? Such a situation will not be remedied by performing verbal acrobatics like this business of identity. It will not be remedied by creating a new image — and it is curious that terms such as creating an image and forging an identity are used as if they were the same thing. It is a confusion of terms, for an image is something which you can create, while identity is something you have. Images can be created with money, propaganda and advertising, which we are very keen on in this firm, whereas identity is a question of that which is inviolable in a human being, which will be alienated by manipulating it.

I believe that the Community will do itself a good turn by either ceasing to talk about identity or making it clear what it means by it. The point is that there are at least two major groups of identities in the Community: a northern group, which has a very pragmatic attitude to life, and a romanian group, whose attitude is more geared to theory, and these two opposites are constantly at issue here, even if we do not realize it from one day to the next. It is the romanian cast of mind which characterizes this organization and which puts forward this remarkable understanding of identity as something one can simply go and create: we can set up committees which will have an identity, we can create symbolic cultures with a European flag, passport, driving licence, stamps, football teams etc — and everywhere identity is confused with the image that one can go out and create. For the rest of us, identity is a question of being oneself. It is a question of where a human being is without the influence of alienating forces, where an institution or a country or a State really is, standing by itself and unfolding its own potential. It is very interesting.

Let me say about the Spaak committee that it is precisely the kind of initiative which makes the Community into something we fear in Denmark: we are creating something which looks and sounds wonderful, but which in reality is an attack on national sovereignty. I think it is best explained by something which happened in Denmark: immediately before the elections on 14 June, Danish politicians felt compelled to adopt a declaration which guaranteed that, if the Community came up with an initiative such as we have here in the Spaak committee, which would press for the abolition of the right of veto and alter the balance between the institutions of the Community, a referendum would automatically be held on it in Denmark. I think that it is my duty here in Parliament to warn that any attempt to force Denmark into making concessions on sovereignty may have serious consequences.



**Bøgh**

We shall then be faced with the situation of a referendum in Denmark, the result of which no-one can predict.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO  
CERRETTI

*Vice-President*

**Mr Romualdi.** — (*IT*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, with this speech on behalf of the Group of the European Right, we are resuming in Parliament — after our victorious political electoral campaign in Italy and in France — the battle for Europe; a battle — as we would remind those who seem scandalized at the increase in our numbers — that we have always fought and especially so from the day when the present Institutions of the Community were set up, which we immediately became part of, whereas the Socialists and Communists remained apart or even opposed them. It is a well not to forget this, not from any wish to exclude them but to avoid any possibility that they, the last on the scene, should exclude those that were first. It is a battle that we, more than any other political party, know to be difficult, but for that very reason exciting. Difficult for many reasons, some of which relate to the very nature and character of this Parliament of ours, and which we shall talk about subsequently. Difficult also because, as we have said, it is not a popular one, as is always the case with a really revolutionary, innovative cause such as this battle for Europe really is — as our new President has very rightly pointed out in his investiture speech, for which we thank him.

But let us get on the speech of the President-in-Office of the Council, and the Fontainebleau Summit which was not, in all truth, a great success, as the Mitterrandian propaganda made it out to be, and as was repeated here, although there were a few discordant views expressed. It was not even a great compromise: it was a well-presented but modest one, only useful in practice to Mitterrand, who could not resign himself to closing the inglorious six-months' period of office of the French Presidency without at least having apparently succeeded in unblocking the European mechanism, which the somewhat shopkeeperish obstinacy of Mrs Thatcher seemed to have stopped for evermore.

Above all, Fontainebleau was not a happy stage in European events; Europe's machinery remained clogged, as the President-in-Office of the Council had to admit this morning. Mitterrand, up against it in his own country, was obliged to squeeze some political and Community capital out of Fontainebleau. Mrs Thatcher was of course able to report to Westminster that she had got back a large part of her money, but in

effect there was no change in her hostile position in regard to Community finances; and Kohl, in turn, achieved some saving in Germany's traditional financial commitments, but this was unfortunately at Europe's expense. There was nothing for Europe, no increase, for the time being, not even in the modest VAT rate. And that is an increase that, when it comes, will be hardly sufficient to cover the increase in expenses arising from the entrance of Spain and Portugal into the Community — that is, if their joining is not prevented or put back once again, by more French Socialist vetoes!

Nothing, then, for the new common policies that are fundamental to the great recovery of the Community, in whose favour, however, our governments committed themselves at Fontainebleau to approving the new draft Treaty that was adopted by Parliament, though they relegated it to the attention of a committee which is destined to the same melancholy fate that Spinelli and the Parliament had said they did not want, and which we must reject forcibly.

Obviously, a Europe at last capable of coming of age is of no interest either to our governments or to their parties, except as something to talk about. What it was more important to do at this time was to slim down and coordinate, institutionally as well, the efforts of the organs of the Community and, in particular, to give prestige and power to this Parliament. But the appointment, for example, of Mr Delors to the office of President of the Commission, which was negotiated privately at Fontainebleau, has certainly not had this effect. We regret this, because tardy consultation with the enlarged Bureau, which will take place tomorrow, does not put matters right. We protest, therefore. Delors is an excellent person, but he has been appointed in the worst way possible: we are faced with the unacceptable policy of the *fait accompli*, which humiliates and offends Parliament and calls into question both its authority and its power of initiative.

Madam President, we should have preferred to make this protest of ours direct to the French Presidency, which bears full responsibility for this as it does for other things, but unfortunately we can only do it now and, seeing that the French Presidency has now run its term, we regret having to do it in vain, and uselessly in regard to the responsibilities that threaten to characterize the life of this Parliament also.

**Mr Pannella.** — (*IT*) Madam President, may I permit first of all to offer you my congratulations on the outcome of today's elections, which have made you not only chronologically the first person to occupy the Chair in place of our President, but also the first person elected by our Assembly.

Madam President, as far as Fontainebleau is concerned, I think we should get our ideas clear immediately, however briefly and in haste, having regard to the time at our disposal.

**Pannella**

Undoubtedly, as far as the Europe of the petty squabbles is concerned, Fontainebleau achieved something. But these are not Europe's real problems: the banner under which our political parties — not only the PPE — canvassed their votes in Italy and all over Europe, was the banner of the new Treaty, which this Parliament adopted. I should not like to think that, once the enthusiasm for Parliament's action — which culminated in the adoption of that draft Treaty — is over, we should all of a sudden go back to our old ways. We say at once that, if at Fontainebleau there were thoughts of other things, we can only agree with what has been reported to us, namely that the *ad hoc* Committee can certainly be made responsible for preparing, on the basis also of this Treaty, the political — not diplomatic — conference of Heads of State or Government which the Heads of State or Government, on the basis of our draft Treaty, must hold; and that they must then entrust the European Parliament with the final stage of this programme. There is no other way, if we are to observe objective deadlines. On this point, therefore, I have nothing further to add.

We shall see during tomorrow afternoon's debate to what extent the support of the political parties twenty days ago for European federation was so much false pretences, or whether this is a Parliament that is setting out with the intention of fighting against time, against putrefaction and against the decay of the Commission's policy — not to mention the Council, although that might please my Danish friends, who are actually against Europe and against the Community, and hence always agree with the Council; which is why when, exceptionally, it happens that someone takes a different line, as President Mitterrand did, they are all frightened out of their skins.

Tomorrow, therefore, the debate will already be tough, and will be about precise texts and resolutions. The old and putrid majorities, which you used in your voting yesterday and today on the Presidencies, are majorities of misfortune. The only majorities or minorities, in this Parliament, must be formed on the question of the creation, using the method and text of the European Parliament, of the United States of Europe, as I call them, or European Union, to use the formal term.

Now that new forces, that are very close to us historically, have finally entered this Parliament, there are two points that I should like to make regarding the problem of security. We accuse, Madam President, those that believe they stand for security in Europe. We accuse them of being like the old France and the old Britain: but the old France of the 1930s relied for its security on the strategy of the Maginot Line. We dispute this: a Europe and a West that do not make use of the food weapon against the Soviet bloc and the filthy, dangerous acts that it commits; a West that sends thirty million tons of cereals in one year to Moscow; a Europe that wants missiles, which are the new form of Maginot Line today, instead of using the weapons

of propaganda, the weapons of Helsinki, the weapons of technology; and that sends its capitalists — as has happened — to sign agreements in Russia and then take part in anti-Communist, pro-Soviet — not pro-Communist — talks on Afghanistan, for financial gain.

Against such a background I think we have to denounce the slumbers, ladies and gentlemen, of you who say that you stand for security. You stand for the Maginot Line in its new form because, in reality, you cannot and do not use the food weapon, the technological weapon, the financial weapon; because on Poland, for example, with regard to Jaruzelski, you were very glib, here, with your applause for Solidarity, but then, at another level, you approved the continuation of the enormous bank loans to those in Warsaw who had restored 'order' using the methods they did!

I say this to make it clear that the old watersheds, with the old worthless pacifist philosophies on the one hand and the old worthless philosophies of rearmament on the other, can lead only to the end of all hope for Europe, and the end even of Europe as it is today.

As a Radical Party, we hope that what is before us is a debate about what is new, not just another of the squalid debates of the 1950s: with those for missiles, and those against, and both sides mobilized in the name of fear and death, thinking that in this way we can create a new Europe. But you are wrong! It is through prompt mobilization, every time, for some vital law — and the law creating the United States of Europe is a vital law — that we can really hope to fight for justice, freedom and peace.

Let us have done with your old stories, the putrefaction on the Right, the putrefaction of the Left, the rotten power agreements! Instead, let us say 'Yes' to some political project. I say again, even after what happened yesterday, with only eleven votes for the principal author of a certain line of action: it is along the lines of the Treaty, along Spinelli's lines, along the lines of federalism, that we can really represent something very different from grandpa's Europe, *l'Europe de papa*, with its disasters and its catastrophes.

**Mr Glinne.** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the European Council may not have quelled all our frustrations but, in our view, it has the merit of having broken the distressing deadlock on the series of problems besetting the Community which previous summits had failed to settle, despite the careful preparations and stalwart efforts made by the Greek Presidency.

The political success of Fontainebleau is limited, but undeniable. Indeed, the bureau of the Socialist Group congratulated President Mitterrand on the outcome as long ago as 27 June. And we all know how he would have been pilloried from certain quarters if the result

## Glinne

had been different and Fontainebleau had added to the sequence of failures.

Mrs Veil, for instance, by minimizing the Fontainebleau result in her speech a few minutes ago, was indulging in an exercise in domestic politics which was less than straightforward, since she adopted a sceptical attitude which was deliberate and took no account of the circumstances.

On the political aspects of the Fontainebleau result, I should first of all say that the majority of the Socialist Group supports the increase in own resources, given that this is tied up with the problem of enlargement and bearing in mind that we consider it unacceptable to propose that increased agricultural expenditure should be financed by cutting back on the non-compulsory part of the budget, especially in the areas of social and regional policy or development cooperation.

It is our hope that the procedures for ratification of the 1.4% ceiling on own resources from VAT revenues will be completed by 1 January 1986 at the latest, this being the presumed and necessary date for the accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community, and that the maximum rate can be raised to 1.6%, as planned, by 1 January 1988.

Since the European Council has declared that the negotiations for the accession of the Iberian countries should be completed by 30 September 1984 at the latest, I should like to ask the current Presidency of the Council for its comments on the progress that has been achieved to date. I would stress, in passing, that the problem of prior conditions must of course be resolved, as was emphasized several years ago by our group, in a speech made by Mr Sutra.

On the subject of social policy, our group is firmly convinced of the need for something more than what was agreed by the European Council: it is necessary, in our view, to finance and develop policies and programmes which will focus the interest of the world of work in Europe, notably in the campaigns against unemployment, poverty and deterioration of the environment. To our minds, this is a fundamental requirement, and at the same time a major factor conditioning the credibility of the European venture.

As regards the Europe of the citizen, we note the positive fact that the summit has at least taken up positions which could meet the expectations of European citizens, who have lost patience with the formalities of personal checks at border crossing-points and the lack of mutual recognition of university diplomas, to take just two examples. We expect practical proposals within the next six months.

Finally, on the institutional plane, our group attaches the highest importance to the commitment given by the Heads of State or Government on the subject of political and institutional development of the Com-

munity. In our view, the *ad hoc* committee, made up of personal representatives of the Heads of State or Government after the example of the Spaak Committee, which has been briefed to consider institutional issues and bring forward suggestions for ways and means of improving cooperation in the political or other spheres, should cooperate closely with the Parliament in carrying out its instructions on the basis of this Fontainebleau decision, a decision which must necessarily entail giving the most serious consideration to the draft treaty on the European Union adopted by Parliament on 14 February last.

**Mr Croux.** — (NL) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, is it possible to imagine a greater contrast than the one we have witnessed this morning? On the one hand, we have had the President of the Council, Mr FitzGerald, emphasizing the merits of the Fontainebleau summit and, on the other, the President of the Commission, Mr Thorn, sending out a distress signal by saying that the existence of the Community is threatened and a split is opening in its operations. That is what has been said here this morning. The Community no longer has the money to honour simple commitments. It looks as if the budget cannot be balanced, the agricultural policy cannot be financed, there is no money for a new policy to combat unemployment. We all go on saying that 12½ million are out of work, but at European level, where it is said something must be done, nothing is in fact being done.

We do not have an effective solution to the problems of the Third World. As a European bloc we are too weak to play a genuine role between East and West. We are full of doubt about the accession of Spain and Portugal. Let us be perfectly honest and admit that this is the way things stand. And why is this? Because there is no political will to give real shape to Europe.

A great deal has been said here about the Spaak Committee, and I have taken the trouble to look at the memoirs of my compatriot to see what he himself wrote about the Spaak Committee and the preparation of the Treaties of Rome. One of the sentences he wrote could be quoted here at any time, Madam President, and it is this: 'Where there is a political will, there are no insurmountable difficulties. Where there is no political will, any practical difficulty' — and we might add 'financial difficulty' — 'becomes a pretext to bring about the failure of negotiation and construction.' That is the fact of the matter.

We have just had elections, and in all ten of our Member States we have conducted campaigns in which we encountered indifference, and here again we might recall something Paul-Henri Spaak said in his memoirs when discussing the situation in 1955: 'The majority of the public was not hostile, it was indifferent. The work was done by a minority that knew what it wanted.'

**Croux**

We cannot fully endorse this statement because we believe that a majority of the citizens of Europe do in fact want progress towards European integration, but that it is the hesitation, the procrastination, the lack of political will which gives rise to the resentment, perhaps even indifference and here and there hostility of the general public, of the citizens of Europe. In these circumstances, it was our task, as they say, to 'sell' Parliament to the electors. But I tell you, Madam President, in a political system it is impossible to market a single institution. Every political system consists of a range of institutions: an executive, a Council of Ministers, a Commission, a Parliament, a Court of Justice. It is this range of institutions that forms the basis of a political structure.

We Members of Parliament say to the Council: under the Treaty of Rome you have undertaken to have this endorsed and ratified by your parliaments so that European integration may become a reality, and it is in this respect that the political groupings in Europe have failed. That is why, Madam President, as Egon Klepsch has already referred to the budgetary and socio-economic problems, I wish to emphasize the importance my group attaches to the institutional problems. Not because of any abstract institutional interest that might exist, but because we are convinced — as I have said before — that without good instruments, without a structure, satisfactory work cannot be done in a political society, and we do not have these instruments or this structure. We therefore say that for the fight against unemployment, for the agricultural policy, for the determination of Europe's position in the world we need a good structure and institutions that work well.

We have therefore tabled a motion for a resolution, ladies and gentlemen, which we hope you will support. We want to place the emphasis on three points in particular.

Firstly, we want this study to cover not only the Stuttgart declaration but above all the European Parliament's proposal for a new Treaty, because it was the outcome of agreement among all the political, democratic forces in Europe. No political authority must or can ignore this. We are entitled to demand this.

Secondly, we stress the method to be adopted. Paul-Henri Spaak gave his name to the Spaak Committee. It was not given the name of an expert. What was novel about the Spaak method which was introduced by the Foreign Ministers at that time was that experts were put to work, but under the political guidance and responsibility of a political figure. Experts are needed, but the political decisions must be taken at political level. I find it regrettable that no one from the Council, from the Irish Government, is now with us. I would go so far as to say that it must become a Fitzgerald Committee and that in the next six months the committee should bear the name of the then President of the Council. The current and living political reality

of Europe must be reflected in the activities of this committee.

Thirdly, we cannot say often enough that we must find the political will to act. I have already quoted what Paul-Henri Spaak said. I do not want to quote him again, but as this new Parliament gets down to work, it is time to say: we cannot go on in the same way as we have done for the last five years.

The first directly elected Parliament achieved various important things. It drew up a proposal for a new Treaty and a plan for economic recovery, for combating unemployment. We find Heads of Government and the Council regularly referring to them. But Parliament cannot go on saying in the next five years what it has been saying for the last five years. We shall be compelled, where the Commission and the Council are concerned, to assume political responsibility and also to demand political responsibility from those who have received the mandate from the peoples of Europe not only to govern their own countries but also to continue with the construction of Europe. Legally and politically, that is the message which they gave democratically under the Treaty of Rome and on so many other occasions in 1972 and 1973.

All the Member States, even Britain, even Denmark said: we want political union before 1980. Almost five years later, what is the situation? Unsatisfactory. And who has suffered as a result? The citizens of Europe, my friends. That is why, as this new Parliament gets down to work, we call on the Council to keep the promise that has been made here in this respect by Mr Mitterrand, Mr FitzGerald and all those other representatives of the Council. We have had enough of fine words, we have a duty to the citizens, our electors, to achieve political union, and we are also convinced that it is needed for peace and prosperity not only in Europe but outside Europe too. That is our task, and we intend to perform it.

*(Applause from the centre and right)*

**Mr Møller.** — (DA) Madam President, I feel that the last speech set the tone for us, the tone we know from the last five years and which we have heard among our citizens, the tone which is usually referred to as 'Euro-pessimism', i.e. a lack of faith and confidence in the future of Europe. I also tend to speak in this minor key on these occasions, but I would rather use a major key, because I think that since our last sitting in May many things have happened which give us grounds for optimism. We were full of optimism during the last part-session in May, when we heard Mr Mitterrand's enkindling and inspiring address to us. Many of us were also full of optimism at the elections to the European Parliament, which took place shortly afterwards and from which this Assembly was born. Despite the small turnout, and although it can be said that in my country we should have got more people out to vote,

**Møller**

and of course we should have done so, we nevertheless achieved a better voting percentage in Denmark than in 1979, which after all is one of the most lukewarm of all the countries which at present belong to the European Communities.

And now another result I should like to draw attention to, because the House has so often heard from Mr Bøgh and others that the Danish members, who have now gone to the Rainbow Group, represent the majority among the Danish people opposed to the European Communities. That is perhaps not entirely clear, and I should therefore like to point out that Danish election result confirmed that the ladies and gentlemen from the Rainbow Group, who are against the Community, only represent a third or less of the Danish voters who turned out and cast their votes. The party I belong to came out as the largest Danish group in the European Parliament, and I am of course grateful for that.

Also since our part-session in May we have seen the French presidency achieve results in the pursuit of the line laid down by President Mitterrand. Now that period in office has expired, but I think we have reason to thank the French presidency, because it really got to grips, firmly, surefootedly and with that shrewdness which is peculiar to the French, with the solution of a number of the problems needing to be solved, and because it finally gave us greater hope with the Fontainebleau compromise, which again demonstrated that it is easier to get statesmen and politicians to reach a settlement immediately after an election than before an election. We therefore had to be patient in the final period and wait until the aftermath of the elections had died away — for, when someone goes back on his word, he only does so after the voters have given their verdict!

The Fontainebleau settlement swept aside the problem which had for so long and so stubbornly stood in the way of the solution of a number of other problems, namely the problem of the British budget contribution. We managed to get it solved, and I hope that we can follow through. It is now the task of the Irish presidency to continue along the path which was staked out in a number of areas in the Fontainebleau settlement. I am not equally enthusiastic about everything, a common national anthem, a common flag and so forth. Those are not the things which will advance our cause. We have the Marseillaise as a kind of common march, and we have our own national anthems. I do not think there are grounds for doing a lot on those lines. But the budget problems, the economic problems, the problems of freedom of movement for citizens in Europe were touched upon, and statements were made on them at Fontainebleau. I think that there are grounds for pointing out in this debate that the French presidency set a worthy conclusion to its 6 month term of office.

I have already said that these terms of presidential office are too short for any real continuity in work to be

achieved. As soon as a presidency is on the point of solving a problem, it has to be passed on to a new team of people, and before they really get to grips with it, they to pass it on to the next shift at the end of the year. It might be a good occasion to consider whether perhaps we ought to have somewhat longer terms of presidential office, because under the present system it can easily happen that no-one ever really gets down to a rational solution of the problems.

I should therefore like to welcome the Irish presidency. Ireland is in a similar position to Denmark: we are not large or populous countries which loom large in the European landscape. But if we have the will, we can get quite a lot done, in spite of everything. I do not think we should expect any great and spectacular progress from the Irish presidency, and I also think that the Taoiseach today showed us that small steps also have their value. They certainly have. We might during the Irish presidency get a solution to the transport problems, the queues of trucks, persons and traffic at our frontiers, so that the citizens can say: the situation has been alleviated here; things have become easier here, since we have had the European Community. The Taoiseach rightly pointed to the way the United States function, not by jams of trucks at state lines but by free passage through the states from the Atlantic to the Pacific. This is not perhaps the stuff of great visions, but it is the kind of thing which can be solved during a six-month term of office, if the will is there.

Neither do I expect major treaty amendments. There are many national objections which must be met before the treaties can really be amended, and that cannot happen in my country without a referendum. So a number of countries in their impatience have decided to go ahead on their own initiative, and the others will simply have to follow them. I am not particularly happy about that, but I can understand it. I understand that the original six Member States of the Community cannot wait for us newcomers to acquire the political will and the political courage necessary to take a real step forward. I therefore hope that the Western European Union, which has now had new life breathed into it, can achieve some of the aims which have been set and in respect of which the Treaty of Rome is not thought to provide a suitable basis for work which will secure progress.

I think that we should keep European political cooperation within the confines of European Community membership. In it we have a means of giving Western Europe an influence over the world's problems. It has been rightly pointed out here today that we in Europe have gradually been losing our influence over the solution of the world's problems. It looks as though only the two superpowers are left to decide everything. If they can agree, that's all to the good, and everybody is happy. If they cannot agree, which is all too often the case, Europe has perhaps a role to play. The problems of the Middle East are outside Europe's back door.

**Møller**

Why should it not be possible for our foreign ministers, when they meet, to devise constructive solutions, which have not yet been considered in the United States, to the problems of the Middle East, problems which are of such crucial significance to world peace?

I should like to mention one other little thing which made me optimistic for the Community. It was the judgment handed down when my colleague, Mr Kent Kirk, took his case to the European Court of Justice. He showed that we have created a Community in which an individual, a fisherman from a Danish provincial city, Esbjerg — who was quite evidently a member of this Assembly, but the European Court did not of course take that into account — could sail across the North Sea, be apprehended by the British fleet, which at least in my childhood and young manhood was considered to be one of the great world powers — the British Navy and the Prussian Army — and nevertheless obtain justice. He was able to win his case because we have a European Court of Justice. We have a legal instance which guarantees that our citizens can directly affirm their rights which are enshrined in the Treaties if they have recourse to the European Court of Justice. Madam President, that is the kind of thing that counts. You may say that it is a small matter. You may say that it is a big affair, that it was foolhardy, that it was a PR operation. You can say what you will, but it is something that counts in the assessment of what this Community is worth. A small man, like Terje Vigen, who came to grief during the Napoleonic wars when he was apprehended by the British Fleet, today can win his cause *vis à vis* the Commission — I should like to say that to Mr Narjes — and show that the Treaty is to be interpreted in such and such a way and that he was right in his interpretation.

I hope that the Irish presidency, which represents a small country like mine, not a populous country, not one of the large, powerful nations, now that it is taking over the presidency from France, will tackle the small problems which are capable of solution and, before its six-month term of office is at an end, will achieve a solution to problems which we can appraise and which can be solved within the framework of the Community.

*(Applause from the right)*

**Mrs De March.** — (FR) Madam President, Mr President-in-Office, progress which we consider to be important for the Community has been made in several fields over recent months. I am thinking in particular of the recommendation on the reduction of working time, the agreement on the Esprit programme, and the strengthening of the Community's commercial instruments.

While we welcome these developments, we do not see the Fontainebleau Summit in the same positive light. It

did, admittedly, bring solutions to several disputed issues. It also saw the beginnings of a settlement of the budget crisis. The fact nevertheless remains that the distortion of a principle enshrined in the Treaties was, so to speak, institutionalized by the establishment of a system guaranteeing the United Kingdom reimbursement of its contribution to the Community budget, even though one can take comfort in the knowledge that no promise of reimbursement on a permanent basis was given.

By this action, our countries have recognized the right of one Member State to opt out of the full range of Community rules. In our view, this precedent means that conditions will not be ideal for our countries as they enter the negotiations which are to be completed within the agreed time-scale of two years.

I would add that the money conceded to the United Kingdom will be sorely missed in other areas of European policy. On an annual basis, it corresponds to the total amount granted for the development of the 64 African, Caribbean and Pacific countries with which the Community cooperates under the Lomé Convention.

Mr President, as has been demonstrated by the very low turn-out in the European elections, the citizens of our countries are deeply disappointed — the President-in-Office actually used the word disenchanted this morning — at the course that the Community is taking.

Our small farmers are having to bear the full brunt of the milk quotas and their disastrous impact on beef and veal prices. Our young people, our workers, are facing the prospects of massive unemployment and unremitting deterioration in their living conditions.

They are looking for concrete responses to their everyday problems. From this point of view, it has to be acknowledged that the outcome of the Fontainebleau Summit has not lived up to their expectations.

You have said, Mr President-in-Office, that we should be alive to the frustrations and hopes of our peoples. On these vital issues, if we are to meet the challenges of our times, only the adoption of measures which will foster economic recovery, develop employment, reduce working time, encourage cooperation among our countries and promote peace and disarmament, only if such action is taken will Europe become a really concrete presence in the minds of our citizens.

It is along these lines that the French Communists and Allies intend to continue to make proposals, as in the past.

Finally, Mr President-in-Office, you said this morning that 'the health of the Third World is vital'. And yet all of us in this Chamber are aware of the tragic circumstances now confronting the countries of the Third

## De March

World. I therefore put this question: Is it not high time that the North-South dialogue was given fresh impetus? Here too, the French Communists and Allies will be submitting constructive proposals and supporting all initiatives along these lines.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Maher.** — Madam President, may I congratulate you on your re-election as Vice-President of this Parliament.

Madam President, I was impressed by the speech of the Taoiseach this morning as President-in-Office of the European Council and, of course, as the leader of the government of my own country. I paid especial attention to the stress he put on the importance of this Parliament; however, I must here enter a note of criticism. While I recognize Ambassador Fogarty as being present in the Chamber, I do not think that is enough. I think there is a responsibility on the Taoiseach as President-in-Office of the Council or the Foreign Minister as President-in-Office of the Council of Foreign Ministers to be present in the Chamber, because that would give credence to what the Taoiseach said about the importance of Parliament. If he is not here to listen to what the parliamentarians have to say, the words do not ring very true. I hope I am not being too harsh in this criticism of the leader of my own government, but I think there should be some explanation as to why neither one nor the other is present.

While the Fontainebleau Summit certainly did prevent the European Community from going right over the precipice — and we welcome that — nevertheless, it did nothing in my view to cure the *malaise* that has come to affect the European Community. Of course we acknowledge the progress that has been made in the past, but very little is happening to suggest that Europe is taking any real steps forward. I think the basis of that *malaise* is that member governments — and this should be put clearly to them by the European Parliament — are refusing to concede any further sovereignty to a central power, a central authority. I think, that lies at the basis of our entire problems. They do not want to give any more power to the European Parliament or to other European institutions over and above what they have. That is why, for instance, we have made virtually no progress on monetary union, which I regard as essential to any real progress in the European Community.

We often blame the Americans and the Japanese for the impact they are having on the development of the countries of the European Community, but I do not think we have any right to blame the Americans, for the Americans at least have a unified monetary system that has come to be known as the 'almighty dollar'. It may not be almighty, but it is pretty mighty because, in fact, it has a detrimental effect on the development of the European Community. We know what has hap-

pened in the last few years. There has been a massive flow of funds out of Europe to the dollar area because the dollar is strong and because interest-rates are high, just at a time when Europe needed this money very badly to help solve the problem that Mr FitzGerald pointed out very lucidly this morning, that of unemployment. It is absolutely ridiculous that we should be sending financial resources to the USA to help them fuel their own recovery — which they are doing very well and solving their unemployment problem — when we need those resources very badly to solve our own problems. After all, we should be just as powerful as the USA if, in fact, we were unified.

In agriculture too, we are failing to take some of the solutions that are needed. It is all very well to tell farmers to cease milk production or not produce any more meat or any more grain, but of course that does not solve the problem, because the farmers have to live, they have to be supported some way if they do not get the price from the market. What we need to do is to give them the opportunity to produce alternative products, and that we have not done. The Commission has not proposed any alternatives.

We have failed to do anything about a forestry policy. We have a huge deficit here, we import massive amounts of timber, the highest cost to the European Community in terms of imports after oil, yet we have no common approach to forestry. We have a deficit in protein products, yet we have no policy on protein. If we gave the farmers an alternative, an opportunity to change to other kinds of production, then we should begin to solve our problems.

The way we are going now, we run the gravest risk of doing away with the one common policy that we have — agriculture — because we are going to re-nationalize it. If we fail to provide the resources at European level to pay the farmers reasonable prices, but way of direct income supports or whatever, they will arise at national level and that, in fact, will renationalize the CAP. If we do that, then we begin to dismantle the European Community.

**Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf.** — (DE) Mr President, it is indeed rather surprising to find that the president of the Council, the Irishman, Mr FitzGerald, representative of a country which is one of the smaller and not one of the economically stronger countries of the Community and that does not belong to NATO, speaks of the need to strengthen Europe, of the economic and technical challenges and of the need for common security measures in Europe or the Community. I think he must realize that the logical outcome of all this would be for the Community to become a major economic and military power and that the economic and political forces which would decide this — I am speaking as a native of the economically rather strong Federal Republic — are being given major support in the Council by the Federal Republic.

**Graefe zu Baringdorf**

That does not mean — which is why I am surprised — consideration for the concerns of smaller Community countries. It does not mean consideration for the autonomy and viability of rural areas or remote regions, of which Ireland is surely one. It does not mean consideration of measures to give the majority of people in these or even in our countries a reasonable way of life. It is no use pointing out in Fontainebleau that greater freedom of movement or equality is to be created within the Community on 1 January 1985 by giving everybody a uniform passport. In our view this measure and all the talk about abolishing frontiers and frontier controls — a subject on which our Chancellor Kohl also has much to say — has little to do with freedom of movement.

*(Objection from the centre)*

I expect some people in our country and in others are jumping with joy at the chance to be able to reduce the freedom of movement of the individual even more, because they can store these uniform passports in their computers in order to monitor people who are against the development of the Community with even more ease.

The real rulers in this Europe are not the people, not the nations, but capital, which seeks to exert political pressure in the various governments and which, in the pursuit of its interests, forcibly deprives more and more people of their chances of adequate living conditions and job prospects.

*(Objection from the centre)*

We now have nearly 15 million unemployed, with another million every year. The previous speaker spoke of agriculture and the fact that no sensible solution had been found there. The solution that was found is one solution! But it too benefits capital, capital-intensive undertakings in the food industry, in the cooperatives, while the burden is borne by the tens or even hundreds of thousands of farmers who are being squeezed out of the labour market, out of their jobs.

Take the dairy sector, where the quotas and limits that look so reasonable have been decided. The smallholders will bear the brunt. Let me give you some figures: 77% of all smallholders in the Community produce only 30% of the milk, but the 15% milk surplus is to be removed via the smallholders. If my sums are right, half the small dairy farmers will have to give up their work if things go on this way.

*(Interjection from the centre: 'They are not right!')*

We cannot accept this trend. It is a trend, as I have said elsewhere, which runs counter to a rational environmental policy. It is precisely the smallholders who shape and preserve the environment. If small-scale farming disappears, the environment is bound to suffer, and not just the environment but also the people,

because food is bound to suffer from chemically processed, rationalized large-scale food production.

*(Interjection)*

We must realize that the ill-treated animal, the ill-treated plant and the ill-treated environment are signs of ill-treated people. What we do to one species will be reflected in another.

This is not a Europe we Greens will support. We will consistently follow and publicize the policy to which we are committed: the peace movement, the women's movement, the movements against the exploitation of the Third World and the movement — from which I stem — against the destruction of small-scale farming. We will continue our work consistently. I hope that our political activities will succeed in making more people aware of the unholy destruction caused by this economic policy.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Woltjer.** — (NL) Madam President, when it was admitted after the summit conference in Fontainebleau that the *impasse* that had existed for at least a year in the European Community had been forcibly overcome, there was a sigh of relief throughout Europe and certainly among parliamentarians, who had rightly pointed out how very little faith the public still had in the European cause.

However, Madam President, now that the clouds have cleared slightly, if we take another look at what was actually decided in Fontainebleau, we are right to voice some criticism here this afternoon. I shall not go into everything I should like to criticize. The chairman of my group, Rudi Arndt, had already given a rough indication of the aspects of what was decided, or rather not decided, in Fontainebleau which my group cannot accept. As my old colleagues would expect, I shall confine myself to taking another careful look at the agreement on agriculture, which was again discussed in Fontainebleau.

Madam President, let us consider once again the situation after the milk agreement had been reached in Brussels. We debated this in Parliament at the time, when I acted as Parliament's rapporteur, and we explicitly said that this agreement has a number of positive aspects, in that something is at last being done about surplus production and about the MCAs, which distort competition, but that it also has various negative aspects. I also referred to some of these negative aspects in my report, one being that there is a danger of our moving back towards the renationalization of the agricultural policy rather than strengthening it. Another, no less important aspect I referred to in my report at that time was that the agreement was far too expensive, particularly when compared to the amount entered in the budget for agriculture, and that this would cause serious problems this year.



**Woltjer**

At the moment the only conclusion we can draw is that these problems have always been in the offing, that we face enormous problems that the agricultural policy is indeed in very serious danger, that for more than a month now the Commission has not been able to honour its commitments, that cuts are already being made wherever possible and that this situation may have very serious consequences. The Budget Council, as everyone now knows, has not even been able to give any kind of indication of how it intends to remedy this situation.

Those were the aspects we criticized most at that time. In fact, I must say that, when we heard what the Commission had to say, our impression was that it was giving in slightly, and that gave us some kind of hope again. An agreement was reached, Parliament backing down and saying: all right, all things considered, we accept.

But now, after Fontainebleau, I believe we should discuss the matter again, because something special happened in Fontainebleau: the previous agreement was blown up out of all proportion. If you think carefully about what happened in Fontainebleau, you will realize that the income element, the income policy that was previously a European responsibility, has in fact been renationalized. We have in fact agreed that Germany should be able to pay its farmers a national subsidy, an income subsidy, and that this has nothing to do with the dismantling of MCAs and compensation for them, but that a national income subsidy has been added for general payment to these farmers. If you consider the effects this will have, it simply means that what we have here is a very significant move towards renationalization.

I hope my German colleagues will take this up, because it is not for me to reconcile the appeal in Europe for cuts in the agricultural policy with what amounts to an attempt in the Federal Republic to see who can now pay the farmers the highest subsidy. That is the perverse situation we are now in. In brief, renationalization is rampant as a great effort is made to remove the income element from the common agricultural policy and make it a national responsibility. That is the first aspect. This was in fact sanctioned in Fontainebleau.

The second aspect with which we have to contend, Madam President, is that, because one Member State has taken this action and because of the way in which it was taken, other Member States which depend, for example, on the export of agricultural products — my own country, for instance — will be forced to follow suit. Compensation for the dismantling of the MCAs might be acceptable — and we in this Parliament have accepted it — but now the Federal Republic has its own policy and other Member States, especially those that rely on exports and normal conditions of competition, are being forced to take action. The Dutch Government, for example, immediately announced its

intention of including something similar in its budget for next year and of helping the farmers to ensure that Dutch agriculture does not lose any of its competitiveness. But this means, Madam President, that other Member States will be forced to take measures of their own. I need only refer to fruit and vegetables, an area in which Britain will have to react. We have already had the pigmeat and other such issues in France. As you know — and we protested about this when it happened — the French farmers closed the frontiers because they felt the MCAs, which should be dismantled as soon as possible, placed them in a unfair competitive position. I believe this kind of thing must be discussed here and that we of the European Parliament must sharply criticize such action. It is not that we begrudge these farmers their incomes, but what is happening here is renationalization. Everyone surely realizes that, if the European Parliament really believes the common agricultural policy should be retained, we must continue to keep a close eye on it and try to reverse this process because, if we now drop the income element and much of the structural policy, there will be very little left of a common agricultural policy. It will in fact become the responsibility of the Member States, who will have only one aim in mind: an open market and as competitive a position as possible. In other words, they will want to safeguard their own interests, and there will be nothing left of a Community approach.

Madam President, I feel it is right that we of the Socialist Group should stress this point here, because we have often been sharply criticized for our views on the agricultural policy. The Socialists have often been accused of wanting to do away with this policy, but I can tell you that I am standing here on behalf of the Socialist Group to defend the common agricultural policy and to ensure that we do not go any further down the road towards renationalization, which is now being actively encouraged by one Member State.

**Mr Ryan.** — Madam President, I join with my colleagues in extending to you our warmest congratulations on your well-deserved re-election to the office of Vice-President. Long may you reign and enjoy doing so!

In this springtime of the second directly-elected European Parliament, the fact that a committed European, Dr Garret FitzGerald, is President-in-Office of the Council and addressed us today gives cause for hope that the seeds of new ideas and initiatives which the Irish Presidency will implant will produce a much healthier Europe. We in Parliament are particularly encouraged by his generous recognition of the value of the work already done by Parliament; but our joy is tempered by the knowledge that his high opinion of Parliament is obviously not shared by most members of the Council of Ministers. If I dwell on this for a few moments, it is not because of any hostility or envy towards that institution, for I did have the privilege of

**Ryan**

enjoying, with a few other Members of Parliament, membership of the Council of Ministers for some years.

An examination of the decisions made at the European Council at Fontainebleau reveals no mention whatsoever of the existence or the relevance of the European Parliament. In that it was no different from most other communiqués from a European summit, though Parliament is, under the Treaty, one arm of the budgetary authority and the Fontainebleau communiqué devotes eleven paragraphs to budgetary issues. The Council ignores the legal necessity to obtain Parliament's concurrence, yet presumes to issue final decisions. The disenchantment of parliamentarians with the outcome of the Fontainebleau Council has increased this week in the light of the failure in Council to honour the agreement on the financing of the 1984 budget that steps would be taken at the July meeting 'to cover the needs of the 1984 budget and to ensure that the Community operates normally.' Possibly in the view of one Member State, normal operation of the Community is that it should limp from crisis to crisis in the face of that member's intransigence on budgetary matters and agricultural issues, but the rest of Europe is unlikely to tolerate indefinitely selfish obstruction as normal.

In the belief that all Council members subscribed to the conclusions of the Fontainebleau Summit, Parliament's Committee on Budgets was disposed to approve the release to the United Kingdom of the proposed 1983 rebate to that country. If for any reason the resources required in 1984 and onwards to finance agreed policies are not forthcoming, the Committee on Budgets and Parliament as a whole will have to have second thoughts about rebates to any Member State. Obviously, the Community cannot hand back money which it does not receive.

A legal analysis of the Fontainebleau agreement would identify it as no more than an agreement to agree, which legally is not an agreement at all. It may be that it is no more than a declaration of good intentions, but this Community of ours will not make any progress and mutual distrust between EEC institutions will continue unless reliance can be put on declarations made by Heads of State or Government at summits and elsewhere.

Were the European Council genuinely interested in what this Parliament does, it surely would not have made reference to the setting up of an *ad hoc* committee on institutional affairs without doing two things at the same time — first, recognizing the vital work already accomplished by this Parliament in the production of a draft treaty on European union and, secondly, asking the Parliament to be involved, in future work. We note from the President's statement today that the Commission will be an active participant in the work of the institutional committee and the other *ad hoc* committee, that on European identity;

but Parliament is not to be involved at all. The only crumb of comfort is the assurance offered by the President-in-Office of the Council that he will 'ensure that contact is maintained with Parliament in respect of their — that is, the committees' — activities'. For that much we are thankful, but we should like the President when replying to be good enough to expand on how he proposes to inform Parliament. Possibly, also, he would undertake to consult his Council colleagues with a view to giving the people's directly-elected representatives in this Parliament a meaningful say in the work of those *ad hoc* committees.

In his generous tribute to Parliament, Dr FitzGerald visualized that Parliament would have a crucial role to play in the lives of our peoples during the next five years. Our group agrees with him, but we have never seen any European Council or Council of Ministers statement give proper recognition to the importance of Parliament's decisions. I would urge the Irish Presidency to make history by insisting that the European Council in Dublin next December enshrine in any text adopted the relevance of the European Parliament and give it purposeful roles. I speak both from the head and the heart — out of a heartfelt belief in democracy and in European union and out of an intellectual conviction that if this Parliament is not fully recognized and involved in a worthwhile way in running Europe in the next five years, democracy will die.

At Fontainebleau a list of cosmetic items was agreed upon, items to improve the image of the Community. We should not be successful politicians if we disregarded the significance of emblems and appearances, and therefore we approve wholeheartedly such ideas as a European flag, a European passport, a European currency, a European anthem and so forth. But in welcoming cosmetic initiatives we must not overlook more substantial matters. The conditions under which this Parliament is obliged by others to work are more than just a cosmetic issue: they constitute an issue of substance. Our Christian-Democratic Group and Parliament itself has voted in favour of one meeting-place. In continuing to obstruct the wishes of Parliament to have one seat, the governments of Member States are in flagrant abuse of democracy.

Citizens are scandalized at the sight and cost of this Parliament, obliged as it is to hold committee meetings for three weeks a month in Brussels and shift then for a week's plenary sittings to Strasbourg, while two-thirds of its secretariat is housed in Luxembourg and one-third in Brussels and all are obliged with their documentation, machinery and support services to travel between three working-places. Under the Treaty, Parliament is, unfortunately, powerless to correct this scandal. This insufferable state of affairs must be corrected by the European Council as a matter of extreme urgency.

I am aware, Madam President, that I shall not be universally thanked for directing attention to the obvious,

**Ryan**

because of the difficulty of finding a solution to it; but we should be lacking in courage if we did not emphasize the obvious. The seat of Parliament, Commission and Council should be in one place equipped with good means of surface and air travel to all regions of the Community, and convenient for our friends in the Fourth Estate, the journalists, to cover and report upon the activities of all the Community's institutions. Media coverage in the twentieth century is essential to the healthy operation of democracy. Adequate attention will not be paid to the vital work of this Parliament as long as it is condemned to keep perpetually on the move.

President FitzGerald is right in singling out the scale and nature of European unemployment as evidence of our failure to use to our own advantage the scale of production and market spread possible within an Economic Community of 270 million people. No wonder millions of Europeans are unemployed when the European demand for most video recorders, home computers, cameras and many motor vehicles, to mention but a few items, is not met by European manufacturers but by American and Japanese producers! Collectively, Europeans have all the enterprise, skills and resources necessary to compete with their rivals from advanced industrialized countries, but we fail to do so. Again and again Parliament has drawn attention to this deplorable state of affairs and has called for a Community solution.

Time is running against Europe. Unless the national obstacles to genuine internal trade are quickly removed, Europe will continue to be saturated by foreign competitors and unemployment will continue to grow. We are grateful to the President-in-Office of the Council, Dr FitzGerald, for drawing our attention to some of these crucial issues, which I am sure the Irish Presidency, with its former courage when in the presidency, will tackle resolutely over the next six months.

**President.** — Would Members please note that the deadline for submitting nominations for the election of the Quaestors, first ballot, is 9.30 tomorrow morning, Thursday 26 July.

**Mr Prag.** — Madam President, self-criticism is a very engaging characteristic and it is a very welcome sign in this Chamber, particularly when a President of the European Council criticizes 'the cumbersome process of intergovernmental bargaining', meaning, of course, the procedures of the European Council itself. It is a very welcome sign when a Head of Government criticizes the Member States' governments, because we are so used to hearing criticism of the Community, the EEC, without people really knowing what it is they are criticizing.

We are very grateful to the Irish Prime Minister, Dr FitzGerald, both for his Europeanism and for his

frankness. We, too, in my group wish the governments would show the same devotion to European unity in practice that they profess in principle. We wish, for example, that the governments would attack the question of the free movement of goods and people across our internal borders when they come to framing the rules and regulations of their own countries in the same way as they do when professing their European faith in speeches. How right Dr FitzGerald was to put the blame for slowness and ineffectuality where it really lies — with the ten governments sitting in the Council!

It is a time, Madam President, when we may have reached one of those turning-points in the history of the Community — I say, we *may* have reached. We have the Stuttgart Declaration of June last year; Genscher-Colombo, heavily gutted but still with some practical, if limited, suggestions; we have the draft treaty of this Parliament on the table, a relatively moderate and evolutionary document based essentially on the *acquis communautaire*, but with an entirely new and more democratic legislative procedure; and now we have the new Spaak committee presided over by Senator Dooge and the second committee aimed at making the Community a reality to its peoples.

It is a time when there may be, there just may be, some justification for optimism and some indication of a real political will to deal with the massive problems which we face — above all, to produce the common policies that we need for a Europe of high technology, for a Europe of the most modern equipment, a Europe not looking backwards to the past but forwards to the twenty-first century, a Europe able to compete with the best in the world. The Community can serve its peoples best by doing all the things which will help to make us the best in the world in the economic field — not by such unacceptable and ineffectual means as cutting working-hours and increasing industrial costs, but by promoting research and development, by improving job-training, by stimulating investment.

I say to the governments represented by the Irish presidency: give us a decision-taking machinery that works instead of failing to take decisions; give us a Community that is effective and positive in world affairs instead of merely reacting to what others do! The last thing we want, Madam President, is more words tied up neatly in documents with red ribbons and gathering dust in pigeonholes, but that is the risk we always run as a Community and I am afraid it is the way things have gone in the past. This time, let the Ministers produce the words but let them do something about them afterwards!

**Mr Ephremidis.** — (GR) Madam President, both inside and outside Parliament the Fontainebleau Council is being hailed as a success, and even a victory. For us Members of the Greek Communist Party the Fontainebleau Council was a Pyrrhic victory, just

**Ephremidis**

as much of a failure as its predecessors. In general terms, because the solution to the British problem is a temporary one and the problem will arise again in 1986. It is no more than the establishment of a precedent for Britain to claim rights and to receive huge rebates from the rest of us via the Community's budget, and more particularly from Greece with a first instalment of 1.5 billion drachmas. The increase in own resources is not aimed, for example, at dealing with the tragic problem of unemployment or eliminating the difference between the better and the less well developed countries in the Community and its various regions. Its orientation and motivation is to cope with the crisis to the benefit of large capital by loading the burden onto the workers. The aim of so-called financial discipline is to strengthen the control of the Community's Directorate over the movement of resources, and to reduce agricultural expenditure.

In political terms, the decisions in favour of political union and the *ad hoc* establishment of committees are steps which go further towards restricting the national independence of Member States, especially the smaller and weaker ones such as Greece.

Such steps pose a threat to peace, since along with the promotion of military integration, instead of relieving our continent from non-European military presences and nuclear missiles, we are becoming more deeply involved with Reagan's continuing arms race and cold-war policy.

Particularly as far as Greece is concerned the Fontainebleau Council does not justify any cheering at all, even though the Greek Government, and for its part the right-wing opposition may have been misled into praising it. Because among Greece's main interests and demands was the special and adequate financing of the Mediterranean programmes and the projects in the five-year plan submitted by the government, as well as some special measures for the protection of our national production, both industrial and agricultural. At Fontainebleau all this was set aside and made much more difficult, because the special financing of the Mediterranean programmes was linked to the structural funds and its value, according to the Commission's latest proposals, was reduced from 633 million ECU to only 140 million ECU, while in parallel, at the Council of Ministers of Finance Britain imposed a veto demanding that the proportion of the structural funds should be reduced by half. The result of so-called financial discipline is in fact a drastic reduction in the agricultural expenditure that is so vital for Greece.

Politically, the restriction of our national independence, especially as regards our foreign policy, will become yet more stifling despite the fact that our national interests demand that in some situations at least our policy should differ from that imposed by the Community's Directorate.

Madam President, we have not been cheered out of our disquiet by what the President of the European

Council, or indeed the new President of our Parliament had to say. On the contrary, we are if anything more worried, because they have paraded old recipes before a new Parliament. Recipes that operate within the framework of the policy imposed by State-monopolistic capitalism which, against the background of its deep and appalling crisis urges towards fascism and war.

Our hopes rest on the struggles of working people and of the peace movements, the alignment of Communists with Socialists, and the cooperation of all progressive, democratic and peace-loving forces.

**Mr Fich.** — (DA) Madam President, I should like to present some reflections on the decisions which were taken in regard to the budget at Fontainebleau.

Everyone was no doubt happy after the Fontainebleau meeting, since we had the feeling that a number of budgetary problems had been solved, which meant that we could get on with our work. I myself was particularly glad that the final document from the Fontainebleau meeting said that the problem relating to the budget balances of individual Member States could be solved in principle by way of the expenditure side of the budget.

What did we see happen after the Fontainebleau meeting? First of all there was a meeting of finance ministers shortly afterwards at which none of what had been decided at Fontainebleau was followed up, and shortly after that, this week in fact, there was a meeting of foreign ministers at which again none of the Fontainebleau decisions were followed up. And so, quite honestly in my opinion, we are in a situation in which the best that can be said is that the Fontainebleau meeting might as well not have taken place, for nothing that was decided there has since been put into effect.

A crucial element in the Fontainebleau decision was of course the question of the repayments to Great Britain and Federal Germany. That is what I particularly want to speak about in this context. In the past few years, certain amounts of money have been refunded by way of the Community budget, and Parliament has demanded ever increasing controls over the moneys which are repaid to Great Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany. We said that it should be money under non-compulsory expenditure, and it should be used for energy, the fight against unemployment, transport policy and similar purposes. What was decided at Fontainebleau is that this system should be abandoned and that instead the income side of the budget should be adjusted in such a way that the countries concerned pay less into the Community budget. A monumental mistake was made in this way at Fontainebleau.

The Community budget has two sides: an income side and an expenditure side. The income side has so far

## Fich

been reasonably acceptable, since it has provided a fair reflection of the economic potential of the Member States, while on the expenditure side there have quite definitely been problems. I have done some calculations myself. If you look at what each individual in the Member States pays into the Community budget, you will see that Luxembourg leads at about 60 ECU per head per annum. Then come France and the Federal Republic of Germany at about 50 ECU, and you can go right down the scale till you come to Greece, which pays about 18 ECU per person. This seems to be quite a reasonable system, a progression of about 300%, in other words a system which to a large extent reflects the economic potential of the populations of the countries in question. On the other hand, on the expenditure side of the budget, there have definitely been problems, because expenditure has fallen in some Member States.

What was decided at Fontainebleau was that adjustments should be made on the income side. And what is the meaning of correction mechanisms? It is that the population of Great Britain get to pay the same as or less per person than the population of Greece. The question I wanted to ask today is of course: is that fair? Does it reflect the true economic potential of the countries concerned? In my opinion, it does not. In my opinion we should stick to the reasonable income system which the Community budget has; on the other hand, we can look at the expenditure side and make certain adjustments there. It is precisely that which the Fontainebleau meeting got wrong. The Fontainebleau meeting corrected what actually works in the Community budget, but left alone what does not work.

I do not think we should accept that in Parliament. I will therefore say quite clearly to the Council and the Commission that, if we try to implement the Fontainebleau decisions by way of the budget in such a way as to reduce the contributions of certain Member States, that of Great Britain for example, we shall not have a budget in 1985. We want the adjustments to be on the expenditure side and we want the adjustments to be made in accordance with the regulations applying to the adjustments already made. If the Council and the Commission cannot accept this, I repeat clearly and distinctly on behalf of the Socialist Group, that there will be no budget in 1985.

**Mr Averof-Tossitsas.** — (GR) Madam President, 25 years ago I was privileged to live through the agonies and dreams accompanying the birth of the European Community, and later on the difficulties of our own accession. Those were not easy days, but we were guided by a number of great men who knew to inspire political will. I remember that in connection with our accession there was to be a meeting at the Quai d'Orsay, at which we were due to announce that we would not join because of objections raised by certain technocrats concerning our fruit and vegetables. The then leader of our party, the great European Constan-

tine Karamanlis, appealed to De Gaulle and Adenauer, and at that meeting, which started as a summit conference intended to confirm the breaking off of negotiations regarding our accession, the late Mr Spaak came and said: 'The problem is a political one. We do have the political will to solve the matter. The experts have nothing to say.' And so we came through in just a few weeks.

I too dreamed the dreams of those men, who were the fathers of Europe. They were great dreams. Not all of them have been realized, and today the European Community is accused by some of having progressed far too slowly. This is only partly true. The European Community has rendered great service to Europe's peoples, especially the workers. This is proved by the way the economy has developed in the countries of the Community, and there are figures to show that this was due to the economic links forged by the Community. A further proof is the enormous development of the agricultural economy in all those countries, which would have lagged far behind without the EEC. Consider also all the projects carried out thanks to supplementary finance from the Community. Unfortunately, both because of neglect on our part and due to imperfections in the Community's organization, these facts are not widely known and the farmers, who benefit more than anyone else, are unaware of how much of what they receive, how many of the projects carried out, are only possible thanks to the Community's existence.

Today we are once more experiencing difficulties which we all know about. I too accept that the revival achieved at Fontainebleau is not fully effective, and just gives us a breathing space without much certainty as to the future. However, I hope that we shall find the political will that was present in other crises of the EEC, so that these difficulties may be overcome. Because if we consider what would happen if they are not overcome, there would be a fall in our standard of living that not even the system that my friend Mr Ephremidis believes in, nor indeed any other system could put right. The standard of living, especially of working people and the agricultural community, would be condemned to fall were it not for the economic links of the EEC.

There is another and more serious matter for the correction of which some progress is evident in the recent decisions accepted a short time ago by the left wing. I refer to the *ad hoc* committees and other efforts being made at the highest level to vitalize the ideal of a citizens' Europe. The only thing I want to say about this is that I think it essential for these committees to maintain close functional unity and close organizational contact with our Parliament. Because this Parliament has a popular mandate from the people of ten nations, a privilege unique in the history of the world, and from this fact it derives great authority and is at the same time a storehouse of talents that can be of great help to the Committees in question in various ways,

**Averof-Tossitsas**

'not just with words but with practical solutions that will lead us towards the ideal of a united Europe.

At this point I would like to tell you that our own representation will help with all due diligence to add flesh to the bones of the ideal of a united Europe, not just because our founder is one of the first and greatest of Europeans, but also because we all believe in the European ideal.

I should now like to say in French, so as to be understood by more people, something rather important, plus one or two observations.

First of all, despite appearances, I would like to make it clear that the majority of Greek people are in favour of a united Europe, a new Europe. And rightly so, since a Europe of the people, a Europe of democratic governments, is bound to be a Europe of peace. My friend Mr Ephremidis spoke just a little while back about the peace marches. To that I would answer by repeating President Mitterrand's observation that the peace marches are here in the West, whilst the missiles are in the East. It is not peace marches that make for peace in the West. What does promote peace is the fact that our governments are founded on the will of the people, and the people want peace. And we are the only governments, we Ten, like those of our ideological companions, who observe all human rights, excepting one territory, part of the unfortunate Cyprus.

I would conclude, Madam President, by declaring our faith in a new Europe in which we see a guarantee of peace and democracy which gives sense to human life.

**Mrs Castle.** — Madam President, first I want to salute Rudi Arndt's vigorous and telling speech. There is a great deal of common ground in the Socialist Group concerning the situation which faces us following Fontainebleau. We are united in deploring the failure to launch a coordinated plan of economic recovery in Europe that would at last begin to deal with the tragedy of unemployment which darkens so many lives. We are united in calling for deeds, not words, in the field of budgetary discipline, and we are united in rejecting any attempt to balance the 1984 budget by making inroads into the expenditure, already so pathetically meagre, on our social, regional and development aid policies.

But there are some things with which we do not agree. We in the British Labour group cannot accept in particular the first paragraph of the motion put forward by the Socialist Group, which welcomes the general results of Fontainebleau. Surely this debate reveals that there is hardly anybody who has spoken who really thinks that Fontainebleau had been a success! Certainly we reject it as an opportunity tragically missed, an opportunity for Britain as well as for the Community. Not only did Mrs Thatcher fail to get the loaf of the rebate which she was saying she was insisting upon: she came away with half a loaf.

Of course, I do not expect this Parliament to recognize that, as we do in Britain, as a failure of negotiation on her part. But what is more important, indeed, central to the whole situation, was her agreement to increase the Community's own resources before any long-term solution had been agreed upon for financing the Community on the basis of ability to pay and before she had received any guarantee that budget restructuring would be carried through or indeed that there would be any effective budgetary control at all. This morning Mr Thorn reminded us that at the Dublin Summit of 1979 Mrs Thatcher argued that the problem of the United Kingdom's contribution could only be solved in the context of a complete restructuring of our budget to make room for new policies.

And what happened at Fontainebleau after all these years in which she has been pressing that point of view? At Fontainebleau, Mrs Thatcher meekly accepted an increase in the Community's own resources in return for a few weak words about the need for controlling expenditure. Oh, what a fall was there, my countrymen! Indeed, a Select Committee of the British House of Commons has published this damning indictment of the communiqué of Fontainebleau:

On what is probably the key component of any lasting settlement, budgetary control, little or no substantive progress was made on the position agreed at the Brussels Summit.

The Select Committee goes on to add that the Treasury's failure to tell the committee how much of the extra revenues for which Mrs Thatcher voted would go on extra expenditure on agriculture, the Treasury's failure to have even that figure available 'raises', said the committee, 'doubts concerning the whole basis on which the proposed increase in own-resources was negotiated'. Those words come from a committee on which there is a majority of Conservatives.

Recent developments have shown, only in the last couple of days, how much the Select Committee's doubts were justified. We all know that the Commission is asking for a supplementary budget this year of 2.1 billion ECUs, or 1.26 billion pounds sterling. What is it for? Not for new policies. It is to cover mounting agricultural costs, and the Commission has asked Member States to give it advances on the extra money which has not yet been raised in order to cover this agricultural cost. There is budgetary control for you! Worse still, when the British Government rightly refused to make those advances, knowing that the House of Commons would never endorse its action if it did, then the Commission yesterday took the law into its own hands, going ahead with a series of measures to finance the agricultural surpluses. Yesterday it announced it was going to resume the sales of cut-price butter to Russia and other countries — 75 000 tonnes this year, 150 000 tonnes next year. In addition, it is going to sell 7 m tonnes of surplus wheat to

## Castle

the Soviet Union. It is also to take extra measures to support the beef market. In other words, the Commission is now spending money it has not got, money which the British Government has said it should not have.

The Commission's excuse is that the food mountains are out of control. Yes, it is true that agricultural reform has failed, the quota system has not reduced the problem of agricultural overspending, and the Commission has said that the butter mountain, despite the quotas, will go on rising by 200 000 tonnes a year indefinitely. So we face a constitutional crisis as well as a financial one. Britain's rights are being openly defied by the European bureaucracy.

The Commission is going to bring some of these measures into effect in August and the Council of Ministers is not even due to meet until September, so that when it does it will be faced with a *fait accompli* which will override Britain's protest. So Fontainebleau has solved nothing. The so-called agricultural reform is a failure. Mrs Thatcher has brought this upon her own head by giving up the one weapon she possessed — refusal to increase resources until reform had genuinely been carried through.

**Mr Welsh.** — On a point of order, Madam President. Could I make a request to you? I think we all listened attentively to what Mrs Castle had to say. It was very well said. Of course, it was disastrously wrong, but it was a very good performance. I think it is a very great pity that not a single one of her British Labour colleagues was here to listen to her and, actually, until the very end, none of the members of the Socialist Group. So in the interests, Madam President, of those of the Socialist Group who may not hear about it, could they have a transcript of what the right honourable lady said?

**President.** — Mr Welsh, that is not a point of order.

**Mr Antoniozzi.** — (IT) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, Athens, Brussels, Stuttgart and now Fontainebleau. These are the four most recent stages in European events. I say 'events' though I should have preferred to say 'Europe's progress', but Europe came to a stop at Athens and at Brussels. Stuttgart seems to have given a few encouraging verbal indications, but they seem to us to be too near to the elections to be really credible. There is an old adage of Chancellor Bismarck, about the things that are said before elections, which has been very clearly confirmed at Fontainebleau. This conference disappointed us, even though there were some tenuous signs of movement. The budget problems, which were the subject of a very good speech by my colleague Mr Klepsch, remained unsolved, and they are problems that have been dragging on for a long time without any adequate political will for their solution — the more so since the figures

involved are for the most part laughable. That already betrays a lack of political will.

The budgetary imbalances, the problems regarding own resources and their expansion, together with the financing of the 1984 budget and the temporary waiver in regard to compensatory amounts in West Germany's are questions that were discussed only to be left for further detailed examination in the future: nothing definite, nothing decisive, not even in part! What causes us even greater concern is the question of Europe from the standpoint of its citizens and its institutional problems. Two *ad hoc* committees are to be set up, and so, ladies and gentlemen, the age-old see-saw between Parliament, the Council and the Commission is set in motion once again, as if we had not already had so many reports on these matters — including the Vedel report, the Tindemans report, or all the work done in the life of the first Parliament from 1979 to 1984 on questions regarding inter-institutional relations, which were adequately dealt with the Political Affairs Committee and its special sub-committee, as well as the Committee on Institutional Affairs which, with the seal of authority of Parliament, prepared a proper draft treaty that comprises a complete and valid project for a political union, for a first stage at least, like the Genscher-Colombo proposals.

Fontainebleau and the Council of Ministers that followed it have brought so much work to nought: above all, they have weakened our confidence, already severely shaken, in the representatives of the ten governments, and their will to make genuine progress with the political union of Europe.

Another two committees: that is what the Council has created. Our sense of history and our critical faculties tell us to be mistrustful, and induce us to face up squarely to the problem of further suitable initiatives on our part, to speed Europe's progress. At Fontainebleau we were promised virtually nothing on the financial side, and still less on the legal, institutional side.

We should have preferred that, when speaking of the Spaak Committee, explicit mention were made of the draft treaty for European political union, which we adopted on 14 February 1984; we should have liked some mention to be made of the important question of human rights; and we should have liked commitments to be respected regarding the conciliation procedure concerning the office of President of the Commission of the European Communities. We have recently been presented, out of the blue, with a press communiqué which takes into account only the urgent internal needs of a Member State, which, as it changes its government, subjects the European Community and its procedures — both those that are already laid down and those that have still to be determined — to the effects of national situations to which we cannot be made subject in this way, and of the form and substance of which we must be critical.

**Antoniozzi**

My criticism is directed not at the person selected, who is respectable, qualified and highly skilled, but at the manner and method of his appointment, which we cannot possibly support, not least because of the unexpectedly offhand treatment of Parliament, which tries in every way possible to do its own important job.

The assurances that the President has given us today are not sufficient. They are late in coming, even though we hope they will be borne out by the facts.

Mr President-in-Office of the Council, we know how sensitive you are in regard to the problems of prospective European policy. I remember that when, in recent months, I was making a wide-ranging survey, in conjunction with other members, of the governments in the Community, we brought to you, in Dublin, the text of the draft treaty, of which you expressed your broad approval. We know you to be a consistent politician and a man of integrity, and we trust that in your six months as President we shall make progress towards the common objective. This objective, we remind everyone — both here and outside — once again, is not suggested by political fantasy or the search for something new: it has been indicated by 300 million European citizens, who have given us this task.

Peace, freedom and progress are such important values that we will take whatever action is in our power, as Members of the European Parliament, if any of the Community's institutions show themselves inadequate to the task. We shall do everything in our power to discharge our mandate, speaking with the clarity and force conferred upon us by the democratic commitment that we assumed in June, before the citizens of Europe. Affirming all this, at the start of the second democratically elected Parliament, has almost the value of an oath of allegiance and commitment to Europe — that Europe whose affairs we are about to manage from this headquarters.

**Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission.** — (DE) Madam President, may I first convey my warm congratulations on your re-election and on the large majority of votes cast to appoint you to this high office. May I add that I am leaving the first political debate of this Parliament with a sense of encouragement, an encouragement due above all to the resolve shown on all sides to take political action, to make political progress and take political measures. My answer can be short because President Thorn said a great deal about the Commission's position in his speech.

I shall confine myself to a few points. First I would like to correct a mistake in the speech by Mr Arndt. The Commission did not approve raising the VAT rate in Germany from 3% to 5%; it rejected it and it also made its rejection public. Secondly, under the Treaty the Council has the right unanimously to suspend such

a Commission decision and, thirdly, the Council has exercised that power.

For the rest, the budget will be the subject of discussion in a further debate tomorrow. I need not go into this matter further, except to make one political comment. The greatest of all dangers — and here I would agree with others who have spoken on this matter — is surely the danger that the budget will be renationalized and that the Community will forfeit its repute and credibility together with its budgetary autonomy. In my view all other aspects are subordinate to this one.

As regards the comments on Fontainebleau, and the proposed 'citizens' committee', may I add that in the Commission's view this committee should help the Commission and Parliament to translate Community legislation into national law rapidly and also to extend it to areas which have not hitherto been the subject of Community discussions or decisions. We do not regard this committee as an instrument that can bypass the Commission, Council and Parliament and the Community decision-making processes and that should consider or decide at national level matters which are the responsibility of this Community.

We agree in the main with what was said about economic policy. But when people speak of pessimism about Europe, it might be a good idea to analyse the origins of this pessimism in detail. I could well imagine that we would then come upon many examples of what we are accustomed to attack as the paralysis of Europe. This apt term may be a very useful key to any further analysis of the situation.

On agricultural policy may I remind you once again of the Community's basic problem. It is that we have constantly rising productivity while consumption is stagnating and does not seem likely to improve even in the long term, partly because of the falling population and partly because the world markets offer us no export opportunities. This situation cannot be resolved in a few months. Even the most resolute policy will take years. That is why I think it is too early to say that the decisions of 1 March and 1 April have proved inadequate. They have not even been fully implemented. We will need more time for that, so we should not judge them precipitately.

The Commission will not fail in political resolve to further the process of integration in an active, forward-looking way and to take the initiative. May I refer you to a decision taken by the Council yesterday adopting a Commission document on the consolidation of the internal market which has been discussed here on many occasions. This document calls on all the Community institutions to resolve many of the outstanding concerns concerning the European internal market in a concentrated 18-month attack, i.e. to give this Community the internal structures it needs before the accession of Spain and Portugal, so that the question of the free movement of goods, passengers and ser-



**Narjes**

vices is resolved before enlargement begins. That is the first practical test of the much-praised political resolve which the Commission shares with everyone.

**President.** — I thank colleagues for their kind congratulations on my election as Vice-President of the Assembly.

The debate is closed.

Voting on the motions for resolutions will take place at 9 a.m. on Friday.<sup>1</sup>

*(The sitting closed at 7.50 p.m.)*

---

<sup>1</sup> *Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.*

## SITTING OF THURSDAY, 26 JULY 1984

### Contents

1. <i>Approval of the Minutes:</i> <i>Mr Pannella; Mr Alavanos; Mr Glezos; Mr Baudis; Mr Pannella; Mr Selva</i> . . . . .	68	<i>Mrs Ewing; Mr Christensen; Mr Le Pen; Mr Tortora; Mr Fich; Mr Barry (Council); Mr Habsburg; Mr Toksvig; Mrs Boserup; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Lalor; Mr de la Malene; Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mr Paisley; Mr Saby; Mr McCartin; Mr Jepsen; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Maher; Mr Hume; Mr Herman; Mr Seligman; Mr Pranchere; Mrs Salisch; Mr Langes; Mr O'Donnell; Mr Antoniozzi; Mr Pfennig; Mr Sutra; Mr Seligman; Mr Tugendhat</i> . . .	76
2. <i>Decision on urgency:</i> <i>Mr Musso; Mr Le Pen; Mr Musso</i> . . . . .	70		
3. <i>Election of the Quaestors</i> . . . . .	71		
4. <i>Irish Presidency (Council statement):</i> <i>Mr Barry (Council)</i> . . . . .	71		
5. <i>Election of the Quaestors (continuation)</i> . . .	76	7. <i>Sakharov — Proposal for a resolution (Doc. 2-379/84/rev.) by Mr Formigoni and others:</i>  <i>Mr Formigoni; Mr Hansch; Mr Gerontopoulos; Mr Segre; Mr Deniau; Mr Carignon; Mr Schwalba-Hoth; Mr de Camaret; Mr Antony; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Pannella; Mr Alavanos; Mr Hansch; Mr Fanton; Mr Pannella</i>	109
6. <i>Irish Presidency (Council statement) (continuation):</i> <i>Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mrs Hoff; Mrs Barbarella; Mrs Banotti; Mr Hume; Mrs Ewing; Mrs Banotti; Lord Douro; Mr Cervetti; Mrs Veil;</i>			

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*President*

*(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)*

#### 1. *Approval of the Minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

**Mr Pannella.** — (FR) Mr President, I only wanted to point out that in yesterday's minutes there seems to be no trace of the two recommendations in the form of procedural motions on the time of the convening and

the opening of the sitting which I moved. I simply wanted to draw attention to this.

**President.** — The statements will be entered in the Minutes.

**Mr Alavanos.** — (GR) Mr President, in yesterday's minutes I see a point where, in our opinion, there has occurred without your knowledge a serious violation of the Rules of Procedure, which I ask you to put right. Yesterday's minutes state that urgent procedure was agreed to for proposed resolution No 2-379/84 on an empty seat in the Chamber of the European Parliament for Andrei Sakharov. I too participated in yesterday's voting without having the text to hand. Today I received the text of the proposed resolution and saw that it relates to a resolution on the basis of Article 57 of the Rules of Procedure. In my opinion such a proposal cannot be considered because Article 57 of the Rules of Procedure states: 'A request

**Alavanos**

that a debate on a proposal on which Parliament has been consulted . . . be treated as urgent may be made to Parliament by the President.' Therefore, the following points arise:

First point: This concerns a debate upon which Parliament is not required to express an opinion.

Secondly, in connection with this matter urgent procedure was not proposed to us by the President.

Thirdly, Rule 57(5) states that 'An urgent debate may be held without a report pursuant to Rule 99(1) or, exceptionally, on the basis of an oral report by the committee responsible'. In both these cases the matter must have passed through the hands of the competent committee. In the present instance the committee in question is the Political Committee, and so far as I know there is at present no such committee in the European Parliament.

For these reasons, Mr President, I think that this serious contravention of the Rules of Procedure, which I believe occurred without your knowledge, must be corrected and that the corresponding point in the minutes should be deleted from the agenda. Colleagues can bring the matter up under Article 48 at the next part-session.

**President.** — Mr Alavanos, yesterday Parliament approved urgent procedure on the question submitted to it by the President. I realize that it is not part of the statements made by the President-in-Office of the Council; however, we have not voted on the subject matter itself. That vote will be taken tomorrow. Those who are in favour of the proposal will vote 'Yes' and those who are against it will vote 'No'.

**Mr Alavanos.** — (GR) Mr President, we all recall your statement that you intend to be President over Parliament as a whole, and I think that at this time you are facing a serious problem. What should prevail: a vote in Parliament in which I too took part in ignorance of certain essentials, or the Rule of Procedure itself, on whose basis Article 57 of the Rules of Procedure cannot be applied to the resolution proposed by the Christian Democrats? Can we violate the Rule of Procedure by claiming that a vote was taken? I put to you the following questions: Is Article 57 of the Rules of Procedure being obeyed? Is Parliament required to express an opinion on the basis of a proposal by the Commission or Council? Was the matter submitted to the competent committee, the Political Committee? I think the answer to all these questions has to be no. Thus, we cannot invoke a mistaken vote to justify approval of a contravention of the Rules of Procedure, and I think that this specific matter has more general significance as well, if we are to be able to say that under your Presidency Parliament's work has commenced in a good and proper way on the basis of the Rules of Procedure.

**President.** — Mr Alavanos I cannot accept your criticism that I have misinterpreted the Rules of Procedure. I proceeded in accordance with the Rules, but on the basis of Rule 48 and not Rule 57 of the Rules. That is clearly indicated in the Minutes.

Moreover, I pointed out to the House that the agenda did not specify any particular time for the topical and urgent debate, but that this in no way prevented the House from considering the requests for urgent procedure. This, in fact, is what took place. It voted with a clear majority in favour of urgent procedure, with the understanding that the vote on the subject matter itself would be taken tomorrow. Therefore, ladies and gentlemen, in my view the matter was dealt with in a completely legal and regular manner.

**Mr Glezos.** — (GR) Mr President, the minutes have not been issued in the Greek language in a sufficient number of copies. I also protest because even your own speech is not available in Greek, and we cannot always rely on the interpreters. They may do their work very well, but I need to have the text if I am to participate properly in Parliament. I feel that by comparison with other Members I am a Member 'capitis diminutio' unless I have all the documents in my own language, just as other colleagues have.

Furthermore, Mr President, owing to these deficiencies I do not know whether I could, for example, bring up the matter of the Olympic Games taking place just now in Los Angeles, so that Parliament might support a truce as used to happen in ancient Greece.

**President.** — Mr Glezos, I have to admit that your protest is fully justified. I apologise and ask you to understand that our officials had more work than they could easily cope with. Nonetheless, you are quite right: in accordance with the customs and rules of this Parliament texts are distributed in all the languages. We shall therefore make every effort to ensure that texts are distributed in all the languages, including, of course, Greek.

Your protest will be recorded in the Minutes of today's sitting together with Mr Alavanos's remarks.

*(Parliament approved the Minutes)<sup>1</sup>*

**Mr Baudis.** — (FR) Mr President, I want to say a few words on the provisions on the Rules of Procedure on access to the Chamber. I am thinking more particularly of the working conditions of journalists. Many of our colleagues will have noticed that the day before yesterday, during the inaugural sitting, the television

<sup>1</sup> Documents received — *Deliberations of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions concerning petitions: See Minutes.*

**Baudis**

crews, of which there were many present on that day, were working in far from ideal conditions. And when we came to watch that evening the filmed reports of the proceedings we were reminded of a passage in the speech of the Oldest Member, Mrs Thome-Patenotre when she referred to the backs of European heads. For that, in fact, was all that could be seen, since the television cameras had no access to the chamber, notably at voting time. And I believe that because of the presence of large numbers of the public — which is all to the good — representatives of the written press did not fare much better.

For several days now we have been bemoaning the regrettably low turn-out in the European elections. We are all saying we should ensure that the public at large knows about our work. And we wring our hands, saying that imagination is what is needed. No doubt it is. But, I think, so is a little common sense. Here are men and women doing their job, the job of journalists, trying to let the world know what we are doing. Surely they are entitled to reasonable conditions? I feel the Bureau should give thought to these conditions in interpreting the Rules of Procedure.

*(Applause from the centre)*

**President.** — Mr Baudis, you are particularly well-qualified to speak on the difficulties experienced by newspaper and radio journalists.

Your comments will be referred to the Bureau. We shall try to find a better system for the coming sessions.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(FR)* Mr President, I should also like to say something about working conditions. In parliaments throughout the world, and particularly those that have a certain tradition behind them, the communications media can, if they so wish, perfectly well carry out their task of informing and do it all the better because the assembly itself is able to carry on its work in peace.

If I may be allowed to express an opinion, it is that it seems to me illusory to imagine that the press will do its job of informing better if we, the Assembly, depart further from our rules and traditions. On the contrary, I fear that already too much of our time is taken up with those who have no right to be here.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**Mr Selva.** — *(IT)* Mr President, I do not agree at all with Mr Pannella. On the contrary, I should like to join Mr Baudis in urging, in my capacity also as Vice-Chairman of the Association of European Journalists, that the working conditions of our journalist friends should be facilitated in every possible way, and this applies also to television and radio within the Cham-

ber. I am, moreover, doing no more than emphasize what you have already said, Mr President: the work of the European Parliament is meaningful if it finds the right echo in public opinion. This is not a corporate appeal made just because I am a journalist, but the expression of the hope that every one of us members of the new European Parliament cherishes: namely, that the work of our Assembly should find an intelligent — and also, whenever necessary, critical — echo in public opinion.

**President.** — We shall not begin a debate on the press now. What Mr Baudis, Mr Pannella and Mr Selva said come to exactly the same thing. I already stated that the question would be referred to the Bureau since I feel that the concern expressed by the three Members is fully justified.

## 2. Decision on urgency

### LE PEN MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (DOC. 2-388/84 'FREE ZONES')

**President.** — I shall call one speaker for and one speaker against this motion for a resolution. Mr Musso has indicated that he wishes to speak against it.

**Mr Musso.** — I should first like to hear the arguments of the speaker in favour.

**President.** — No, the custom is to call speakers in the order in which they ask to speak.

**Mr Le Pen.** — *(FR)* I am quite astonished to see someone asking to speak against without having heard the arguments in favour. That's what's called prejudice.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are questions on which we can take different sides because we have different political attitudes. But in this particular case my group's concern is, if I may put it so, unconnected with political philosophy. We want to ask for urgency because we feel that the crisis which the European continent is experiencing is aggravated considerably where other problems are added, as for instance an insular situation. What we ask for Corsica, Sardinia and, possibly, once Spain has joined the Common Market, for the Balearic Islands, is, no doubt, equally valid for all islands, most certainly those of the Mediterranean, but also those of the Atlantic or the North Sea.

This is why, ladies and gentlemen, I think it would be possible, indeed natural, for the overwhelming majority, even the whole Assembly, to vote for this motion

**Le Pen**

by urgent procedure, without making any political commitment thereby.

**Mr Musso.** — (FR) Mr President, I should first of all like to say to Mr Le Pen that there was no prejudice on my part: that is why I wanted to hear him out first to see if my arguments still stood.

The motion for a resolution proposed by Mr Le Pen refers to Sardinia and the Balearics in the preamble, while the substantive part mentions only Corsica. Since, among the French representatives in this House, I am the only Corsican born and living in Corsica, you will agree that I am at least as well qualified as anybody, including Mr Le Pen, to speak on the subject.

Let me then tell you that, while I am altogether in favour of Parliament's dealing with the question — by an urgent procedure, in view of the exceptionally serious nature of the situation in Corsica — I do not believe that this Parliament can decide to make Corsica a customs-free area, given that its population has not been consulted and we do not even know whether it would be in favour.

(Applause)

May I add that I do not believe that it is within the powers of this House to vote such a resolution.

This is why I ask you to reject the urgency procedure.

(Parliament rejected the urgency procedure)

**Mr Musso.** — (FR) Now that the vote has been taken — for I did not wish to influence its outcome — may I just say that yesterday I have myself tabled a motion for a resolution, but under Rule 47, to enable the committee to deal with it thoroughly.

### 3. Election of the Quaestors

**President.** — The next item is the election of the quaestors of the European Parliament. I have the following candidates: Mr Carossino, Mr Glinne, Mr Maher, Mr Pannella, Mr Simpson and Mr Wawrzik.

Since the number of candidates is greater than the number of posts to be filled we must, under Rule 15 of the Rules of Procedure, hold a secret ballot.

The ballot is open.

(The vote was taken)

The ballot is closed.

I would ask the tellers to count the votes.

(The sitting was adjourned at 10.40 a.m. and resumed at 10.45 a.m.)

## IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

### Vice-President

#### 4. Irish Presidency (Council statement)

**President.** — The next item is the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council on the programme of the Irish presidency, followed by a debate. The debate also includes:

- the motion for a resolution by Mrs Barbarella (Doc. 2-377/84/rev.) and others, on the Council's responsibility as regards the Community budget; and
- the motion for a resolution by Mrs Hoff (Doc. 2-402/84) and others, on transfer of appropriations No 1/84

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council.** — Mr President, I should like to start by congratulating you on your election and to say that when an Irish President-in-Office is speaking in front of an Irish Vice-President of Parliament he feels very much at home! I hope your term of office will be happy and productive for Parliament and for Europe.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Ireland has assumed the Presidency of the Council at a time of great challenge for the European Community and of equally great opportunity. The decisions reached at the European Council at Fontainebleau last month represented a decisive breakthrough and so opened the way for the relaunching of the Community to which the Heads of State or Government of the Member States committed themselves some twelve months ago in Stuttgart. Yesterday you had the opportunity of hearing An Taoiseach, Dr FitzGerald, report on that crucial meeting.

Our task, then, during the coming months of the Irish Presidency will be — taking the Fontainebleau agreements as a departure point — to advance the relaunching of the Community in fulfilment of the Stuttgart mandate. Our ultimate objective must be to transform the Community as it is into a force for dynamic change and development in Europe, especially in those areas of primary economic and social importance for our people and of direct concern to them.

In this task we shall be looking to this Parliament for the fullest cooperation. The Irish Presidency wishes to

**Barry**

construct a good working relationship with you, the newly-elected democratic voice of Europe. We intend to spare no effort to make certain that a spirit of workmanlike cooperation between Parliament and Council becomes something to be taken as a matter of course and not a subject of some uncertainty and even mistrust. We shall spare no effort to ensure that Parliament will be informed by the Presidency to the fullest extent possible of what are the positions of the Council and the state of its deliberations.

We therefore await invitations from your committees to have Presidents of the various Councils come and address them during the Irish Presidency. It is our intention that the fullest consideration will be accorded by Council to the opinions of Parliament.

We regard relations with the European Parliament as an issue of substance for the Irish Presidency. We do not consider it merely as a concept to which token gestures have to be made. The Parliament has, of course, a role and place accorded it by the Treaty. But, apart from this, recent events have underlined the importance of this Assembly to the advancement of the Community. The recent European Parliament elections represented a unique exercise in democracy which has focused greater global attention on the Community and on the Parliament in particular. President Mitterrand in his address on 24 May put to the Parliament a vision of Europe which all the Community institutions have to play a part in furthering. The Taoiseach, Dr FitzGerald, spoke to you yesterday in support of these themes. It is not my purpose here today to reiterate what he said to you yesterday. Suffice it for me to reaffirm that he and I both look to the Parliament to support the Irish Presidency in advancing the further construction of Europe which the results at Fontainebleau opened up to us once more. Let us take the opportunity of a successful European Council and a newly-elected European Parliament to begin in earnest that relaunching which is so essential for the further strengthening and development of the Community and the well-being of its citizens.

But first of all, and principally, the Community must agree on a solution to the budgetary problems which, Fontainebleau notwithstanding, still beset the Community. A clear majority of Member States agree with the Commission that there will be major shortfalls as regards the financing of Community policies in both 1984 and 1985. The Fontainebleau European Council asked the Budget Council to cover the needs of the 1984 budget in order to ensure that the Community operates normally. In the same perspective, the Commission has proposed a preliminary draft supplementary and amending budget for 1984, and a preliminary draft budget for 1985; it has also asked the Council to adopt new measures in order to ensure that revenue is available to cover ineluctable Community needs.

These problems were discussed in the past week by the Budget Council and the General Affairs Council. I regret to say that no solutions have yet emerged.

As regards the 1984 budgetary position, nine Member States agree on the need to provide additional finance and they are close to agreement on what constitutes the irreducible minimum for extra financing. But they are somewhat further apart on whether this financing should be raised on the basis of a Community regulation or through an intergovernmental agreement. One delegation contests the need for additional financing. It seeks a solution through a mixture of savings and deferrals of expenditure into 1985 and, in consequence, has not yet found it possible to agree to a common position.

As regards the 1985 budget, provisional agreement has been reached on a draft which respects the 1% VAT ceiling. This, of course, has involved substantial cuts in the Commission proposals as regards both compulsory and non-compulsory expenditure. Agreement has so far remained conditional, because many delegations hinge their acceptance of a 1% budget for 1985 to

— a satisfactory outcome to the problems of the 1984 supplementary budget; and

— a firm commitment that, if the Community were to prove underfinanced next year, the Council for its part would undertake to provide additional funds to meet the additional requirements arising. A declaration embodying this commitment is in discussion, and I am hopeful that decisions will be reached soon.

At the Foreign Affairs Council last Tuesday, there was a common understanding by all delegations that the necessary decisions must be made in September and a common political commitment to decide within that deadline. Delegations were concerned that the failure of the Council to agree this month on solutions to our budgetary problems would call into question the impressive achievements of Fontainebleau and could, if the position were not rectified quickly, imperil the normal, satisfactory functioning of the Community.

The Irish Presidency fully shares these concerns and will employ all its resources of energy and imagination to ensure that the right solutions are reached, that the necessary decisions are taken in time, that the rights and competences of all institutions are fully respected and that the normal functioning of the Community is maintained and developed in 1984 and 1985.

One of the major challenges for the Community in period immediately ahead will be the need to respond relevantly and effectively to the continuing unemployment crisis in the Community. This was given particular emphasis by the Taoiseach in his address to you yesterday. The Irish Presidency strongly holds the view that the economic climate has now changed to the extent that a review of policies is necessary in order to assess their appropriateness notably insofar as the employment situation in the Community is concerned. Surely a better concertation of the economic policies of the Member States could increase the margin of manoeuvre of the Community as a whole and

**Barry**

facilitate a greater orientation in international and economic and financial policies to the benefit of debtor countries? The Irish Presidency is exploring with the Commission methods by which the collective strengths and the individual economies can be harnessed more effectively. In this way, the multiplier effect of collective action could be used to strengthen growth and to give a greater spur to employment throughout the Community.

Of course, the identification of a specific initiative will not be easy. My own government considers that perhaps the most appropriate stimulatory action might be some temporary fiscal reflation in the Member States with the stronger economies. I would, however, be interested to hear the views of this House on other possible policy options which would result in reducing unemployment in the Community without, at the same time, setting off renewed inflationary pressures.

It is our intention also, parallel with this exercise, to pursue with the utmost vigour, through the Social Affairs Council, all the proposals the Commission have to put to us which have a bearing on the employment situation in the Community. We are, of course, particularly anxious to receive the Commission's communication on the 'Long-term unemployed'; and this House has my assurance that we shall treat this important dossier with the highest priority. We shall also be working for significant progress during our Presidency on the recent proposals for a programme of action and research to combat poverty.

We feel strongly that a manifest sign of a developing and dynamic Community — politically and economically — will be the successful conclusion of the negotiations on enlargement. The accession of Spain and Portugal will be a further step of tremendous import for the European construction — in the creation of that ever-closer union amongst the peoples of Europe which the founding fathers of this Community set as their goal. The completion of the negotiations are clearly one of the highest priorities of the Irish Presidency.

The European Council at Fontainebleau reaffirmed that the negotiations with Spain and Portugal should be completed by the end of September next. We are determined to complete the negotiations by this date or in the shortest possible time thereafter. We have already revised and intensified the calendar of negotiating meetings with Spain and Portugal. And, in the last few days, I have visited Madrid and Lisbon to demonstrate our political commitment to an early conclusion of the negotiations and to maintain their momentum. These steps clearly reflect the importance and priority which we attach to the issue.

The negotiations are entering their final, decisive phase. They will inevitably involve difficult concessions, both in striking a balance between existing Member States and as between the Community collec-

tively and the applicant States. The drafting and negotiating of the individual compromise texts will involve very fine judgement. We draw encouragement from the political will of our partners, which has been confirmed at the highest level by the European Council. The Irish Presidency is committed to ensuring that the idea of a Community enlarged to 12 Member States will become a reality on 1 January 1986.

Another important milestone in the history of the Community will be the negotiation of a successor convention to the second Lomé Convention between the Community and the ACP States. The successful conclusion of the negotiations is a second major objective of the Irish Presidency. Here, I must pay tribute to my predecessor, who, during the three conferences held under his Presidency, has achieved decisive progress in the negotiations. The Commission, for its part, has also played an essential role.

After the recent conference with the ACP States in Luxembourg, there was broad agreement on the general shape of the future convention and on most of the chapters. Drafting work is already well advanced. There are, nonetheless, still some problems to be resolved which, although limited in number, are nevertheless important, particularly regarding trade and Stabex. Also, the overall financial allocations for Lomé III have still to be determined. At the end of the Luxembourg Conference, our ACP friends all stressed the importance they attach to a satisfactory solution of these problems.

It was the positive outcome as well as the excellent atmosphere reigning at the Luxembourg Conference which prompted the latter to agree that a small ministerial group should meet in Brussels on a date to be fixed by the two co-Presidents to complete the negotiations, on the understanding that the decisions would be taken subject to confirmation.

The Irish Presidency, determined to maintain the momentum of the negotiations, has proposed to the ACP Presidency that this ministerial group should be convened for the beginning of October. Without claiming that it will be easy to solve the remaining problems, I am convinced that success is close at hand and that the signing of the new convention will be able to take place before the end of the year. This is essential for ensuring the continuity of ACP-EEC cooperation.

Our Mediterranean partners are seriously concerned about the possible consequences for them of the third enlargement. The Community had given them an undertaking that we shall endeavour to take account of the problems enlargement could create for them and to define our approach on future policy before the end of the enlargement negotiations. Examination has already begun of the proposals submitted by the Commission following the exploratory talks with the Mediterranean countries and consultations with Spain and

**Barry**

Portugal. This examination will have to be continued during the final phase of the enlargement negotiations, when it should become possible to identify the problems more clearly. The Presidency intends to pay close attention to this dossier.

A constant of Community policy is the maintenance and development of free trade and the combating of protectionism.

As regards multilateral relations, all the major trading partners, as a result of a Community initiative, have given a political undertaking to speed up the implementation of the Tokyo Round tariff reductions. This undertaking, given at the last OECD ministerial meeting, was confirmed at the Economic Summit in London and should therefore be put into practice on 1 January 1985.

Like our Japanese and American partners, the Community too is of the opinion that a new round of multilateral trade negotiations could be an important contribution towards strengthening the multilateral trade system, for the mutual benefit of all economies, of the industrialized countries and of the developing countries alike. It is with this in mind that the Community will take part in the consultations and discussions which are about to begin within GATT in order to determine in practical terms the objectives and content which a new round of negotiations could have.

The Community's bilateral relations with its major trading partners will be another area which we hope to advance over the next six months.

We are firmly committed to solving trade problems in general, and with the United States in particular, in a spirit of cooperation, through frank and open consultation. We want at all costs to avoid an escalation of restrictive measures and countermeasures. These can only have negative consequences for our respective economies. We sincerely hope that our American friends share this aim and will co-operate with us in order to attain it. I should say that the Taoiseach, Dr FitzGerald, assured President Reagan during his recent visit to Ireland of our intention to give priority during the Irish Presidency to the resolution of problems between the Community and the United States.

The Community's trade deficit with Japan remains at an alarmingly high level, and we are conscious of the need to pursue, unrelentingly, our efforts to remedy the situation. Since Prime Minister Nakasone's important statement last October on the need to stimulate domestic Japanese demand and facilitate imports from third countries to Japan, a new spirit of cooperation seems to have emerged. However, if the Prime Minister's statement is to be translated into concrete action, much greater practical efforts are required at the official level and in business circles.

The EFTA countries continue to be the Community's most important trading partners. We intend to make

every endeavour to ensure that the objectives agreed at the Ministerial meeting last April with our EFTA partners are achieved, with a view to strengthening, consolidating and enlarging cooperation with those countries in a number of areas of mutual interest.

The realization in the Community of a genuinely free and open internal market, allowing enterprises to develop their capacities to the full, remains one of the principal aims set for us by the Treaty. We have seen progress made over the past six months on resolving problems which impede the functioning of the internal market. The Irish Presidency hopes to build on these achievements. It will strive to make progress with all the dossiers concerned with the full achievement of the huge internal market of the Community. I might mention especially the simplification, indeed the elimination, of frontier formalities. We hope to make progress also with questions of the free circulation of products and the elimination of various technical and fiscal obstacles to trade, and with measures designed to improve the legal environment of enterprises. The Presidency has provided, in its calendar for the coming months, for two Internal Market Councils in order to deal with these numerous problems.

The linkage of certain matters relating to the Internal Market with transport matters is obvious. Here I am glad to say that the Transport Council of 10 May last was successful. Basing our work on the achievements of that Council, which must be maintained, the Presidency will concentrate its work on making it possible, before the end of the year, to adopt texts on the weights and dimensions of commercial vehicles and the Community quota for goods transport by road. We also wish to make progress on the examination of other dossiers dealing with the harmonization of conditions of competition and the progress of liberalization of trade in services. We also intend to report before the end of the Presidency on progress relating to the Commission's Memorandum on the development of a Community air transport policy.

The European Council in Stuttgart in June of last year attached considerable importance and gave a much-needed impetus to the development of new policies. We are all very keenly aware of the importance of scientific and technical research to the Community's efforts to meet and deal effectively with the challenge posed by the United States and Japan, particularly in high technologies. The will to move ahead and increase resources in this area has been expressed time and again by the Heads of State or Government. The Irish Presidency fully endorses these views. We are anxious that the Commission bring forward further proposals, particularly in telecommunications, biotechnology and data-processing.

As regards the Community's energy policy, the Presidency will wish to advance work in a number of specific areas, namely: the establishment of Community policy objectives in the period up to 1995; the adop-



**Barry**

tion of a regulation providing aids for solid fuel consumption and production; the review and extension of a regulation supporting hydro-carbon technology. While these programmes are all in the nature of ongoing work, it must not be forgotten that it may be necessary to act urgently on a Community level if the situation in the Gulf deteriorates further.

Environmental policy is an area which has the increasing and concerned attention of the European public. The Irish Presidency proposes to continue work on developing a vigorous and effective environmental policy at Community level. Specifically, we intend to proceed with work on the control of trans-frontier shipments of hazardous waste, the Environmental Impact Assessment System and draft directives on pollution and the proposal on the reduction of lead in petrol.

The decisions taken by the Community at the end of March on agricultural prices and on other measures relating to the common agricultural policy were indeed far-reaching. But the CAP remains — it must remain — one of the cornerstones of our Community. For my part, I wish to affirm my wish to continue the work to ensure that the objectives of the common agricultural policy are fully attained. I feel that, in this task, I can count on your support and solidarity. In the coming months, we must ensure that the common agricultural policy works as smoothly and as effectively as possible. There are a large number of agricultural issues which will require our attention. I have in mind in particular the new agriculture structures régime, the surplus situation in the wine sector and the 'balance-sheets' for beef imports in 1985.

It is gratifying to record that a more assured basis has been created for the common fisheries policy. We shall endeavour to pursue the development of this policy which was achieved under the French Presidency. We aim to contribute to this by formalizing under our Presidency the total allowable catches and quotas in Community waters for 1985. And we shall continue the fisheries negotiations with third countries.

Mr President, please allow me now to speak on the process of political cooperation among the Ten.

Ireland takes over the Presidency at a time of considerable uncertainty in international affairs. Rapidly changing political realities around the world, and the volatility inherent in situations of crisis, do not make it easy to chart a clear course through this terrain. The task of reconciling national viewpoints and of promoting a common European perception of world events becomes a particularly onerous one under these circumstances. It is, nonetheless, a task which the Irish Presidency intends to tackle with energy and determination. It is our conviction that, now more than ever, a strong and coherent European voice must be heard in the international arena and that practical political

cooperation among the Ten should be directed towards this end.

*(Applause)*

During the second half of this year, the Ten will need to address themselves in European Political Cooperation to a host of complex and difficult issues.

The tragic conflict in the Lebanon and in the Middle East generally will continue to claim our sympathetic attention. Continued careful reflection will be required on the manner in which the legitimate rights and aspirations of all the States and peoples in the Middle East can best be safeguarded. The ongoing war between Iran and Iraq poses a further serious threat to the stability of the region and, indeed, to international security. The pursuit of a comprehensive and lasting settlement to the various problems of the Middle East will remain an overriding concern of the Ten over the next six months.

The overall picture of East-West relations is not encouraging at present. Under the Irish Presidency, the Ten will do all in their power to reduce tensions and to promote a more stable and cooperative relationship between East and West. It will be our object to work towards the restoration of international confidence and so strengthen the prospects for peace and stability on our own continent and in the world generally.

The situation in Poland is viewed by the Ten with particular concern. The recent amnesty to political prisoners has been greeted by the Ten as an encouraging and positive gesture. We shall continue to follow developments closely and take appropriate opportunities to underline the importance of reconciliation and dialogue between all sections of the Polish population.

Regarding the ongoing CSCE process, it will be the Ten's concern to ensure that all provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and the Madrid concluding documents are fully implemented. We attach importance to the Conference on Disarmament in Europe and will work to ensure the cohesion of the Ten both in that forum and at other meetings due to take place in the CSCE context in the coming months.

Conscious of the wide range of human, economic and cultural ties which exist between Latin America and the 10 countries of the European Community, the Ten under the Irish Presidency will be considering ways in which dialogue and cooperation with Latin America can be strengthened. In regard to the situation in Central America, the Ten will make the fullest possible contribution to the search for a durable political settlement, in particular by lending their support in as concrete a way as possible to the peace initiative undertaken by the Contadora group of countries.

The Ten will also continue to follow developments in Africa with close attention and will endeavour to

**Barry**

ensure that independence and stability are achieved in Southern Africa.

It will be an important objective of the Irish Presidency to continue and expand, at the 39th Session of the United Nations General Assembly, the successful coordination of the Ten on a wide variety of political, economic and human rights issues which has been a characteristic of previous sessions.

The theme of human rights, of course, is one which is not confined to the General Assembly but is echoed across the full range of international relations in one form or another. Under the Irish Presidency, the Ten will be prepared to show concern at violations of human rights whenever they occur and to defend human liberties whenever they are threatened.

Mr President, let me assure you that I look forward with great pleasure to the opportunities I shall have over the next six months to report at each of your part-sessions on developments in the field of political cooperation. I shall be honoured to continue the dialogue with the Members of this Assembly in the various forms open to us. I look forward, in particular, to welcoming the members of the Political Affairs Committee to Dublin for one of our two colloquies later this year.

Mr President, my report to the Parliament this morning on the work programme for the Irish Presidency has necessarily had to be confined in the time available to an outline, an identification of the most important areas to which we wish to give priority and where we would wish to see significant progress made in the coming months. In our efforts to achieve this progress, we intend to keep in very close touch with the European Parliament, and, of course, with your President, to whom I would like to extend my warmest congratulations on his election.

The institutional system established by the Treaties and by practice has demonstrated the importance of relations of trust between the European Parliament and the Council in many areas. I spoke at the beginning of my address of the intention of the Irish Presidency that the Presidents of the various specialist Councils should come to committee meetings of Parliament to outline to them the work in progress and the work planned. For my own part, within the limits imposed by other duties I must carry out as President of the Council, I shall ensure that I visit the Parliament in each part-session.

*(Applause)*

The climate, Mr President, in which this newly-elected Parliament is starting its term of office is not an easy one. The same is true, of course, for the climate in which Ireland is taking over the Presidency of the Council. By striving to combine our efforts, we can hope to bring about changes in a number of features

of that climate and so contribute to the achievement as soon as possible of prosperity and full employment for our people. This is essential if the internal and external peace of the Member States is to be maintained and safeguarded.

Go raibh maith agat.

*(Applause)*

### 5. Election of the Quaestors (contd)

**President.** — I shall now give the results of the ballot for the election of the five Quaestors.

Number of Members voting: 371

Blank or spoiled papers: 8

Valid votes: 363

Absolute majority: 182

Votes obtained:

- Mr Glinne: 302
- Mr Wawrzik: 283
- Mr Maher: 275
- Mr Simpson: 268
- Mr Carossino: 261
- Mr Pannella: 62.

Since they obtained an absolute majority of the votes cast, I hereby declare Mr Glinne, Mr Wawrzik, Mr Maher, Mr Simpson and Mr Carossino elected Quaestors of the European Parliament and would like to extend to them my heartiest congratulations.

*(Applause)*

In accordance with Rule 14(2), the order of precedence of the Quaestors is determined by the order in which they were elected.

### 6. Irish Presidency — Council statement (contd)

**Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission.** — Mr President, it is a great pleasure for me to come to this, the first part-session of the second directly-elected European Parliament. It is an occasion when one can welcome back a number of old friends; one can rejoice in the arrival of some people with whom one had the pleasure of working in different circumstances at different times in the past; and of course, it is an occasion when one grieves over the absence of some familiar faces.

### Tugendhat

Mr President, I join with the President-in-Office of the Council in congratulating President Pflimlin on his election and, indeed, the Vice-Presidents and the Quaestors and the other Members of this Parliament who have achieved success in ballots which have been held since then.

In his speech, the President-in-Office of the Council, as is appropriate, covered a very wide range of subjects and dealt with the very extensive work programme that he envisaged for the Irish presidency over the next six months. My task is more restrictive. I am going to concentrate on some of the budgetary matters which at present, I think it is not too much to say, rather overshadow the life of the Community and some of which need to be dealt with as a matter of urgency. Despite their importance, despite the extent to which some of them, as I say, overshadow the life of the Community, it may be that because of the election campaign and other responsibilities, not all Members have been able to follow developments in the budgetary field as closely over the last few months as those of us in this House and elsewhere who have been actively concerned in them. I will, therefore, with your permission and that of the House, go into a certain historical account as well as dealing with the topical matters of the moment.

The 1984 budget was adopted by Parliament last December with a figure of 16 500 m ECU for EAGGF (Guarantee). The figure corresponded to the Commission's proposal of May 1983 put forward in the preliminary draft budget. It reflected the political will of the Commission to contain agricultural spending within reasonable limits. In order to do so, the Commission put forward at the end of July 1983 concrete proposals for a reform of the common agricultural policy. These are contained in a document generally now known as COM 500. However, the agricultural decisions eventually taken by the Council on 31 March 1983 fell short of the ambitions for reform which the Commission put forward. In addition, as many Members of this House will no doubt clearly remember, a significant amount of agricultural expenditure has been carried forward from 1983 to 1984. Furthermore, there is an unfavourable development in some of the agricultural markets. As a consequence of all these factors, the Commission estimates that the expenditure requirements for EAGGF (Guarantee) in this year are 1 983 m ECU higher than the amount of 16 500 m ECU which we budgeted for. This includes 150 m ECU earmarked to make a start on reducing the presently high level of stocks, notably in the beef and milk sectors.

Since, in the 1984 budget as adopted, there is only a very small margin left within the 1% ceiling of VAT, the additional expenditure requirements of about 2 000 m ECU cannot be financed within the present framework of the Community's own resources. For this reason, the Commission put forward on 18 April 1984 a legal instrument for making additional revenue

available. The proposal is based on Article 235, because the Commission believes that other articles of the Treaty do not empower the Council to oblige Member States to make revenue available to the Community.

The Parliament's Committee on Budgets had an in-depth discussion on the Commission's proposal, and Mrs Scrivener drew up a resolution on that basis. This resolution was discussed in plenary sitting on 23 May 1984, when I made the Commission's position on the Scrivener report clear and dealt with the amendments which had been proposed to it. For internal reasons — the Parliament's internal reasons, that is to say — Parliament did not vote on that report. In the beginning of July, the Commission also put forward a preliminary draft amending and supplementary budget for 1984, and we have amended our proposal for a legal instrument to cover budgetary requirements in 1984 in the light of the parliamentary discussion.

I presented these proposals to the Committee on Budgets on 12 July and will only briefly summarize them here. The preliminary draft amending and supplementary budget proposes three changes on the expenditure side: for agriculture, the estimate is, as I said, that a further 1 983 m ECU will be required; for administrative expenditure, 27.7 m ECU will be required for inescapable additional expenditure requirements; and there is a need for 46 m ECU of payment credits in the execution of existing, legally-binding commitments under the third Financial Protocol for Turkey.

On the revenue side, a number of changes had also to be introduced. A revenue shortfall in the Community's traditional own resources of about 560 m ECU is likely to occur for this year. Adjustment in VAT of the previous years amounts to a reduction of revenues from this source of 208 m ECU. The balance available at the end of 1983 amounted to 307 m ECU. Similarly, the Commission foresees a balance for the end of 1984 of 350 m ECU. This balance will be obtained through strict management measures.

The Commission believes that these measures can be taken without putting into jeopardy the continuity of Community structural policies, a fear expressed in Mrs Barbarella's resolution, and while still enabling the full execution of all the commitments credits included in the adopted budget. As a result of the changes to the revenue side and the additional expenditure requirements, an amount of 2 071 m ECU cannot be covered within the 1% ceiling of VAT. For the purpose of covering this shortfall, the Commission has amended its proposal for a legal instrument in the light of the discussions which took place in the Committee on Budgets and in plenary sitting. The main amendments correspond to those which Mrs Scrivener put forward in her report. References are made to Member States' obligations under the Treaties — that is to say, Article 5 of the EEC Treaty and Article 192 of the Euratom

### Tugendhat

Treaty — and to the requirement of a budget in balance — that is, Article 199 of the EEC Treaty. Secondly, interest-bearing loans by the Member States are replaced by non-interest-bearing advances on new 'own resources'.

The Budget Council, on 19 and 20 July, as the House knows, failed to reach agreement on the principle and on the content of a supplementary and amending budget for 1984. The Commission has drawn the attention of the Council to the seriousness of the situation which has arisen from this failure. We have urged that an absolute priority be given to the adoption of a draft supplementary budget for 1984, accompanied by measures guaranteeing the availability of the additional resources which are required. The normal implementation of the decisions taken by the Community in the agricultural field must be ensured in accordance with the conclusions of the European Council on 26 June.

The Commission must be in a position to exercise fully its management responsibilities to cope with such developments as may occur on the various agricultural markets so as to fulfill the legitimate expectations of agricultural producers. This corresponds fully with the spirit of Mrs Barbarella's resolution on the responsibility of the Council in this area.

Since the Budget Council can formally establish a draft supplementary budget for 1984 only when the resources for additional revenue have been irrevocably identified, I must emphasize that Parliament's opinion on the Commission proposal for a legal instrument is an important element here. Parliament has failed to give an opinion, and if we are to have this supplementary budget for 1984, we have to have the additional revenue, and we shall not have the additional revenue unless Parliament gets its skids on.

For the Commission, the final adoption of a supplementary budget by October at the latest is essential. The EAGGF (Guarantee) advances for the month of November will have to be decided upon before 20 October. If the Commission's estimates for additional expenditure requirements are confirmed during the summer months, the Commission would not be in a position to honour all expenditure requirements for the month of November in the absence of a supplementary budget. A late adoption or the absence of a supplementary budget would imply that expenditure requirements could not be met by Community finance. Despite this, the Commission is of the opinion that contractual obligations to third parties, be they agricultural producers or other operators, have to be honoured. If the Community budget is unable to do so for some weeks before the end of the year, responsibility would lie with the national authorities. I need hardly say that the Commission would deeply deprecate any resort to national financing, however temporary.

That is all I can say for the moment on the budgetary situation in 1984. I have made the Commission's views

known in the clearest possible terms to the Budget and Foreign Ministers, and I hope very much that in September the outlook will be more promising than it is at present.

Let me now briefly refer to 1985. Here again, in the view of the Commission, it is impossible to meet all expenditure requirements which are necessary for the normal functioning of the Community within the 1% ceiling. The Commission has therefore proposed that the new 'own resources' decision increasing the VAT ceiling to 1.4% should enter into force on 1 October 1985 and that the decision should enter into effect retroactively from 1 January 1985. The Commission considers that such an arrangement is fully compatible with the terms of the Fontainebleau Agreement.

As regards the points raised in the resolutions of Mrs Barbarella and Mrs Hoff, President Thorn set out the Commission's position yesterday. I myself simply wish to emphasize two points. First, the Commission has already requested that the Council should adopt a draft budget which is consistent with the real needs of the common agricultural policy and with those of other Community policies and which takes account of the political priorities decided by the Community in each sector. This is indeed the only political approach compatible with the normal functioning of the Community. Second, during the long negotiations leading up to the Fontainebleau Agreement and at Fontainebleau itself, the Commission impressed upon Member States' representatives that the rights of Parliament in the budgetary field are guaranteed by the Treaty and have to be respected. I can assure you that we continue to do so.

This brings me to the end of what is, as I say, a brief review of the budgetary outlook. May I conclude by saying that I hope that we are now at the beginning of a fruitful cooperation between this newly-elected Parliament and the Commission on budgetary matters in the years that lie ahead. Inevitably there will, from time to time, be tension between us. But I trust that it will usually be creative tension and that whatever our differences, we shall always both be inspired by the desire to serve the best interests of the Community which we are all of us dedicated to uphold.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission.** — (DA) Mr President, Honourable Members, it is a great pleasure for me too to have this opportunity of speaking to the newly elected Parliament in its first part-session, and I should like to add my good wishes to those of Vice-President Tugendhat to the newly elected President and his Vice-Presidents and the Quaestors, who are now taking up their distinguished posts for the next term of office.

As Commissioner responsible for agriculture, I should like to inform Parliament of the Commission's inten-

**Dalsager**

tions with regard to the management of the markets for wine, beef and dairy products in the coming months.

To begin with, wine. There have been a number of problems in getting the existing market arrangements to work as intended. There has been a marked increase in wine distilling over the past year: from a starting figure of 18 million hectolitres to 32 million hectolitres. At the same time, it has been necessary to increase the budget resources to be applied in the wine sector — absolutely essential. In an attempt to improve the situation, the Commission has held a number of meetings with experts in the wine sector. These deliberations have resulted in the framing of a programme of action for the wine sector, comprising a number of measures in the short, medium and long term to improve the efficiency of the existing market system. One of the biggest problems in this connection was that the functioning of the market system depends to a large extent on whether reliable data can be obtained on production trends in the Community. The Commission has therefore decided to apply a programme to improve the statistics, which amongst other things means that it will be possible to penalize those producers who submit incorrect information.

Secondly, it is necessary to get compulsory distillation to work better. We must do this by limiting preventive distillation to a certain quantity per hectare, while at the same time imposing limits on the periods of time for which it is possible to enter into contracts for preventive distillation. In this way, the Commission will be in a better position at the start of the market year to decide the quantities which will need to be made subject to compulsory distillation.

Thirdly, it has proved necessary to limit access to distillation for other wines, i.e. Charentais wine, wine used for the production of brandies, and table grapes. The distillation of such wines has recently got out of hand, and a regularization of this area has become necessary.

With regard to restoring the balance on the wine market in the medium and long term, it is necessary to apply a number of structural measures. In this connection, we propose the introduction of cessation premiums for the production of wine and a freeze on the support for production restructuring. These measures are based on the view that the situation in the wine sector is gradually beginning to resemble that facing us in the typical surplus sectors. Last autumn, the Commission put forward a proposal for a freeze on the possibility of adding sugar in wine production, but the Council has not so far been able to adopt it. It is necessary to include this proposal in our action, since we must continue our efforts to secure a limitation in the use of sugar, and eventually its abandonment. This widespread use of sugar is without doubt one of the reasons why there has been such a marked increase in wine distilling, since it is extremely advantageous to

use sugar in the production of wine in order subsequently to send the product for distillation. But it is not particularly good business for the Community. The permissible yield in the production of quality wines fluctuates considerably from one region to another. We must have stricter rules to govern yields, so that we can guarantee that the products concerned really are quality wines.

Finally, I should like to point out that the Commission intends to put forward proposals for the setting up of a wine register. This register will be an indispensable element in the future management of the market system for wine.

The Commission has considered the possibility of introducing quotas for the production of wine. We have refrained from doing so, however, and instead propose the establishment of a form of guarantee threshold for wine. This means that the guide price of wine will be frozen for as long as voluntary distillation and compulsory distillation exceed 12 million hectolitres. It is thus a direct follow-up to what we put forward at the time in the earlier document referred to here, COM (84) 500. A document which gives more details of the Commission's intentions will be sent to Members of Parliament within a very short space of time, so that you will have an opportunity of studying the details.

Mr President, I turn now to beef, and here I must say that the Commission expects an increased incidence of slaughter cows, which will presumably continue a little way into 1985. This increase is the result of the introduction of quotas in the production of milk. According to figures submitted by the Member States we expect a further 900 000 cows to be slaughtered this year, and that about 500 000 will be slaughtered next year. According to this figure, which of course must be treated with a certain amount of caution, the increase in supply, taken in conjunction with the normal increases in the production of beef, will presumably mean that total production in 1984 will be about 300 000 tonnes above that of 1983. On the other hand, the consumption of beef is showing a slight rising trend, and we expect a small increase in consumption compared with last year. In addition to this, it should be noted that there are excellent possibilities on the external market, and we expect a substantial increase in exports compared with last year. There should thus be no danger of a catastrophic increase in stockpiles in the short term.

The expectation of a large number of slaughterings has meant a substantial drop in prices on the market for slaughter cows. It is therefore necessary to support that part of the market during this difficult period. The Commission intends to do its best to manage the market in such a way that we get through this difficult period without too many serious problems on the market.

**Dalsager**

In that connection, the Commission intends to look at the possibility of introducing intervention for half sides earlier than originally expected, probably with effect from sometime in mid-August. To make the intervention as flexible as possible, the Commission intends to look into the possibility of imposing simultaneous intervention for forequarters and hindquarters respectively. The intervention will continue to apply only to meat from male animals. In order to move the accumulation of beef which may be expected from the large number of slaughterings of milk cows, the Commission intends to look into the possibility of introducing a concurrent private storage regulation on the basis of which we expect that it will be possible to remove 75 000 tonnes of meat from the market this year. It will thus be possible to withdraw this meat from storage at a later stage, when the market has stabilized. The Commission is convinced that by these measures it will be possible to restore confidence in the market so that it will settle back to its normal pattern.

Mr President, I now come to the market for dairy products. Here the position is that the Council's compromise on 31 March, which provided for the introduction of quotas for the production of milk in the Community, will already take effect in the current year in the form of a reduction in milk production. It will not, however, be great enough to prevent the continued existence of an imbalance between supply and demand in dairy products. Despite a limitation of production, the Community's already large stockpiles of butter will continue to increase unless additional efforts are deployed to limit stocks. This development is mainly due to the fact that the possibilities for export sales of butter have decreased substantially over the past year. Sales on the internal market, on the other hand, have developed positively since the sharp price reduction of 11% decided by the Council of Ministers on 31 March. This is not enough to alter the balance, however. Butter stocks will continue to rise unless new measures are applied.

Large butter stocks are very cost-intensive, primarily because of the high costs of the storage arrangements. The stockpiling of 1 million tonnes of butter costs 400 million ECU on a yearly basis. At the same time, the existence of large stocks of butter, all things being equal, will mean a lower sale price when the time comes for the stocks to be sold. It is therefore necessary that measures be taken as soon as possible so that a further increase in stocks can be avoided.

As I have already pointed out, it is particularly export sales of butter which have declined recently. The Commission, however, thinks that there are possibilities for increasing present levels of butter exports, including in particular sales of old butter from the Community's cold stores, in the first instance butter which is over six months old. The Commission will therefore be examining the possibilities in the period ahead of selling this older butter on the external market, possibly by means of a reduction in its sale price.

Our problem is therefore that we must sell the butter in such a way that we do not distort the normal butter market and butter sales.

The Commission also intends to examine the possibilities of offering butter for sale at a reduced price within the Community for a number of industrial purposes. The reasoning which led to these conclusions was motivated by cost considerations, the Commission has in the first instance adopted those measures which are most cost-effective. At a later stage the Commission intends to return to the question of possible further measures on the internal market in the form of particularly cheap sale arrangements and social butter, a subject which has also been raised on a number of occasions in Parliament. The budget situation, however, does not permit any action in these fields at the present time but, as I have said, we shall return to the situation at the start of the autumn, when we hope that the budget situation will have been clarified.

As you will note from what I have said, the Commission has studied the situation on the various markets for agricultural products and has taken the necessary measures, having regard to the financial situation in the Community. I want to stress that we are concerned with a sensible and prudent management of the markets in complete conformity with the conclusions of the Heads of State at Fontainebleau, which in no way prejudices the work of the budgetary authorities on the supplementary budget for 1984.

I thank you for your attention, and I hope that the excellent cooperation I enjoyed with the previous Parliament will continue with the new Parliament, and I look forward to meeting Parliament's new Committee on Agriculture in September, when we shall again have an opportunity of studying the problems in the various sectors.

Finally, I stress that the arrangements I have outlined must be taken as an expression of the Commission's desire and duty to provide prudent and rational management of the individual markets.

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES

*Vice-President*

**Mrs Hoff.** — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen! I shall refer to those parts of the Fontainebleau negotiations between the Heads of State and of Government which concern budgetary matters, as well as to the relevant passages in the speeches made by the President-in-Office of the Council and by Mr Tugendhat.

At Fontainebleau budgetary policy was dealt with as though the only people competent to handle it were

## Hoff

the heads of government of the Member States. But EEC budgetary policy — let me say it now quite clearly — is not a matter for the Council alone, the two parts of the budgetary authority are the Council *and* the Parliament. That is the way things are, and that is the way they should remain. I was very pleased to hear the President-in-Office of the Council stress that very emphatically in the first part of his speech. Parliament will not allow its rights to be curtailed in any way. We shall vigilantly preserve all our powers and we shall watch that no decisions are taken without the cooperation of Parliament. So much for the preamble.

The Fontainebleau agreements or declarations — I do not like to call them decisions since they were unilateral — are intended to ensure that the present financial crisis in the Community is surmounted. The existing 1984 budgetary deficit is to be made good by the provision of additional finance by the Member States. There are however no binding agreements on this point so far.

Neither was there any satisfactory agreement at Fontainebleau on the long-term solution which Parliament has repeatedly demanded to the problem of the future financing of the Community. This means that we are now in a situation where there is no firm foundation on which to draw up the supplementary budget for 1984 or the draft budget 1985. One fears that the plans presented there are built on sand. In view of this fact it is difficult to isolate consideration of the proposed transfer to Great Britain from the overall context. Whilst it was still under the influence of the Fontainebleau decisions the Committee on Budgets of the previous Parliament did in fact agree — we must remember this — to the transfer of resources. But we did make one reservation then. We said that on such an important political question as the transfer of resources it must also be possible for the Plenary to be consulted and to be involved in the decision-taking process. That is why the Committee on Budget and we of the Socialist Group wanted to lay the question of the transfer of resources before the House by means of a motion for a resolution and to discuss it.

Various motions and motions for resolutions are now on the table. We shall have to vote and take a decision on them later. I am expressly asking you not to consider the problem of the transfer of resources to Great Britain in isolation from other budgetary questions. The 1984 budgetary deficit and the draft 1985 budget must be viewed together. The fact that even the Council of Finance Ministers was unable to reach agreement on a supplementary budget last week strengthens my conviction. It means that Parliament has to take some decision on it in September. I also believe that it is legally indefensible for the resources to be released now since — I must say it once more — the question of the 1984 budgetary deficit and the draft 1985 budget has not been cleared up.

A propos the fact that the Council of Finance Ministers failed to reach agreement on a supplementary budget for 1984, I should like to remind you once more that the draft budget was rejected by the Socialist Group in December 1983 because even at that point it was obvious that the resources provided in it would not be adequate — and the figures which the Commissioner, Mr Tugendhat, mentioned just now are way above what we estimated then. I mention this here, because I wish to make it quite clear that the Commission had plenty of time to deal with these problems. It is not Parliament's fault if delays are occurring now and creating substantial difficulties for the Community. There were months and months in which to prepare the supplementary budget and discuss it carefully, so that, as I keep on saying, in the past it was never Parliament that was to blame if decisions intended to secure the harmonious development of the Community were delayed. It was not Parliament which met at Stuttgart and Athens and it would be very unfair to blame Parliament for things for which the Council and the Commission are responsible.

In conclusion I should like to emphasise once more that in the past the Socialist Group, the Committee on Budgets, and indeed Parliament as a whole, have in their cooperation with the Commission and the Council tried consistently to prevent the occurrence of financial crises like the present one. It was in our interest not to allow the ship to founder. We now find that it is imminent. We now see that this is so, both as regards the permanent solution to future financing and the short-term solution to the present crisis.

And if Mr Tugendhat said just now that these discussions mark the beginnings of a fruitful cooperation between Parliament, Commission and Council, I should like, with your permission, to amend this a little and say that the starting point was fixed a long time ago, the previous Parliament was also looking for that kind of cooperation. The thing now is to pursue this cooperation in a positive way, as all parties have done hitherto. If the Fontainebleau decisions are viewed in this light, then I have to say that in this context one partner has quite clearly fallen short of its obligations. In any appraisal of the positive steps which were taken there it has to be said that Parliament was bypassed. In future we shall safeguard our existing rights and powers in the budgetary field more energetically than hitherto and we shall extend them in the future.

**Mrs Barbarella.** — (IT) Madam President, I should like first of all to make it clear that, in presenting our motion for a resolution to the Assembly, we were moved by our very grave concern at the turn which, since some months now, the financial and budget affairs of the Community are taking. I must say that our concern has been further increased this morning after having heard what President Barry has said on the subject.

**Barbarella**

It seems to us, in fact, that the danger that payments will cease and, therefore, the Community will be incapable of functioning, is becoming an increasingly real and imminent fact. Now it seems to us almost unbelievable that, faced with such a serious situation, no less than two Councils of Ministers — first the Finance Ministers and then those responsible for foreign affairs — should have failed to reach agreement on the adoption of the preliminary budgets, the draft supplementary budget for 1984 and the general budget for 1985, and this despite the fact — and I want to emphasise this — that at Fontainebleau the Heads of State and Government had undertaken to guarantee the normal functioning of the Community.

For this reason we are proposing, with our resolution, that the new Parliament should take up a very firm position denouncing the failure of the Council of Ministers to meet their obligations and reminding them forcibly of their primary responsibilities, which are to adopt these budgets, so as to allow Parliament to set the relative procedures in motion, and, at the same time, to guarantee the necessary financial cover, especially where 1984 is concerned, the expenditure for which was already voted last year, having been fixed by decisions taken by the Council of Ministers itself.

We should therefore like Parliament emphatically to reaffirm this denunciation, pointing out at the same time the areas where, in our view, action is absolutely essential. There are four such areas — two concerning the 1984 supplementary budget, and two regarding the 1985 budget.

As regards the 1984 supplementary budget, Commissioner Tugendhat has given us the relevant details, for which I congratulate him; I think it should be said again in this Chamber that no reduction in EAGGF — Guarantee expenditure is possible in that budget. Contractual obligations to third parties who are agricultural producers must be honoured. If there have to be changes with regard to the common agricultural policy, those changes should be made through a thorough reform of Community regulations, not by means of budgetary operations. This is a fundamental necessity. The other point is the fact that we cannot accept any cut in expenditure for the structural policies. We think that the same firm stand is essential on this point. And that cannot be done either with a policy of 'cuts', as some of the government delegations would like, or — I repeat — and I say this to the Commission, even with book-keeping devices involving the shifting of payments, or plain budgetary accounting devices.

With regard to the 1985 budget, we consider that in the case of that budget also, structural policies cannot be compressed. If they were, it would mean that the Community could not really carry on, and it would in my view lose both internal and external credibility, seriously endangering the very life of the Community institutions.

Finally, Madam President, there is the question of Great Britain's financial imbalance. We consider that the Fontainebleau agreement is not satisfactory, and that the mechanism of the VAT differential is neither correct nor in conformity with the principles of the Treaty, nor is it in line with the nature of own resources. We therefore consider that the 1985 budget must include the amounts agreed to be allocated to Community programmes in favour of Great Britain.

In conclusion, we consider it necessary to reaffirm, in our resolution, the budgetary powers of Parliament. That means that we shall in no way accept any failure to respect our competence, and this is not, Madam President, because we desire our institutional rights to be respected for selfish reasons but, simply, because we consider that, over the years, our institution has proved itself able, through the budget, to implement a successful policy of Community intervention in new areas, new fields, and new policies, which are the essential instrument for the future of the Community.

*(Applause from the benches of the Communist Group)*

**Mrs Banotti.** — A chathaoirleach agus a chomhphobail, tá sé de phribhléid agam ar maidin labhart so teach seé don choad uair.

Is mian liom a rá ar dtús cé chomh géar agus a mhothuím an onóir atá bronnata orm ag muintir Bhláth Cliath bheith páirteach ar a son i gcúrsaí an Chomhphobail Eorpach. Tá sé chuspóir agam an dualgas sin . . .

*(Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it is my privilege this morning to speak for the first time in this House. I should like to begin by saying how deeply I appreciate the honour conferred on me by the people of Dublin in electing me to represent them in the European Community. It will be my aim to carry out that responsibility . . .)*

**President.** — Excuse me, I am afraid I do not know what language you are speaking in, but there are only seven official languages of the Community and therefore I must request you, in order that you should be understood by all the Members of this House and for the benefit of publication of your speech, to speak in one of the official languages of the Community.

**Mrs Banotti.** — My apologies, Madam President, but I did provide a translation before I spoke.

**President.** — I am sorry, Mrs Banotti, but I must inform you that it is not for you to provide translation, it is for the administration of this House to provide the translation. We must conform to the Rules of Procedure and to the Treaties, and we must have speeches in one of the official languages.



**Mr Hume.** — Could I draw your attention, Madam President, to the fact that the language which Mrs Banotti is speaking is in fact a recognized language of this Community?

**President.** — Mr Hume, I must inform you that there are hundreds of languages in this Community which are recognized as languages, without being one of the official languages of the Community.

(*Mr Hume: 'Officially recognized'*)

I am referring to official languages of the Community that are contained in the Treaties of this Community. I would ask you kindly to proceed with your speech, Mrs Banotti.

**Mrs Ewing.** — In pursuance of Mr Hume's point of order, there is a distinction, I think, that must be drawn in favour of the Irish language. As the Treaties have all been translated into that language, it has a degree of official recognition which unfortunately has not been gained, to my knowledge, by my own country's language of Gaelic. It is in a different situation from those other languages that you mentioned.

**President.** — Mrs Ewing, I am sure this will be a very interesting subject for debate later on during the next five years of this Parliament. But today, until we have any further decision or changes in the Treaties or changes in the Rules of Procedure, I would request that the speeches are made in one of the official languages recognized in the Treaties and in the Rules of Procedure.

Would you kindly now take the floor, Mrs Banotti.

**Mrs Banotti.** — Madam President, I have the privilege to speak to this House for the first time this morning. I wish to begin by saying, as I did in my native language, how keenly I feel the honour conferred on me by the people of Dublin to participate on their behalf in the affairs of the European Community. It is my aim to fulfill the duties so entrusted to me to the best of my ability and to play my part in the work which is before all of us in the direction of European unity and the welfare of all our peoples.

Ladies and gentlemen, still on this same subject, I should like to restrict what I have to say to those questions that are of greatest interest to me.

I am a social worker in the city of Dublin and in the course of my profession I am brought daily face to face with the effects which the political measures, with which this Assembly has to deal, have on people. I have taken positive note of the fact that the Council has concerned itself with the problems of long-term unemployment of men and women, mainly under 45

years of age, who find themselves excluded from the active, normal life of the community.

Unemployment often breeds a feeling of apathy and desperation in the persons that are affected.

Apathy and desperation are the things that face our long-term middle-aged unemployed. It is for this reason that I welcomed the commitment by Mr Barry to seek solutions to this great problem before us. On the other hand, we have our young unemployed who will not be so passive. Already the signs of legitimate anger and social unrest are evident in many of our cities. In some of our cities, there are those who are only too willing to take the law into their own hands.

I welcome also the commitment of the Commission to investing the resources necessary to deal effectively with the challenge posed by the US and Japan in developing technologies. Today's children are playing with and working with computers and scientific equipment that were still in the realms of science fiction when I was a child. They play with these sophisticated toys with the same ease with which we played with pencils and paper. We have a wonderful, talented and well-educated young population. Let us marry their skills and energies and hopes to the development of these new technologies in Europe!

For the ordinary citizens, the practical advantages of our membership of the European Community are often difficult to see reflected in their daily lives. The retention of these internal trade barriers for protectionist reasons results in their having to pay more for goods and services than they ought to and, indeed, than they can afford to. I welcome also the commitment to seek redress for these problems. People do not come out to vote for regulations and rules. The recent elections have shown us that. They will not thank us for the hours and days we spend arguing over paragraphs or phrases in the legal text. They will appreciate the work of this Assembly if it improves their daily lives and offers some hope for the future of their children.

Colleagues, we have a huge task to perform in the coming years, and I welcome the opportunity to start my own work in this Parliament under the presidency of the Irish members. Let us keep it simple, let us keep it human and let us keep it relevant! We must interpret the Community back to the people who voted for us. Madam *la doyenne* spoke on the first day about the fact that people do not read pamphlets, but they do listen to the people they have elected to speak for them in the European Parliament. This is our great responsibility: to reinterpret back to our people the work we do here and the value of the work we do here.

Thank you, Madam President. I would just like to end by repeating: let us keep in the coming five years our

**Banotti**

work simple, our work relevant and our work, above all, human!

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Thank you, Mrs Banotti. We have a practice in the House that I come from in my country to congratulate all those who make their maiden speeches. May I congratulate you from the Chair on your maiden speech in this House.

*(Applause)*

**Lord Douro.** — Madam President, I also would like to begin, as is the custom in the United Kingdom, by congratulating the previous speaker on her maiden speech. None of us will be left in any doubt as to what a considerable linguist she is!

I would also like to welcome the Irish presidency. Ireland rightly has the reputation for being a strong member of the European Community, and Ireland has taken over the very difficult problem of following up the complex agreements reached at Fontainebleau. It will not be easy for any President of the Council to discharge this task efficiently, and I wish every success to the new President-in-Office of the Council.

I would like to start by asking the President-in-Office about the communiqué of the Fontainebleau Summit. He referred, quite rightly, as other Members have referred, to Clause 3 of that communiqué, in which it was agreed that, pending the ratification of the new 'own resources' steps would be taken to meet the needs of the 1984 budget and to ensure that the Community operates normally. However, in the copy of the document that I have in front of me, it says that whereas Clauses 1, 2 and 4 were discussed and agreed by the Heads of Government, the remaining clauses had been issued on the authority of the presidency. Whereas I personally do not doubt the requirement for the Council to agree on a 1984 supplementary budget — I am sure we must have one — I would like the President-in-Office of the Council in his summing-up speech to comment on whether Conclusion No 3 was officially endorsed by all members of the Council at Fontainebleau.

As I said, the Irish presidency has a very difficult task. We have the problem of the 1984 supplementary budget; we have the problem of the draft 1985 budget; we have the problem of the new 'own resources' decision, and these are all to one extent or another interconnected. I was going to say that I was delighted that the Committee on Budgets had at least removed one problem from the scene when they voted on 12 July to release the 1983 refund to the United Kingdom. I was therefore very concerned at what Mrs Hoff said in her speech, because my memory of the 12 July meeting of the Committee on Budgets of the former Parliament

was that we did at length consider whether the committee was legally entitled to take that decision and we did decide overwhelmingly that the committee was authorized to take the decision on the transfer request which we had received from the Commission. We then proceeded to vote. We voted by 20 to 0, with two abstentions, to release the funds, and I am therefore very surprised that Mrs Hoff should now question whether the Committee on Budgets had the authority to take that decision. As far as I can see, it is quite clear. It has been the custom and, indeed, the procedure of this House that the Committee on Budgets does have delegated authority to approve transfer requests out of Chapter 100 onto the spending lines and I am very, very surprised that any Member of this House should now question retrospectively the authority of the Committee on Budgets to do that. I must warn the House that if any other Members are tempted by the arguments of Mrs Hoff, we shall be performing a grave disservice, not only to the future efficiency of the budgetary procedure relating to transfers, but we shall also be removing from the Committee on Budgets an important delegated authority which it has had for many years. I do caution Members not to tamper with that arrangement, which has been in existence for a long time.

I understand the misgivings felt in many parts of this House about the agreement at Fontainebleau. Any compromise — and this, we all know, was a difficult compromise to reach — any compromise is bound, in certain respects, to satisfy no one. However, in the end, all 10 Heads of Government agreed to it in the spirit of trying to reach a compromise so that the workings of the Community should no longer be held up. All 10 Member States agreed to that compromise. I think, therefore, the best attitude of this House is to express, if it wishes, certain misgivings about that compromise, but to do nothing which would seek to upset a very delicate situation.

Mrs Hoff said quite rightly that the European Parliament is an important arm of the budgetary authority. Of course, the European Parliament must therefore be involved in any decisions about how the budget is structured. In particular, there is a continuing discussion about budgetary discipline. The Irish presidency will be presiding over these difficult discussions about budgetary discipline, and I must say that it is essential that the European Parliament should be involved in what is finally decided about budgetary discipline. If there is to be a smooth working of the Community when budgetary discipline is established, when the limits are established for expenditure in the following year, it is essential and important that the European Parliament should be involved in that procedure, should be party to it, because if the European Parliament is not party to that agreement, then of course the European Parliament cannot be expected to abide by the agreement in the subsequent budgetary procedure.

Nevertheless, the compromise was reached. It has the advantage of being simple to understand, whereas the

**Douro**

draft agreement which was nearly reached at the Brussels Summit was highly complicated. I hope it will end the annual disagreements about how much money should be repaid to the United Kingdom.

That is all I wanted to say at this stage on the budget. I would just like to conclude by saying to the President-in-Office that many Members of this House would like to see a full debate in September on the question of Spanish and Portuguese accession. Many groups intend to put down an oral question with debate on that subject to the Council. We hope that the President-in-Office will come to Parliament and participate in a debate with us all on the state of the negotiations. It is an important impending development in the Community that these two countries should join us. The Fontainebleau Summit agreed that the negotiations should be concluded by the end of September. I hope the Irish presidency will therefore join in a debate in our September part-session so that Members of this House can have a proper opportunity to express their opinion on this extremely important matter.

*(Applause from the European Democratic Group)*

**Mr Cervetti.** — (IT) Madam President, despite the agreements reached by the European Council at Fontainebleau, the EEC is once again in the throes of a serious financial crisis, and one which the Council of Budget Ministers failed last week to tackle.

It is a crisis with a number of paradoxical aspects: in the past the Council has taken decisions, especially in the agricultural sector, which have involved an increase in expenditure, and now the same body refuses to put these decisions into execution.

The danger that the Community will disintegrate is not merely a theoretical one: unless a supplementary budget for 1984 is adopted, it will be necessary in October — as the President of the Commission has reminded us — to suspend the payments that are due to farmers in accordance with Community regulations. It is not hard to imagine the destructive effects that this would have.

On the other hand we must reject, on the grounds of inconsistency, the awkward attempt made by some countries to have us believe that the 1984 and 1985 budget problems can be resolved by means of 'cuts'. This solution, which is totally unrealistic and inconclusive, would only lead to the further, inadmissible penalization of the weakest areas and countries in the Community. Nor can we accept the hypocrisy of those that maintain that, for 1985, we can keep within the limits of the 1% VAT.

Technical considerations should not make us lose sight of the political aspects of the present crisis in the Community, which are still more alarming.

How is it possible that, a few weeks after a European Council that appeared to have settled for ever the so-called Community 'disputes', we discover that the disputes are deeper than ever?

Obviously, that shows that it is no use trying to make do with ambiguous, bungled solutions to serious problems, which will only come back again unresolved.

In other words, in its haste to settle disputes at all costs, the European Council at Fontainebleau did not look with sufficient attention at how deep were the underlying causes of the disputes. And yet they need looking at very carefully indeed. Mr President of the Council, we recognize that the speeches made here yesterday and today contain not merely words but also positive observations and proposals. But speeches will remain half incomplete, half ineffective, unless they are backed by what we hope will be a sincere, unprejudiced analysis of the causes of the present crisis.

There was the problem of the rebate to Great Britain, which hid a different conception of the Community and its future: but that was undoubtedly not the only problem. There was also the ambiguous behaviour of other countries, who regarded the Community more with the annoyance of 'net contributors' than with the intention of making it into an instrument of recovery and progress for all Member States.

These problems have still not been tackled clearly. For their solution a deep change is necessary in our conception of how the Community and its policies should operate, as well as a thorough reform of its institutions and their ability to take the relevant decisions. We consider that one necessary decision is the rejection of the permanent blackmail method.

It is of fundamental importance to acknowledge that it is not possible to continue with the narrow outlooks and procedures of the past, and that, because of their underlying logic, as well as the inadequacy of their scope, the Treaties of Rome themselves are now an inadequate frame in relation to actual needs. Worse than that, they are a kind of 'Nessus' shirt' that drives its wearer mad, and could even lead to the dissolution of the Community that it contains.

It was the awareness of all this that drove us to promote and support Parliament's draft Treaty for European Union, which is identified with the name of Altiero Spinelli — and that is no mere coincidence. This is the first decisive problem that must be tackled by the Irish Presidency. We ask that Presidency to set up, quickly, the *ad hoc* Committee, as decided by the Fontainebleau Council, which could report — as requested by Parliament on 14 February — to a conference of Heads of State and Government, which in turn should send any proposed amendments to Parliament for final approval. Immediately thereafter the ratification procedure should be started.

## Cervetti

That, however, is not sufficient. There are other big problems and basic questions of the greatest urgency. Without going into details I would say that, in our opinion, the following are the directions in which action needs to be taken: first, the search for peace and the resumption of the dialogue between the great powers, so as to set immediately in motion, with Europe's participation, the process of disarmament. Secondly, the fight against unemployment, both manual and intellectual, especially the unemployment of youth and women, both by concerted economic recovery and by social policy measures such as the reduction of working hours and the introduction of flexibility in working time. Thirdly, a policy designed to adapt the industrial and economic structure of the European countries to the great changes that are taking place in the world, and then a positive response to the challenge of the United States and Japan, by refusing to imitate the ways of others and creating, instead, an original identity based on concepts of equity and efficiency. Fourthly, the search — we say — for new, fairer relationships with the developing countries. Finally the unremitting attempt to re-establish equilibrium within the EEC, partly as a means of deriving benefit from the necessary expansion of the Community to include Spain and Portugal.

Of all the urgent problems we consider that absolute priority should be given to the question of the budget, so as to guarantee the continuity of agricultural expenditure and the expansion of structural expenditure, which moreover is the aim of the motion for a resolution presented by Mrs Barbarella.

We shall judge the Irish Presidency not so much by the lists of problems that it is able to give us as by the new achievements it can claim to have brought about.

For our part, we shall continue to discharge our original function within this Assembly, the function of a great popular party of the left and of the forces of progress, and one that is able to look beyond doctrinaire disputes over cooperation and integration, and beyond the confrontations of opposing positions. We shall continue to look for the widest possible degrees of convergence, so that parties with different beliefs can acknowledge each other in a pact for the recovery of Europe and the renewal of its institutions.

Our guiding principles are the principles of progress, justice, democracy, peace, unity and the independence of Europe. We shall be true to all of these values, and they will be the basis for everything we do.

*(Applause from the benches of the Communist Group).*

**Mrs Veil.** — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, as we all know the urgent problems faced today by the Community, and hence by the Irish Presidency, are budgetary problems. One cannot see how the Community could go on functioning unless these problems are urgently dealt with.

We therefore come to treat them with our eyes quite open and we urge the Irish Presidency to find solutions in this area.

I shall not say more on this subject since Mrs Scrivener — who knows the subject thoroughly, for she has been general rapporteur for the budget — will have occasion to address the Irish Presidency on this theme in the course of the debate.

What I want to say now is a few words on the subject of contacts between Parliament and the Presidency and to thank the President of the European Council for what he said to us yesterday about the way he intended to tackle the subject and for the commitments he has already given about calling a conference of Foreign Ministers, probably in November, which will help to re-establish more frequent contacts, not just between the Presidency of the Council and the European Parliament, but also between the Governments. What I should like to see at that meeting is a resumption of the discussion on the legislative conciliation procedure. There is much to do there. At one of the early meetings of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, chaired by Lord Carrington, in 1981, certain undertakings were given by the Council. I should be very happy to see this matter considered again at a very early date.

We have also heard yesterday mention of undertakings concerning the relationship of this *ad hoc* committee — once it has been set up — and Parliament. It would be intolerable, indeed unthinkable, that an *ad hoc* committee responsible for promoting the European citizenship did not, as a matter of priority, have close contact with the European Parliament. On this point we have had an assurance from the President of the European Council. I want to take this opportunity to thank the President of the European Council for coming yesterday to inform the enlarged Bureau — and I mean inform, and not consult, as would have been desirable — of the appointment of the President of the Commission.

I am, of course, aware that the Irish Presidency is in no way responsible for this state of affairs and that, on the contrary, it was out of courtesy that we were told, after the event. But that meant that there could be no question of consultation, since we learnt of the appointment from the newspapers. We can only deplore such a procedure, although we wish to thank the Irish Presidency for trying to find a solution that masks a little the reality and, above all, for undertaking to see how matters can be improved in future in this respect and, indeed, more generally, in the matter of consultation which, as regards the appointment of the President of the Commission, should be respected in relations between Parliament and Council.

We have refused to give our opinion, because it would have had no meaning, given that we had simply been informed of the fact.

## Veil

For the present, what I wish to say as spokesperson of the Liberal Group is that we consider it a matter of urgency to which we want to draw the Irish Presidency's attention, that the electoral procedure for the next elections be considered, even though the matter will not arise again for another five years.

I referred yesterday to the low turn-out in some countries for the elections to the European Parliament. According to some surveys the result in certain constituencies, or rather in some of the regions concerned show that the electoral procedure makes an important difference not only as regards numerical representation but also the equitable and democratic nature of this representation.

It must be a matter for profound regret that in one of the Community countries 19.5% of voters who went to the polls are not represented in this Parliament. This, to us, is an outrage against democracy and the respect to which the citizens of Europe are entitled. Let me quote a few figures which seem to me very significant. In the United Kingdom the Alliance obtained 2 500 000 votes — 19.5% of those cast — but it has not a single Member. It is an affront to democracy that, with more votes than the total polls of Denmark, Ireland and Luxembourg combined, the Alliance should be totally unrepresented while these three countries have 37 seats.

It is urgently necessary for the Council to concern itself with this problem and, indeed, to fulfil its institutional obligations according to which there should be in all the Community countries a uniform voting system enabling all the Community countries, and hence all the citizens, to be democratically represented in our institution.

I have deliberately centred my entire speech on behalf of the Liberal Group on this problem in order to stress the importance which we attach to it. We are counting on you, Mr President, to ensure that action is taken now so that within five years — and we know that this is by no means too long — all the Governments will have been able to act so that we may, as the preceding Parliament urged, in the 1989 elections have a uniform voting system in all the Community countries. We are convinced that when that happens the citizens of Europe will become more interested in Europe, knowing that we are really a democratically and fairly elected Parliament.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Ewing.** — Madam President, I am delighted to follow Mrs Veil on the very last point that she raised. It will not have escaped the attention of her group that I defeated the person they very much hoped would come to join them. I may say that he is a friend of mine, and we do not find it particularly congenial to have to fight each other knowing that both of us under

a fair system would be here anyway. I am, of course, on record as having said this many times before: I say it again, and I heartily subscribe to Mrs Veil's remarks.

It is disappointing, is it not, to look at the UK turnout of 32.56%, to compare it with the figures for Belgium, Luxembourg and Italy and to say again what once Roy Jenkins said in this House: We get the wooden spoon!

I stand before you as one bitterly disappointed that I could not come this time, as I did last time, and say that my constituency turned out in far greater numbers, for I only achieved 40%. I tried so hard for five years to persuade everyone to vote, even if they did not necessarily vote for me. Turn out and vote in these elections, I said at many a street corner, in many an island and many a highland glen, and for some reason we have had this low, low appreciation. The young man on the Inverness street did not see the importance of this Community, he did not feel it was his Community, he did not feel that this Parliament was his Parliament and he did not feel it was dynamic enough to interest him sufficiently to walk to the ballot boxes — or perhaps his hopes had been dashed.

I urge the Irish presidency to give top priority to this question of the young and their frustration and disillusionment — the youth unemployment issue — because our youth are our future. We still have in our societies the work ethic, yet we attach the stigma of joblessness to many young people leaving school whose fault it is not. I would urge very simply that we look at the best systems, and I believe Germany has the best among our Member States. What about a little upward harmonization to ensure that all our school-leavers are entitled either to a job or to full-time education or training? If we had such an ambition, even if we just made a start on this during the next six months when the Irish have the responsibility, I think it would help to cure some of the apathy and frustration that was shown during the elections, particularly in the UK and in Ireland.

It is also my feeling that the greater the emphasis on materialistic battles, such as the 'UK money back' argument, the less the interest on the part of the electors. This 'money back' business, given great headlines because the press prefers bad news to good news, created lots of anger but little interest in voting. It led to confrontation and distrust which will take years to go away. Of course, it was good for the press but very, very bad for this Community. I have always voted for paying the money back, but I have always made it plain to this House that I do not really agree with it. I would rather have seen Mrs Thatcher use her energy — and she has plenty of that — in defending our industries and in seeking money for structural policies under the Regional Fund, such as the one working in the Western Isles, such as the one proposed for Greece or the one she will not match for the rest of the Highlands and Islands. That is the way we can get some-

**Ewing**

where in our ambitions for a better and more evenly balanced Europe! I would rather have seen more money devoted to social policies than just a dollop of money which was, and still seems to be, a bone of contention. I have never enjoyed confrontation, and I think it had a definite part to play in the low electoral turnout in the UK.

I turn to quite another subject and ask the Irish President-in-Office to consider this point. With regard to human rights, this House has a very honourable tradition of fighting for many people behind bars in many parts of the globe who look to us to win them free. I would ask that when this House passes a resolution or puts an oral question calling for some kind of action, there should be a clear answer, either that action will be taken as requested or that it will not, and that if action is to be taken, they should then later report to this House on the outcome. Too often we just receive a bland kind of non-answer from the Council and we never really feel that we are getting anywhere. That, I think, is a very simple and practical request.

On the question of Lomé III, our magnificent partnership with the 63 Lomé countries, the best package, I think, that the world has yet seen, although it is by no means perfect or sufficient, it is vital that there should be a separate chapter on fishing, because fishing could fill the gap in the race against hunger. At present there is a great need of practical training skills, and I would add to the plea for a separate chapter on fishing, that they consider a separate chapter on alternative energy, because that could be of great assistance to the Lomé countries.

Finally, with regard to the subject of fishing and negotiations with Spain, it is alarming to read in the Irish presidency's calendar that the first meeting on fisheries is planned for 1 and 2 October and yet Prime Minister FitzGerald remarked in his speech that the negotiations with Spain and Portugal should be concluded by 30 September. Perhaps someone can explain that to me, but it worries me very much indeed, because I think these negotiations are being shrouded in secrecy from Parliament. That is why I deplore that we did not set up a fisheries committee. The Spanish fleet is greater than all the EEC fleets put together. We do not know where they are to go, but we do know there is no room for them in the North Sea. They could be encouraged into positive partnerships to help our Lomé partners, but we should like to hear more about it. Are we going to be consulted properly? The situation is really very serious. Representing, as I do, peripheral regions where fishing is a way of life and where usually there is no alternative employment, I need to know whether the Community is going to say to these fishing communities, we are just going to sit and watch you die. That is what it comes down to. The Community cannot wear a human face and a death mask at the same time. I urge this House to think again about

fishing: then, perhaps in five years' time, the vote will be higher everywhere.

*(Applause from the right)*

**Mr Christensen.** — (DA) Madam President, I rise to speak on behalf of the People's Movement against the EEC, and I should like to thank the Irish Foreign Minister for not making one single mention of union. We hope that this is an indication that the Presidency will not be active in that field.

But when the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers describes this Assembly as the democratic voice of Europe, it is a studied insult both to that part of Europe which has nothing to do with this Assembly and to the Council of Europe. We do not accept that the European Community should have a common foreign or security policy, and I fully understand the allusion to difficulties which was inherent in the Minister's address. We cannot help but be surprised that, of all countries, non-aligned Ireland should have accepted the common foreign and security policy.

We must stress in the strongest terms that a solution of the budget problem by way of EEC directives is illegal, on the basis both of the Treaty and of the Danish Constitution. A legal problem of this kind will not be solved by political negotiations, but by upholding the law.

The President-in-Office asks for good advice on the question of fighting unemployment without creating inflation. I will gladly accede to that request. Let the individual countries decide for themselves, and let us cooperate as free and independent nations. That is what happens in EFTA, where unemployment is only a third of what it is in the Netherlands and Denmark.

It is not enough for the President-in-Office to speak fine words about free trade and the fight against protectionism, when the truth is that EEC protectionism is prolonging and deepening the crisis and widening the gap between the rich and poor nations. When the Minister speaks about difficulties for the Mediterranean countries on the possible enlargement of the Community, the reasons are to be found in areas such as the EEC's own protectionism. That is what creates the problems which the President-in-Office refers to. We too can see the sense in removing technical barriers to trade, but it is a question which the individual countries themselves should decide. We do not accept reductions in our environmental legislation and the blocking of progress in the achievement of a better quality of life.

The President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers referred to the question of human rights. We also consider that to be a vital issue, and we are opposed to violations of human rights wherever they occur. But according to the constitution of the Council of

## Christensen

Europe, the right forum for the discussion of these problems is the Council of Europe, when the Member States of the Council of Europe are concerned, otherwise the United Nations is the proper forum. They are also the concern of non-governmental organizations, such as Amnesty International. This Assembly has no competence for interfering in other countries' affairs — and indeed in the internal affairs of Member States.

## IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*President*

**Mr Le Pen.** — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, some of the speakers this morning were wondering at the reasons for the lack of interest of the European voters in our institution. Undoubtedly, the inability to be present at our sittings, especially at the inaugural part-session is one reason, though it may not be the only one.

The President-in-Office of the Council will forgive me if I do not reply directly to his speech, because this is the first opportunity I have to express in this forum the views of my group, and more specifically those of the movement which was elected in France by, let me remind you, 2 200 000 votes.

I believe we are witnessing, even if we dare not admit it to ourselves, the permanent decline of Europe, of its power, its influence in all spheres and, worse still, of its vitality. Europe seems to be a dying star in the international firmament. And it is the sacred duty of politicians to tell their people the truth, however hard it may be.

The truth must be told above all to the young. Parliament cannot confine its debates exclusively to material, economic, technical or administrative matters. Nor can it confine its horizons only to the short and medium term. As a new member of this Assembly I am aware that outsiders sometimes speak of Byzantine disputes on the sex of angels at a time when the barbarians are knocking at the gates. But can one even mention barbarians today without being immediately accused of racialism?

Europe, we must find the courage to tell ourselves, was the great-loser in the Second World War, with its enormous loss of human life and material destruction. And Europe's influence in the world has been considerably reduced. Since 1945 a large part of its territory has been under occupation, under the pitiless rule of the USSR. In 1984 we might as well speak the name of Big Brother. Our sister nations in Eastern Europe are separated from us by the iron curtain and entire peoples are deprived of the most basic political rights. We owe it to ourselves to tell them that we shall never

accept the division that was made at Yalta and approved in Helsinki.

In the West, Europe has not stopped accusing itself before the tribunal of history. Well, we should have the courage to tell ourselves that in bringing about the Second World War Germany was not the only guilty party, nor did that country have a monopoly of crimes. Today's Europe is marching backwards into the future, lost in the contemplation of its past grandeurs and woes. And that, no doubt, is the reason why the young care nothing about it.

But, ladies and gentlemen, terrible threats hang over our future, our prosperity, our freedom and our very survival. Threats of military aggression and subversion from the USSR which has SS-20 missiles pointed at Western Europe; threats of another subversion, arising from the combination of a suicidally declining birth-rate and a population explosion in the Third World which is already manifesting itself by waves of immigration which, in the absence of a comprehensive policy, will assume for Europe dramatic proportions in the coming years. And there is the threat of economic ruin born of a crisis which you know very well is not a traditional crisis, but is due to the irretrievable loss of industrial monopoly on which Europe's power was built in recent centuries.

We have to face these facts so that we can draw useful conclusions from them. We are exposed to the dangers of moral and spiritual ruin which manifests itself in moral laxity and the abandonment of essential disciplines — in society, in the community, in the family.

The young people of Europe — and it is to them that I dedicate this speech — should know that in the 15 years which separate us from the next centuries their future, their freedom and their survival will be at stake. They cannot win the challenge otherwise than by developing to an unprecedented degree their abilities, their sense of responsibility and of freedom in all spheres of human activity, but more particularly in intellectual endeavour, in business enterprise and in education. They must resist the insatiable appetites of state power and bureaucracy and look to their glorious past, remembering that if Europe exists today it is not because she has submitted to History. It is because she fought and suffered. The history of Europe is, first and foremost, the story of the battles of Marathon, and Salamina, of Lepanto, Vienna and Poitiers. And let Europe — and Europe's young people — remember that, whatever the future holds in store, if they are prepared to fight, then if they cannot repeat Marathon, they will at least have had the merit of making a stand at Thermopylae, so that they can say to their country: 'Here thy sons fell in defence of thy laws'.

*(Applause from the right)*

**Mr Tortora.** — (*IT*) We of the Radical party already contributed yesterday to the debate on the Fontaine-

**Tortora**

bleau Summit, with a speech by Marco Pannella. We are increasingly convinced that it is absolutely necessary that the Treaty submitted to our Parliament should be the formal, precise reference point for policies — both of the Community and of individual Member States — in opposition to the old, pseudo-realistic belief in continuing to entrust both the present and the future of Europe to diplomatic meetings or budgetary convenience.

But today there is one observation that needs to be made, regarding the statement by the President of the Council, and that is absolutely critical as far as we are concerned: it concerns the absence of the North-South initiative, and I therefore oppose the policy of extermination by hunger in the world that the statement by the Irish Presidency confirms and therefore makes worse. And on this point also, as on the first point, the Commission and the Council have to be committed to implementing the objectives and general policy set down in resolution No 375 of the European Parliament, following on the manifest appeal of the Nobel Prizewinners and, in particular, the fight for these aims carried on by the Radical party.

Having explained these two points, there is another absolutely urgent matter to which the Community and Parliament itself must give a human, legal and political response that will justly deserve to be called European in both scope and quality. I refer to the question of the 'Esprit des Lois', but I would also say the 'Lettre des Lois'. We can only, in fact, continue to fight the civil and legal barbarities of totalitarian states and more or less autonomous minorities, as well as their satellites and the other fanatics, villains and assassins, by basing justice on law, and the life of all the European States and their citizens on the certainty of that justice.

We call upon Parliament to mobilize in support of the respect for human and political rights as officially proclaimed and protected by the international agreements of 1966 — agreements which are and should be absolutely binding. Indeed, they should be preferentially binding as far as positive national rights are concerned, whereas, for example, in my country they are trampled under foot and disregarded, so that the defence of citizens' rights — as is universally recognized — lies even below the already barbarous level of the laws and procedures imposed in Italy by Fascism. I need only tell you that preventive imprisonment, that leper of the penal process, can — or could — last up to 12 years in our country; that it lasts, in certain cases, up to 8 years before any judgement is made. That is the case — one among many — of Giuliano Naria, a man who has been reduced to the status of a parcel, shuttled from one prison to another, from one hospital to another, no more than a human grub. I visited him two days ago, as my first deed as a Member of the European Parliament. And then we learn from the citizens of other countries in the Community — if it is true, and it is true — how for example British citizens, despite official intervention, have remained in

Italian prisons for over six months without even being able to understand what they were accused of, or by whom.

We call first of all upon the President-in-Office of the Council, and on the Commission, as well as on Parliament, to make a commitment on this front — in respect of the human, civil and political rights of all citizens — a central and essential feature of the working of the new Treaty proposed by us.

The Radical party in Italy has for some years now been carrying on — and perhaps it is only now being listened to with greater interest — a veritable battle for the restoration of a legal status that has been violated and invalidated by special legislation, and by laws that reward so-called 'repentant' assassins, that make a farce of the penal process, and an immense tragedy of the very certainty of the law.

We will fight, and in particular will fight, to enable Italy, along with those nations that call themselves free and Western, to give up the barbarous practice of medieval rites and guarantee its own citizens a system of justice worthy of a true democracy.

**Mr Fich.** — (DA) Mr President, I should like to comment on a number of the budget problems with which the Irish Presidency is confronted. There are budget problems with which we have gradually become familiar over many years, and they have become an inheritance which is passed on from one presidency to another. These budget problems are a crucial key to the development of the Community, since in many cases they have threatened to block Community cooperation and in others they have actually succeeded in doing so.

Many of us believed, when the summit conference took place recently in Fontainebleau, that an important step had thus been taken towards the solution of a number of these budget problems, but we now see that, after the meeting of finance ministers last week and that of foreign ministers this week in the Council, the Fontainebleau meeting has clearly not produced the result that many of us had expected. What are these problems then? First of all, of course they concern the supplementary budget for 1984. The position here is that the Commission put forward a proposal, which we in the Socialist Group feel came too late. The Commission already knew in December 1983 that the figures for the 1984 budget no longer added up, but still hesitated for a very long time to produce a proposal. Now it is on the table, but the finance ministers have not yet been able to agree on it. The central issue is of course that it shows up this gigantic shortfall on the budget for 1984. The Socialist Group is prepared to back action to make good this shortfall. We are already to accept a proposal for the payment of an advance to meet the shortfall on the 1984 budget. But we are not prepared to accept that part of this shortfall



**Fich**

be met by savings, for example, in the Social Fund. We think that the fight against unemployment is the paramount issue in the Community, and we do not therefore want resources which we set aside for the fight against unemployment to be used to pay for still higher surpluses of agricultural products for 1984.

The second problem is of course the budget for 1985. We do not yet know what the draft budget for 1985 will be. The Council of Ministers has not been able to present it to us. But we know what one element in it will be: that is the question of the repayment to the United Kingdom. It is a conflict we have had for several years here in Parliament. We wanted this repayment to the United Kingdom to be undertaken in a rational and orderly manner, so that we should have some control over the purposes for which the money was used. We therefore asked that it be used for policies of a Community interest. But now, after the Fontainebleau meeting, we see that, instead of adjusting the payments from the Community so that certain countries could draw greater benefit from the Community, they are making adjustments on the income side. I should like to say clearly and distinctly to the Commission that this is unacceptable and, if the Irish Presidency goes along with this proposal from the Commission, that is also unacceptable. I can say today, on behalf of the Socialist Group, that, if this adjustment to the contributions system, this alteration to what is actually most sound in the Community's budget policy, is upheld, there will not be any budget for 1985, because the budget for 1985 will be rejected by Parliament.

I should also like to make some comments on the question of raising the VAT ceiling. The Socialist Group has supported the raising of the VAT ceiling for specific purposes. To begin with, we said that resources should be increased in conjunction with the enlargement of the Community, and then that resources should be increased in the interests of strengthening the structural funds, notably the Social Fund, for the fight against unemployment. But we do not at any time want to participate in the use of any increased VAT money to finance a continued increase in the production of surpluses in agriculture. I want to make that quite clear to both the Council and the Commission.

I will conclude by saying to the Irish Presidency that we are prepared to be very cooperative in the Socialist Group. But, insofar as the supplementary budget for 1984 is to be financed through cutbacks in the fight against unemployment, insofar as the 1985 budget carries an entirely irregular repayment to the United Kingdom, it is clear that the Socialist Group cannot participate. If that is the case, the Irish Presidency will meet with opposition from the Socialist Group.

**President.** — The President-in-Office of the Council has asked to speak now to answer the questions put to him. He has to leave shortly.

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council.** — Thank you, Mr President, for the courtesy of the House in recognizing the difficulties with time that I have and in allowing me to intervene at this stage in the debate to reply to some of the points made.

You were not present earlier, Mr President, when I congratulated you on your election as President. I wish you very well in that onerous office which you now have taken on and I wish to assure you, as I have had the opportunity to do on two occasions privately in the last two days, of my full cooperation and my determination that relations between the Council and Parliament during my presidency, through you and me personally, and down into the other organs of the Community, will be as friendly, as cooperative and as mutually productive as possible.

I want to say a few words about some of the points raised during the debate. I was very impressed by the quality of the debate and by the number of contributors. I would like, first of all, to take up a point that was raised just before lunch and which may come to the kernel of the difficulty we have in the European Community at the moment. Mrs Veil said that we needed to consider the method of voting in the Community, and she quoted as evidence the fact that almost 20% of the electorate of one country was disenfranchised, as she said, because they had actually no representative in this Parliament. I think the Council of Ministers last year went some way towards achieving a common electoral system throughout the Community, and now that the urgency of the election is behind us I think we should continue on that work and try to achieve some uniformity of election systems before the next direct elections take place in 1989.

The problem with the Communities is far more fundamental than the voting system. I do not think that the voting system in any one country or in any group of countries was alone responsible for the low turnout in June for elections to this Parliament. I think that all of us in the Council, whether presided over by the Irish, or the Italians who follow us, or the French before us, also in the Commission and in Parliament, have a very real problem here. If we are still ambitious to achieve the goal of the founding fathers to unite the peoples of Europe, I think that our performance over the last few years in relation to many of the very difficult problems that face us must become much more imaginative and courageous. Otherwise, we shall not achieve the goal and this Parliament, this Council and this Commission will be written off in a hundred years' time as having failed to make the contribution which I think is so vital for the well-being of our children, of their children and so on into the succeeding centuries.

Lofty goals were established for us by the founding members of this Community, and I would say that of all the presidencies, of all the people who have controlled this Community in the last 25 years, those of the last three or four years have not shown the same

**Barry**

level of commitment to achieving those goals as was there before. Unless we can start off, as I said in my speech this morning, and pick up again the torch lit in Stuttgart and carried through the Athens, the Brussels and finally the Fontainebleau Summits, if we cannot pick that up and carry it forward, then the future of this Community is in grave doubt. It will not be because of the voting systems, but because of a lack of courage, commitment and imagination on the part of those whose responsibility it is *now* to advance this Community. The responsibility is ours now, and if we do not face the challenge, then I feel that the low European vote that was cast in the middle of June for this Parliament is the first danger-signal for the life of this Community. It is essential that we recognize that fact and work towards changing it.

An Taoiseach said yesterday when speaking to this Parliament, and I repeat now, that in that regard the Irish presidency will not be found wanting. As I said in my speech this morning, we recognize that there are two or three vital problems which during our presidency it will be essential to deal with as far as possible — the budget, enlargement and the ACP. They are the three major ones. There are many others as well, including the relationship with Parliament, which I think is something that I should not have to speak about here. It should be taken for granted that relations with Parliament are as cordial and as cooperative as possible. My attitude to Parliament will be as I conveyed to you over lunch, Mr President, and as I promised in my speech this morning. I shall be present at every part-session of this Parliament to answer your questions, to consult with your committees. I promise you that as soon as I get the dates for the committee meetings that you are in the process of establishing today, I shall convey those dates urgently to the Irish Presidents of the various Councils whose responsibility it will be — I shall insist that it is a responsibility: it is not something that they are free to choose about — to come here and speak to and enter into consultation with those committees.

The budget has been referred to by virtually every speaker in this Parliament in the last two days. There is absolutely no doubt that it is the immediate problem facing my presidency. We are facing a significant shortfall in the funds available to finance the policies willed by this Community, the policies that were brought into being by this Community, proposed by its Commission and adopted by its Council. No self-respecting Community can allow that position to drift to the point of stagnation. If we want the policies, we must provide the funds to finance those policies. It is a self-evident fact that if we have policies that the Commission, the Council and Parliament decide are necessary for the advancement of the European ideal, then the funds to finance those policies must be provided. My belief is that what was said at Fontainebleau was an instruction from the Heads of State or Government to the Council of Ministers to ensure that the 1984 budget was financed in 1984.

As I said this morning, as An Taoiseach and President Thorn said yesterday, that is not a view shared by all the ten members of the Council. I hope we can make progress in this regard at the Budget Council and General Affairs Council meetings scheduled for September, and so recognize our obligations to finance those policies in this year.

We also face a shortfall in the budget for 1985 in as much as it has been designed to respect the 1% ceiling for VAT: because certain things have been left out of that budget, we should recognize that that budget will not suffice for the whole of 1985. I think — and again there is no unanimity on this in the Council — that the new 'own resources' that were identified as being necessary as far back as Stuttgart and were passed at Fontainebleau last month must be put in place prior to 1 January 1986 and must be available to the Commission before that date in order to finance what is almost certainly going to be a shortfall in the 1985 budget.

I want to say a brief word on two other problems which are recognized as major challenges facing this Community. Again I go back to the founding fathers and their dream of a united Europe living in peace with the world and at peace amongst themselves, as being a goal well worth striving for. I talk about the enlargement. This Community, up to ten years ago almost to the date, was comprised of six Member States. On 1 January 1973, it was expanded by three Member States — the United Kingdom, Denmark and my own country. Since then, Greece has joined the Community making it ten. We are now in the process of negotiating with two old European countries, Spain and Portugal, on their accession to the European Communities. The European Council has decided that that accession should take place on 1 January 1986. It has been the responsibility of the intervening presidencies to complete negotiations with those two countries to ensure that that happened. I want to repeat the undertaking An Taoiseach gave yesterday and that I gave this morning, that we shall increase the tempo of the work, we shall increase the number of meetings, we shall increase the availability of the offices of the presidency and we shall maintain our determination to see that those deadlines are adhered to. We believe that the arrival of Spain and Portugal to join the existing ten Member States is a significant step on the road to European unity. We must all face the concessions that are necessary to ensure that that happens in the time available. I firmly repeat the undertaking given so trenchantly by An Taoiseach yesterday that we in that regard will play our part.

My third and last point concerns the negotiations for the completion of Lomé III. We are talking here about economic and social cooperation between ten — no matter what difficulties we have internally at the moment or what problems we can recognize in the ten Member States collectively — of the wealthier members of the world's community on the one hand and 64 of the poorer members on the other. It would be

**Barry**

inconceivable if we were not ready to sign a further agreement in that regard — inconceivable! The whole point of the European Community would be lost. We are not just a community of trading nations coming together for their mutual benefit. Our significance in the world must be far more than that, far more. We can most readily show our commitment to that ideal by making the necessary concessions in time and in money to complete this third Lomé Convention and to ensure that it comes into effect on 1 January 1985. Again, I want to assure the Members of this Parliament, who I know are as concerned as is the presidency and indeed the Commission, that we will do everything in our power to ensure that that Convention is signed by everybody concerned before the end of this year.

There are many problems that I have not touched on in my few concluding remarks today, Mr President, but I assure the Members of the House that I am conscious of their contribution and of the points they are making. I want to assure them also that in the field of political cooperation — and one speaker said before lunch that he was surprised at the Irish presidency being concerned about defence — when we speak of political cooperation we are not talking about a defence agreement. We are talking about trying to arrive at a common position amongst ten Member States on problems outside or inside those states. I think that in ten years we have made enormous progress in this regard. It is extraordinary how, when discussing these problems, we very readily come to the same point of view: that is something that was impossible ten years ago. I hope that that kind of progress in political cooperation will continue in the future. Again I want to promise the House that as far as the Irish presidency is concerned, we shall do what we can to encourage that.

Finally, Mr President, I would again like to congratulate you, the Vice-Presidents and the Quaestors who have been elected here today and to repeat the undertaking given by the Taoiseach and myself that as far as we are concerned in this six months, cooperation between the Council and Parliament will be at a high level.

Go raibh maith agat.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Thank you Mr Barry, for your statement to the House. You answered most, if not all, of the questions put to you by the Members. We all appreciate the attentive way you followed our debates. We noted in particular your commitment to strengthening, as far as possible, cooperation between the Council and Parliament. I therefore wish the Irish presidency every success in its efforts on behalf of Europe.

**Mr Habsburg.** — *(DE)* The President-in-Office of the Council is taking on a difficult, but by no means

hopeless, legacy. He is taking over from the French Presidency. The latter was not able to achieve everything that was expected of it, but it — and especially President Mitterrand, whose cultural and economic policies I am unable to share — must be given credit for one thing in particular, a strong and exemplary commitment to Europe.

We owe a large vote of thanks to the French head of State, for it was his unfailing efforts which served to stem the crisis. The President-in-Office is also taking up his duties after European elections which have given rise to various complaints. Admittedly an average fall of 2% is not a sparkling achievement, but neither is it as bad as those who wish us ill would like to maintain. Our achievement can stand comparison with Swiss referenda or American presidential elections. Let us not gaze as though hypnotised at the section of the population which did not vote, instead let us look towards those who sacrificed a day's holiday to their faith in Europe, in spite of a lack of information and the steady drip, drip of defeatism. Our duty is to them, let us not disappoint them.

The events which have taken place at our frontiers in recent weeks demonstrate what it is really about. When Chancellor Kohl and President Mitterrand finally promised to end frontier controls, all the forces of bureaucracy were mobilized against the free movement of persons. There was a struggle between the political will and the deadweight of bureaucracy. This time, at least in part, the political will triumphed, but only because courageous citizens took their fate into their own hands. It was the many drivers who disregarded the irate floundering of customs officials, who were the deciding factor.

Under no circumstances should we stop here. What was achieved at the Franco-German border — and still needs a good deal of improvement even there — must now be implemented at the other internal frontiers — including those with neutral States such as Austria, which have expressed their willingness to join in this movement to free our citizens. Bureaucrats and their Minnesänger in the media are now saying that implementation of the Rome Treaties in the matter of frontier controls is playing into the hands of organized crime. In answer to that it cannot be stressed often enough that in many parts of the world there are other ways of catching criminals, which do not involve the chicanery of obsolete frontiers. We are no worse than our American friends, who have been able to introduce freedom of movement over a whole continent!

Since the day before yesterday we in Germany have had before us a concrete proposal, tabled by the CDU/CSU alliance, for an international fight against crime. It should have happened a long time ago. The Council should give serious consideration to the idea of setting up a European police office in Paris and should not allow the proposal to disappear into its bottomless files.

**Habsburg**

The Council will face a difficult task in concluding the negotiations on the southern expansion. These are in a state of extreme crisis because we of the EEC appear to lose sight of the overriding political and defensive significance of the matter in the haggling over wine, oil and citrus fruit. There is a French proverb which says, 'Plaie d'argent n'est pas mortelle'. I hope that the President-in-Office of the Council and his colleagues will think on this truth, because otherwise it might well be that we shall make sure of a few special privileges and gamble away the Mediterranean and our freedom in the process.

One last remark. The President of the Council comes from the western frontiers of the Community. Let him not forget that it does not end at the eastern frontier where the red hegemony begins. The Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Romanians, to name but a few — and not forgetting the millions of Germans who live behind barbed wire and minefields — are just as much Europeans as we are. It is our duty to intercede for their freedom, self-determination and decolonisation.

I ask the President-in-Office of the Council to keep these instructions from the people of Europe constantly before him during his term of office.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Toksvig.** — (DA) Mr President, when I rise to speak so soon after taking my seat, it is for two reasons. The first is that I am very glad that my début coincides with the Irish Presidency. I have for a long time held the Ireland which the Presidency represents in warm esteem and have had a personal admiration for Dr Garret FitzGerald, born of many years' trust and cooperation in journalism.

I was very pleased to hear in Foreign Minister Barry's speech that the Presidency will endeavour to bring the negotiations with Spain and Portugal to the speediest possible conclusion, so that these two countries can join the Community by 1 January 1986 at the latest. It was, he said, the political question to which the Irish Presidency gave the highest priority, and on behalf of the Danish conservative members, I gladly endorse that view. It is an enlargement which has been in preparation for a very long time, and it is important to show the rest of the world and the rest of Europe that the only criterion we impose for admission to our ranks is that of pluralist democracy. It is therefore vital that the negotiations be continued and that these countries be admitted to this closer European cooperation which we have envisaged.

There has been some discussion during the election campaign and here these past few days on the subject of making fresh changes in the provisions of the Treaties for our future development. Many have turned their eyes to the future, and they are right to do so —

that is how it should be. But I believe that the day-to-day problems should be solved first, and I have a concrete question for the Presidency, which I should like to put here. I want to ask the Presidency to consider whether it is not time to call on the Commission to produce a survey of the areas covered by the existing Treaties in which cooperation has not yet been developed to the full. We have a set of Treaty provisions which is broad, comprehensive and in many cases visionary. We have not yet made use of it, and it is high time we got from the Commission a survey showing where the gaps are and where we can make a practical contribution.

The Danish conservative members over the next five years in Parliament will be devoting their energies to reaching that one goal: that every time we meet for a part-session we can take note that we have taken two, three or four determined steps forward. I no longer believe in seven league strides, the age of fairy tales is over. But, if we work together, I believe we can make progress. It has not escaped my notice, as a new member, that there are difficulties to be overcome. Only by the well thought out organization of practical cooperation between us shall we succeed in achieving the more visionary objectives embodied in the Treaty of Rome.

**Mrs Boserup.** — (DA) Mr President, the President-in-Office of the Council began his statement this morning by discussing the budget problems and, because they are very obvious and very difficult, I will be content here with stating my party's position with regard to them.

We first have to fill the gap in 1984, and we might have liked to settle the matter by making savings, but we realize that it is too late. Time is too short for such savings to have any effect. That emerged clearly from Commissioner Dalsager's clear and sober account of the situation in the agriculture sector. It cannot be done.

Three possibilities are left to us. We can defer the expenditure till 1985. That must be rejected. It can be compared with postdating cheques or uttering cheques without funds to back them. We can demand extra contributions from the Member States. That is a bad idea because we do not have a long-term solution to the problem of the apportionment key between the Member States. We could, finally, let the Member States sort it out themselves in the two months in question. This solution will be expensive for Denmark. Nevertheless our party recommends that we do it that way. It is the most attractive solution. It is time we paid our own bills, and it is time that we realized that Denmark is one of the richest countries in the Community.

As regards 1985, we think that there should be a budget within the 1% ceiling. If we do not do that, we

**Boserup**

shall be acting irresponsibly and shall end up in the same situation next summer as we are in now. Moreover it is unfortunate, but evidently typical of the Community's style of working, that we have an atmosphere of disaster here, lashed up by the pressure of time. The Commission has known and has been saying since 1 April that we have run short of money, and it seems to me that we could have received a draft supplementary and amending budget somewhat earlier.

Otherwise, it is neither new nor unfortunate for the Danish members that we are talking about money. The Danish pro-Community parties have always talked about money and about all that we could gain from being in the Community. Now that the money is running out, some of us are happy to have a little political talk on what we are doing at all in this company.

**Mrs Scrivener.** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, notwithstanding the answers which the President of the Council has been good enough to give us, I should nevertheless like to stress the financial and budgetary matters with which the Community is faced and on which, as we all know, its very existence depends.

Unfortunately, the events of recent days have proved that the Council of Ministers has not been able to come to an agreement and to provide for the necessary financing for 1984 nor, apparently, for 1985.

Let me, in a general way, set out Parliament's position — I do not think anyone will object to that — and let me stress one very simple but altogether fundamental fact, which is that undertakings given must be honoured. Let me remind you, for it is relevant, that the undertakings in question were given *by the Council*: whether we are talking of agricultural problems, of measures in the structural domain, or of research or the Esprit programme by which we all set such store. The budget is agreed simultaneously by the Council and Parliament.

If that were not the case, if we could not find a way of keeping to those commitments, it would mean a complete disjunction between words and deeds, and that would mean an even more serious loss of the Community's credibility. We know that for 1984 we are 2.7 thousand million ECUs short. No solution is in sight for 1985 and everybody knows — indeed you have said so, Mr President that it will not be possible to keep to the 1% VAT ceiling, given that the Commission's preliminary draft budget calls for 1.12%.

Some people talk of savings, claiming that they should be enough to cover what has come to be called the 'hole in the budget'.

Well, it is true that in the past some appropriations have not been spent. If that were the case for 1984, I think Parliament would have the wit to ensure that the

unspent amounts are transferred to other headings and, indeed, given the special gravity of the situation, to see to it that non-obligatory expenditure appropriations — provided, of course that they have not been spent — are used to supplement obligatory expenditure, always, of course, with the proviso that Parliament's margin of manoeuvre is not affected.

It is true that it was necessary to settle the question of the budgetary refund to the United Kingdom, because it was bogging down the Community's entire functioning. Parliament, however, stated clearly that the true solution to the problem required elimination of the causes, not merely the effects of distortions as between Member States. In other words, while countries facing certain difficulties could be given temporary or degressive help in the form of authorized additional expenditure, the definitive solution required the institution of new policies which would enable each country gradually to overcome its handicap.

But what was agreed at Fontainebleau was merely to turn the Community budget into an equalization fund which would enable each State to make a budgetary contribution equal exactly to what it is getting out of the Community. There is no mention of degressivity, of the essentially temporary nature of the measure, nor of any new policies which in future would eliminate such imbalances.

Such a system, which today has been applied to the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, can in fact be applied to any country. Tomorrow, then, it can result in such a tangle of reimbursements and reliefs of contributions among the States with a positive net balance that the Community would remain a Community only in name, with more of the characteristics of a marriage settlement for the separate ownership of goods than of the solidarity enjoined by the Treaties.

As for the political revival of Europe, no thought was spared, alas, for that.

Finally, let me say that we in this House are very upset about the text adopted on budgetary discipline, about which little has been said so far. The European Parliament might regard it as a provocation that immediately after its election an attempt is being made to reduce its budgetary powers, which are also enshrined in the Treaties.

While this Parliament agrees, and has itself said so, that firm discipline is needed not only in the budgetary policies of all the Member States, but also in that of the Community, this should not serve as a pretext for muzzling an institution which has had the wisdom to use its budgetary powers to oppose every attempt to set back the European construction.

These, Mr President, are the comments I had to offer. They concern not only budgetary and financial mat-

**Scrivener**

ters but the very future of the Community. We have great hopes of your presidency and we want to thank you in advance for what we believe you will be able to do.

**Mr Lalor.** — Mr President, the European Community as such is limping from one disaster to another. Our hopes and expectations were raised following the Fontainebleau Summit, but these hopes are now being wrecked yet again. Just a month ago agreement was reached to raise the Community's own resources by 0.4%. Now, only a matter of weeks later, we are faced with a further budgetary crisis. The Budget Council had the responsibility on 19 July to reach an agreement on the financing of the 1984 budgetary deficit. It totally failed to discharge its duty. As a consequence of such incompetence and obvious lack of real political will, are the farmers once again to be the eternal victims of Europe? Is the EEC's only fully developed policy, the common agricultural policy, to be consistently eroded by one budgetary cut after another until it is finally destroyed? Now we are faced with a trial of strength between the Commission and the Council because of the failure of the Council to resolve the crisis.

There can be no doubt whatsoever that, for its part, the newly-elected European Parliament will discharge its budgetary duties speedily and efficiently as we have always done in the past. I urge the Irish President-in-Office of the Council to spare no effort in persuading his partners to reach an immediate and lasting solution. Decision making in the European Community has gone off the rails. Can the Community and, least of all, my own country and the people I represent, afford this indecisiveness? The institutions of the European Communities must pull together.

For the next five months Ireland has the honour of presiding over the destinies of the EEC. Its responsibilities are enormous. The Members of the European Parliament, I have no doubt whatsoever, are only too willing to facilitate its work. However, we expect the Council to show courage and to take decisions that will lead Europe out of its present financial *impasse*. Unemployment is crippling the advance of the peoples of the European Community. It is creating disillusionment with our institutions at home and in Europe, particularly among our young.

Our priority must be the creation of jobs for the thirteen million people who are unemployed in the Community. In Ireland, we have the greatest percentage of unemployed among the ten Member States. According to official figures, the number of people out of work at the end of June this year, at almost 211 000, represents between 16 and 17% of our total workforce. For a small country such as mine, this is a disastrous situation. Since a large proportion of this figure is made up of young people, male and female, the prospects are extremely bleak. The European Parliament has

expressed its concern and brought forward proposals for the unemployed on very many occasions in the recent past. We shall continue to do so. Unfortunately, I fear that the Council of Ministers, in turn, shows no sign of sharing our commitment to the unemployed.

A policy to create employment must be based on productive investment and wider markets. It must ensure a trained work force, particularly in the area of new technologies and the development of our natural resources. We have one of Europe's youngest populations, and training them to meet the challenge of the technological era must be our objective. Training programmes which do not demonstrably improve employment prospects are a cynical exploitation of young people. The European Community should provide the finance required for the establishment and expansion of small businesses by improving the existing facilities and by further interest subsidies on Community loans. Small enterprises should also qualify for inclusion in common industrial and research programmes with a view to promoting cooperation and technology transfers between the small firms as well as between small and large firms and universities.

The nauseating budgetary blocking tactics of one Member State, as outlined by the Council President this morning, are counteracting the ability of the Community to get on with the job of bringing us out of the recession and creating this much-needed employment.

Since its inception, we have been totally committed to the principles and aims of the common agricultural policy. No other country in the Community is more dependent economically on agriculture than Ireland. Community preference is a fundamental principle in the common agricultural policy. This principle, however, is being blatantly violated. To give but one example: the importation of cheap butter from New Zealand at a time when the dairy industry in the Community is being obliged to make major sacrifices is a very serious provocation. I ask the President-in-Office to give an undertaking here today that unacceptable derogations of this type will be done away with once and for all.

Since the whole question of farm structures is now on the Council table for review, I appeal to the President-in-Office to resist any efforts to dilute or diminish in any way this vitally important aspect of the CAP. I would add that for Ireland there is a vital necessity for a coherent and integrated agricultural structures programme for reasons which are only too well known to the President-in-Office. Furthermore, I call on the President of the Council to restore without delay the AI and the limestone subsidies which have been stopped and which have resulted in the loss of hundreds of jobs in these sectors in Ireland. We must preserve as many jobs as possible on family holdings which are firmly rooted in their social and economic environment.

**Lalor**

Disparities in income and living conditions as between different farmers and different regions must be reduced. We must take full advantage of the diversity of agricultural production which is steadily increasing, particularly with a view to the eventual enlargement of the Community.

The fruits of Fontainebleau have been shortlived and, indeed, the Irish presidency can speedily restore confidence and consolidate Community solidarity. The future for all of us is uncertain. It is time, once and for all, to meet the crisis head on and to resolve it. I sincerely hope that the Irish presidency can generate the necessary political will. This will be a difficult task but not an impossible one.

Finally, I would make a solemn request to the Irish President-in-Office of the Council to use every possible endeavour to ensure that the report of the New Ireland Forum be examined by the Council and that the UK be invited to treat this report with the urgency and the importance that it merits and demands.

I conclude, Mr President, by wishing you a very successful five years and wishing the Irish presidency every success during its period of office.

**Mr de la Malène.** — (FR) Mr President, I was interested and pleased to hear you say just now that the Council intended to establish close cooperation and coordination with our Assembly. Let me repeat what we said yesterday. I am sorry that the President-in-Office of the Council did not think it necessary to attend during the first debate in order to hear all the various speakers. It is a bad custom to be there to listen to the first speakers but then not to hear the others. It shows an attitude that I prefer not to put a name to. Especially where the speaker we have just heard is concerned.

(Applause)

**President.** — Your comment has been noted.<sup>1</sup>

## IN THE CHAIR: MR NORD

### *Vice-President*

**Mr Roelants du Vivier.** — (FR) Mr President, we are witnessing a strange situation where Mr Barry and his colleagues expound on the need to bring Europe closer to its citizens — and the poor electoral turn-out only serves to underline that need — while at the same time these same politicians continue the hateful tradi-

tion of taking decisions without consulting Parliament. This is what is known as speaking with two tongues.

Because we believe in grass-roots democracy, we the ecologists must protest against the recent budgetary decisions taken prior to any consultation with this Assembly.

As regards the substance of the budgetary question, I want to stress the total inacceptability of the application of the rule of 'fair return'. It is the surest way to revive national egoisms.

But, what is even more important, the fact that three-quarters of the budget should still be allocated to agriculture, to the detriment of other important policies, such as social policy or environmental policy (which gets only 3% of the budgetary resources) goes directly against our expectations and those of many citizens in Europe's various regions.

Let us remember that 50% of agricultural expenditure goes on the destruction of surplus stocks or on subsidizing exports which often bear no relation to the needs of the so-called beneficiaries. A policy for a more diversified agriculture centred on small and medium sized farms would be less of a financial burden and much more advantageous in terms of providing employment and useful work. The President-in-Office of the Council, coming as he does from Ireland, knows this well.

And then, as ecologists, we cannot see why 70% of the resources for research and development should be allocated to nuclear energy. A budgetary re-allocation is urgently needed, otherwise we shall be devoting very considerable resources to the promotion of an expensive technology which is dangerous and above all outdated. We shall do everything in our power to oppose research and development being promoted in this dead-end direction and we shall be putting forward proposals for diversifying the research financed by the Community and — as regards the energy sector — for directing it towards rational use of energy, energy saving and renewable energy sources.

Mr Barry was right to say that environmental policy is an area of concern for the public at large in Europe. This makes us all the more disappointed by the vague programme he outlined in just two sentences of his speech. The political will, and hence the budgetary means, seemed strikingly absent in his statement. For the ecologists, the environment is not a gimmick, nor is it a piggy-bank where you put a few coins for emergency cosmetic surgery after an accident. It is the basis of a new comprehensive policy for society as a whole.

This is why budgetary decisions are not innocuous: they may, as in this instance, represent the starting point of a new era.

Either we opt for a post-industrial society in which economics and ecology can be reconciled, or we

<sup>1</sup> Membership of committees (vote): see Minutes.

**Roelants du Vivier**

acquiesce in decline by applying a drip-feed to industrial society to prolong its life; either we choose inter-planetary solidarity with nature and with all of humanity, or we grind down the peoples of the Third World, we promote the war rivalry between the two blocks — and we all perish together.

These are the points I wanted to offer for consideration at the start of the Irish Presidency in my capacity as a Belgian ecologist and a new Member of this Parliament.

**Mr Paisley.** — Mr President, I wish first of all to record the anger that is felt among my constituents about the proposal to sell off the butter to Russia and to the rich Middle East countries. In Northern Ireland there are many people unemployed — the largest unemployment ratio in the whole of this Community. There are also many old-age pensioners and many people employed in industry, and their consideration should be put before the people of Russia or the Middle East countries. I want to record my opposition to that proposal.

I want also to put on record the facts of the matter concerning the recent arrangements for dairy farmers in Northern Ireland. Milk production is the cornerstone of Northern Ireland's agriculture, and there is a relative absence of farming alternatives. These considerations were recognized in the preamble to the Commission regulation 1371/84, which acknowledged that in Ireland and the regions of Northern Ireland the contribution which dairy-farming makes, directly or indirectly, to the gross national product is substantially greater than the average for other regions of the Community. Scope for developing alternatives to milk production is very limited in these regions. This led the Council of Ministers to give a special additional quantity of 65 000 tonnes, 63 m litres to Northern Ireland; but unfortunately for us, that never reached the Northern Ireland dairy industry. When the United Kingdom Government reports in September on how they have operated their milk quota, I trust that the Commission will keep in mind the following questions.

First, no information has yet been provided either in the presentation or in the UK dairy-produce quota regulations on the objective method by which they arrived at a reduction of 10.35% on 1983 deliveries as the basic wholesale quota for Northern Ireland as compared to only 6.25% for England and Wales and 6.39% for Scotland. Secondly, the Commission must be entitled to ask why, for the past three months, in advance of the publication of the UK dairy quota regulations, the Northern Ireland quota was repeatedly explained by United Kingdom Ministers in terms of 1981 production, plus one or two per cent, plus 65 000 tonnes, plus a transfer from the England and Wales quota in contravention of the Community's regulations. Thirdly, it may be appropriate for the Commission then to enquire into the calculation of the

quotas for the whole of Scotland and the division of that quota between the three milk marketing boards in that region. Fourthly, while the UK Government may now have got the presentation roughly in accord with Community regulations, the Commission may contend that the result is not in accord with the attempt that Northern Ireland should have had this additional quota in very difficult circumstances. I do not know what would have happened if the Council of Ministers had not been prepared to help Northern Ireland by giving this additional quota.

In closing, I would point out that dairy-farming in Northern Ireland is now in a very serious position and needs immediate help, and I trust the Commission will look urgently into this matter. Northern Ireland has, of course, as I have already mentioned, the largest unemployment rate of the Community. Therefore, it is essential that all jobs be safeguarded, especially jobs in the dairy industry.

Just one final comment to a previous speaker, who suggested that this Assembly should discuss internal arrangements in Northern Ireland by discussing the New Ireland Forum Report. I would like to say that that report has been rejected overwhelmingly by the democratic vote of the Northern Ireland people: it is no concern of this particular Parliament and is outside its orbit. I might say that as the one who polled in the election the overwhelming vote in opposition to it, I would like to enter my strong protest here today against any suggestion that the internal political arrangements of Northern Ireland within the United Kingdom should be the subject of discussion in this body.

**Mr Saby.** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Community is in a situation which one could ascribe to Alfred Jarry, and leave it at that, were it not for the seriousness of the consequences, not only for the 280 million of its inhabitants, but also, in the long run, for Europe's economic, cultural, political and social identity.

We are thus today faced with a situation which Parliament cannot simply ignore. It must fulfil its role and its responsibility.

What has been happening? We are voting the budget for 1984. At a certain point we find that, given the world prices and the hazards of climate, the common agricultural policy needs to be reformed. We find that we cannot go on paying without limits in order to produce vast quantities of produce when, in the world markets we are finding serious obstacles to sales and trade, while at home we are forced to spend very large sums to support the farmers.

This is where the Community at last identifies the problem and the Council tries to find more rational solutions. But this is also where things start getting dif-



## Saby

difficult. We have a Council of Ministers which is prepared to face up to its responsibilities and which tells us: We are going to halt agricultural expenditure, but we are also going to do our duty. So, the Council puts down supplementary expenditure for agriculture. But this is where we face a situation new in our experience: for we are one of the two branches of the budgetary authority which is here taking a decision on its own account, but without making a corresponding decision about revenue to set off this expenditure.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the situation in which we have been placed. And now we are being told: We are going to put forward proposals and we are asking the Commission to make proposals to provide the revenue made necessary by the decisions taken by the Council of Ministers.

The previous Committee on Budgets did not like this at all.

Today, it is for the new Parliament and the new Committee on Budgets to make their own assessment of such dealings in political, financial and institutional terms. It comes down to this: either the budgetary authority consists of both Parliament and Council, and Parliament is associated with decisions on new expenditure *and* with those on finding the revenue to cover it, or it is the Council, within the framework of the implementation of the 1984 budget takes responsibility for the additional expenditure *and* for the corresponding revenue.

Indeed, it seems to me that we have the makings of an institutional conflict here. How can it be that an institution, which is one of the two branches of the budgetary authority, having unilaterally decided on expenditure, takes no decision on revenue?

Either the Council will find a way of remedying this oversight — painful as it is to Parliament — or the problem will arise again in all its acuteness. The only other way out is to return to the institutional game and see what can be done with a supplementary budget.

These, Mr President, are matters which this Parliament should be considering. But we must always remember the facts. And the facts are that today we have a shortfall of at least two thousand million ECU! Also, we are faced with the consequences of the Fontainebleau summit on the British and the German questions. Can we today separate the two? It is a question I put for consideration by Parliament. Can we today agree to transfers being made to the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany and at the same time accept the Council's refusal to face its responsibilities on the question of a supplementary budget? I believe this is something that this Assembly will have to settle today or tomorrow.

But in fact, the present situation requires that we go beyond the institutional aspects. The situation

demands that, by October, we have the same budgetary authority as the Council and that we have a draft supplementary budget. Because the Community's obligations towards its creditors cannot go on being postponed. Parliament must also demand that false pretences are not sought in the discharge of our responsibilities and obligations. We cannot agree that the 1985 budget should be drawn up on the basis of resources which will not be available before 1986. We cannot agree that the Council should condemn to oblivion all the efforts made by the States gathered together at Fontainebleau. We cannot agree, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, that a real solution to the financial problems should be deferred because of lack of realism and of a sense of responsibility. And that is what we are talking about today. We, the Parliament, are saying to the Council: Now that you have managed to reach an agreement at Fontainebleau, are you really prepared to go ahead and give the Community a new start? Or was Fontainebleau no more than a decoy? Are you prepared to take the responsibility for the disappearance of the common agricultural policy through re-nationalizing the relevant expenditure? Are you prepared to take the responsibility for the Community's backwardness in point-of-growth technologies? Are you prepared to take the responsibility for preventing the Community from catching up within the next five years and taking up the planetary challenge in economic, monetary and social terms? Are you prepared to take the responsibility for the gradual death of the Community as its members withdraw more and more into their national shells?

What Parliament must say clearly to the Council is this: By October we must know whether the Community's financial obligations for 1985 are to be met, or whether, through the Council's fault, the Community will no longer be in existence in two or three years' time!

**Mr McCartin.** — Mr President, first of all I want to welcome you to your office and wish you well over the next two-and-a-half years. I also wish to welcome Mr Barry to the Irish presidency, my past and present colleague, in fact, in the Irish Parliament, and to wish him well in his efforts towards the development of European policies. Since he has come here and spoken about his belief in the development of policies that are necessary to bring the peoples of Europe closer together on the road towards progress and prosperity, I want to say that many politicians will do that in the presence of Members of the European Parliament but on their own national scene and in their own political daily lives in their national parliaments will sometimes hold a different view. Mr Barry is a committed European who sells the idea of Europe and promotes the cause of Europe in his own constituency and in the Irish Parliament. I believe that the presidency for the next six months is in the hands of somebody who is sincerely committed to developing the policies that we need.

**McCartin**

Before I say my own few words, I want to express solidarity with our Irish colleague, Mr Paisley, when he regrets the situation in which British dairy farmers find themselves at present. Since we should recognize regions of need more than national or any other sort of boundaries, Northern Ireland should have been the subject of special consideration in the new milk régime which was agreed last year. I have always believed that, and I want to say to him that the farmers of that area have my concern. This was an opportunity to develop the common agricultural policy towards a regional purpose which would have created in that area of immensely, dangerously high unemployment an opportunity for more people to earn a living and to develop the industry which the farmers of Northern Ireland are so good at. Perhaps next year we may see the development of a policy, not for just 26 counties of Ireland, but for all of Ireland, for that would be promoting policies that make both economic sense and regional sense.

After the second direct elections — our first trial, you might say, with the electorate — our minds are fresh to the problems that have arisen. Probably the first problem that arose for all of us as we went out to seek re-election was the question: after five years, did the electorate of Europe think that this Parliament was really necessary? Could we convince them that it was worth the cost that we have incurred in coming here to Strasbourg? Could we convince them that we had made any sort of contribution towards an improvement in their lives? It was rather difficult to do that.

The excuse we put forward was, of course, that this was an infant institution. After five years, we had barely begun to feel the ground under our feet and we did not expect in the first five years of our existence as a directly-elected Parliament to resolve all the problems. That excuse will not hold water after ten years. Things move fast in the modern world. After five years more, we shall have to offer the people a better explanation as to what we have been doing and how, in fact, we have sought through our activities here to promote their aspirations. I was glad when Mr Barry said that he would be recognizing this Parliament and seeking to promote a better cooperation with us and a better recognition of our rights.

Of course, one of the big problems that Parliament has had is the fact that compulsory spending was almost up to the limit of our resources. If we had an extension of our resources, perhaps Parliament, through the development of new policies, would find a more meaningful rôle for itself. But it is regrettable that the extension of resources which has been agreed with the enlargement of the Community will not, in fact, provide for this Parliament any significant powers with which to develop our ideas into policies that will bring the people of Europe closer together and promote their aspirations.

Already, I think, this Parliament has to begin the fight for a further extended budget which will give us the

means before the next election to develop real policies, a variety of necessary policies to convince the people of Europe that we are a real Parliament which wields powers for their good.

My next point concerns the problem of unemployment. We shall not solve the problem of unemployment with the development of social policies alone. It is only through promoting a greater convergence of our economic policies and by using the Commission as a sort of super-government for the Community to give economic advice that the countries with economic difficulties and difficulties in selling the right policies to their people can be helped and at the same time the recurrence of a situation be prevented where one area of the Community will over an indefinite period be demanding and expecting assistance from others.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Jepsen.** — *(DA)* Mr President, may I be permitted, following on from what the chairman of the Danish Conservative Group, Vice-President Poul Møller, said yesterday, to voice both optimism and expectancy with regard to the results which the new Irish Presidency may succeed in achieving during the much heralded activity of the coming months in the Council. We are confident that it will prove possible to give effect to the Fontainebleau compromise on the budget problems and, we hope, at the earliest opportunity. The budget problems have indeed dominated the internal life of the Community over recent years in such a way that we might feel that the dynamism which it was the intention to impart to European cooperation through the Community from the beginning in 1957 has petered out. Parliament has clearly placed on record the duty that the Council has of achieving the solution not only of the question of the British budget contribution but also the problems that the automatic mechanism in agricultural expenditure raises from a cost point of view.

As a new member of this Assembly, I shall not present any good advice on how the problems are to be solved in detail, but I feel that we can be confident that the Irish Presidency will follow up the success of the French Presidency in such a way that the Community will function as the driving force for a positive and dynamic development of cooperation between the Member States. If we are to get both the old and, especially, the young, as the President of Parliament so graphically pointed out in his address on taking the chair the other day, to have faith in the European Communities — and we must do that — then we need to show optimism, dynamism and effectiveness. All the institutions of the Community must work together, if we are to have the vital energy to get through the five-year term which Parliament has just begun.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Kyrkos.** — (GR) Mr President, between Stuttgart and Fontainebleau Europe has achieved no more than to confirm the need, but also the inability to find an avenue of escape from the present crisis. This is the fruit of the prevailing political thinking.

The entry of a group of fascists into the European Parliament shows clearly where the impasses faced by the European Community can lead. With this opportunity let me call to mind that for us Greeks the rose demonstration of a few days ago has another symbolic meaning as well, because it coincided with the day when the military dictatorship in Greece fell. I would like in particular to inform President Pflimlin that among the Vice-Chairmen of the Le Pen group, which so impudently offered him its support, there is one from Greece as well, who was elected with the aid of a photograph of Colonel Papadopoulos, the leader of the criminal fascist regime that you too had all condemned.

Colleagues on the Conservative side of the House, we are divided by many issues, but I appeal to you to join us in consigning to the most stringent moral and political isolation the forces of fascism and racism which, by definition, are fighting to destroy every peace-loving and democratic prospect in Europe.

In the report by the Irish Presidency we heard a useful but flat inventory of the problems we face. We did not hear any original thinking on initiatives and solutions. Yesterday and today Dr. FitzGerald and Mr Barry noted the need for new policies. However, we also need the finance to support these new policies. The meagre increase in own resources is, as was also proved by yesterday's speech by the President Mr Thorn, an illusory increase and certainly one that is insufficient to ensure even a balanced budget. The Community will not develop unless we eliminate the inequalities caused by the fact that some countries and regions base their development on the retarded development of others. And yet, the integrated Mediterranean programmes and the promises of finance from the Community's structural funds for major works in the Greek five-year plan are at risk of being postponed to the Greek Callends, to name only two examples that are of particular interest to Greece.

Mr President, I would not wish to finish without voicing a thought addressed in particular to the Irish Presidency: you come from a deeply divided country. We ask you to undertake substantial initiatives on behalf of another country that is a source of international crisis and creates the risk of international explosion. The day before yesterday saw the completion of a decade since the Turkish invasion and occupation of 38% of the territory of an independent country that cooperates with the Community with a customs agreement. Turkey has provocatively ignored repeated decisions by the UNO and the Security Council. Gentlemen of the Irish Presidency, we look to you to give the most persistent support to the initiatives by the Secretary

General of the UNO, which have the approval of the Republic of Cyprus. We ask this in the name of the autonomous role that the Community can and must pursue on the international scene.

I wish the Irish Presidency every success.

**Mr Maher.** — Mr President, I listened carefully to the speech of the Foreign Minister of my country this morning, who is at present President-in-Office of the Council. I must say that I support him in almost everything that he said. But could I make some suggestions?

I think that many of these things we have heard being said before, we have heard expression being given to these aspirations of goodwill, but the time has come when words are not enough. Perhaps we ought to be offering some evidence to the population of Europe that this Community means something to them. None of us can be satisfied with the level of participation recently in the elections to the European Parliament: if you except those countries that have compulsory voting, then the level of participation was frighteningly low. I believe one reason is that many people do not see that the Community is of any great benefit to them. Might I suggest a small gesture to the Irish Government which would give clear evidence to the Irish population that the European Community means something to them?

Ten years ago, a derogation was obtained from free trade in motor-cars imported into the Republic of Ireland in order to protect the assembly industry in Ireland. That assembly industry is now gone in spite of the protection. The derogation is ending this year, and I would ask the Irish Government to allow free trade in motor-cars, for this would bring down the price of motor-cars to the ordinary consumer in Ireland, where they are about double the average price in other countries. This would be a real gesture, for then the Irish consumer, much hard-pressed, would see that being a member of the common market at last means something to us. It would put money into our pockets. If that could be done, then people would begin to see that it is worth belonging to this Community, it has meaning for us. Indeed, I might also turn to the Danes and say the same thing. They tax their motor-car consumers out of existence. It costs, I believe, about three times as much in Denmark to buy a motor-car as the average in the rest of the Community.

I should like to make another suggestion of a completely different kind. In working for the achievement of world peace and lessening the dangers of a nuclear holocaust, again I think it is time to follow up fine words by action. I would recommend to the Irish Government, the government of a small country with no nuclear capability whatever — and they never will have it in my view, thanks to be God for that — that they get together with other very small countries with no nuclear capability to act as a kind of honest broker

**Maher**

between the major powers in confrontation to try and see whether it is possible to achieve a diminution of the nuclear weaponry that is building up in the world today: 50 000 extra warheads are being built each year, and yet we have no money for food aid! We cannot afford to get rid of our surpluses, but we can spend billions every year, 365 times as much, on weaponry for destruction as we spend on food aid. This would be clear evidence that this Community meant something to the people living in these countries.

(Applause)

**Mr Hume.** — Mr President, I am particularly pleased to have the opportunity to speak in this debate today on the occasion of the Irish presidency. I think it is extremely important that small countries in this Community should have a major voice in this Community and that, in particular, the youngest independent sovereign state in the European Community should have assumed the key rôle of the presidency. The unity of Europe can only be preserved if we recognize, preserve and develop its diversity as well. It is to the smaller voices in the Community that the duty falls of continually reminding this Community of the necessity to preserve and develop our diversity.

The President-in-Office of the Council, Dr FitzGerald, and his colleague, Mr Barry, both spoke on a wide range of issues. I do not intend in the time available to follow them down the road of every issue, but I would like to concentrate on what both of them recognized as the major issue facing this Community. That is the question of unemployment — an absolutely massive human problem facing the peoples of the European Community today — and in particular, the problem of youth unemployment. I come from a region which has the highest unemployment rate in this entire Community: at the moment it is 22%, and according to reliable forecasts, if the *status quo* continues in Northern Ireland, it will reach 33% in six years' time — one-third of the community and one out of two young people with no hope of a job.

What I have to say from my experience of the devastating effects of unemployment on a society is that this Community will ignore at its peril the threat that unemployment, and youth employment in particular, poses to the very democratic process itself. The existence of widespread youth unemployment has a close connection with violence, with paramilitary organizations and with those who do not wish to pursue the democratic process. I believe it to be the major problem facing the European Community.

The President-in-Office rightly stressed the need for the Community to create an economic climate in which growth can take place, because it is patent nonsense in a common market for member governments to be pursuing conflicting economic policies. This, however, is not enough to ensure that we create an

economic climate for growth; we must also consider the policies that are pursued by the Community itself. There has been a great deal of discussion about the need for reforming the common agricultural policy. There are not many people who would dispute that, but I should like to remind this House that it is specifically the poorer and more deprived areas of this Community that are the most heavily dependent on agriculture, and we must remember this important fact when considering any changes in agricultural policy. Moreover, the industrial countries who complain about the size of their budgetary payments should have it pointed out to them repeatedly that the freedom of access for their industrial goods to the markets of this Community does not cost a single penny in budgetary terms. It is therefore their duty to support other Community policies designed to help the regions that allow them this freedom of access for their industrial goods.

That means for me that changes in agriculture should be based on a more regional approach, so that the poorer regions are cushioned against the harsher effects. Indeed, if we had taken a more regional approach to agricultural policy in the recent milk disputes, I believe that areas like my own would have been saved a great deal of hardship. What I mean is quite simply that those areas of this Community which can easily switch to other agricultural products without causing any damage to either employment or other aspects of the local economy are the ones that should be penalized for overproduction; but it is a serious injustice when regions which have only one simple raw material, e.g., grass, and only two products based on that — beef and milk — are penalized for producing those very products.

As regards the other two major areas of policy — those covered by the Social and Regional Funds — the result is what can only be described as one of the great failures of this Community. The high-minded commitment in the Treaty of Rome to removing the imbalances in living standards between the different regions of this Community has clearly not been fulfilled. One of the main reasons for this is that there has been very little attempt to develop the Social and Regional Funds — supposedly the instruments for removing these imbalances — into active regional policies. I hope that the call by the President-in-Office for the development of the Social Fund into something much more than a simple training fund — that is to say, into a means of creating employment in the Community — will be followed and followed with some rigour, and that in the process there will be a much heavier concentration, particularly in the more deprived regions, upon giving assistance to small and medium-sized enterprises than, as hitherto in many regions, upon attracting multinational investment.

In the last 10 years, some 60% of all new jobs in the United States have been created in enterprises employing fewer than 20 people. It is remarkable that in the poorer areas of the European Community the corres-

## Hume

ponding figure is only 27%, so there is quite a lag to be made up and this is clearly an area to which the Social Fund could be heavily applied.

Similarly, the Regional Fund has hitherto been no more than a fund, and the first step towards turning it into a regional policy is, of course, the notion of developing integrated operations. I am very pleased that the city of Belfast should have been one of the first areas to be chosen for an experiment in this type of policy; but I should like to see that policy developed further, with integrated operations being developed for whole regions, particularly for the major urban areas, where there are serious problems arising from industrial decline, and also, of course, for rural areas within the framework of rural development programmes.

Ever since Mansholt, there has been a strong tendency in this Community to encourage people to leave the land. That is not only false on economic grounds, because people leaving the land today are simply swelling already swollen dole queues in the city, but it is also socially and culturally unacceptable to disrupt rural communities. I welcome in particular the Commission's commitment to the introduction of a new anti-poverty programme singling out those sections of society that suffer most from high unemployment, are dependent on social welfare and receive very little assistance from this Community — the elderly, the young, and the single-parent family, and I look forward to a considerable development of that programme.

Coming, as I do, from Northern Ireland, I should like to say that the continuing tragedy of Northern Ireland is an affront to the ideals on which this Community was founded, ideals which suggest that we should be doing all in our power to remove ancient quarrels. The European Parliament has already spoken eloquently on this quarrel, particularly in the Haagerup report, and I would commend the Commission's first response to that report which came a month ago. I look forward to the development of that response, but I believe that the suggestion made by the British Labour Members, which applied to the presidency of the Commission, should receive further consideration within the Council of Ministers, precisely because if, as a Community, we are to concern ourselves with conflict situations all over the world, our first duty is to concern ourselves with those in our own midst.

Finally, we have had mentioned the wider East-West and nuclear conflicts. I take a very simple view of these matters: there is no such thing as a good nuclear weapon, and therefore nuclear weapons should be wiped out. The alternative to war must, of course, be a political one, and we should never forget that the original purpose of this Community was to develop an alternative to war among peoples. That is the great incentive for strengthening this Community and its institutions: I would encourage the Irish presidency in

its declared intention to do so, and wish them well in the next six months.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Herman.** — (FR) Mr President of the Council, re-reading the speech you gave this morning I was staggered to see the gap between reality and words. I quote: 'It is our intention that the fullest consideration will be accorded by the Council to the opinions of Parliament'.

These are brave words that do you honour, and it is not my intention now to question the good intentions of the Irish Presidency which, I know, means to promote the interests of Europe. But, on the basis of what we know, I have to say that it is a long distance between the cup and the lip.

Some time ago, after a detailed and thorough study, the validity of which has not been questioned, this Parliament took the trouble to put forward interesting proposals on two matters which are of particular concern to us: monetary integration and economic recovery. We have still to receive the slightest reaction from the Council. May I ask you what you intend to do? Have you studied the proposals? When and where? And, in the light of your encouraging statements, may we hope that, taking advantage of the approaching holiday period, you will see to it that these documents are looked into and that you will let us know what you think of them and what you mean to do?

If now, passing from the Parliament to the Commission, I look again at your speech, I find that you await new proposals from the Commission on research and the new technologies. Well, to my knowledge, the Commission's shelves are bulging with proposals — some of them very interesting and very important — which the Council has not accepted or which are still waiting for an answer.

What is the point of asking the Commission for new proposals when those which have been put before you are still waiting for action? We should like to be able to take you at your word and we are counting on you to change things so that we may soon hear the good news of action you intend to take on proposals from Parliament and the Commission.

In closing, I should like to reiterate the question that my colleague, Lord Douro put this morning: How much credence should we give to the statements by Presidency of the Council. I am not speaking of yours; I mean the previous one. After Fontainebleau a document was published stating, of course, that the Council had agreed that measures be taken to complete the financial year 1984 and provide finance for the policies in course of implementation. The fly-leaf of that document bears a little paragraph which says: 'Sections 1, 2 and 4 have been debated and approved by the Council,

**Herman**

but Section 3 — and that is the one to which I am referring — is published on the sole authority of the Presidency'.

I don't know what you think of this, but I must say that for Parliament this is well nigh intolerable. We can't be told that the Council has taken certain decisions and be informed in the same document that the Council has considered and taken decisions on other sections, but not on that one. You really must take some account both of the searching for information which you force on us and of the reaction of public opinion and of the media to the way you act. It is part of the process of the building of Europe. In the future you really must be careful to avoid this kind of ambiguity and tell us clearly what is the Council's position, because it is of immediate and great importance.

**Mr Seligman.** — Mr President, I want to make three particular points. First, I want to comment on Mrs Hoff's speech and resolution on the budgetary situation. Running the Community on a day-to-day basis is not something that a Parliament of 434 people can do. The Fontainebleau compromise was difficult enough with ten people bargaining: it is not something that 434 people could do anything like as well. So let us not try and run this Community from Parliament on a day-to-day basis! That Parliament should try and use its powers to decide or at least influence basic policy, yes, but that Parliament should try back-seat driving on a day-to-day basis, no! Let us leave the Fontainebleau success intact. Nibbling at it as mice nibble at the insulation on wire is very dangerous. It could set Europe on fire again. So let us leave Fontainebleau as it was — a great success.

The second point: Mrs Veil wanted to introduce proportional representation for Britain. Is it not strange that not enough voters in any one of the 39 seats contested by the Alliance thought that the Alliance candidate was good enough to represent them in the European Parliament? We have seen the disadvantage of proportional representation in this new Parliament itself. See how many previous national delegations to this Parliament have been swept aside *in toto*, without even consulting the voters in some cases, and replaced with a completely new list by the party managers themselves! Now that is not something we like. We must find some way, if there are to be lists, of compiling those lists so as to incorporate the influence of the will of the people. Perhaps as American primaries are managed — something on those lines. Then we might find proportional representation a little easier to support. When proportional representation was discussed in this Parliament previously, my group were prepared to support the additional-member system on the lines of the German national elections, in which, as you know, a small proportion of the seats are allocated in proportion to the total votes cast. Now that is something we might be prepared to support. We certainly would not support national lists or regional lists. We

want something which is still based on constituencies, but reflects the opinion of minorities.

Finally, on a less serious note, Commissioner Dalsager said that intervention will only apply to male beef. Now what is the difference between male and female beef, Mr Commissioner? What is the justification for this sexual discrimination?

**Mr Pranchère.** — (FR) Mr President, after the comments of our colleague Danièle de March on the Fontainebleau summit, I shall confine myself, at the start of the Irish Presidency, to a few words about the situation of family farm-holdings.

That situation is catastrophic. The incomes of small dairy farmers are crumbling. The milk quotas, which are simply intolerable in France, while they prevent young people taking up agriculture, promote concentration and do not affect the productive potential of large 'milk factories'. It is the stock-farmers who suffer. Let me give just one example: in the beef market which has been undermined by mass slaughtering of dairy cattle and improper imports, there has been a fall in prices to 73% of the guidance price. In the wine market it is 70%. This is an intolerable state of affairs and we demand that the Commission take much more effective steps to ensure that the prices and the guarantees — already, alas, quite inadequate — agreed in March 1984 are observed.

Working farmers have to protest all the more vigorously because — according to Mr Dalsager's statement — the Commission is not sympathetic while the Council is giving way to Mrs Thatcher's new manipulations.

This Parliament must have put before it budget proposals on expenditure for the common agricultural policy for 1984. This is why, unlike Mr de la Malène, we have refused to vote a blank cheque for the Council.

More fundamentally, the real modernization of the CAP still remains to be done: the March 1984 agreement and the Fontainebleau summit have not brought it nearer.

As regards Community preference, it must be said that the EEC remains the dumping-ground for American agricultural surpluses. Imports of concentrated feeds alone, which are mostly transformed in the milk factories, account for 15 million tonnes of milk. The Community budget loses between two and four thousand million ECUs in customs duty exemptions.

And as for uniform prices — in the Federal Republic of Germany monetary compensatory amounts, which have been modified, but not eliminated, have been immediately replaced by VAT exemptions — a compensatory mechanism for which the Treaties do not provide!

**Pranchère**

There is talk of financial solidarity, but the compensation to the United Kingdom is costing us another thousand million ECUs, which would pay for an increase of 8% in guaranteed agricultural prices.

We are still waiting for an exports policy.

Finally, the cost and the consequences of enlargement — which we are against, but which has been approved in fact, even in the RPR's resolution, Mr de la Malène! — are going to fall heavily on the French farmer.

The French Communists and Allies will continue to defend the incomes and the interests of the agricultural workers on family holdings, for this form of farming is essential for maintaining a high quality of output, providing employment and preserving the way of life of our countries.

**Mrs Salisch.** — (DE) Mr President, colleagues! I should like to speak on one of the priority matters mentioned by the President-in-Office of the Council in his speech yesterday, namely the employment situation.

We are of course very happy that the Irish Presidency places so much importance on combating unemployment. Naturally we are also pleased that the Irish Minister for Employment will seek increased cooperation with us in committee. I should just like to say to the Council that we are gradually becoming suspicious when we hear repeatedly at the start of each Council Presidency that the main task is to persevere in the battle against unemployment. Since we started hearing these promises from the Council the figures for unemployment in Europe have more than doubled! And they are still rising. I sometimes wonder whether the Council will eventually develop lockjaw as a result of constantly muttering that it will do something, when in fact nothing happens in the end. As I said, we take the promises of the Irish President in the spirit in which they are made and hope — given goodwill — that the other members of the Council will show the same sense of commitment.

I have already said that there has been little improvement in the unemployment situation in Europe in recent years, the unemployment figures are rising. The Council's employment programme would have to be very long and very comprehensive, because when I think of all the things outstanding, I do not know what should be tackled first.

There is still a proposal for joint action to reduce working hours in Europe. You know that a majority of this Parliament placed particular importance on this question. We do not expect the Council to put off the question of common rules on working hours for ever, as wage agreements in the individual Member States will inevitably be affected if we do not aim for some joint procedure.

The next unfinished item on the Council's desk is the Vredeling directive. Unfortunately I did not hear anything about it in yesterday's speech by the Minister, Mr Barry. It would be nice if we could learn from the Irish Presidency whether it intends to take up the Vredeling directive — which concerns workers' rights of co-determination —, to deal with it, and if possible pass it.

The next point which has to be attended to: the question of eliminating unemployment among young people. What I said just now about lockjaw must be particularly applicable here. What a lot of proposals we made! In spite of that it is obvious that very little has happened for young people in Europe. The unemployment figures for them are rising too and in them — this is a point which cannot be stressed enough — the number of long-term unemployed who have no prospect of employment is mounting steadily. Naturally the Socialist Group and I are aware that a country like Ireland knows that this is a burning issue. Many people here in Europe are wondering whether it can be assumed that people willingly accept unemployment as their lot, or whether there will be an explosion somewhere which will shake our democratic system, if unemployment continues as it is. We do now have Member States where there have been explosions because those affected obviously are no longer content with their lot. We *must* be concerned about it, we cannot be indifferent to it. It is imperative that the Council of Ministers take action here.

I expect that note will be taken of the plans submitted by this Parliament and that the Member States will in fact adopt co-ordinated measures to fight the problem of youth unemployment in all the countries.

Next item on the agenda: fight against unemployment amongst women. I confess that I enjoy raising this point, because it shows how much Parliament has achieved here, although the same cannot be said for the Council of Ministers. Female unemployment: I was slightly disappointed that the Council representative did not tell us yesterday that the Irish Presidency would view the question of equal rights for women in employment as a priority matter. It is something I would wish for, and hope that it will be mentioned in reply. This brings us to a rather delicate matter, namely the fact that the Council of Ministers instructed the Commission to withdraw the directive on voluntary part-time work, which is of vital importance for women, and to convert it into a mere recommendation. We in Parliament should like to hear more about this as well, because we should like to know whether we are to be consulted again and what progress is being made on these matters which are so important to women. It is unacceptable for women to be driven out of the labour market and to be deprived of equal rights in the face of an economic crisis. But we see that in many Member States there are at least attempts to push women out of the labour market

**Salisch**

because it is thought that this will provide an easier way out of the unemployment problem.

These are a few of the points which should be raised here. For me the most serious item is this: whilst we are listening to the sometimes rather touching declarations by the Council that unemployment is the central theme which has to be dealt with, we find that suddenly these golden words are worthless if the Council, and the Commission as well, is in a mess because there is no longer enough money. Then it is quite evident that no-one has any compunction about, for example, dipping into the coffers of the European Social Fund. Suddenly no-one has any compunction about holding up resources which are urgently needed for combating unemployment, in order to finance the surpluses from agricultural production. It is a scandal! We must say so and say so clearly.

The Council of Ministers ought to know that it is not possible to play pick-a-stick with cooked spaghetti, that it is not possible to say on the one hand that the problem is being tackled and on the other to cut back the resources which could be used to overcome it!

**Mr Langes.** — (DE) Mr President, colleagues! I shall take my cue from Mrs Salisch and take up immediately the theme which was a central point both for Mr FitzGerald and here this morning: the question of the Community's finances.

It is after all very difficult for the citizens and voters of Europe to understand why the European Community is for ever fighting over financial problems. Compared, for instance, with the budget of a region — in my case North-Rhine Westphalia in the Federal Republic of Germany — these financial problems are in fact very small. If the European Community is concerned primarily with monetary questions which it is unable to resolve, it is a very sad affair. My thanks therefore go to the Irish President of the Council, who said quite calmly and clearly that we really must tackle this problem.

On the one hand we know that we have a deficit this year and that it must be made good. There has to be a supplementary budget. We also have a duty to draw up a new budget for 1985 and we know that as a result of a decision of the Council of Ministers we have to make do with one per cent value added tax. Everybody knows that that is impossible. In addition we are faced with an existing demand — I say this to my Conservative friends here in the Chamber — which I am certain comes from the right and which we Christian Democrats have supported, that a certain imbalance must be equalised and that we — the European Community — therefore have to provide a certain amount of compensation for the United Kingdom.

But it is also our duty as a Parliament to act as house-keepers, and we have to recognise that at the moment

our house is not in order. We therefore expect the United Kingdom to accept that we acknowledge and recognise its claim, but that at the present time it cannot be met because of the financial situation, not least because so far the United Kingdom is the only country which has prevented the hole in the 1984 budget from being stopped up. I believe our Conservative colleagues — and those of the Labour Party — will very quickly understand that the Commission must be given the opportunity to obtain revenue this year, but it was our Conservative colleagues who prevented this decision from being taken here as a matter of urgency. You said, we shall do it in September. Agreed; we shall discuss the supplementary budget and the, as I see it, justifiable claim of the United Kingdom in September. We cannot give away money when we know that there will be none left in two days' time. The Irish Presidency can depend on the Christian Democracy entirely. We are prepared to do our duty as a Parliament, after the Council has failed to do its duty and did not succeed in solving this problem at Fontainebleau; even if the final declaration from Fontainebleau does make it appear to have been solved. Even the Irish Prime Minister had to admit that it obviously had not been resolved, as can be seen now from the United Kingdom. That is why we are prepared for very stormy times in September and October, because we shall have to solve a whole host of financial problems. You may rest assured of our constructive cooperation.

A heartfelt plea to the people of the United Kingdom: let the people of your country help the European Community find a truly acceptable solution to this problem.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**Mr O'Donnell.** — Mr President, I should like at the outset to welcome Mr Barry as President-in-Office and to wish him very well in the onerous and very difficult task which lies before him in the months ahead. As a former ministerial colleague of Mr Barry's, I am very well aware of his strong personal commitment to Europe. I am confident that his term of office will further enhance his reputation, well established in Ireland, as a man of action, as a man who can make decisions and, what is more important, can get them implemented.

Ireland has assumed the presidency at a time when this Community is at the crossroads, at a time when major and far-reaching decisions have to be taken if this Community is to survive, to develop and to expand. In the course of his very comprehensive and informative address this morning, the President-in-Office has spelled out in detail the major and most urgent problems which have to be tackled. With a view to reaching the best possible solutions to these problems, the President-in-Office very rightly lays especial emphasis on the need to establish the best possible working relationship between the Council and this Parliament.



### O'Donnell

The magnitude of the problems facing this Community at the present time makes it imperative that the various institutions work together in a concerted and determined effort to find the most effective answers to these problems. This Parliament, composed as it is of the directly-elected representatives of the people of Europe, can and will, if given the opportunity, make a major contribution to the relaunching of this Community in fulfilment of the Stuttgart mandate.

The views expressed by Mr Barry on the rôle of this Parliament are therefore especially welcome at this most critical time in the Community's history. Signposting the road ahead, the President-in-Office gave top priority to what must rightly be regarded as a *sine qua non* for the future progress and development of this Community. That is the need to ensure the proper and adequate financing of the Community in the years ahead. We must be realistic and face the fact that this Community can make no real progress if it is to continue to drift from one financial crisis to another as has been the case for far too long now.

We are faced with the imminent enlargement of this Community. We are faced with the frightening spectre of growing unemployment as well as ever-widening regional disparities within this Community. We need a common transport policy and a Community energy policy, to mention but a few of the areas demanding urgent attention. All these and the other problems facing this Community can only be tackled effectively with the availability of adequate financial resources. It is our earnest wish that the hopes and aims of the Irish presidency in respect of the present budgetary problems and the future financing of the Community will be achieved.

The Members of this Parliament will, I am sure, be very pleased that the Irish presidency has placed special emphasis on the need to formulate and implement a new dynamic Community policy to tackle the serious unemployment situation which confronts us. Both Dr FitzGerald and Mr Barry laid stress on the obvious need for collective Community action rather than a continuation of unilateral national action. This Community has immense potential resources, human as well as physical. There is no doubt whatsoever that concerted Community action directed to the full development of this potential can successfully meet the almost daunting challenge of creating full employment for our people in the years ahead.

The President-in-Office has referred to several areas of Community policy. I wish, however, to direct his attention to an area of Community policy which demands immediate attention. I am referring to the need for the Council to give the green light for the implementation of the new guidelines for a Community regional policy which were proposed by the Commission in the autumn of 1981 and unanimously approved by this Parliament in April 1982. These

guidelines have not yet been approved by the Council of Ministers.

It is an unfortunate fact that since the establishment of this Community almost a quarter of a century ago, the rich regions have become richer while the poor have become poorer. The new guidelines on regional policy approved by this Parliament in 1982 constitute the first major attempt to formulate a coherent European regional policy, and I think it is indeed regrettable that the Council of Ministers so far have failed to give approval to these new guidelines. I therefore earnestly urge my parliamentary colleague, the present President-in-Office, to ensure that the Council loses no further time in implementing the new guidelines for a coherent regional policy for this Community, a policy which is so badly needed.

**Mr Antoniazzi.** — (IT) Mr President, Mr President of the Council of Foreign Affairs of the Community, ladies and gentlemen, in my speech during the general debate on the Fontainebleau Summit yesterday, when replying to President FitzGerald, who was reporting to the Assembly on behalf also of his colleagues, I did not fail to express my disappointment at what we were told, in an understandably emasculated form, about a meeting chaired by President Mitterand himself.

After Athens, Brussels and Stuttgart, Fontainebleau is yet another part of a dimly-lit scenario, shrouded in shadow, that was created by the Governments, who continue however to betray the spirit and the substance of the commitments and prospects of the Community. Today, Foreign Minister, over and above the ritual utterances that now no longer impress anyone, you have given us confirmation of what we feared and what we thought. Naturally we are not criticizing you personally — we hold you in respect, and know you to be a 'good European' — we are criticizing the role you play. You are not speaking personally: you speak at the start of a six-months' term of office during which you will undoubtedly attempt to improve the situation, but you are restricted in what you do by what the other nine partners think.

In your speech you touched on the usual questions of cooperation in international policy which repeat some good intentions that we share on the question of peace, which is to be achieved by means of joint agreements to tackle the problems of the Middle East, Lebanon, the Iraq-Iran conflict, East-West relations, the still worrying picture of Afghanistan and Poland, and Latin America, with its movements and the praise-worthy initiatives of the Contadora group. North-South relations should be buttressed by the strengthening of Community policies in that direction, and the commitment to implement all the dispositions of the final Act of Helsinki — within the framework also of the CSCE Conference — should be put into further effect.

**Antoniazzi**

The internal problems of the Community are referred to in your speech in terms only of hopes, which are certainly sincere but represent nothing concrete. You asked for collaboration from Parliament. We have given you this collaboration over a long period, but does not the Council itself feel it should collaborate with Parliament? The enormous number of resolutions that we have sent to the Council, without any reply, shows us that it is the Council that does not collaborate, does not wish to collaborate with us. Take care, therefore, Mr President, with regard to invocations that remain pure rhetoric unless they are matched by the facts!

You said that the budget remains a thorny question. Of course: with a one per cent ceiling, how can we think of new Community policies, if we haven't enough resources even for the policies that are in force? You give us confirmation of this yourself, when you tell us that, unfortunately, no solutions have been found. The problems to be solved are of two kinds: firstly, they are of a political — legal and political — cultural nature, and here we have to take steps with changes to the institutions, which you have not given sufficient mention to, thereby proving that the Council is still making no move towards the aim of political Union. Secondly, they are of a socio-economic and legal character, and on this point there are no adequate proposals for employment, economic and monetary policy, research, the extension of the Mediterranean policy, energy, human rights, and so on.

Mr President, yours is the eleventh Presidency-in-Office of the Council of Ministers during the existence of the European Parliament, which was elected by direct universal suffrage. I am recalling this fact in order to tell the Council of Ministers very frankly that, since we have been directly elected by 300 million citizens we cannot betray a mandate that carries with it the commitment to take action to change systems and procedures: we cannot make progress on European lines if those elected by the people have not the power to manage Europe politically.

Minister, if the Council will not adapt itself to these needs, it will be the beginning of a tough period in relations between our institutions. The confidence that we have in you allows us the hope that things will improve during the six months of your Presidency. We express this hope for you, for us, and for Europe, as a point of equilibrium in a better, more peaceful international relationship.

**Mr Pfennig.** — (DE) Mr President, colleagues! I should like to speak, as some of my colleagues have already done, on the financial aspects of the Fontainebleau summit. The summit made it clear that we are having to pick up the bill now, for 1984 and 1985, for the fact that the Council has let things slide for so long. In 1981 we, as the European Parliament, made proposals for the future of the European Community

budget. We said then that a system must finally be found which makes clear which exchequer — the national or the European — is responsible for what expenditure and what its obligations are; a system of financial equalisation must be found, based on objective criteria, to equalise through the expenditure side of the budget any budgetary imbalance which is to the disadvantage of one Member State. We did in fact specify which areas in our opinion were European obligations and should be financed out of the European budget. I can only remember that, for example, item 15 of the relevant resolution listed the area Space — satellite technology — communications.

At Fontainebleau the Council concluded — it is virtually the first sentence in the financial decisions — that a permanent balance could be achieved only through the expenditure side of the budget. It agreed, therefore, with what the European Parliament had decided was right years ago.

Now the Council is doing the exact opposite of what it decided there. It is not a question of restructuring the expenditure side of the budget, or — to give another concrete example — financing a future European space or satellite policy through the European budget. No, it is to be financed on the basis of agreements between the Member States concerned. Nobody is taking the trouble to finance anything through the European Community budget, or, in other words, to assign new tasks to the European Community. Consequently it is not possible to equalise the imbalance which is disadvantaging one Member State, because we still abide by the old system under which agriculture is the main burden on the budget. Consequently there had to be an apparent system of equalisation on the income side of the budget which, if it enters into force in its present form, would for the first time present us with a situation where the citizens of one Member State contribute only a 33% rate of tax to the Community share of tax revenue. In that way we are creating for the first time a system under which the Community knowingly allows unequal treatment of citizens in tax matters.

The worst thing is that these decisions are not even uniformly interpreted by all the Member States. It is for example not at all clear whether these equalisation arrangements are confined to the three years up to 1987 or whether they are to apply *ad infinitum*? On this point the Council's proposal does not provide for any time limit. It is also not clear when this is to apply, and it now appears — if I have understood the latest Council decisions correctly — that it is not even clear whether equalisation funds for the 1984 and 1985 budgets are to be provided by advances from the national exchequers. To me this does not appear to be a particularly good solution. Some people are already saying that one member is obviously trying to deceive the other members a second time by consciously trying to misunderstand decisions.

**Pfennig**

I do not want to go that far, but let me say quite clearly that as far as it is in its power to do so, the European Parliament will not allow this. I also say equally clearly that we shall not allow a system which is intended only as an equalising measure for a transitional period, and which knowingly results in unequal treatment of citizens of the Community in fiscal matters, to become a permanent system in the future. If we allowed that, the result would be that in the absence of any further development of ideas the Community would very quickly be able to close down because the other Member States would demand that what applies to one Member State also apply to them.

We of the European Parliament shall have to take care that this does not become the permanent state of the Community.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**IN THE CHAIR: MR SEEFELD***Vice-President*

**Mr Sutra.** — (FR) Mr President, just a few words to put a question to Commissioner Tugendhat.

According to the Fontainebleau agreement the refund to the United Kingdom this year has been fixed by the Member States as a lump sum. Next year it is to be determined as a percentage of the Community budget and of our expenditure.

By refusing a supplementary budget this year and thus ensuring that 1984 expenditure will be transferred to 1985, the United Kingdom is clearly seeking to increase the 1985 budget and thereby raise the refund that it expects in 1985.

The European Parliament and its Committee on Budgets will oppose — by a very large majority, I trust — such a procedural fraud. I feel that the Commission ought, through you, as Commissioner for the Budget, to tell us in the most formal terms that it is now undertaking to see that in no circumstances the amounts carried over from 1984 to 1985 can be subject to rebate.

**Mr Seligman.** — Mr President, on a point of order. Mr Sutra seems mixed up about our wanting a larger budget in 1985 to get a bigger rebate, but we should also have to pay a lot more money, so it is not a sensible argument. It should be refuted.

**Mr Tugendhat,** *Vice-President of the Commission.* — Mr President, we have had a long debate. It has ranged over many subjects. Honourable Members

have talked about unemployment, they have talked about electoral systems, Central America, budgetary matters. I think it would be impossible for me to reply, without taking almost as long as the debate has taken, to all the points that have been raised. Therefore, at this late hour I will not attempt to do so.

I would, if I may, just like to make one general reflection. It is this: that I do hope, having listened to the speeches made in the Chamber over many hours, that honourable Members of all parties will speak in the same terms in their own countries, in their own constituencies, in their own parties at home as they have been speaking here. I have often been struck during the period of the last Parliament by the extent to which there is so often a very wide measure of agreement within this Chamber regardless sometimes of party, regardless sometimes of nationality. Yet, as the elections clearly showed, that wide measure of agreement on priorities and on objectives that is felt in this Parliament and is indeed felt in the European institutions as a whole is not reflected in the domestic debates, is not reflected in the domestic public opinion.

Clearly, at the end of five years, this Parliament will be judged in part by what it achieves within the context of the Community, by what it achieves in terms of its relationship with the other Community institutions, the Council and the Commission. But in the long run, I think that this Parliament, the second directly-elected European Parliament, and indeed the other Community institutions during the coming five years will primarily be judged by their success in converting public opinion in our various Member States to the same views as those which are expressed so eloquently and on which agreement is so widespread within this Chamber and within the other European institutions.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

*7. Sakharov*

**President.** — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-379/84/rev.) by Mr Formigoni and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party on leaving an empty seat in the Chamber of the European Parliament for Andrei Sakharov.

**Mr Formigoni.** — (IT) Mr President, the meaning of our motion is as follows: the European Parliament has undertaken, amongst others, a task for which it is responsible to the peoples of Europe: the task of being a factor for peace, and working for peace. But peace can only be authentic when it is founded on the respect of certain unrenounceable values — freedom, justice and

**Formigoni**

the search for truth. Peace, therefore, cannot be separated from respect for the rights of man and peoples.

There are many countries in Europe and many situations in the world where these fundamental rights are not respected. Where thousands of men and women see their own rights to live and to freedom of thought, conscience and religion ridden over roughshod. This — as I was saying — happens in many countries, in Europe and in the rest of the world. Inside Europe the fate of many Soviet citizens and citizens of other countries in Eastern Europe is a source of particular concern — citizens that we know are imprisoned because of their ideas or their religious beliefs. Or even citizens about whom nothing more is heard.

In 1975 the Helsinki Treaty was signed: it was signed by all the countries of Europe, excepting Albania. The Helsinki Treaty guarantees, amongst other things, the free circulation of men and ideas, and the right of the individual to know and act upon his rights and duties in relation to living and working conditions.

Our proposal to leave an empty seat in the Chamber of the European Parliament for Andrei Sakharov is a proposal to hand over, symbolically, to Andrei Sakharov, a post in representation of all those that suffer, in the world, for their own ideas.

We know that other men are suffering on this account in Latin American and Central American countries, or in Africa or the Far East. We are proposing the seat for Andrei Sakharov because there is no news of his fate, and that is something, of which we all feel the need, and which we want to have. Andrei Sakharov represents all of these people: Andrei Sakharov was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace: since 1980 he has been banned from leaving the city of Gorki, and from having any contact with the press. We know that he started a hunger strike, and there has been no further news of him for several months. That is why we are asking the President of the Parliament to ask the Soviet Government officially for news of his fate, and why we call on the Parliament to leave an empty seat in the Chamber in his name. Finally, we ask the European Parliament to send a delegation to the Soviet Union, to the city of Gorki, to announce this resolution in person to the one whom it concerns.

Finally, we should like to ask the President of the Parliament to forward this resolution, for information, to the Council and the Commission.

*(Applause from the Centre and the Right).*

**Mr Hänsch.** — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! Over recent years the Socialist Group has taken up the fate of Andrei Sakharov in the Soviet Union in a whole series of motions for resolutions, and we of this House have repeatedly united in our concern over his fate. I should like to remind my colleagues that we

have introduced a total of 15 motions — I once counted them — taking up the fate of Andrei Sakharov. In the last 18 months we have had three debates on Andrei Sakharov and violations of human rights in the Soviet Union. The last debate in this House was two months ago, no more. I should like to ask whether we are really helping Andrei Sakharov and reinforcing and furthering the influence of this House on European political cooperation and on the foreign ministers by holding a Sakharov debate every two months.

First of all I should like to explain once more on behalf of the Socialist Group that we are calling on the Government of the Soviet Union to free the scientist and Nobel prizewinner Andrei Sakharov, a defender of freedom and human rights, an old and sick man, and to allow him and his wife to live wherever they please.

And because we of the Parliament are today only reaffirming a position taken many times over past years, we expressly welcome and support the clear way in which the French President François Mitterand spoke out for Sakharov in Moscow. We are also solidly behind any efforts by the Heads of State and of Government and by the Foreign Ministers to alter and improve Sakharov's lot.

We want these efforts to continue: on behalf of Sakharov, as well as on behalf of all the other defenders of freedom and human rights, not just in the Soviet Union, but in all other parts of the world as well.

Nevertheless we are unable to support and endorse our colleague's motion that a seat be left vacant in the Chamber. I should like to remind you that during the last Parliament we not only discussed, but decided by a majority of the House to leave a seat vacant for those European States which are not members of the Community. I wonder what happened to that majority decision? It has vanished somewhere! And, colleagues, I prophesy to you now: the same thing will happen to this idea of an empty seat for Sakharov! The ridicule to which Parliament is exposing itself will be even greater. It is doing nothing but generate hot air.

We want to help Andrei Sakharov. We genuinely want to help him, but we are not interested in a cheap show with an empty seat — and that is what this motion is. For this reason we — the Socialist Group — shall not support 1. and 2. of your motion for a resolution.

*(Applause from the Left)*

**Mr Gerontopoulos.** — (GR) Mr President, I agree entirely with the proposal by our colleague Mr Formigoni. However, I would like to see its scope enlarged. I propose that the empty seat should be dedicated to the citizens of Eastern Europe. As was also said by Mrs Patenotre, who presided over our inaugural part-session, the people of Eastern Europe have their place

**Gerontopoulos**

in our great European family. Personally, I believe that only with their participation will the ideal of European Union be fully realised. It does not matter that the dictatorial structure of their government today constitutes an insuperable barrier to their assumption of their rightful place. Tomorrow, when those peoples gain their freedom, it is certain that one of their first acts will be to apply to join the European Community, in which of course they will be very welcome.

I therefore ask that a seat be held waiting for them.

**Mr Segre.** — (IT) Mr President, yesterday, in his first speech in the Chamber, the new General Secretary of our Party, Mr Natta, emphasized once again that we Italian Communists attribute a universal value to democracy.

This is a political fact — or rather, an ethical and political fact — that is for us essential, and cannot be renounced. Hence the importance that we have always attributed to the question of the rights of man and peoples, an importance that we shall continue to insist on attributing to it, because this world, which is moving towards a new century and a new millennium, is still a long way — and it is perhaps becoming ever further — from being a world free from oppression, from constraints, from fear, need and poverty.

In this context we place the protest that we have always raised against the state of isolation in which Andrei Sakharov is held, as well as our solidarity with the great scientist. We emphasize again today, strongly, this protest and this solidarity.

We do not suffer from any political squint, and we look at all the different facts of life with the same objectivity. This, if I may be allowed to say so, is our great strength, a serious political strength, untouched by demagogical stresses, convinced of the supremacy of politics over propaganda, and bent on seeking concrete results.

Now it does not seem to us that Mr Formigoni's motion can improve Andrei Sakharov's lot. In the last Parliament it was already decided — as Mr Hänsch has just recalled — to leave an empty seat for the European countries that do not belong to the European Community. But, Mr President, can we go on adding empty seats in this Parliament whenever we want? We, at all events, shall not take this course, and we shall not, for example, propose — just to keep the question to Europe and a country associated with the EEC — an empty seat for Turkey...

*(Applause from the benches of the Communist Group)*

... until the time comes when there are no more death sentences and persecutions in that country, even though we shall continue firmly in this and in every other case to fight for the respect of the rights of man.

We are convinced that this Parliament of ours has a great and noble function to discharge in this connection: and it will only discharge that function fully if it moves in a sphere of firm, constant, consistent, universal appeal to the great principles of freedom, deriving thereby moral strength and also a real capacity for political impact.

For these reasons, whilst emphasizing again our solidarity with Andrei Sakharov, we consider it wiser to abstain from a vote that adds nothing and might perhaps to some extent prejudice, in some way or other, the efforts that are being made in different forms in a number of quarters to improve the future lot of this cultured man, whose commitment we regard with profound admiration.

*(Applause from the Left).*

**Mr Deniau.** — (FR) Mr President, may I, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, say a few words on this very important and sensitive question, with all the modesty becoming a new Member, though a rather mature one.

I am thoroughly convinced that it is our mission — Parliament's and Europe's — to concern ourselves with this type of question, and to concern ourselves actively. No country is great unless it is greater than what it is. The Europe that we are trying to build will not be the Europe of our dreams unless it can concern itself with facts and problems which are beyond it. The problem of Andrei Sakharov is precisely the type problem that is of direct interest to us as Europeans. I also feel that in this sphere symbols have their importance. The worst that can happen is silence. And in a battle such as that for Andrei Sakharov we should remember that it is our duty not to be silent and that we must ensure a consistency and a discipline in our actions.

Mr President, on behalf of my group and in my own name I declare that the resolution before us is fully consonant with our aims and our role.

On the other hand, I should be happy if paragraph 2 of the resolution could be left out. I feel that at all stages in this battle we should look for the most serious the most practical, and the most striking gesture — for symbols have their importance — but one which at the same time can be put into effect.

Quite frankly, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am not convinced that an empty seat is the best way to achieve the end we seek.

Dare I say it, Mr President, with no ironic intent on the part of a new Member: probably it is the filled seat, rather than an empty one that draws most attention. And this, unfortunately, is equally true of many of our meetings.

**Deniau**

I should also like this not to be just a transitory gesture, but for action to follow. May I, on behalf of the Liberal Group, table an amendment? What I should like is that we try — with the agreement of the authors of the resolution, of course to transform this text, by setting aside for the time being paragraph 2, into something positive. I should like to take up the idea put forward by my Italian colleagues, Mr Gawronski and Mr Bettiza and take this opportunity to set up a European Parliament Prize, which would be called 'The Andrei Sakharov European Prize of the European Parliament'. This prize would be granted each year in the sphere which is that in which Andrei Sakharov is waging his struggle. It might include the application of the Helsinki agreements and East-West relations, intellectual achievements, scientific research, spiritual freedom, the conformance of constitutional practice to the written constitution — in a word, topical subjects of present times. This decision would have to be taken each year, Mr President.

I feel that in this way we would ensure continuity and we would be doing something positive by giving further substance to the symbol and to the gesture that we want to make.

(Applause)

**Mr Carignon.** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I just want to second, on behalf of my group, the proposal before us. It is purely symbolic but it is very important. We wish to second it for two reasons.

First, this Parliament has already, to its honour, held debates and intervened in a substantial way in the area of human rights. Outside, these debates and statements have produced a considerable effect. And like Mr Deniau, I do not think that we should stop half-way.

Secondly, as the author of the resolution has reminded us, human rights are being trampled on in many countries of the world, and particularly in those of Eastern Europe. We must not, by remaining silent, give the impression that we condone or acquiesce in this situation.

For these two reasons we support the motion for a resolution and consider it very important. We feel that it is important for the European Parliament to adopt it. In doing so, it will show that it is not indifferent to this fundamental question which concerns us here in the free part of Europe and it will demonstrate that we are alert to all infringements of human rights anywhere.

**Mr Schwalba-Hoth.** — (DE) Mr President, colleagues! As new members of a Group which is new here we were surprised by this resolution. We are very sensitive on this matter, not just because of our poli-

tics, but because of the reception we were given. First of all we were put on the outside row, we have not been allowed a vice-president, and we have just found out that we are not to have the chairmanship of any committee.

If we look at this motion we have to ask ourselves whether it is really because we are new that we are surprised by the motion? Or does it conceal something else? To us this motion appears to be just another way of perpetuating the cold war, as though a certain aim is being pursued, which has nothing to do with Sakharov. We have all seen in recent years what comes of one-sided support of the victims of violations of human rights. We saw it in the Federal Republic of Germany: there was support, even in the CDU, for the independent freedom movement in the German Democratic Republic. When these people were able to leave the GDR for the Federal Republic — what happened then? They were dropped like hot potatoes, because after emigrating to the *so-called* golden west they did not desist from their ideas of overthrowing the system. Or look what happened with the Solidarity movement in Poland. Even the most right-wing Christian Democrats say that it is something they must support. But can anyone imagine that there would be such strong approval if these ideas were to be advocated in the West? No — at least in the Federal Republic of Germany — there would be bans on employment and serious attempts to silence these voices.

This form of double-think extends to other areas. Take right-wing propaganda for example. What is happening with Nicaragua? Lists of alleged political prisoners in Nicaragua are being circulated. It is nonsense: the people on these lists were not gaoled because of political acts, they became members of political parties after they were put in prison; and now people are acting as though they had been imprisoned because of their membership of political groups. It is quite transparent. Let us pursue this line of thought: we can draw an enormous line to include the Olympic Games, which will take place shortly. Four years ago 'Democratic' solidarity was demanding a boycott of the Olympics because of Afghanistan, but none of these so-called democrats demanded a boycott of the USA Olympics because of the invasion of Grenada! No-one mentioned it! Everyone said there had been a slight traffic accident outside the United States!

But that is double-think! And a further instance, we are all sitting here together saying how nice it is here in the Community where there are so many foreigners!

And the right-wing says, how nice, family life! But how do things look for foreigners in the Federal Republic of Germany? Foreigners must not be allowed to bring their dependants into the Federal Republic. Just imagine! Spouses from a country outside the EEC are not allowed to join their spouses in the Federal Republic.

**Schwalba-Hoth**

For these reasons — I have almost finished — we consider that this motion for a resolution is so duplicitous and has such a tactical intention that under no circumstances can we support it in this form. If you look around we have 350 to 400 vacant seats here, and they will not suffice for all those suffering under violations of human rights. We do not want to lecture you, but: if you want to intervene here on behalf of Sakharov, think of the high-security wings in Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany, think of the people occupying houses in West Berlin, who were thrown out of the 'Kuckuck' cultural centre, think of the people being tortured in Turkey. If you are thinking of them as well, then I say, okay you have credibility, we can join you in passing a resolution like this.

**Mr de Camaret.** — (FR) Mr President, I should first like, on behalf of my group, to clarify a point.

Thirty-six hours ago we tabled a priority motion for a resolution on the subject we are debating now. For what mysterious reason has this motion disappeared to return in the form of an amendment? I think it must be due to an over-zealous application of the Rules of Procedure.

I believe that our institution — and here I am at one with Mr Formigoni and, to a lesser extent, with Mr Deniau — owes it to itself and to the Sakharov family to concern itself with his case, even if it should require, not one, but fifteen resolutions, as our Socialist colleague has been saying. We have to remind the Soviet authorities that we shall give him our support on every occasion — and this sitting is such an occasion. It is a good thing to leave an empty seat. It would be even better if that seat were occupied. On that point Mr Deniau is right. At all events, if there is urgency, then there is certainly urgency about the Sakharovs, above and beyond any procedural urgencies.

For the second part of my speech I would ask you, Mr President, to give the floor to Mr Bernard Antony because according to the Rules of Procedure we are entitled to two speakers to support the amendment.

**Mr Antony.** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, clearly, the Sakharov affair is urgent. This was why our first concern was that it should be debated at the new European Parliament's first part-session. Of course, we should have wished to have our motion for a resolution debated, but we shall give our support to the one which has been tabled by the European People's Party.

Having said that, let me remind you that, if there is urgency about the Sakharov affair, it is even more urgent that we are clear about what is really at stake today — and that is the survival of Europe and the dignity of our institution, which depend on the rejection of the most thoroughly wicked regime that history has ever known.

Of course, there are and there always have been bad regimes. But we should not forget that today the gulags are a reality. The Sakharovs are the symbol, but behind them there are 15 million prisoners. And there are 150 million dead — killed by deportation or massacre in all the countries which have fallen under Communist rule.

That, we say, is what is at stake. We want the Jews, the Christians, the Moslems, and all those who are suffering in the thousands of concentration camps which are still open — in one direction only — in Eastern Europe to be set free.

To our mind, fifteen resolutions are not enough. We need twenty, we need forty. We need, above all, to have a Council of Ministers do its job, the job that the free peoples and the peoples awaiting freedom expect of it, and that is to tell the Soviet Union that it is time it joined the modern world, freeing, as a first step, the peoples that it has enslaved.

*(Applause from the extreme right)*

**Mr Ulburghs.** — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I fully endorse the motion for a resolution that has been tabled by my colleagues of the Group of the European People's Party on Andrei Sakharov. I agree that an empty chair should be set aside for him in this Chamber. But I should like to add something to this resolution, the proposal that a second empty chair should be left for someone who is the symbol of the oppressed peoples of the Third World who are struggling for their freedom and dignity. I am referring to Nelson Mandela. He is a symbol for 20 million Blacks in South Africa who are oppressed and do not have the right to make their voices heard and of 2,000 million people in the Third World who are hungry and fighting for their emancipation. We therefore wish to reiterate the same three requests in Nelson Mandela's favour. They read as follows:

The European Parliament, firstly, instructs its President to make an official request to the Governments in Pretoria and Moscow for information on the fate and health of Nelson Mandela and Andrei Sakharov; secondly, decides to leave two seats vacant in the Chamber of the European Parliament, one for Nelson Mandela and one for Andrei Sakharov; thirdly, decides to send a select delegation from the European Parliament to South Africa and the USSR to bring this resolution personally to the notice of the persons concerned.

I am prepared to be a member of this select delegation.

**President.** — Mr Ulburghs, the European Parliament has on many occasions in the past spoken about Nelson Mandela and has delivered a series of statements and opinions. You are entitled to introduce another

**President**

resolution, but I would ask you to do so in the proper manner.

**Mr Pannella.** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I feel that this proposal is certainly valuable. But frankly, I have to say to Mr Formigoni that the value seems to me a little dubious.

To present it suddenly, without a preliminary debate, without even trying to think about it together, without really trying to combat the things which we all detest, may be a brilliant stroke of partisanship but it does not seem to me to have the virtue of prudence which is essential in the service of our cause.

An empty seat? Why not? If the cause of Sakharov is important so is that of Nelson Mandela. And if that is the symbol we choose, why not provide an empty seat for the thirty million people who are killed each year through the policy of assassination by hunger? Simply because their names are not known?

Do we really want to leave to the churches alone the commemoration of the martyrdom of these victims, Mr Formigoni?

Certain contradictions were mentioned just now. When it was a question of boycotting what was largely a public relations exercise — I mean the Olympic Games — you were nearly all against it. Over Afghanistan you were anxious to save ... what? Perhaps the advertising contracts? We were the only ones in this House to remind the EPP colleagues that in France in 1936 only Pierre Mendes-France said that the Berlin Olympics should be boycotted. He was perhaps more far-sighted then than the wise realists who put their trust in the Maginot line ...

Mr President, we, like our colleagues on the right, have also drawn up a resolution which I think should be examined and discussed in the Political Affairs Committee. The aim of that resolution is not to make play with the Sakharov case but to direct our forces towards the defence of freedom and the law.

I ask Mr Formigoni, how are we to reconcile the condemnation of the missiles with the sending of thirty million tonnes of cereals to Moscow which enables the Soviet Union to use this food weapon to play its own politics of North against South, a politics of extermination?

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**Mr Alavanos.** — (GR) Mr President, this is a procedural matter relating to the Presidency. I bring it to your attention because in my opinion it is serious. We are debating the Formigoni proposed resolution, whose text states that it is put forward on the basis of Article 57 of the Rules of Procedure. The article in

question provides that urgent procedure can be proposed when Parliament's opinion is being sought by Council or by the Commission. However, no such request for an opinion has been received from either Council or the Commission. Moreover, Article 57, paragraph 5 states clearly that urgent procedure should be examined by the competent Parliamentary committee in each case. However, the committees, and specifically the Political Committee, have not yet been formed. In my opinion if we go on to take a vote on this matter, this will constitute a serious contravention by the Presidency and I do not think that is a good thing, especially at the beginning of its period in office. Besides, I think that if some people are only interested in matters of this kind and not in matters such as nuclear missiles and Europe's security and survival, they could afford to wait until the September part-session and not flaunt the Rules of Procedure in such a plain and unacceptable way.

**President.** — Mr Alavanos it has been pointed out to me that there is clearly a printing error in this motion for a resolution. It was introduced by the EPP group under Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure, and if you care to look at the Minutes of yesterday's sitting you will note that on page 6 it is stated that this motion for a resolution was tabled under Rule 48. I would ask you to note this change. There has clearly been a mistake in transcribing the motion for a resolution.

The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

**Mr Hänsch.** — (DE) Mr President, is this a new form of procedure? Surely, it has been customary hitherto to vote on urgent motions immediately after the debate?

**President.** — Mr Hänsch, the House has agreed that all votes on the topics for debate will be taken at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

**Mr Fanton.** — (FR) Mr President, I want to say something about our Assembly's working methods.

I still have the memory of an earlier Parliament in which, as far as the average Member could see, chaos was the order of the day. You never knew what was going to be debated. You came into the House: debate on a text had already started; debate on another text had unaccountably finished. The same thing is happening today. A short while ago we could see that Mr Tugendhat was down to speak after the last Member's speech. Some of us therefore assumed that Mr Tugendhat would be speaking for some time. But the next thing was that the debate was opened on the report which is now before us, though no Member



**Fanton**

who happened to be absent from the Chamber was informed of this.

Might I ask the new President and also those responsible for the administration of the House to try to make the necessary effort, to find ways of informing Members what is going on.

I know you are going to tell me that it was on the Order paper; however, it does not make it any easier to follow what is going on.

I should like to make two suggestions to the Bureau. In some national Parliaments there are slightly more modern means of announcing who the next speaker is to be than by holding up a piece of cardboard on which someone has scribbled his name. Perhaps a delegation from the Parliament, more particularly a delegation of its officials, could be sent to visit those Parliaments. They would learn more up-to-date methods there. We are sitting in a modern Chamber and it is rather ridiculous to have little bits of cardboard with someone writing up names and changing them as the proceedings continue. That is my first suggestion.

But before the matter is completed — and knowing something of the European Parliament we do not expect anything to happen quickly — perhaps some signal could be used to allow for a one-minute adjournment when one debate has finished, so that Members who are in their offices, are sitting in committees or are elsewhere can be warned that a new debate is beginning. The system of signalling the transition between two debates by means of piece of cardboard is really not good enough. Since we are now at the start of a new Parliament, I should be happy if the new Bureau and the House administration would give consideration to these humble suggestions, Mr President. If one wants to do any work in this House one must possess many virtues, not least that of patience.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Thank you for your remarks, Mr Fanton. First, with regard to Mr Tugendhat you have touched on a matter of continuing concern to us as Members. We do not know in advance whether a Commissioner will deliver a long or a short speech and our Rules of Procedure do not contain any provisions regarding the duration of the Commission's speeches. The problem is that we have no way of exactly calculating the time.

I shall be happy to forward your other proposal to the Bureau. I shall inform you and the House in due course on the Bureau's reaction to your suggestion.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(FR)* Mr President, even though it is understandable in the light of the Rules of Procedure, it is nevertheless regrettable that resolutions should automatically become amendments. If you add to this the fact that Amendments Nos 1 and 2, that is to say Mr Le Pen's and mine, have not been distributed in the Chamber, I wonder if we can still call this a debate. It's not a debate, it is a sham. We might as well vote by telephone, without any debate. They could just as well phone us, or better still the group chairmen, and get the results: 138 socialist votes, etc., I have made enquiries and I was told that the distribution could not be made because of shortage of staff. We come back again to what Mr Fanton was saying.

At any rate we shall not allow a vote to be taken until this is remedied and until the Members have their rights!

**President.** — Mr Pannella, as a Member of this House for many years you are obviously aware of the agreement whereby amendments are no longer distributed in the Chamber but at the distribution service. Every Member can find out what amendments have been tabled. If you want a different system you must request it in the proper manner and the presidency will then have to consider it. Is that in fact what you are proposing? If not, I would ask you to state clearly what you are proposing.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(FR)* Mr President, it is all in accordance with Rule 74, I have to agree with you, though I deplore it. However, it so happens this week that we are in an exceptional situation. We have at present a time limit of one month or one week for debates and urgent debates are voted late in a different context. Was it right to be voting on urgent procedures when no provision had been made for them? It was a break with the traditional interpretation of the Rules. We only have a few minutes between the reading of the resolution and the tabling of amendments.

I have this specific request: if the usual time-limits are not observed, then at least those responsible should take the trouble to distribute the amendments in the House. And let it be done, if possible, today.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, I have taken note of your request. I can only assure you that I will raise the matter with my colleagues in the Bureau.

*(The sitting was closed at 6.25 p.m.)<sup>1</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> *Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.*

## SITTING OF FRIDAY, 27 JULY 1984

### Contents

1. <i>Membership of Parliament:</i> <i>Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	116	<i>Mr de la Malène; Mr Marshall; Mr Bombard; Mr Balfe; Mr Sutra; Mr Nielsen; Mr Møller; Mr Klepsch; Mr Pearce; Mr Pannella; Mr Segre; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Formigoni; Mrs Banotti; Mr Ford</i> . . . . .	116
2. <i>Votes:</i> <i>Mr Glinne; Mr Pannella; Mr P. Beazley; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Pannella; Mr Glinne; Lord Douro; Mr Langes; Mr Balfe; Lady Elles; Mr Pfennig; Mr Prout; Mrs Castle; Lord Douro;</i>		3. <i>Adjournment of the session:</i> <i>Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	124

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*President*

*(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)<sup>1</sup>*

#### 1. *Membership of Parliament*

**President.** — The Luxembourg authorities have officially notified me of the election of Mrs Lydie Schmit to the European Parliament.

Rule 6(3) of the Rules of Procedure lays down:

Until such time as a Member's credentials have been verified or ruling has been given on any dispute, the Member shall take his seat in Parliament and on its committees and shall enjoy all the rights attaching thereto.

**Mr Pannella.** — (FR) Mr President, have we any news from the Dutch Parliament? This Assembly is still not complete.

Have we had any assurances regarding the Dutch Parliament's observance of the Treaties, Mr President?

**President.** — We have not yet received any communication on this subject. As soon as we do, I shall inform the House.

Mr Averof-Tossitsas has informed me in writing of his resignation as Member of Parliament, in conformity with the second subparagraph of Article 12(2) of the Act concerning the election of the representatives of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage.

Parliament hereby establishes that there is a vacancy and will inform the Member State concerned thereof.<sup>1</sup>

#### 2. *Votes*

**MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS: EUROPEAN COUNCIL MEETING IN FONTAINEBLEAU: — DE LA MALÈNE (DOC. 2-376/84)**

#### *Explanation of vote*

**Mr Glinne.** — (FR) Mr President, we voted against the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr de la Malène and others because recital C(b) obviously ignores the precautions taken in the Council declaration regarding

<sup>1</sup> For approval of the Minutes, see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

<sup>1</sup> For items relating to the membership of committees, the application of Rule 116 of the Rules of Procedure, and the calendar of part-sessions, see the Minutes.

**Glinne**

the conditions governing the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal.

Moreover, paragraph 2, when referring to Britain's demands, adopts a tone of which we cannot approve.

*(Parliament rejected the motion for a resolution)*

- CASTLE (DOC. 2-381/84): rejected
- ARNDT (DOC. 2-382/rev.): adopted
- HAHN (DOC. 2-383/84): adopted
- VON WOGAU (DOC. 2-384/84): adopted

\*  
\* \*

#### KLEPSCH AND SPINELLI MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS (DOCS 2-380/84 AND 2-378/84: FONTAINEBLEAU: AD HOC COMMITTEE

**President.** — On these motions for resolutions, I have received Amendment No 1/corr., seeking to replace the two motions by a new text.

**Mr Pannella.** — (FR) Mr President, we cannot carry on working in these conditions. Not only are the amendments not distributed, but they are not even to be found in our pigeon-holes, as a result of which all Members attending the sitting, when you announce an amendment that they have not heard of, will have to stand up, leave the Chamber and queue up at the documentation counter.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I am very sorry, but the documents have been put in the pigeon-holes.

**Mr Pannella.** — (FR) I deny that! I insist that we be informed by the parliamentary services. Amendments have not been put in the pigeon-holes for some months now. We have even been told that we have to go and fetch them.

**President.** — We take your point, Mr Pannella.

**Mr P. Beazley.** — Mr President, I had no papers in my box and I asked at the documentation counter immediately before this sitting. I collected all available papers, and any further papers on this were not available.

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, I was assured that the documents had been put in your pigeon-holes.

Apart from that, I must say that it is virtually impossible to distribute them in the sitting, as Mr Pannella was suggesting.

**Mrs Scrivener.** — (FR) Mr President, I wish to confirm what Mr Pannella has just said. It is perfectly true. I myself had a lot of trouble in collecting all the texts and all the amendments, and I am sure that less than half of my colleagues have a copy of the texts they are voting on. The situation is therefore far from simple, and there is no doubt there is much room for improvement in the distribution of texts and amendments.

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, to avoid any misunderstandings I wish to point out, especially for the benefit of our new colleagues, that this is what our Rules of Procedure call a compromise amendment — that is, an amendment tabled on behalf of a number of groups of this House to replace a number of other texts. This procedure is peculiar to this Parliament, and I am unaware of any cases where it exists in the national parliaments. It has the obvious advantage of making it easier to reach a fairly broad consensus in the House.

On the other hand, you will all appreciate that these compromise amendments are, by the nature of things, often drawn up and tabled very late in the day, and this may help to explain — though not to excuse — the fact that, contrary to what I had thought, their distribution has not taken place.

Since we nevertheless have to get on, I will read out the text very slowly to give the interpreters time.

First of all, this amendment has been tabled by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the EPP Group, and by Mr Cervetti, Mr di Bartolomei, Mr Gawronski, Mr Prag, Mr Spinelli, Mr Pannella and Mrs Lizin.

Mr Pannella, I suppose you are familiar with it, since you are one of the signatories.

**Mr Pannella.** — (FR) I have an interest in the fact being known.

**Mr Glinne.** — (FR) With regard to the authors, I am surprised that my name is not included. I took part in the editing of the final wording, and added my name, subject to the agreement of my group, to the original list of signatories. I have the text here in front of me.

**President.** — Very well, your name will be added as a signatory on behalf of the Socialist Group.

This is the text of the amendment:

The European Parliament,

**President**

- A. having regard to its resolution of 14 February 1984<sup>1</sup> adopting the draft Treaty on European Union;
- B. taking note of the speech made before the European Parliament on 24 May 1984 by Mr François Mitterrand, President of the European Council, and the debates on the subject of the draft Treaty on European Union in the Italian and Belgian Parliaments, the Bundestag, the Danish Parliament and within the delegations responsible for Community matters in the French National Assembly and Senate;
- C. pending the forthcoming debates in those national parliaments which have not yet expressed their views on this subject;
- D. having regard to point 7 of the final communiqué of the European Council held at Fontainebleau, which decided on the setting up of and *ad hoc* committee along the lines of the Spaak committee,
  1. calls on the Heads of State or Government of the Member States of the European Community to appoint as soon as possible their representatives on the *ad hoc* Committee on Institutional Affairs and calls on this committee to use as a basis for its work the draft Treaty establishing the European Union adopted by Parliament on 14 February 1984;
  2. requests the Council to involve the European Parliament closely with the work of this committee and calls on its President and the President of the Council to decide on the form this collaboration should take;
  3. urgently calls on the Heads of State or Government of the Community to convene a conference at the highest level, in the light of the conclusions reached by this committee, and to entrust the European Parliament with the task of finalizing, if necessary, the text of the draft treaty, taking into account the guidelines laid down by the above conference and any suggestions by the national parliaments;

**Mr Glinne.** — (FR) The text we agreed on says, 'by national parliaments', not 'by the'.

**President.** — I fail, I must say, to see the importance of this distinction, but I meant to say, 'by national parliaments'. I hardly think there can be any misunderstanding as to the meaning of this phrase.

The amendment goes on:

4. considers it important that the treaty thus drafted should be submitted without delay to the various Member States of the Community for ratification;
5. instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission of the European Communities and to the governments of the Member States.

That is the wording of this compromise amendment, which I now put to the vote.

*(Parliament adopted the compromise amendment)*

The other motions for resolutions on this subject accordingly fall.

I wish to inform the House that while the Prime Minister of Ireland, President-in-Office of the European Council, and the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers were here, I felt I ought to take the opportunity of telling them that the European Parliament would certainly be most anxious to be associated with the work of this committee, and I am gratified to see what I told these gentlemen confirmed by the vote that has just taken place.

*(Applause)*

**BARBARELLA MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (DOC. 2-377/84/REV.: COUNCIL'S RESPONSIBILITY AS REGARDS THE BUDGET): ADOPTED**

\*  
\* \*

**HOFF MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (DOC. 2-402/84: TRANSFER OF APPROPRIATIONS NO 1/84):**

**Lord Douro.** — Mr President, there are two amendments tabled to this resolution which seek to overturn the established practice and procedure of this European Parliament.

For many years, the Committee on Budgets has had delegated authority to decide on transfers out of Chapter 100 onto the spending lines. There are two amendments — one of which I am in fact in favour of, but it is the same principle — namely, Amendment No 1 and Amendment No 7, both of which seek to establish that the full Parliament should have the right to take back from the Committee on Budgets the authority to decide on transfers.

Therefore, on a point of order, I propose to you that Amendments Nos 1 and 7 are inadmissible and are out of order.

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 77, 19. 3. 1984, p. 33.

**Mr Langes.** — (DE) Mr President, I ask you to reject this proposal. There is a letter from Mr Lange, chairman of the Committee on Budgets of the old parliament, and Mrs Scrivener, our rapporteur, which says very clearly that the question of releasing these funds for Great Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany was to be laid before the newly-elected Parliament in plenary sitting. These two amendments are accordingly admissible.

**Mr Balfe.** — Mr President, I hope that you will find it possible to support the point that has been made by Lord Douro. I would stress that the only purpose that I and my friends had in tabling this amendment was to make sure that in the event of your not accepting that point of order an amendment was before the House which would enable a decision to be made which was acceptable to my friends and myself.

I believe that the precedents established and the Rules are quite clear, that both of these amendments are out of order and that if a ruling is given in another direction, we shall be setting a precedent which overturns many years of work within this Parliament.

(Applause)

**President.** — I am sorry, but I am perfectly familiar with the substantive points and the points of method that have been raised. For my part, I consider the tabling of these amendments to be in order and that, from the point of view of form, they cannot be declared inadmissible on the grounds of any practices that may have been followed in the past.

It is for the Parliament to accept them or reject them.

**Lady Elles.** — Mr President, I would just like to clarify the point raised by Mr Langes, who quite rightly said that there was a letter concerning this decision. However, I would like to inform the House, since this letter has been circulated to all Members of the House, that it says very clearly that the Committee on Budgets agreed to approve the proposal and all that the committee asked was that Parliament should take note of this agreement.

(Applause)

It is perfectly clear in the text of this letter that the decision was taken properly in due and legal form, by 20 votes to zero with two abstentions, and all that the committee required was that, in view of the importance of the matter, Parliament should take note of the committee's decision.

There is no other inference in that letter. I would therefore support Lord Douro and Mr Balfe in saying that either you accept that these two amendments are inadmissible or they are totally irrelevant to the consti-

tutional position of the Committee on Budgets in this House.

(Applause)

**President.** — I thank Lady Elles, who will recall that this matter was raised in the Bureau. The Bureau decided — unanimously, I think — to distribute the letter in question to all Members of Parliament as a working document for their information, and this, I believe, has been done. Everyone is therefore acquainted with this letter, but I cannot permit a debate to be started on the substance of the matter. It is a question of procedure pure and simple, and I insist that this exchange of views must not be allowed to go any further. I for my part consider the amendments to be admissible. Moreover, they are contrary to one another in their object, so that Parliament — which, after all, is sovereign — is in a perfect position to take what it considers to be a proper decision on the substance. In this way, everything is, I think, perfectly clear.

(Applause)

**Mr Pfennig.** — (DE) Like you, Mr President, I regard Amendment No 7 as admissible, because it conforms to the procedure agreed upon in 1978 by the Chairman of the Committee on Budgets and the President of the European Parliament and there is a letter along these lines from the Chairman of the Committee on Budgets, dated 18 July.

On Amendment No 7, I wish to state that the EPP Group has tabled this amendment because we cannot allow the Community to become illiquid in September, at a time when two Member States will have received their money but no decision has yet been taken to cover the deficit in the 1984 budget. For our group, this means, as can be seen from the wording of the amendment, that the transfer of appropriations will be approved when measures to cover the budgetary requirements for 1984 have been taken so as to assure the normal working of the Community. That was the decision taken at Fontainebleau.

(Applause)

**Mr Prout.** — Mr President, you have made a very important procedural ruling. It is a ruling which could have dramatic political implications. I think it is important that the House understands the basis on which you have made this ruling, because it is quite clear from the Bureau minutes of 15 June 1978 that Parliament has delegated a power to the Committee on Budgets to decide on a transfer. As Lady Elles rightly pointed out to you, in the preamble to the five decisions of the Committee on Budgets made on 12 July, it states: 'The Budget Committee finally agreed to approve ...'. Now that statement is consistent with the delegated authority that it had of 15 June 1978.

**Prout**

It is a tradition in all democratic countries that you do not legislate retrospectively. It is inherent in the European Convention on Human Rights, and that Convention is enshrined in the jurisprudence of the European Court.

*(Laughter)*

We are an international democratic institution. For a decision of this Parliament to contradict such a fundamental precedent of democratic societies would be very damaging to the work that we are attempting to do. So I do implore you, Mr President, to reconsider your decision.

*(Applause from certain quarters)*

**President.** — I should like to reply briefly to Mr Prout, who asks me on what basis I have made my ruling. Rule 54(3) states:

The President shall decide whether amendments are admissible.

So much for the Rules of Procedure.

Why did I consider these amendments to be admissible? The reason is that in my view, whatever argument may be drawn from a position taken by the former Committee on Budgets — incidentally, very recently: in fact, it was last week — it is not for me to express any views on the matter. In the end, it is always the House that is sovereign.

*(Applause)*

I am sorry to have to disagree, for once, with Mr Prout. I believe that leaving this matter to the Parliament's decision is in conformity with the Rules of Procedure, at all events with the principles of democracy and, may I add, with the principles of human rights, ...

*(Applause)*

... to which I, for my part, attach very great importance.

I repeat: happily, things have turned out in such a way that Parliament is, first of all, informed of all the data and, secondly, is confronted with two draft amendments whose objects are mutually opposed, with the result that it can make up its own mind. Everyone in this House can therefore make a clear decision with full knowledge of the facts.

#### *Explanations of vote*

**Mrs Castle.** — Mr President, the adoption of Amendment No 7 this morning shows how hollow is the

agreement reached at Fontainebleau. The rebate we are talking about is due to the United Kingdom — long overdue. It was promised at Stuttgart. That promise was reconfirmed at Fontainebleau. It was embodied in an agreement with Fontainebleau, and now this Parliament, which called for an agreement, has smashed it about by moving this decision to delay to December.

Do not be fooled by the word 'delay'. The purpose of waiting until December is to say to the United Kingdom then, either you give us the money for next year — not for the new policies, but to continue to finance the agricultural extravagance — or you shall not get back what we have said is legally due to you. So, we in the United Kingdom are being invited to provide the money to pay our own rebate back to ourselves. This proves how wrong it was for Margaret Thatcher ever to agree to an increase in the Community's own resources on such flimsy achievements as that. It is now for the British House of Commons to refuse to endorse any increase in own resources and to give this money to a Parliament and a Community that will only spend it on agricultural surpluses.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Lord Douro.** — Mr President, this is a very sad day for members of this group. We began the second directly-elected European Parliament with an alliance on the centre and centre-right of this Parliament ...

*(Interjection: 'Some alliance!')*

... and that alliance has failed in the first week.

*(Applause from the left)*

It is in every respect a disgraceful decision of this House.

*(Cries of 'Hear, hear!')*

It has introduced retrospectivity into the way we conduct our affairs, and I am amazed that every single Member of this House is not ashamed of the introduction of that element, which particularly parties on this side of the House should never ever condone.

It has opened up an old wound. This, I remind the House, is the 1983 refund for the United Kingdom. It was agreed, as Mrs Castle has said, at Stuttgart last year under the chairmanship of Chancellor Kohl of the Federal Republic. How ironic it is that his party is the party that has introduced today this amendment!

The United Kingdom's stance in the Council of Ministers on the supplementary budget for 1984 has already reduced the Commission's demands from 2.6 billion to 1.3 billion, when they originally said that 2.6 billion was the absolute minimum they required. That shows

**Douro**

that the United Kingdom was right to apply pressure on the Commission. However, the United Kingdom and all other governments have subscribed to that part of the Fontainebleau communiqué which says that steps will be taken to cover the needs of the 1984 budget and to ensure that the Community operates normally. The United Kingdom subscribed to that clause. What the European Parliament has done today has made it almost impossible for the United Kingdom now to agree to extra financing for 1984 or to consider at this stage any increase in the Community's own resources. That is the full implication of what the European Parliament has decided today by its vote on Amendment No 7.

*(Applause from the European Democratic Group)*

**Mr de la Malène.** — (FR) Mr President, without wishing to dramatize the situation, I should like to tell our British friends very firmly that they must not pass the buck. We have had the Fontainebleau agreement, during which the governments agreed upon the amount of Britain's rebates. In this agreement, there was a paragraph stating that the Council of Ministers would agree upon measures to fulfil the 1984 and 1985 'gap'. It was possible to think in all honesty that a *bona fide* agreement had been reached with the British Government, that the latter, having got what it wanted at Fontainebleau, was prepared, together with its partners, to fill the 'gap' in the 1984 and 1985 budgets.

Of course, the other governments made a mistake, at the Council meeting that followed Fontainebleau, in failing to make the release of these funds entirely conditional upon the British Government's agreement. That was the other governments' mistake; but the British Government was wrong in failing to play the game at the series of Council meetings that have taken place since. There has been a meeting of the Council of Ministers for Agriculture, of the Budget Council, then of the General Affairs Council, and at all these meetings the British Government has gone on saying that the gap had to be filled by saving on the 1984 budget and on agricultural appropriations, thus making it clear that at Fontainebleau it was not in agreement with any of its partners on the subject of the common agricultural policy.

The British Government wants to fill the gap at the expense of the farmers of Europe, contrary to the agreement reached at Fontainebleau. It is no good passing the buck: the responsibility lies firmly with the British Government.

*(Applause from the right)*

**Mr Marshall.** — Mr President, Sir Peter Vanneck and I share a profession whose motto is *dictum meum pactum*. For those who need such a translation, which they should not in an international European Assem-

bly, that means 'my word is my bond'. When people no longer act under that motto, then any community is at risk. I am afraid that the financial distrust that passing Amendment No 7 has created, puts both the future of this Community at risk and makes me wonder if Members of this House have not got a death-wish about them.

I believe passing the Pfennig amendment, was a despicable act, because it reneged on commitments agreed at Stuttgart and it reneged on commitments agreed at Fontainebleau. It is really absurd for Mr de Malène to say that the unlimited demand of French farmers for more money has to be met by Community taxpayers. There has to come a time when the demand of farmers for more cash has to be restricted. I am afraid that the Community taxpayers and the Community consumers believe that that time has now come.

I believe that in passing this amendment and possibly passing this resolution this morning, the House is doing a disservice to itself and a disservice to the cause of Europe. I believe it is quite absurd for the House a few minutes ago to ask for action on the Spinelli report and then to behave in a way like this, because passing Amendment No 7 is merely manna to anti-marketeers in the United Kingdom and does nothing whatsoever for the cause of Europe.

**Mr Bombard.** — (FR) On a point of order, Mr President: what are we listening to now? — Certainly not explanations of vote!

**President.** — Mr Bombard, in a matter whose importance is recognized by everyone, I think the Members of this House should be given an opportunity to express their views.

**Mr Balfe.** — Mr President, I shall vote to reject the resolution, which will happen in a minute because it is an irresponsible resolution, it is possibly not even a legal resolution, because at another time I shall challenge your ruling on whether or not the amendments were admissible.

A firm agreement was made at Fontainebleau and, indeed, the words say, as far as the United Kingdom is concerned: 'The following agreement is adopted', and it is then spelled out. 'Whereas for the shortfall in the budget in this year . . .'

**President.** — Excuse me, Mr Balfe, but I see that some colleagues are leaving the Chamber. I would point out to them that the vote on the motion for a resolution as a whole has not yet taken place; it will be taken after the explanations of vote. It is therefore extremely desirable that, first of all, there should be no noise and, secondly, that as many people as possible should take part in the vote.

**Mr Balfe.** — To continue, the Fontainebleau agreement said, so far as this year's shortfall was concerned: 'Steps will be taken at the next Budget Council meeting to deal with that'. Those steps are still being taken. It is not acceptable to this Community that this Parliament should behave in the way that it has. It is exercising powers which it was never meant to have. It is seeking to destroy the whole principle of the Heads of State meeting and the agreement to which they came. When budgetary powers were given to this Parliament, it was in order for them to help formulate the budget of the Community, not to twist and use those powers to deny agreements which have been won and have been won with great difficulty.

It is still possible for this House to reconsider, because if it rejects this resolution the transfer will go ahead. I call on anyone in this House to vote against this resolution and thereby, in rejecting it, to allow the transfer to go through and to solve this problem.

**Mr Sutra.** — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, no one wishes to see the Fontainebleau agreement put into effect more than we do. The sum agreed to by the European Summit as a rebate to Great Britain will — and I use the future tense — have to be paid.

The spirit of Fontainebleau is at stake: we must get back to the spirit of Fontainebleau, which has been betrayed by the Council of Ministers and in particular by the Budget Council.

What is at issue? Let us go further than Mr de la Malène and say that the rebate to Great Britain for 1984 is a lump sum, and the decision reached at Fontainebleau is that Britain's rebate for 1985 should be expressed as a percentage of the European budget. By means of savings — false savings — in 1984 and transfers of expenditure to 1985, Mrs Thatcher's government hopes to swell the 1985 budget and thereby the rebate she is counting on. This amounts to a misuse of procedure, to say nothing of a misappropriation of funds!

Read, Lord Douro, read, colleagues from Britain, Mrs Hoff's resolution closely instead of trying to set your country against Europe! This resolution reaffirms the principle of this payment. By working up the people of your country against Europe, you arrive at the 30% poll you had in the elections to the European Parliament. That is not doing something for Europe. On the contrary, show the people of your country that we have accepted the principle and that it is your government that is rejecting and betraying the spirit of Fontainebleau by refusing the supplementary budget that we need!

This rebate has been postponed for no more than one month. In a month's time, it will be paid, we hope. Nothing could be worse than having to refuse it once more, for that would mean that we should have

neither a supplementary budget nor any new resources.

We hope that, in the spirit of Fontainebleau, you will put Europe on its feet again by accepting the new resources and the supplementary budget. When that moment comes and the spirit of Fontainebleau has been respected, you will receive what is due to you.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Nielsen.** — (*DA*) I shall vote for this resolution after the adoption of Mr Pfennig's amendment. I believe that with this action Parliament is following a consistent policy in line with the expectations raised by what was achieved at Fontainebleau. Unfortunately, so far as the Council meeting is concerned, these expectations have not proved entirely justified.

I cannot forbear to add that I find it sad to observe the exaggerated tactical game which the British are trying to play here. For example, they are insisting that an Assembly — that is, Parliament — which has delegated power to another body cannot change that decision. Yet it is elementary legal knowledge that it can do so. It is undemocratic to wish to deny a parliament the right to decide what it wants, as you have quite rightly said, Mr President. I understand that Mr Møller is to speak after me and I hope he can confirm that the Danish Conservatives are not taking part in this embarrassing game in which our English colleagues are engaged.

**Mr Møller.** — (*DA*) I regret to have to tell Mr Nielsen that I do not entirely agree with him. We all came here on Monday believing that we had got those budget problems solved, that Fontainebleau had at last opened the door so that we could move ahead with European cooperation now that the British budget problem had been settled. In my speech on Wednesday I welcomed the Fontainebleau compromise and said, now we have made some headway, now a door has been opened and we can get on with developing European cooperation. But today it is Parliament that is slamming that door shut. Let us at least trust the British to adhere to the precondition agreed on at Fontainebleau, to get an agreement in Parliament on future financing. In the spirit of Fontainebleau and continuing the discussion on the Irish Prime Minister's statement, let us agree to give the British the refund which the Heads of State agreed to. If there have been technical errors, let us forget about them. It is not our business to shut the door on European cooperation. Our business is to open the door and create new opportunities. This happened with Fontainebleau. Therefore I intend to vote against the motion for a resolution, even if it means going against the interests of my government and Mr Nielsen.

*(Applause from the European Democratic Group)*



**Mr Klepsch.** — (DE) Mr President, my group will support this resolution because we cannot countenance the Community going bankrupt in September simply because two Member States, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom, have got their money but no decision has been made to cover the budgetary shortfall.

For our group — this is clear, too, from the text of the amendment — we might have worded it better, but in the little time available that was not possible — this means that we shall support the transfer of funds as soon as the decisions for covering the budgetary shortfall in 1984 have been taken. So our decision is not retrospective.

We consider it right to make these payments and shall indeed vote for the release of these funds. For us it is simply a question of the budget shortfall. We fully understand that our British colleagues must be wondering whether this means that the promised transfer of money is now to be stopped. That is not so. My group explicitly and emphatically states that we shall agree to this money being released as soon as the funds to cover the budgetary deficit have been agreed.

*(Parliament adopted the motion for a resolution)*

**Mr Pearce.** — Mr President, on a point of order, I would like to ask you to refer to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions the situation that has just happened. You have given a ruling which changed a long-established practice in this House. Mr Nielsen is quite right in saying that the House is sovereign to change its position and to withdraw power that it has delegated if it wishes to do so.

Mr President, the House did not decide that. You decided that personally. And you decided to do that at a moment of crisis in this House, indeed of crisis in the Community, in a highly-charged atmosphere with a vast sum of money involved and at a moment in time which has caused for years to come a major breach between two of the groups in this House. It really would be better in future, Mr President, if you gave the House warning when you intend to change established procedure. Let the House or the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions or the Bureau discuss these things calmly, separated from the political issues concerned.

So I ask you to refer that matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

**President.** — No, I shall not refer it to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. It is not a matter of the Rules of Procedure. Instead, I shall bring your remarks to the attention of the Bureau, and the Bureau will discuss it.

# **FORMIGONI MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (DOC. 2-379/84/CORR.: SAKHAROV)**

**Mr Pannella.** — (FR) Mr President, I wish to point out that the director of the service concerned has told us that the information you have given us, that copies of amendments are normally put in our pigeon-holes, is not true. For several months now, copies of amendments have been at Members' disposal; but if they are to collect them, they have to know that they exist, and they only learn of their existence when the moment comes to vote. Logically, therefore, we should at that moment all get up to go and collect them, which is impossible.

For my part, Mr President, I have just done a good turn by distributing my amendment to the Formigoni resolution — that is to say, Amendment No 2. I do not know whether every Member is expected to distribute working documents.

**President.** — You were a Member of the old Parliament, and so far there has been no change in the methods employed. On the other hand, this does not mean that I regard these methods as being perfect. I shall see whether they can be improved so that all Members are in possession of the texts on which they have to vote. The problem is not easy, but I hope we shall find a solution.

*(Parliament adopted the motion for a resolution)<sup>1</sup>*

**Mr Pannella.** — (FR) Mr President, I asked for the floor on a point of order, since this resolution seems to me to be pointless without paragraph 2. I find myself wondering what it is that we have decided to do.

As for the 'select delegation', I leave that to Mr Formigoni. In any case, one may well ask oneself what the delegation could have to say to the Soviet Government now that the essential proposition, Mr Formigoni's brainwave, had been rejected by this Parliament. This way of going about things, this lack of dialogue, the rejection of these amendments — all this is irresponsible!

*(Applause)*

**President.** — That is not necessarily everyone's view!

**Mr Segre.** — (IT) Mr President, I would urge Mr Formigoni and the other authors of the resolution to think about the situation that has arisen. Since paragraph 2 has now been rejected — and, in my opinion, rightly so —, one fails to understand how paragraph 3 can be left standing and what it is supposed to mean.

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 2 of the motion had been rejected.

**Segre**

Since this Parliament is just beginning its work, I think the best thing would be for the authors to withdraw the resolution.

**President.** — We cannot continue the debate after the vote has been taken. I am sorry, but the House has made its decision. One may have one's own views on the way the voting has gone, but once it has taken place I cannot allow the debate to be reopened.

**Mrs Squarcialupi.** — *(IT)* In my view, the Chair should not have put paragraph 3 to the vote once paragraph 2 had been rejected. Perhaps it was a mistake, but once the mistake has been made I think it must be put right.

This resolution, representing the first step to be taken by a Member who will be presiding over the Political Affairs Committee, contains so many mistakes that I think it would be better for it not to leave this Chamber, in order not to make public the uncoordinated and demagogic approach taken to certain subjects.

**Mr Formigoni.** — *(IT)* I think this is a very sad moment in the life of this Parliament. A motion had been tabled which would have enabled this Parliament to make a significant gesture in defence of human rights, and it is remarkable that paragraph 2 should not have been adopted. However, apart from this decision, which, I repeat, is remarkable and which should give many colleagues food for thought, the resolution seems to me to have a meaning . . .

**President.** — Mr Formigoni, we cannot begin a discussion on a vote that has taken place. You will have other opportunities of expressing your views on this vote. I cannot allow a debate to begin now.

You no longer have the floor.

**Mrs Banotti.** — Mr President, I would like to bring to your attention a point of order. In my speech yesterday, the chairman of the sitting at which I spoke stated that the Irish language was not an official language of the Community. I would like a clarification on the part of the Chair that the Irish language is, in fact, an official language of the Community, albeit not a working language.

**President.** — Your observations have been noted, Mrs Banotti.

**Mr Ford.** — I wish to raise a point of order on Rule 5 of the Parliament's Rules of Procedure. One of the Members of this Parliament was arrested on Wednesday, 4 July, at 11.30 in the morning, was kept in jail

for a period of seven hours and was charged with obstruction of the highway. All this Member was doing was sitting on some grass talking to members of his constituency about parliamentary business. He has been released on bail and is due to appear in court on 1 October.

The former chairman of the Socialist Group has written to the Chief Constable of Merseyside with regard to the case of Mr Leslie Huckfield, asking for proceedings to be suspended. Under Rule 5(3), I would like to request that the proceedings be suspended against Mr Huckfield, and I would like to ask the President to do that on behalf of the European Parliament.

It is intolerable that we have a situation where Members of this Parliament are arrested in the process of their duties, and it is important that this Parliament takes a firm stand on the issue.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — On 4 July, the Member in question was not engaged in the exercise of his duties. Nevertheless, you have raised a serious matter, and I shall submit it to the Bureau.

### 3. *Adjournment of the session*

**President.** — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

I wish you all, ladies and gentlemen, a happy holiday.

**Mr de Courcy Ling.** — Mr President, I simply wanted to say to you that I wished you very good holidays, because I think that all of us here on the centre-right in particular are very glad that we supported you in your candidature. We admire the way you have conducted yourself in your first week of office, and I should like to say in parenthesis that despite the very high feelings running in the House this morning, I for one am totally confident — and this is very bad news for our opponents — I am totally confident that the coalition of the majority in this House will survive.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Thank you, Sir.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(FR)* Mr President, I asked for the floor with the same intention of wishing you every success. I must tell you that we find you in wonderful form at the end of this part-session, and in September, after a good summer, it will be even more remarkable.

**Pannella**

Allow me to add, Mr President, that, coming as they do, and as you are aware, from one who was not among those who voted for you, my felicitations are all the more sincere.

I wish you a happy summer.

**President.** — Thank you, Sir, too.

Once more, a happy holiday to everyone, and we shall meet once more in September.

*(The sitting was closed at 10.30 a.m.)*<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For items relating to written declarations entered in the register under Rule 49, transfer of appropriations, forwarding of resolutions adopted during the sitting, and the dates for the next part-session, see Minutes.







**Salg og abonnement · Verkauf und Abonnement · Πωλήσεις και συνδρομές · Sales and subscriptions  
Vente et abonnements · Vendita e abbonamenti · Verkoop en abonnementen**

---

**BELGIQUE / BELGIË**

---

**Moniteur belge / Belgisch Staatsblad**

Rue de Louvain 40-42 / Leuvensestraat 40-42  
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel  
Tél. 512 00 26  
CCP / Postrekening 000-2005502-27

Sous-dépôts / Agentschappen:

**Librairie européenne /  
Europese Boekhandel**

Rue de la Loi 244 / Wetstraat 244  
1040 Bruxelles / 1040 Brussel

**CREDOC**

Rue de la Montagne 34 / Bergstraat 34  
Bte 11 / Bus 11  
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel

---

**DANMARK**

---

**Schultz Forlag**

Møntergade 21  
1116 København K  
Tlf: (01) 12 11 95  
Girokonto 200 11 95

---

**BR DEUTSCHLAND**

---

**Verlag Bundesanzeiger**

Brëite Straße  
Postfach 10 80 06  
5000 Köln 1  
Tel. (02 21) 20 29-0  
Fernschreiber:  
ANZEIGER BONN 8 882 595

---

**GREECE**

---

**G.C. Eleftheroudakis SA**

International Bookstore  
4 Nikis Street  
Athens (126)  
Tel. 322 63 23  
Telex 219410 ELEF

Sub-agent for Northern Greece:

**Molho's Bookstore**

The Business Bookshop  
10 Tsimiski Street  
Thessaloniki  
Tel. 275 271  
Telex 412885 LIMO

---

**FRANCE**

---

**Service de vente en France des publications  
des Communautés européennes**

**Journal officiel**

26, rue Desaix  
75732 Paris Cedex 15  
Tél. (1) 578 61 39

---

**IRELAND**

---

**Government Publications Sales Office**

Sun Alliance House  
Molesworth Street  
Dublin 2  
Tel. 71 03 09

or by post

**Stationery Office**

St Martin's House  
Waterloo Road  
Dublin 4  
Tel. 78 96 44

---

**ITALIA**

---

**Licosa Spa**

Via Lamarmora, 45  
Casella postale 552  
50 121 Firenze  
Tel. 57 97 51  
Telex 570466 LICOSA I  
CCP 343 509

Subagente:

**Libreria scientifica Lucio de Biasio - AEIOU**

Via Meravigli, 16  
20 123 Milano  
Tel. 80 76 79

---

**GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG**

---

**Office des publications officielles  
des Communautés européennes**

5, rue du Commerce  
L-2985 Luxembourg  
Tél. 49 00 81 - 49 01 91  
Télex PUBOF - Lu 1322  
CCP 19190-81  
CC bancaire BIL 8-109/6003/200

**Messageries Paul Kraus**

11, rue Christophe Plantin  
L-2339 Luxembourg  
Tél. 48 21 31  
Télex 2515

---

**NEDERLAND**

---

**Staatsdrukkerij- en uitgeverijbedrijf**

Christoffel Plantijnstraat  
Postbus 20014  
2500 EA 's-Gravenhage  
Tel. (070) 78 99 11

---

**UNITED KINGDOM**

---

**HM Stationery Office**

HMSO Publications Centre  
51 Nine Elms Lane  
London SW8 5DR  
Tel. 01-211 3935

Sub-agent:

**Alan Armstrong & Associates**

European Bookshop  
London Business School  
Sussex Place  
London NW1 4SA  
Tel. 01-723 3902

---

**ESPAÑA**

---

**Mundi-Prensa Libros, S.A.**

Castelló 37  
Madrid 1  
Tel. (91) 275 46 55  
Telex 49370-MPLI-E

---

**PORTUGAL**

---

**Livraria Bertrand, s.a.r.l.**

Rua João de Deus  
Venda Nova  
Amadora  
Tél. 97 45 71  
Telex 12709-LITRAN-P

---

**SCHWEIZ / SUISSE / SVIZZERA**

---

**Librairie Payot**

6, rue Grenus  
1211 Genève  
Tél. 31 89 50  
CCP 12-236

---

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

---

**European Community Information  
Service**

2100 M Street, NW  
Suite 707  
Washington, DC 20037  
Tel. (202) 862 9500

---

**CANADA**

---

**Renouf Publishing Co., Ltd**

2182 St Catherine Street West  
Montreal  
Quebec H3H 1M7  
Tel. (514) 937 3519

---

**JAPAN**

---

**Kinokuniya Company Ltd**

17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome  
Shiniuku-ku  
Tokyo 160-91  
Tel. (03) 354 0131

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprise:

- report of proceedings,
- annual indexes.

---

## Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg:

Annual subscription 1984/1985    ECU 63.30    BFR 2 900    IRL 46    UKL 36.50    USD 55

Single issue price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

---

ECU 8.72    BFR 400    IRL 6.40    UKL 5.20    USD 8



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS  
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

