

Annex

# Official Journal

## of the

### European Communities

No 2-327

English edition

## Debates of the European Parliament

---

1985-1986 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 10 to 14 June 1985

Europe House, Strasbourg

**General contents**

<b>Sitting of Monday, 10 June 1985</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Resumption of the session, p. 1 — Tragic events of 29 May 1985 in Brussels, p. 1 — Agenda, p. 1 — Deadline for tabling amendments, p. 3 — Votes, p. 5 — Waiving of immunity, p. 6 — Social situation, p. 9	
<b>Sitting of Tuesday, 11 June 1985</b> .....	<b>25</b>
Decision on urgency, p. 26 — Budget 1985, p. 27 — Draft estimates for 1986, p. 45 — Italian presidency (statement by the Council), p. 49 — Question Time, p. 80 — Annex (Formal sitting on the occasion of the visit to the European Parliament of Mr Sandro Pertini, President of Italy), p. 93	
<b>Sitting of Wednesday, 12 June 1985</b> .....	<b>99</b>
Minutes, p. 100 — Ethiopia, p. 101 — Internal market — Public supply contracts — Roll-over protection on tractors, p. 105 — Right to petition Parliament — European driving licence — European passport — Obstacles at intra-Community borders, p. 126 — Accession of Spain and Portugal, p. 128 — Calendar 1986, p. 128 — Action taken on the opinions of Parliament, p. 128 — Question Time (continuation), p. 130 — Right to petition Parliament — European driving licence — European passport — Obstacles at intra-Community borders (continuation), p. 145 — Votes, p. 153 — Annex, p. 159 — Annex 'Question Time', p. 163	
<b>Sitting of Thursday, 13 June 1985</b> .....	<b>204</b>
Minutes, p. 205 — EEC and Central America and Latin America, p. 206 — Budget 1985 — Votes, p. 215 — EEC and Central America and Latin America (continuation), p. 223 — Agenda, p. 226 — Farm prices (Commission statement), p. 227 — EEC and Central America and Latin America (continuation), p. 235 — IMP, p. 239 — Topical and urgent debate, p. 251 — Votes, p. 259 — Right to petition Parliament — European driving licence — European passport — Obstacles at intra-Community borders (continuation), p. 264 — Hydrocarbons, p. 267 — RACE programme, p. 270 — EDF — Fisheries, p. 274	

(Continued overleaf)

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.

Contents (continued)

**Sitting of Friday, 14 June 1985** ..... 278

Minutes, p. 278 — Votes, p. 278 — Regulations on the officials of the Communities in consequence of the accession of Spain and Portugal, p. 281 — Minutes, p. 286 — Quick-frozen foodstuffs, p. 288 — Emission of pollutants, p. 291 — Foodstuffs and plastic materials, p. 294 — Importation of meat products, p. 297 — Adjournment, p. 298

## SITTING OF MONDAY, 10 JUNE 1985

### Contents

<p>1. <i>Resumption of the session</i> . . . . . 1</p> <p>2. <i>Tragic events of 29 May 1985 in Brussels</i> . . . . . 1</p> <p>3. <i>Agenda</i> <i>Mr Pannella; Mr Balfe; Mr Ford; Mr Cryer; Mr Arndt</i> . . . . . 1</p> <p>4. <i>Deadline for tabling amendments</i> <i>Mr Pannella; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Cryer; Mr Marshall; Mr Tomlinson</i> . . . . . 3</p> <p>5. <i>Votes</i> <i>Mrs Daly; Mr Sherlock; Mr Klepsch; Mr Mertens; Mr Gautier; Mrs Daly</i> . . . . . 5</p> <p>6. <i>Waiving of immunity — Report (Doc. A 2-46/85) by Mr Donnez</i> <i>Mr Donnez; Mr Pannella; Mr Donnez; Mrs Fontaine</i> . . . . . 6</p>	<p>7. <i>Social situation — Oral questions (Doc. B 2-385/85/rev.) by Mr Didò and others to the Council; (Doc. B 2-100/85) by Mrs Maij-Weggen and others to the Council, and (Doc. B 2-435/85) by Mrs Chouraqui and others to the Commission</i> <i>Mr Didò; Mr De Michelis (Council); Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Natali (Commission); Mr Vetter; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Tuckman; Mr Raggio; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Lalor; Mr Härlin; Mr Vernimmen; Mr Chanterie; Mr Wurtz; Mrs Lemass; Mr Christensen; Mrs Lenz; Mr Welsh</i> . . . . . 9</p>
--	---

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*President*

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

1. *Resumption of the session*

**President.** — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 10 May 1985.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Approval of the Minutes — Verification of credentials — Membership of Committees of Inquiry — Waiving of parliamentary immunity — Petitions — Authorization to draw up reports — Referrals to committee — Changes in referral — Transfers of appropriations — Written declarations (Rule 49) — Documents received — Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council: see Minutes.*

2. *Tragic events of 29 May 1985 in Brussels*

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, we have all been deeply saddened by the tragic events that took place recently in Brussels on the occasion of the football match between Liverpool and Juventus.

I would ask you to observe one minute's silence in remembrance of the victims.

*(The House rose and observed one minute's silence)*

3. *Agenda*

**President.** — At its meetings of 7 and 23 May 1985 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed to you.

**President**

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

*Monday:*

- inclusion in a joint debate, with Item No 110 on the agenda, of the following oral questions:
  - by Mrs Maij-Weggen and others (Doc. B 2-100/85) to the Council on legislation in the field of categories of persons, working time and equal treatment for men and women;
  - by Mrs Chouraqui and others (Doc. B 2-435/85), on behalf of the EDA Group, to the Commission on the rise in unemployment in the Community in 1984.

**Mr Pannella (NI).** — (FR) Mr President, it is stated in the draft agenda, under the item to which you have just referred, that the deadline set for the tabling of amendments is 6 June.

The first point here, Mr President, is that this is not so, since we have just approved the previous minutes and no such decision was taken.

Secondly, we cannot now set a deadline for a date which has already passed. Nothing of the sort has ever been seen, except in this House.

I would therefore ask you to make clear that a right laid down in the Rules of Procedure cannot be withheld.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, when we have adopted the agenda, we shall then be going on to fix the deadlines for tabling amendments. Your question will be dealt with at that stage.

**Mr Balfe (S).** — Mr President, I am sure that everybody in this House was deeply appreciative of the minute's silence we had a moment ago. I would like to ask you to refer to the Bureau the question of how long a minute's silence is. Today a minute's silence lasted 9 seconds. Last month a minute's silence for a motion by Mr Chambeiron lasted 27 seconds. I do not mean this to be facetious, but I think that if we are to have silences, they should last an agreed length of time. I would ask, therefore, that you ask the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to define what is meant by the term 'a minute's silence'.

**President.** — I do not think that that is a matter for the Committee on the Rules of procedure and Petitions.

*(The President read the amendments to the agenda for Tuesday and Wednesday)<sup>1</sup>*

*Thursday:*

<sup>1</sup> See Minutes.

- 9.30 a.m.: consideration of the reports by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul (Doc. A 2-42/85), Mr van Aerssen (Doc. A 2-45/85) and Mr McGowan (Doc. A 2-44/85) on Central America and Latin America;
- 10.30 a.m.: vote on the budget
  - possibly, continuation of the debate on Central America and Latin America, until no later than 1 p.m.;
- 3 p.m. to 4.30 p.m.: consideration of the report by Mr De Pasquale (Doc. A 2-49/85) on IMPs;
- 4.30 p.m. to 7.30 p.m.: topical and urgent debate;
- 7.30 p.m.: vote on the reports on which the debate has closed;
- one hour after the end of voting time: beginning of the night sitting;
- inclusion of a supplementary report (Doc. A 2-57/85) by Mrs Schleicher on the limitation of emissions of pollutants into the air from large combustion plants, after the other report (Doc. A 2-53/85) by Mrs Schleicher which is entered as Item No 106 on the agenda.

I have received from Mr Ford and 20 other signatories, pursuant to Rule 56(1), a request that the Rothley report (Doc. A 2-35/85/rev.) be considered before the joint debate on Central America and Latin America.

**Mr Ford (S).** — Mr President, I would like to have the Rothley report rather earlier on the agenda because clearly, at least in the United Kingdom, it is creating a great deal of interest as those who have seen the press reports today will know. In the Commission proposal there are no financial figures. I find this very disturbing. Calculations done on the back of an envelope suggest that this could cost the Community up to 75 million pounds per year. I think Parliament needs to be aware of this and I think we need to have a full Chamber to be able to debate the issue properly.

Also in the Committee on Budgets' opinion it says that there are no provisions available to make sure that people who leave on voluntary early retirement don't go off and get jobs elsewhere that bring them in even more money than they would have been earning if they had not taken early retirement. We have had examples in the past where people who took early retirement from the Community when Greece joined the Community actually went on to work again for the Community in different capacities. Clearly, it seems to me with these kinds of important issues, we need to have a debate at a time when Members are going to be present.

When we debated the Casini report on Ispra and early retirements, the Commission promised that before any similar proposals were brought forward again in

**Ford**

future, they would look at the situation afresh. Clearly they have not. I think this House wants an opportunity to hear the Commission's views when they have more than half a dozen Members in the building which is what we normally have between 9 p.m. and midnight.

It is funny that this, like the Casini report, is scheduled for a late-night sitting, isn't it? One might almost suspect that it was a conspiracy because certainly I got the report less than 12 hours before the deadline for tabling amendments. I managed to submit some amendments but I don't suspect there will be very many others. I suspect this is a conspiracy on behalf of the Commission. I hope the Members here today will vote to put it on the agenda when they *will* be present and there will be an opportunity to debate it, and debate it properly. Prove there is not a conspiracy over this issue to pay out large sums of money to bureaucrats, at a time when other people in the Community are suffering very badly and getting far less than this, when they are being made compulsorily redundant — and there are plenty of examples of this in the United Kingdom!

**Mr Cryer (S).** — Mr President, I think it would be very useful if we had this debate a bit earlier so that the press can be present to report on the debate, because there are a number of people in my constituency, and I have no doubt many other constituencies throughout the Common Market, who would be very interested in the sort of sums that are being bandied around.

Is it true, for example, that some civil servants of the Commission who will take this retirement — or early home-to-bed scheme, as it were, because they are not actually going to be retired, they are simply going to be sent home — are going to be sent home on 28 000 pounds a year? The people who will be interested are those thousands of steelworkers who have been made redundant as a result of Common Market policies. The 1 100 workers at Tinsley Park Steelworks in Sheffield, which faces closure as a result of cutbacks in steel capacity, would be very interested too. I take the view that we ought to be able to have this debate earlier so that if there is a question of double standards — one standard for people in the Commission who are going to be retiring on 28 000 quid a year and will be able to get other jobs and another for steelworkers who pick up a few hundred quid or at most a few thousand quid — then, in fact, that sort of double standard should be exposed. I think that people would like to know if this sort of money is involved. A lot of local authorities who were knocked back when they made applications to the Social Fund for schemes to get people off the dole, training schemes of one sort or another, who had their applications ignored, cut back, given no priority, would, I think, be very interested to see whether this scheme for funding lavish payments to Common Market officials is going to cost in the order of 12 million pounds — I can think of better ways of spending the money.

Of course we want to see adequate compensation for people who are made redundant. But, in fact, if the scale of redundancy pay for steelworkers were to be the same as the scale of compensation for Commission officials, the Commission might have less enthusiasm for closing down steelworks, backed as it is so enthusiastically by the Thatcher government. So I suggest that in order to clear the air, in order to bring everything out in the open so that the Commission cannot be accused of some sort of conspiracy to get this through this Assembly with the minimum of attention, this proposed alteration to the draft agenda should be accepted.

**Mr Arndt (S).** — (*DE*) Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group and on behalf of all the national delegations within the Socialist Group — and, I trust, on behalf of many others — I wish to oppose most vigorously this request,

(*Applause*)

which seeks to substitute discussion of the admittedly important question of redundancy payments to Community staff for discussion of three reports dealing with Central and Latin America.

These three reports are very important for the development of democracy in Central America and to counter trends towards dictatorship: trade relations have a real part to play here. I object very strongly to Members waving enormous banners, both inside and outside the Chamber, calling for freedom for the people of Latin America, and then, when it comes to discussing an important aspect of this subject, raising other topics which are only important for their national press

(*Applause*)

This decision touches the social conscience of this House, because it involves our determination to help the peoples of Central and South America to defend their freedom and democracy. I call upon you to vote for the freedom and democracy of the peoples of Central and South America and to reject this request.

(*Applause*)

(*Parliament rejected Mr Ford's request — Having heard the President read the amendments to Friday's agenda<sup>1</sup>, Parliament adopted the draft agenda thus amended*)

#### 4. *Deadline for tabling amendments*

**President.** — The deadline for tabling amendments to the following reports has been extended until this evening at 8 p.m.:

<sup>1</sup> See Minutes

**President**

- Patterson report (Doc. A 2-50/85);
- Chanterie report (Doc. A 2-41/85);
- Price report (Doc. A 2-39/85);
- Squarcialupi report (Doc. A 2-52/85);
- De Pasquale report (Doc. A 2-49/85).

**Mr Pannella (NI).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I think we have now reached the point to which you were referring earlier. We have in fact — my colleagues Mr Tortora and Mr Ciccimessere and I — tabled an amendment to the report by Mr Chanterie.

I believe that we have the right to exercise our prerogatives. I find it inconceivable from the legal viewpoint that an Assembly should vote deadlines which have already come and gone six days ago. I would therefore ask you quite simply to adopt this amendment and, for the future, to find a different solution from the one that you are proposing, which is legally null and void. It is quite simply impossible.

**President.** — With regard to the report by Mr Chanterie, I would point out to you that I announced just now that the deadline for tabling amendments to that report had been extended until 8 p.m. this evening. It is now only 5.25 p.m.; it is still perfectly possible therefore to table amendments to it. I find it hard to see how we could do our business any other way. The House has just adopted the agenda for the present part-session, and it is only when that has been done that the deadlines for tabling amendments can be fixed and possibly extended.

**Mr Pannella (NI).** — *(FR)* Mr President, this announcement is most important, since this situation has been dragging on for a year or two. With the solution that you are adopting, we shall no longer find ourselves reading, as we often have, that there are agenda proposals for which the deadlines have been set even before the House meets.

To my mind, this means that we have just carried a point of principle.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, I do believe that we are in agreement. The fact is that the agenda is drawn up by the House; it has done so just now. All that the Bureau does is to make proposals which may be amended, as is indeed very frequently the case. You have had an example of that today. I feel that the order we follow is a very logical one: the House decides on the draft agenda, either by adopting the enlarged Bureau's draft or by amending it. In amending it, we are also free to amend the deadlines for tabling amendments which may have been envisaged at the drafting stage.

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — Mr President, I tried to catch your eye before we voted on the adoption of the agenda to ask you when you propose to report to the House — as you undertook to do at the May part-session — on the results of the correspondence you had concerning alleged irregularities in the vote on the fixing of agricultural prices several months ago. I think this matter has now dragged on sufficiently long and I think Members of the House would appreciate a statement from you on the outcome of the correspondence that you have had.

**President.** — I do not have to make any report on this question. This is all about a decision taken in the Committee on Budgets.

**Mr Cryer (S).** — Mr President, you read out a list of reports which have the deadline for tabling amendments extended to 8 p.m. tonight. Could you tell me if you included the Rothley report in that list?

**President.** — The deadline for tabling amendments to the Rothley report has indeed expired. If you wish to request that it be extended, you may do so.

**Mr Cryer (S).** — Mr President, I think it would be very useful to extend the deadline to enable further amendments to be tabled to it.

**President.** — You want the deadline for tabling amendments to this report to be extended until this evening?

**Mr Cryer (S).** — Yes, Mr President. Until as late as possible this evening, say, 8 p.m.

**President.** — If no one has any objections, that is agreed.

**Mr Marshall (ED).** — Mr President, further to Mr Tomlinson's point of order, may I respectfully suggest that you have missed the point. We are not talking about the Committee on Budgets, but Members of this House who certainly had not signed in but who somehow managed to vote. You did assure us at a previous part-session that you would investigate whether in fact they were public-spirited chaps who did not want their *per diems* or whether they were in fact chaps for whom someone had by some accident of fate voted. I think this House would like to hear the result of that investigation.

**President.** — A report on the matter has been submitted to the Bureau.

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — Mr President, I do not want to go on with this matter, having raised it now, I think, at every part-session since the vote we had on the agricultural price-fixing. But it is on the record that at the last part-session when I raised this question, you clearly advised this House that you had written to four Members of this House. When I asked whether you had had a reply, you said you had not but that you would advise this House when you received a reply and indicate the nature of the reply. I am now asking you, have you received a reply? What is the nature of the reply? If you have not yet received a reply, how do you propose to proceed further?

**President.** — I shall be reporting back to the Bureau. However, I can tell you as of now that of the four letters that I sent out, two have had replies and two have not. That is the position.<sup>1</sup>

#### 5. Votes

**Report (Doc. A 2-23/85) by Mr Mertens, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-686/84 — COM(84) 445 final) for a directive amending Directive 74/63/EEC on the fixing of maximum permitted levels for undesirable substances and products in feedingstuffs, Directive 77/101/EEC on the marketing of straight feedingstuffs and Directive 79/373/EEC on the marketing of compound feedingstuffs<sup>2</sup>.**

**Mrs Daly (ED).** — Mr President, I would like, on behalf of our group, to request that the Mertens report be sent back under Rule 85 to allow the Committees on Development and Agriculture to discuss their opinions with the Committee on the Environment, as promised by Mrs Weber, chairman of the Committee on the Environment, at the last part-session.

**President.** — As Mrs Daly has made this request, I must give the floor to one speaker in favour and one against.

**Mr Sherlock (ED).** — Mr President, I was under the impression that the procedure under Rule 85 did not necessarily call for a speaker in favour and a speaker against.

It is not specifically stated under Rule 85 that you, Mr President, shall call a speaker for and a speaker against. I think you will find it expedient to move immediately to the vote.

**President.** — Thank you for your comment, Mr Sherlock. It may not be laid down in the Rules of Procedure but neither is it forbidden by them. It would be a good thing if the matter were clearly explained to the House.

**Mr Klepsch (PPE).** — (DE) Mr President, I oppose this request because it was rejected last time. I do not think it is permissible to make the same request, simply because the vote was postponed until today on quite different grounds.

*(Parliament rejected Mrs Daly's request)*

**President.** — We shall proceed therefore to the vote.

#### *Proposal for a directive*

*Article 1(5) — Amendments Nos 10 and 1*

**Mr Mertens (PPE), rapporteur.** — (DE) Mr President, in order to facilitate voting, I would like to state that I support all the amendments by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and that I request permission to make recommendations on the other amendments. If I have understood you correctly, you have just called Amendment No 10 by Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz. This amendment was not submitted to the committee. I am against it.

#### *Motion for a resolution*

*After paragraph 5 — After the rejection of Amendment No 13*

**Mr Gautier (S).** — (DE) Mr President, I may not be a member of the committee, but I do believe I can read. It would be advisable to check the report afterwards for consistency: in the directive we have taken a different line from what we have just adopted. We have just adopted Amendment No 12 prohibiting compounds, but nevertheless the rapporteur rejects Amendment No 13 which draws the logical conclusion. I feel that what we have just adopted is somewhat illogical.

**President.** — Thank you for this comment. However, the Assembly is sovereign and can vote as it wishes. It even has the right to contradict itself.

#### *Explanation of vote*

**Mrs Daly (ED).** — I shall vote against this directive and against the Mertens report for two reasons.

<sup>1</sup> *Speaking time:* see Minutes.

<sup>2</sup> See Debates of 10 May 1985.

**Daly**

First, during the ordinary meeting of the ACP-EEC Council of Ministers held in Suva, Fiji, in May 1984, the Community gave an undertaking that the ACP States would be consulted in good time before any regulation was adopted by the Council. In fact, no consultations of any constructive kind have taken place between the two sides since that undertaking was given.

Secondly, at the last part-session of this Parliament an undertaking was given that consultations would take place between the Development and Agriculture Committees and the Environment Committee, and no such consultations have taken place. All along, the Development Committee has maintained that what was really needed is full and effective implementation of the original directive, not the new directive that is proposed today, and for that reason I shall vote against the resolution tonight.

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)<sup>1</sup>*

#### 6. *Waiving of immunity*

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-46/85) by Mr Donnez, on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, on the request for the waiver of Mr Marco Pannella's parliamentary immunity.

**Mr Donnez (L), rapporteur.** — *(FR)* Ladies and gentlemen, we have to deal today with another request for parliamentary immunity to be waived, the honourable Member concerned on this occasion being our excellent colleague Mr Pannella.

On 18 February 1984 the Minister for Justice of the Italian Republic made this request for the waiver of parliamentary immunity to our President, advising him that the Florence Public Prosecutor accused Mr Pannella — if I may summarize the charges against him — of having been one of a number of people who aided and abetted the performance of abortions on consenting women by referring them to various doctors in Italy or abroad. At the material time, it should be pointed out, abortion was illegal in Italy. I shall return to this in a few moments.

To give some further information on the evidence itself, I would add that on 9 January 1975 a clinic was discovered in Florence where abortions were regularly performed on women referred to it by an organization known as CISA — *Centro Italiano Sterilizzazione ed*

*Aborto* — which had in fact been set up by the Italian Radical Party. It should also be pointed out that at the material time Mr Pannella, his party and indeed many other Italians were conducting a political campaign seeking major changes in the Italian legislation on abortion, which was illegal. Following a referendum, of which you no doubt at least saw details in the press, the legislation was changed. It should also be stressed that the examining magistrate points out that the women who obtained abortions in this way generally paid 100 000 *lire*, except for those with such limited resources that they clearly could not afford to pay. Abortions were provided free to these women who could not afford to pay, while the amounts of 100 000 *lire* were paid to CISA, the organization to which I was referring earlier. Neither Mr Pannella nor his political friends were ever accused of having received a single *centesimo* of these payments of 100 000 *lire* per person.

This is the evidence which was laid before the Italian Chamber of Deputies, of which Mr Pannella is a Member, when, on two occasions, requests for the waiver of his parliamentary immunity were referred to it, in much the same way as the one on which you have to decide today. On both occasions the Italian Chamber of Deputies decided, on 19 October 1977 and 23 October 1984, not to waive Mr Pannella's parliamentary immunity, and this effectively means that our decision today is concerned very much more with principles than with practice, since even if we decided for our part to waive Mr Pannella's parliamentary immunity, it would make virtually no difference in practice since Mr Pannella would still be protected by his parliamentary immunity in Italy.

Having explained this, I can now refresh your memories by running through the principles of the legislation which we have to follow when we have to take decisions in this field, which we have already had to do on several occasions. Article 10 of the Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Communities defines parliamentary immunity in very precise terms, prescribing that, on the territory of their respective States, Members of the European Parliament enjoy the same immunities as Members of their national Parliaments, while on the territories of other Member States they enjoy immunity from all legal proceedings, except if found in the act of committing an offence, on the understanding that the Parliament in question, which is this Parliament on this occasion, can always waive parliamentary immunity at the request of the competent authorities, in this case the Minister for Justice of the Italian Republic.

The evidence against Mr Pannella relates to acts committed on Italian territory, and under this Article 10 of the Protocol annexed to the Treaty, therefore, he enjoys parliamentary immunity.

I would add, again to refresh your memories, that in connection with two requests for the waiver of parlia-

<sup>1</sup> The rapporteur was:  
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1 to 8, 12, 15 and 18;  
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 9 to 11, 13, 14, 16, 19 and 20.

## Donnez

mentary immunity on which I had the honour to report to you at the request of the Committee on Legal Affairs during the last Parliament, we worked out a member of general principles which have now become established, definitively in my view. I consider that this was desirable, so as to ensure that we never allow ourselves to be diverted and never take account, in particular, of the nationality of one or other of our number, since otherwise we would assuredly be heading for trouble. We are agreed that the purpose of parliamentary immunity is not to establish a privilege for the benefit of any of us individually; it is a safeguard, a guarantee of independence given to this Parliament, a guarantee of independence from all other authorities, whatever they be.

On the basis of that definition, a renunciation of immunity by a Member whose immunity Parliament has been asked to waive can have no legal effect. My reason for making this clear immediately is that, in this case, Mr Pannella has asked for his parliamentary immunity to be waived.

I would add, of course, that the principle, as I have just defined it, whereby a Member's request for his parliamentary immunity to be waived has no legal effect, should not, as far as possible, be regarded as an absolute rule. We must ask ourselves what is in the interest of our Parliament first and also what is in the interest of the Member concerned, and we must try as far as we are able to reconcile the two.

In the present case, however, I regret for Mr Pannella's sake that I do not think that his request can be accommodated, simply because, in view of the principles which we have evolved and given the independence of this Parliament, it is desirable to maintain these principles and to apply them, in particular, in Mr Pannella's case.

Working on the basis of these definitions, and adding that, for all practical purposes, the time-limits of immunity have been determined by the Court of Justice, which has held that we have an annual session and are in a sense permanently in session, parliamentary immunity applies continuously, even during recesses. This too you have decided, adding that, since parliamentary immunity is intended to protect this institution, the date of the alleged offence is relatively unimportant, a view which is not shared by some of our national parliaments. We for our part consider that parliamentary immunity attaches to the person of a Member by virtue of his or her office, and that it is of little account whether the alleged offences occurred before or after he or she was elected. It is the date of the charges which matters. In the present case, the offences alleged against Mr Pannella predate his re-election to this Parliament but, in the light of the principles by which we have consistently abided and the conception that we have of the protection of our institution, the date of the alleged offence is of only minor relevance. Having established this, we must make up

our minds how we are going to deal with the request that we have received, applying the body of case law that we have built up and will be adding to today.

We have taken the view that, for there to be a coherent concept of European parliamentary immunity, we would have to distance ourselves from the principle applied by our various national parliaments. I have the greatest respect for our national parliaments, but they all have different approaches. It is not possible for us to refer to the case law of one or other of our national parliaments. We have to develop our own case law, and we have decided, in particular, that when the acts of which a Member of the European Parliament is accused have a bearing on his political activity, it is necessary to apply the fundamental criterion in deciding what action is to be taken on a request for the waiver of parliamentary immunity.

According to this criterion, where the acts of which a Member of the European Parliament is accused form part of this political activity, they must be covered by parliamentary immunity.

I believe that we cannot depart from these principles, which are clear and unambiguous; they protect this institution and admit of no deviation.

It is on this basis that we must ask ourselves whether the actions with which Mr Pannella is charged by the Florence Public Prosecutor were part of his political activities, or at least whether the activities with which he is charged were connected with his political activity. This is the question that we have to answer, and no other considerations enter into it.

I point out that no other considerations enter into this question because for some of you, I am convinced, a problem of conscience arises where abortion or termination of pregnancy — call it what you will — is under discussion.

In the present case, however, the problem is not concerned with abortion or termination of pregnancy. It is a legal problem. The question is whether or not the actions of which Mr Pannella is accused can be regarded as being connected with the political activity in which he was engaged in the Radical Party. This is the only question that we have to answer, and in my view there is strong evidence — or, in French legal parlance, substantial, detailed and consistent presumptive evidence — that Mr Pannella's activity, his political activity, was totally integral to the 'offence' of which he is accused by the Florence Public Prosecutor. When I refer to the offence of which he is accused, I do so in inverted commas. I must make it clear that I accuse him of nothing. It is the Florence Public Prosecutor who has laid accusations against Mr Pannella, not I. I have no call to take a stand on a charge of this kind, or on any other for that matter. Indeed, the only question that the Committee on Legal Affairs is asking you to answer — just as it did — is this: in the case

**Donnez**

under consideration, in acting as he did, was Mr Pannella acting according to a political criterion which he had adopted, or was he not? My own answer is that, according to the substantial, detailed and consistent presumptive evidence, he was, because at the time in Italy, let us not forget, Mr Pannella, his political friends and others were campaigning to get the Italian law changed, and it has been changed since. Following the referendum to which I was referring earlier, the Italian law has been changed significantly.

Consequently, if Mr Pannella's activity corresponds to a political criterion, our principles must be applied. It would be inappropriate to waive parliamentary immunity. This is what the Committee on Legal Affairs decided, for its part, by a very large majority. This is what I am asking you to confirm today.

(Applause)

## IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

*Vice-President*

**Mr Pannella (NI).** — (FR) Mr President, it is of course difficult to speak on this subject after our colleague Mr Donnez, who has now set out the case law for us and who explains the legal position so clearly; *juris dicere*, that is the problem.

I have to say, Mr President, that I do not believe that there has been any intention to wage a campaign of political persecution against Emma Bonino, our former colleague who was arrested, against Adele Faccio, against the secretary of my party or against me. At least, I do not believe that this has been a decisive factor.

In fact, Mr President, there is one person whom I should like to hear speak on this subject: he is the judge who signed the arrest warrants, who is now an honourable Member of this House. I believe that, at the time, he did his duty. Abortions were illegal in Italy for a hundred years and could only be obtained from back-street practitioners. This presented no problem for rich women, who could afford to pay, but it could mean death for poor women. As long as millions of people were involved, there were no prosecutions.

The *Partito radicale* came out into the open over a seven-month period, showing the courage of its conviction that it was necessary to secure what we regarded as a human right even more than a right for women, the Christian right to conceive in love and responsibility rather than to be doomed to procreate like animals. At the time when we did this, Mr President, the others were arrested, but I was not. This was

quite a clever move, I think. There was a *fumus persecutionis* as far as the others were concerned.

My presence at this trial — over events which took place in 1975 — is not required, it seems. And yet I made no secret of my involvement; I had signed the contracts for the premises where the operations were performed according to the Karman method, free of charge for those who could not afford to pay, as you have pointed out.

I therefore have the right, Mr President, to ask you to allow me as an Italian citizen, as a European citizen, since I have been charged (with a courtesy not shown to the others: it was an easier matter to take poor little Emma Bonino to trial *in vinculis*), to face my judges, who must try me, to remind everyone of what happened, to remind them that afterwards Catholic Italy — yes, it is a Catholic country, a Christian country — gave us one million signatures for a referendum to repeal this law and that, because it is a deeply Christian country, it gave us a resounding victory.

Mr President, it is my belief, as a Member of the European Parliament, that I am entitled not to be prevented from exercising my rights and duties as a European citizen. I appreciate that this poses problems for our parliamentary institution. But I say again to our liberal colleague, liberal in the noblest and broadest sense: are there not human rights which must be upheld in the face of any leviathan, in the face of any collective institution, such as my right, having been charged, to have my case heard? I am asking you, ladies und gentlemen, to let me go for trial before the Italian judges, because I want to be tried and they do not want to try me. That is the truth of the matter. Trying me would entail passing judgment on what I have done and what I have not done, but it would also entail passing judgment on what the judges did during the pre-trial investigation when, I repeat, your former colleague Emma Bonino, Adele Faccio and others, who were thought to have less potential for causing embarrassment, were held in prison for months, where as I have remained at liberty, even though attempts have of course been made to get at me through my family by calling me the man who wanted to destroy life in the mother's womb, the man who wanted to destroy the life of our families and our societies.

**Mr Donnez (L), rapporteur.** — (FR) Mr President, since Mr Pannella has asked me a question, it is only right that I should answer in my capacity as rapporteur, to explain the position on this matter. While I said earlier that the primary purpose of parliamentary immunity was to protect this institution, I was also at pains to add that we had a duty to do everything in our power to safeguard the hallowed rights of the individual and, in this instance, of Members of this Parliament. This was my meaning when I explained to you that a Member's renunciation of his parliamentary immunity had no legal effect. But this is not to say that

**Donnez**

we are under any obligation to accept such a definition as a hard and fast rule.

In the present instance, I believe that we must adhere to our principles, because they are important. My view is that we must go on saying that whenever an activity allegedly involving an offence is part of a Member's political activity, when there is a connection of some sort between the political activity of one of us and the activity involving the alleged offence, we cannot dissociate one from the other. I fully understand Mr Pannella's personal reaction, especially in view of his feeling of solidarity with all his friends. His attitude is noble, and I can only pay tribute to him for it. For my part, however, I have to uphold the legal principles that we have adopted. If we begin to deviate on this issue, I really do not know where we will end up, but it will definitely not be on the right course that we have followed hitherto, which has consistently been the course dictated not only by liberalism, as Mr Pannella was acknowledging just now, but also by the principle of equal treatment for all our Members, irrespective of nationality or political allegiance. I therefore abide by my report on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

*Explanation of vote*

**Mrs Fontaine (PPE), in writing.** — (FR) In the report which he has just presented to us on the request for the waiver of Mr Pannella's parliamentary immunity, Mr Donnez has once again impressed me by the clarity of vision and rigour that he has brought to his task in seeking to adhere to the principles that the European Parliament has established on this issue.

The case with which we have to deal here is delicate and complex from this point of view, and it is not obvious to all that it is appropriate to apply Parliament's normal criteria on this occasion.

While it is not for us to judge how material or serious the charges are, the activities concerned, by their very nature, must clearly be classed as an offence under the ordinary law, and this in itself would normally lead us to waive Mr Pannella's parliamentary immunity.

On the other hand, however, it seems clear from Mr Pannella's writings and speeches that he ascribed a political intention to the actions with which he is charged, which he saw as a means of securing the changes that he wanted to see in the Italian laws on abortion.

If it is accepted that this intention is to be taken into account, the alleged offence can then be seen as being connected with political activity, so that Parliament would then reach the very different conclusion pro-

posed by its rapporteur, the conclusion that Mr Pannella's parliamentary immunity should be maintained.

But if we accept that this argument is powerful enough to determine our position, we will have other problems to contend with: in particular, there is the risk of leaving the door open to abuse. In Mr Kloeckner's case, where the principles involved were fairly similar, the European Parliament did not accept this argument.

Let us imagine, for instance, the hypothetical case in which an honourable Member had been involved in the illegal introduction of so-called soft drugs into the schools in his country — not for financial gain but because he wanted the law to be changed to liberalize the use of such drugs.

One could think of many other examples, and of course the problem of terrorism comes to mind, since political motives are invariably invoked as justification for terrorism.

We must be clear in our minds that this debate is not concerned with our respective views, as dictated by our consciences, on the issue of voluntary termination of pregnancy, although that is a very important issue with serious implications, but with whether or not we recognize the actions alleged in this case to be of a political nature and with the possibility that our decision in what I would describe as a borderline case may be taken as a precedent in other areas.

The Group of the European People's Party has given thought to this matter, taking account of all the factors involved, including the exceptional nature of waivers of immunity in this Parliament and the fact that the Italian Parliament did not see fit to waive Mr Pannella's immunity.

In the light of all the aspects to which I have referred, some of which have wider implications than Mr Pannella's individual case, our Group will abstain.

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)*

**7. Social situation**

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on three oral questions:

- oral question (Doc. B 2-385/85/rev.) by Mr Didò and others, to the Council, on the state of progress in the Council regarding the social situation;
- oral question (Doc. B 2-100/85), by Mrs Maij-Weggen and others, to the Council, on the legislation in the fields of 'categories' of persons, 'working time' and 'equal treatment' of men and women;

### President

- oral question (Doc. B 2-435/85), by Mrs Chouraqui and others, on behalf of the RDE Group, to the Commission, on the rise in unemployment in the Community in 1984.

**Mr Didò (S).** — *(IT)* Mr President, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, at the part-session of Parliament in April an important debate took place on the fight against widespread unemployment, especially among young people, in the Community. Your own speech, Mr President of the Council, contained some very interesting comments and set out guidelines reflecting the opinions which have so often been expressed by the majority of this House. We are all agreed on the need for measures at Community level to coordinate Member States' policies and financial resources. Extra funds should be made available and full use made of the Community loans in ECU to the European Social Fund and productive investments in Member States as well as developments in transport and telecommunications, and the preservation of our cultural heritage.

Several resolutions were unanimously adopted by this House at the end of the debate, including some very important resolutions tabled by the Socialist Group in collaboration with the Italian Communist Group and the PPE reflecting the views of the European Federation of Trades Unions and outlining wide-ranging measures to reduce unemployment and promote the development of the economy. All of these measures taken together constitute the multi-annual European plan for employment.

It is unnecessary, Mr President, to recapitulate these different proposals which were adopted a few weeks ago and are contained in the resolution on which we are to vote at the end of this debate.

This Parliament and the President of the European Commission both agree that any employment plan must be based on the principle of social dialogue. We stated our conviction last April that the principle of a search for all-round consensus should be reaffirmed if the necessary development of the economy is to be achieved and the protection of workers guaranteed.

The trade union movement is ready to overcome a certain conservative attitude and lack of flexibility which can only be detrimental to the employment market. The current process of transformation and the introduction of new technology must be accompanied by increased flexibility and mobility. These recent problems will not be solved by indiscriminate and haphazard deregulation but by defining new rules, agreed upon by both sides of industry, and by respecting workers' basic rights.

Mr President, the social dialogue and shared decision-making on social policy required for the implementation of job creation and economic development

policies is of vital importance for the timely creation of a large single internal Community market. We must also create a social area on the European model based on the right of workers and employers representatives to access information, to consult and negotiate with each other.

The employment market must be adapted to cope with the introduction and development of new technology, through reforms of the organization and distribution of work and reorganization of working time.

It is with this in mind that we asked the Council to take measures to encourage renewed public and private investment, the implementation of job creation schemes and the setting up of new small and medium-sized undertakings, handicrafts industries and some cooperatives, and also to adopt finally the directives and recommendations on the following matters: part-time and temporary work; social rights (Fifth Directive); information of workers in transnational undertakings; reorganization and reduction of working time.

Mr President, President De Michelis informed us of the positive conclusions reached by the Standing Committee on Employment which met in Brussels on 30 May, conclusions which reflected the broad outlines of Parliament's proposals. We should like you, Mr President, to confirm our appraisal of the situation, but we are more interested to know if there is any likelihood of similar conclusions being reached by the Council of Ministers for Social Affairs and Employment at its meeting on 13 June.

We would like to see more social dialogue, which President Delor's initiative of last January seemed set to achieve.

Mr President, we take this opportunity to insist on the urgent need for action rather than rhetoric. Both the Council of Ministers and the European Council have made too many solemn promises. However, not only is the unemployment rate not falling but it is actually rising all the time. Facts show that the economic revival resulting from a cut in the inflation rate which was helped considerably by workers' acceptance of a stable wage policy has not led to the creation of more jobs. On the contrary, a far-reaching process of restructurization is going on, creating difficulties and even dangers in the social area.

There are many proposals for positive action, agreed upon by the workers and employers representatives themselves and shared by the Commission and Council.

We cannot wait any longer. We want to see firm decisions taken immediately to implement these proposals. We would ask you, Mr President, to communicate this unanimous wish of Parliament to the Commission and the Council.

**Didò**

We would ask the Council of Social Affairs and Employment Ministers at its meeting on 13 June to ask the Commission specifically to draw up proposals this year for the implementation, partly on an experimental basis, of job creation schemes as provided for in the resolutions tabled in April and adopted by Parliament and which reflect the conclusions of the Committee on Employment.

We would also ask the Council to request the EEC Heads of Government, meeting in Milan on 29 and 30 June, to give their support to guidelines laid down in the Multi-annual European plan for Employment and to ask the Committees of Experts to make similar pledges.

It is important to realize, Mr President, that such job creation schemes and the development of the Community economy are imperative, if the tragedy of mass unemployment, particularly among young people, is to be overcome. We also believe this to be the best way to achieve European union, because Europe should not only be a large market, a haven of technological development, but it should be first and foremost a social entity.

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

**Mr De Michelis, President-in-Office of the Council.** — *(IT)* Mr President, it gives me great pleasure, as President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers for Social Affairs, to take part in this sitting and answer the questions of Mr Didò and Mrs Majj-Weggen concerning items on the agenda of the Council meeting to be held in Luxembourg next Thursday 13 June.

I am picking up where I left off last April, when a discussion took place in this House on employment and other social questions, arising out of a series of resolutions tabled by the various groups and voted by this House. The conclusions of this debate were the subject of much discussion over the last few weeks with Members of the Council, especially at the meeting of the Standing Committee on Employment in Brussels on 29 and 30 May, previously referred to by Mr Didò. I think that it is important that this House should be given an idea of the likely outcome of the discussions which will shortly be taking place in Luxembourg. I shall be reporting back to the Council of Ministers who, I am sure, will take account of the conclusions reached.

I should like to speak on two points: first, the directives on the agenda of the Council of Ministers of Social Affairs, and second, schemes to combat unemployment which are the subject of continual discussion. I do not intend to speak for too long on the subject, but I hope to provide satisfactory answers to any Members' questions.

The Council of Ministers of 13 June will run into the same difficulties experienced in previous years and in

the last two terms in its attempt to get agreement among Community Member governments on directives relating to industrial relations, the employment market, workers' rights, and equal treatment for men and women.

Questions of principle and also of substance have made it impossible over the last few years to implement Community legislation in these areas. On many occasions, the Council has been unable to reach a decision on directives referred to it by the Commission, and, therefore, I cannot give you any information on them.

Given these actual circumstances, the Presidency took action this week on two fronts: first, to establish possible grounds for compromise on questions of content — changing the original texts of the directives to get over objections raised by the various members of the Council during the preceding weeks.

Second, to ascertain what instruments the Council intends to use to tackle certain problems — whether it is willing to continue using the directive as a means of dealing with employment problems and working conditions.

In reference to practically all the directives mentioned in the oral question, the Presidency of the Council intends to examine, at the meeting on 13 June, these two central points: one, the possibility of compromise by individual Members of the Council on questions in hand and two, the readiness of the Council to take decisions to implement legislation.

I repeat what I said last April, that when dealing with the social situation we should do all in our power to enable the Council of Ministers of the Community to exercise its authority and take decisions.

I should like to repeat that even negative decisions are decisions, as is realizing the impossibility of adopting legislation on certain matters. As we have seen in the last few terms, no progress will be made if Members get embroiled in inconclusive discussions which amount to no more than a confrontation between irreconcilable differences, giving everybody the impression that Europe is incapable of implementing a proper social policy.

We shall attempt to encourage the Council and also the Commission to lead the way in these matters for the entire Community.

From the point of view of the two issues I have just referred to, we shall explore the situation with regard to the following directives: one on voluntary part-time work, which has encountered resistance from some Council members to the adoption of Community standards which would be binding in all the Member States, and two, the proposal for a directive on the information and consultation of workers which has

### De Michelis

been longest with the Council. We have just submitted proposals to the Council aimed at compromise which, on the one hand, provides for a possible limiting of the scope of a directive on information of workers, and, on the other, the possibility of applying directives on social agreements as well as legislation at national level. This would help to overcome the resistance of those Member States who wish to retain the possibility of legislating at national level on matters such as the information of workers.

The Presidency would like to see Council Members show a willingness to take action on these two directives, not by a formal vote but by empowering the Commission to take a decision. I believe we must put an end to purely academic discussion and take firm decisions on future action.

The proposal for a fifth directive on the structure of limited companies is already on the agenda of today's meeting of the Council, and an initial examination of the articles relating to the administrative bodies of limited companies is being carried out. It could take until the end of this year to complete and even continue into the next term of office. During the coming year more attention will be paid to the problem of worker participation in the parts of the company decision-making process to which the proposals for a directive apply. At this juncture, only matters coming more specifically within the jurisdiction of the Council of Social Affairs will be discussed.

It is our intention to reach a final decision at the meeting of 13 June on the directive on the protection of workers from noise, exploring the possibilities of a compromise which would result in the adoption of the two questions left in abeyance: hearing checks and limits of workers' exposure to noise. I believe that once the various members of the Council reach a compromise on a way of gradually applying the directive, it will be possible to have this directive approved at the sitting of Thursday 13 June.

The differing opinions of various Members of the Council made it very difficult over the last few weeks to obtain final approval of the directive on equal treatment of men and women referred to in Mrs Maij-Weggen's question. There are questions of principle and of substance partly concerning the feasibility of adopting directives on these matters at Community level, and partly, the individual standards provided for in the initial proposals made by the Commission. We have entered these problems on the agenda of the Council, with the intention of testing the willingness of its Members, whilst remembering that it is the first time that the two directives relating to parental leave and equal treatment for men and women in occupational social security schemes are being discussed at a formal sitting of the Council of Ministers.

We have, to some extent, pinpointed the difficulties, both of substance and of principle, and we continue to

be able to provide the Council and the Commission with precise guidelines which will help them to reach a conclusion in the coming weeks.

The third directive on equal treatment of men and women is still being examined and, consequently, will be deferred to the next Presidency, when it will be entered on the agenda of the next formal meeting of the Council of Ministers in December.

I have given you a rough idea of how difficult it is to obtain decisions on social policy, using decrees of the Council which are binding upon Member States, at Community level.

The difficulties lie in joining the renewal of the European idea, political unity and a large internal market to the achievement once and for all of an efficient European social area which the European Parliament, the Council of Ministers and the Commission — in its recent working plan — have called for.

These difficulties will have to be looked at at a more general level starting at the next Summit in Milan. However, they will not be solved by running away from them but by facing up to them, even if this entails changes of direction.

We could achieve this if the Community institutions — Commission, Council, European Parliament — were to show sufficient commitment on the question of employment, or rather unemployment, which is a priority issue in the real world of the Community today requiring appropriate measures. In other words, there must be a general consensus when it comes to enacting Community legislation and it seems to the Presidency that some attempt should be possible to tackle unemployment at Community level.

We have worked in this direction, on the other hand, in full agreement with the decisions taken last April by this Parliament, which voted a series of resolutions of similar content; in agreement also with the decisions taken by the European Council in Brussels last March, which not only confirmed the priority of the fight against unemployment but clearly outlined four areas for action including a large single market, development, measures to encourage the development of small and medium-sized undertakings in particular, actions to speed up the introduction of new technology and — as revealed by the European Council in Brussels last March — specific measures for the creation of jobs, including a study by the Commission on the possibility of using the Social Fund to promote innovative and exemplary experiments, as well as programmes to solve the employment problems of certain socially deprived groups.

In the light of the Council decision and resolutions voted at the session of Parliament, we have spent several weeks drawing up a document which could be adopted on Thursday by the Council of Ministers. At

**De Michelis**

a meeting of the Standing Committee on Employment workers and employers represented there all agreed on most of the major issues and they concluded that action at Community level was more practical. A concrete programme should be drawn up for special measures to combat unemployment in the Community, basically by implementing this special long-term plan as requested by Parliament last April.

The conclusions reached by the Committee on Employment will be the subject of a motion for a resolution (it will be impossible to make it in the form of a resolution) which we shall discuss at the meeting in Luxembourg. As well as giving general indications for this special experimental plan for Community action, we will take up and develop certain specific initiatives which were already examined in the debate of the Standing Committee on Employment.

These initiatives centred on the following: reform of the employment market to render it more flexible, reduce the number of regulations and safeguard a number of workers' rights; encouragement of investment in the public and private sector, concentrating on investment plans of particular interest throughout Europe with a view to the development of marginal employment; a stepping-up of research and the introduction of new technology; defining of supplementary initiatives, particularly in the underdeveloped areas worst hit by the structural crises in the industrial sectors which are essential to the survival of the European economy; adoption of measures to accompany the large internal market of the Community with the organization of a European social area and finally of positive suggestions on new methods of financing.

I should like to develop this a little further. Obviously, long-term special Community action to combat unemployment presupposes the availability of adequate financial resources which should be incorporated into the budgetary provisions set out by the Council of Ministers, Commission and Parliament for the near future. Besides restricting themselves to the possible use of the European Social Fund in the near future, they should also explore new channels within the scope of the Committee on Employment, such as a possible system of Community loans or special financing from the Community budget.

I believe that the best way for the Community to prove its worth and make its mark in Europe is to continue the search for new methods of financing and carry out experiments aimed at showing the practical advantages of the various measures proposed.

The Presidency will respect Parliament's wishes by ensuring that these matters are examined by the Council on 13 June. I agree with the suggestion that they should also be referred to the European Council at the end of June for a more general discussion. The suggestions and requests made by Parliament cannot but assist us in our efforts to overcome the difficulties,

resistance and, I would go so far as to say, legitimate divergence of opinions. We in the Council of Ministers made every effort to take these into account in our attempt to reach decisions.

I think I have supplied you with sufficient information and I reiterate my promise to bring the conclusions of this discussion to the attention of the Council of Ministers on Thursday, either by mentioning points raised in the debate or communicating any formal decisions which might be taken by the House.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE).** — *(NL)* Mr President, you will have noticed that Mr De Michelis has answered questions that appear in my oral question, and I am surprised that you have given Mr Didò the chance to put his questions but denied me and other questioners the same opportunity. It is very boring to ask someone questions he has already answered. I am surprised at this procedure, because my question was added to Mr Didò's at 5 o'clock, and I can also tell you that we submitted our question five weeks earlier than Mr Didò. I am therefore beginning to wonder what in fact is going on here.

**President.** — Mrs Maij-Weggen, Parliament decided at 5 p.m., when considering the order of business, that whilst your question would be taken, only one speaker would actually open the debate and that was Mr Didò. You have heard what the Council has had to say; when you speak later on, you will be able to reply and be in a more advantageous position than Mr Didò because you will be able to take up any short-comings you see in the Council's reply. It was a decision of Parliament on the order of business which resulted in only Mr Didò being called.

**Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission.** — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have been asked to reply to the question by Mrs Chouraqui on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance.

As was mentioned in the oral question, the Commission's working plan for 1985 sets out its economic strategy for effective action to fight unemployment. We are currently working on improvements to the employment market as requested by Parliament.

Only a month ago, the Commission submitted to the Standing Committee on Employment of the Council a working document entitled 'Employment, growth and the European Social Dimension', which included several proposals to do with the working plan I have just mentioned, proposals which reflect to a large extent the positions of the European Parliament. These are the major points contained in the Commission communication: the encouragement of more rapid econo-

## Natali

mic growth with specific emphasis on employment issues, particularly incentives to public and private investment; the creation of a more modern employment market, catering for the needs of all the interested parties; the assurance of close collaboration between workers' and employers' representatives, especially in the introduction of new technology — and in this connection I should like to point out to Mr Didò that some very encouraging talks are taking place between workers' and employers' representatives; the drawing up of other initiatives intended to stimulate economic growth and create jobs, especially in underdeveloped areas subject to wide-ranging structural changes or with particularly high rates of unemployment; the creation of a European social dimension as part of a vast market without barriers to trade.

The conclusions of the chairman of the Committee on Employment illustrated the favourable reception given to these proposals by all those present. The President of the Council told us that they were discussed along with his own proposals for short-term experimental Community measures, coordinated with measures taken by Member States, to create jobs using the possibilities offered by the financial structures of the Community. In the longer term, it might be feasible to launch a special European Employment Plan, but better financial resources would have to be sought. In this connection, I should like to say, Mr President, that the Commission will do all in its power to support the initiatives of the Presidency at the Council meeting of 13 June.

Of course, it is regrettable that a whole series of communications and resolutions which we tabled have had little or no effect because our suggestions were not always implemented correctly. We realize that while most Member States have had to face up to difficult choices in their economic and social policies, some have been in a better position to develop more active policies to fight unemployment without destabilising their economies. The Commission will continue to urge Member States to apply the policies and measures hitherto proposed as soon as possible. I should like the Commission's next annual economic report to include a full account of its general economic strategy with specific proposals for special measures to be taken at Community and national levels.

**Mr Vetter (S).** — (*DE*) Mr President-in-Office of the Council, my colleague Mr Didò has made the points which all the groups in this Parliament had agreed on. Had your reply been remotely satisfactory, I would have been happy to waive my right to speak, but this was not so.

The questions put to you are vitally important for the workers of Europe who represent millions of people in the European Community. What is the Community's attitude, which means above all the Council of Minis-

ters, to all these questions relating to the protection, rights and co-determination of workers?

Particularly in view of the forthcoming meeting of the Council of Ministers for Labour and in the days and weeks ahead that are so important for Europe, I should like to arrive at a more profound level of discussion, for we cannot keep coming back to the same point. There are phases in our historical development when greater commitment is needed.

All of us here in the European Parliament welcomed Commission President Delors' inaugural speech when he spoke of the need to bring Europe closer to the workers and people of Europe. We were all pleased by Mr Andreotti's views as Council President when he described the Council's programme for the first half of 1985 under the Italian Presidency. We attached particular importance to his statement that special attention must be given to the social aspects of the changes and restructuring that are without doubt needed in the national industries.

Every European is aware that steps must be taken if the People's Europe is not to be lost sight of in the European Parliament, in the offices of the Commission and especially in the Council of Ministers, if they continue to behave as they have done in the past.

All of us who take the task of creating a People's Europe seriously must place the interests of the millions of workers and their families at the centre of policy. We must be aware of the millions of men, women and young people who are without jobs, without hope and without a future.

I would ask you, Mr President of the Council: what are the workers and their families to think of this Europe that offers them no protection, gives them no rights and excludes them from any participation in the creation of Europe? How are we to create a new Europe, and how are we to reinstate Europe as a leading political, economic and social power in the world, if we continue to rob the workers of their essential right to co-determination at their place of work and in society?

It is precisely those who wish to transform the European Community into a dynamic society in terms of research and technology who must recognize that the new technologies must be accepted by the working population if they are to bring major benefits. Acceptance of new technologies will remain an empty phrase until there is cooperation and co-determination by workers and their trade unions in all these vital decisions.

I should like to refer briefly to a few specific points: particularly where European company law is concerned, a two-speed process of development can be discerned. Whereas directives on the concentration of capital or international cooperation between undertak-

**Vetter**

ings are adopted, directives which aim to protect the rights of workers are delayed — even in direct opposition to Parliament's wishes.

There is no doubt that harmonization of company law leads to a strengthening of the internal market and saves costs. Companies are able to strengthen their economic potential by the elimination of technical and fiscal obstacles. But if company law is to be given a European dimension for the sake of the internal market and this aspect strengthened, it is essential that workers' rights should be treated in the same way.

The reality in Europe is that in six Community countries i.e. West Germany, Denmark, France, Ireland, Luxembourg and Holland, worker co-determination already exists in joint-stock companies, albeit in very different forms and to a different degree. Only in Belgium, Greece, the United Kingdom and Italy is there no such provision. If European competitiveness is to be taken seriously, the same regulations on the structure of joint-stock companies and the powers and obligations of their constituent bodies must apply in all countries.

The so-called Fifth Directive on company law, which has been before the Council of Ministers for over ten years, must be adopted so that it can be made clear to workers that Europe takes workers' interests seriously. This also applies to the Vredeling Directive, which I am sure you will all recall: at the start of the debate, this directive practically divided us into two opposing camps but was adopted by Parliament after a hard-fought compromise had been reached. The workers of Europe, who initially regarded the Vredeling Directive as discriminatory, now take a very positive view of it.

I am sure you will all remember the strenuous attempts made by the European and US industrial and economic lobbies to prevent the introduction of this directive, which aims to safeguard the rights of workers in multinational companies to information and consultation. I can very well imagine, in the light of the forceful action by these groups in the European Parliament, that the representatives of the multinationals and business consultants will not fail to make themselves heard in the Council of Ministers.

The Council of Ministers should not allow itself to be intimidated and led astray. It is not a question of a 19th century transfer of seignorial powers but of laying the foundations for a balance of interests in places of work to promote stability.

Some two years ago there was a special debate in Parliament on the campaign against unemployment. At the time, Parliament made it quite clear that shortening and restructuring working time was a major element in combating unemployment. In December 1979 the Council of Ministers also took a decision on the restructuring of working time. On the subject of overtime, the Council decision commented laconically that

regular recourse to overtime should be limited, which is at least a small sign of progress.

As far as part-time working is concerned, the Council takes the view that part-time workers should have the same social rights and obligations as full-time workers, provided that consideration is given to the special aspects of part-time work. The Council, therefore, need only take decisions in accordance with what it has already said.

On temporary work, the Council has said that there should be action at Community level to support measures by Member States to monitor temporary work and to ensure that temporary workers have full social protection.

After consulting Parliament, the Commission submitted two draft directives to the Council of Ministers on part-time working, temporary work and fixed-term contracts. There is no doubt, Mr President of the Council, that if Europe is to recover economically, new methods must be found, and to a certain extent part-time work and temporary work could be justified. But let me warn against restricting the concept of flexibility solely to workers and excluding the companies.

*(Applause)*

If workers are prepared to accept such working conditions, then co-determination, industrial democracy and social security must also be guaranteed.

Decent working conditions must include health protection. After consulting Parliament, the Commission, in accordance with its brief, submitted a directive to the Council on noise protection for workers. The Commission proposes a maximum level of 85 dB. This represents the level that would be reached if a motor car were to drive at top speed through the Chamber.

Some of the governments in the Council of Ministers still feel that this is too low and they have suggested that the maximum level be increased to 90 dB — equivalent to a heavy goods vehicle thundering through the Chamber.

I appeal to you, ladies and gentlemen in the Council of Ministers, not to expect the hundreds of thousands of European workers to work under these conditions and to adopt this directive on noise levels, which offers a genuine contribution to the protection of workers at their place of work. I would draw your attention to the fact that currently 50% of all male workers in West Germany retire early at the age of 54 on health grounds.

I would like to say a few words about youth unemployment. Every fourth youngster in the Community is without a job. How are these young people to have any faith in Europe if nothing is done to help them? The European Parliament has put forward numerous

**Vetter**

suggestions on jobs for the young unemployed. If we take the problem of youth unemployment seriously, we must press for the European Social Fund to be topped up to finance pilot schemes to create jobs for young people, and for those regions and sectors of industry that are particularly seriously affected to receive more resources.

The European Community cannot replace completely national measures to provide employment for these groups, but it can set an example so that some young people find jobs, young people who are the new generation of voters and who will thereby regain faith in our European Community.

Mr Council President, I would like to make a personal comment. I have been at the service of working people for the last 37 years. You begin to recognize when the time has come to act. I think the time has come!

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE).** — *(NL)* Mr President, the oral questions that have been tabled by Mr Didò and myself on events in the Council of Social Ministers were prompted by serious concern about the legal position of millions of workers. In the past the Commission has submitted various social action programmes which sought to improve and harmonize the legal position of large categories of employees, and these action programmes included many proposals for directives. The European Parliament fully endorsed these action programmes, knowing that they are very important for many European citizens. In the past the Council has also shown its approval of these programmes and so opened the way for the submission of the proposals for directives. The Commission for its part has done its job well in this respect: it has proposed directives to protect employees at the workplace, directives on vocational training, directives designed to improve worker participation in firms, directives concerning the redistribution of work, directives to eliminate the unequal treatment of men and women and directives to strengthen the position of migrants.

A total of sixteen directives have been proposed, and they have all been approved, with some amendments, by Parliament, often after long and intensive debates, but by a democratic decision-making procedure. And what has the Council done since then? Of the sixteen directives that have been proposed on different aspects, only two have been approved in five years, one on lead and one on asbestos, and that is all as far as directives are concerned. Mr President, any institution that neglects its duty in this way ought really to be dismissed, and yet the same Council will be meeting this week or next to consider this directive for the umpteenth time. And what will it do? It will do what it has been doing for the past five years: it will adopt new recommendations or approve general programmes, programmes which fly away in the wind, programmes

which the citizens of Europe will hear nothing more of within twelve months, programmes about which the national parliaments, I am convinced, know precious little.

Mr President, I should like to shine the spotlight on the most important of the directives that have been gathering dust for the last five years: they are all named in both Mr Didò's and my own oral question. I am referring to the Vredeling directive and the Fifth Directive, to the directive on part-time and temporary workers, the directive on parental leave, the recommendation concerning the redistribution of work and particularly the directives on the equal treatment of men and women.

The Vredeling directive and the Fifth Directive seek to harmonize and strengthen the democratic rules in European industry, especially in the area of worker participation. Present legislation on this aspect differs very widely from one Member State to another. Mr Vetter has given a good example of this. British and Italian employees, for example, have far less say than Dutch and German employees. This is not only a bad thing for the millions of workers who are not sufficiently involved in the major decisions taken in their firms: it is also a bad thing for European industry because foreign investors take account of such factors. Some investors deliberately choose the countries in which the employees have little say. In other words, competition is distorted at the expense of workers with limited rights.

The recommendation and directives on the redistribution of work are similarly very important for many workers, especially working women. The directives that concern part-time and temporary work must harmonize the legal position of part-time and temporary workers at European level. Here again, the situation in the Member States is extremely chaotic. Why is it that hardly any women in Belgium work part-time, whereas over 60 % of women in the Netherlands and Denmark have part-time jobs? It has a great deal to do with the legal position of part-time workers in the various countries, and anyone who wants to redistribute work must ensure that part-time workers have the same legal rights as other workers. Then more people, not only women but men too, will be interested in shorter, flexible working hours. The same is true of the directive on parental leave. Six Member States have parental leave, while others have no such arrangement. Mr President, the Council often talks a great deal about demographic problems, for example. But why do you not give workers, or working women, a proper opportunity to take leave when they have young children? It is no wonder that very many young mothers refuse to go out to work.

A third category of directives I should like to mention concern equal treatment in occupational social security schemes and the equal treatment of men and women in self-employed occupations. The first directive con-

**Maij-Weggen**

cerns pensions. How long are we going to put up with 40 % of working women having to pay higher pension premiums and receiving lower benefits than men? And how long are we going to put up with the discrimination against women wanting to set up their own businesses that is so pronounced in some countries that there are hardly any businesswomen? How much potential female enterprise is suppressed and how many jobs are not created as a result?

To conclude, Mr President, I should like to say a few words about the directives that concern the legal position of migrant workers. Four directives on this subject await a decision. What is the matter with the Council? It is always calling for greater mobility in the labour market, and yet it keeps putting off a decision on these directives. They are after all a precondition for mobility. If we want people to cross frontiers into other Member States in search of work, we must ensure that their legal position is in order. Otherwise, they will be working to their own disadvantage.

Mr President, I have said — quite rightly —: what is the matter with the Council? Two directives in five years and fourteen on the waiting list, that is surely a sign of failure, and the Council should be deeply ashamed. Failure of which millions of European citizens, working men and women, are the victims. And now you tell us you want to launch a new programme. But, Mr President, as the directives have not been approved yet, what are we going to achieve with new programmes? You say you intend making global expressions of will and that you want final instructions for future six-month periods. But, Mr President, these are just words, they are not deeds.

On behalf of my group and of millions of European citizens who have elected us to this Parliament, we appeal to the Council to take decisions, to cut the knots and to approve the fourteen directives that await a decision. We call on the President of the Council to organize a marathon meeting. He should send the recalcitrant Ministers a telegram saying that they may not leave Luxembourg until they have approved at least half of these directives. We have set this out in a resolution, and we call on Parliament to adopt it. Mr President, we hope you will send this appeal to Luxembourg and that it will be heard there.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Tuckman (ED).** — Mr President, one big theme in this debate so far has been the deplorable slowness of the Council in doing anything at all — in fact, slowness is already a funny word because there has not been any movement. Clearly, if there are parliamentary resolutions — whether we have liked all of them or not is irrelevant — they ought to be showing some effect: they do not! In that sense I very much echo what everybody has said in the House so far.

There has also been another theme, and this really is an extraordinarily worrying one from the point of view of Europe and from the point of view of those whom we are trying to help here. Everybody deplores unemployment, everybody is sad if Europe is threatened in its standard of living. There is a definition of what represents sanity: sanity is if you are still in touch with reality. A great deal of what is being said today and what is being repeated all the time seems to ignore some of these realities without which — if we do not recognize them—we are not being sane. If I recall the things said by Mr Vetter — who, unfortunately, does not seem to regard it as a debate but merely as a proclamation because he has gone away — Mr Vetter talks about protecting the worker, the rights of the worker and the co-determination of the work. Rights, protection and co-determination are, of course, very nice things. Mr Vetter claims that they make us more competitive, but I would have thought that out in the Far East, where our real threat comes from, these three words would lead to smiles rather than to threats, to worries, to the sort of reaction that they feel they are facing a genuine competitor who can stop them in some way. If I have rights, that is fine if I can enforce them. If I wish to protect people, that is fair enough if I know how. Co-determination is fine, it seems to work extremely well in some countries. But you, Mr President, know as well I do that in some countries there seems to be resistance even from those who are asked to participate in this kind of exercise against doing so, because the class structure as it exists in their minds says: if we go and participate we are already class traitors. Ghastly words from my point of view and really far removed from what ought to be the reality — but that is how it is being talked about.

Then I hear a lot of people — particularly those represented by Mr Vetter, a man who has been in this field for a very long time and therefore, I would have thought, should know his realities — who talk about the Vredeling draft directive and do not mention the fact that the directive, which was passed by this House, was voted against by his own party. Therefore he does not seem to have liked it very much. What, in fact, is it that he wishes to see passed?

If you listen to the underlying tones in a lot of what has been said, he does not really like part-time work and he does not like temporary work. Yet those are large chunks of the new reality which might perhaps give us extra jobs for people now in unemployment. But because these cannot be organized into the union power-structure, he does not really find them very comfortable. He therefore makes it a complaint — he puts it before this House as something immoral that one should really want to support these. Those were not quite the words used, but the underlying implication is there that really in the last resort Mr Vetter and those who think like him are old-fashioned in a quite fundamental sense: that which supports the structure of unionism suits him and that which is of a much looser kind, of a genuinely democratic kind, of a gen-

**Tuckman**

vine kind — lots of different things happening, some of which might perhaps lead to something — well, they are uncomfortable, they are not organizable and, therefore, he does not really want them.

I want to make it clear that there is a great deal in what is happening that we on our side support. In particular, we support this question of leave for people who are having children; we very much support the notion that the woman really has exactly the same competences and ought to have the same rights as the man, and on that question we are together.

Mr President, I want as my concluding piece, in order to stay within the time-limit, to say that what is really at stake is a number of realities. What we are talking about here may bring comfort to some, but it will not bring jobs to those many who have not got them — to the 13% who are without work. Therefore, I am of the opinion that the whole of this debate lacks a reality which has to be hinged on that very simple question: does that which we are doing create extra customers somewhere in the world, because without them we do not have the income and our present high standard of living is likely to diminish?

**Mr Raggio (COM).** — *(IT)* Mr President, I listened with interest to what the President-in-Office of the Council had to say about his intentions regarding the next meeting for the Council for Social Affairs. I have noted the pledges he has made to do all he can to facilitate the Council's task of deciding on directives on social problems whose state of progress in Council has been too slow. Mr De Michelis's pledge comes as something new and positive and will bring the Council out of the state of inertia in which it has been for so long.

However, I do not think that Parliament should be satisfied with this pledge to facilitate a Council decision at all costs, even if this is a negative one. On the contrary, I think an effort should be made to ensure that the Council for Social Affairs makes decisions which reflect the guidelines, opinions and deliberations of this Parliament. I should like to raise the question of immigration not contained in the oral question tabled by Mr Didò and others. The Commission has made proposals, Parliament has tabled a resolution and I should like to see the Council for Social Affairs show a willingness to take urgent positive action on this question.

As far as the special plan for employment is concerned, we are in agreement on the conclusions of the Standing Committee, referred to by Mr De Michelis, the five points reflecting the guidelines and proposals of the European Parliament, and these indications of a general nature which the President-in-Office of the Council set out this evening. However, there are some further considerations to be taken into account. First, I think I am correct in saying that Mr De Michelis said

at a meeting of the Standing Committee on Employment that the special programme for employment should be operating before next January. If this timetable is to be respected, the Council clearly cannot restrict itself to a policy debate but will have to take decisions. It is equally obvious that if the procedure is to be completed within the year, a suitable timetable will have to be adopted.

Second, there is the question of how the special programme is to be financed, particularly investment projects relating to important sectors such as transport, energy, telecommunications, environmental protection, cultural heritage and public services. It is obviously not a question of simply asking the Commission to find more money. The matter must first of all be dealt with by the Council.

The last question concerns the precise positions and deliberations reached by Parliament on certain fundamental aspects of a special employment policy. I am referring to two particularly important problems — the reorganization of working time and the problem of social dialogue and information of workers about new technology. We shall wait and see if the Council of Social Affairs makes any progress on these two questions at its meeting of 13 June. However, we cannot forget that a much clearer position came from employers' representatives regarding these two questions at a meeting of the Standing Committee. Mr De Michelis only made a fleeting reference to this quite sensitive aspect. I believe, however, that on this attitude from some of the European employers contrary to . . .

**President.** — I am sorry, Mr Raggio, but your speaking time is up.

**Mrs Tove Nielsen (L).** — *(DA)* Mr President, Mr President-in-Office, tomorrow Parliament will be taking stock of the work done by the Italian presidency over the half-year now coming to an end. I doubt if time will be taken up tomorrow to discuss employment policy or social policy matters. It seems appropriate therefore to take this opportunity today to give the Council our views on the work it has done in the employment policy and social policy fields.

I do not think that the President-in-Office is in any doubt that our feelings on the subject are not at all positive. Nor are we the slightest bit proud of anything that has been done. On the contrary, we are utterly despondent to note that in fact nothing whatsoever is happening.

Something that the President-in-Office said caught my attention: he said that negative decisions were also decisions. How right he is! Negative decisions are also decisions — they mean that something is being done. But the real situation is entirely the opposite: nothing

## Nielsen

is being done. Proposals have been piling up on the table of the Council of Ministers for years. There is no doubt that Parliament is the only institution which has played its part and has done what can be expected of a parliament: it has spoken out. Now it is high time that the Council of Ministers plays the role which falls to it. It has not yet done so. We have had our fill of words. It has struck me over the years we have been discussing these matters that this is a disservice to the citizens of Europe. They have a right to expect action: action whose effects they will be able to perceive in their everyday lives. One of the issues which forces its presence upon us is the unemployment prevailing in all the countries of Europe. It is a task we are all agreed on. Why do we not act, so that the citizens can see we are creating a better Europe for them? A Europe with better economic conditions, where people feel ready to invest in business, where new and competitive products are manufactured, where we can hold our own on the great world market in the face of the giants, the USA and Japan. That is what will create new jobs, that is what will produce lasting employment. I am well aware that the Socialist view favours breathing artificial life into something for a short period of time. We Liberals do not believe in that; we want to create something permanent, something which will give all the citizens of Europe a future.

In short we must become more skilful. We shall not have a Europe which can hold its own in the world unless we improve our skills. Why is something not done about vocational training? Why do we not adopt new technology?

The European Parliament has — under my name — produced a report on vocational training and new technology. But why do we not get things moving? We face such great challenges; it is up to us to take them up and exploit them. We are certainly not more stupid than the Americans or the Japanese but, if we do not have the will to win, we shall lose the prize.

So, instead of all the talk that goes on every time the Council meets, Mr President-in-Office, take some action! There are so many important issues to grapple with. Why can our young people not migrate freely across frontiers, establish themselves and follow a trade? In theory they can already do that, but in practice it cannot be done because our youngsters, and the generation before them too, are not equipped for it. We do not know enough about the different systems of education and training: if the qualifications people have are unknown, they are already at a disadvantage, for nobody is willing to risk giving them a job. Why do we not restructure in such a way that manpower can be properly utilized, in places where it can be put to best use? Why do we not learn to see the Community as a *community for all*, one which is not split up into national units, because that is where the real problem arises. The Council of Ministers still holds to national attitudes which stand in the way of decisions, whereas we in the European Parliament have shown

that we can transcend national frontiers and arrive at common European solutions.

It is also our role but now, on behalf of the citizens of Europe, we must demand action to create jobs, to deal with unemployment and to tackle all those questions which have been left to pile up on the table. There is no point in saying that the institutions should be given redefined roles if the institutions we have at the present time cannot even show enough will — and I am thinking mainly of the Council here — to play the roles which we are entitled to expect of them.

**Mr Lalor (RDE).** — Mr President, I welcome the opportunity provided by the oral question tabled by Mr Didò and others to put forward certain points regarding the state of progress on the social situation. The issues raised in Mr Didò's question are complex and certainly were not adequately covered in the Council's reply, which is only matched by the inadequacy of Council action over a number of years now in relation to the growing menace of unemployment.

We must not lose sight of the priority issue which we, as Members of the European Parliament, have raised in the past and will continue to raise in the future. That issue is the overwhelming need and obligation to create jobs for the 13 million people out of work in the Community, particularly the long-term unemployed and the considerable percentage of young people who are without work in each Member State of the Community. Far too much lip service has been paid to this priority question. When it comes to the provision of sufficient financial aid to tackle the problem, the Council is absolutely not prepared to face up to its responsibilities in this regard. Instead of trying to take from one policy to support the needs of another, the Community should have the courage to provide a budget that will enable new policies to be created and to ensure that the existing policies, such as the Regional Fund and the transport policy, can be fully and truly effective. If real and lasting employment opportunities are to be created, then the Council must establish the conditions necessary to achieve our desired economic recovery.

The Didò oral question asked the Council to indicate the state of progress with regard to the directive on consultation of and provision of information for employees in transnational undertakings — otherwise known as the Vredeling Directive. When this first came before the European Parliament it was the subject of long and intensive debate. Dialogue between the two sides of industry is necessary, but the need for the type of Community instrument that has been proposed has certainly not been proved. Informing and consulting employees in firms and establishments on matters of direct concern to them are certainly important aspects of the dialogue between the two sides of industry. It must be underlined that due regard is already given to the information and consultation of

### Lalor

employees in all Member States of the Community, taking into account the different national situations. In addition, both the OECD and the ILO have introduced instruments which deal with the question. What is important here is that they emphasize the voluntary approach.

Improved efficiency in the working of a company is very important, particularly in view of the continuing need for the Community to begin to make real and lasting economic recovery. The measures that have been proposed do not, in my opinion, improve the efficiency of company operations nor the functioning of the common market. I have already stressed the need for the Community to establish the conditions necessary for economic recovery, which embraces the need for new investment and the consolidation of existing investment. If the Vredeling Directive were to be adopted in its entirety, vital US and Japanese investment could be seriously jeopardized. Investment means employment. With 13 million people out of work, we can surely suggest that even more jobs should not be threatened by introducing an unworkable and divisive directive.

Without question, one of the major issues of the proposed Vredeling Directive is that which deals with the confidentiality of information. Even under the amended Commission proposal, while information relating to rationalization plans, manufacturing and working methods and, in particular, the introduction of new working methods no longer needs to be disclosed, a clear picture of the structure, the economic and financial situation, the probable development of the business and of production and sales as well as investment prospects are to be communicated to the employees' representatives. The European Parliament's amendments to this section, which propose that information should not be made available which might contain any company secret or business secret, are stronger than the proposal in the Commission's revised text.

With the best will in the world, confidentiality is not feasible when information has to be passed on to a large number of people. Commercial information is a valuable resource and can be very useful to competitors. I urge the Council to put forward its views on the whole question of secrecy. Furthermore, in view of the fact that an *ad hoc* working party was set up towards the end of last year to review the draft Council directive, I would ask what conclusions have been reached on this vital question. In addition, I would ask the Council to state whether or not the *ad hoc* working party considered the question of the number of people who would have to be employed in a subsidiary before such a directive could be applied and, if so, what is its position now on this matter.

Harmony in the workplace is essential. To have to legislate for harmony is counterproductive. Voluntary arrangements between both sides of industry at the

level of the individual enterprise is our preference. Our priority at this time is the creation of satisfying and lasting employment, and measures to encourage full-time work must be our main task. We must clear up the type of situation where you 17.6% of the workforce unemployed in a country like Ireland, which heads the list at the present time. I hope the Council tackles this problem sooner rather than later.

**Mr Härlin (ARC).** — (DE) Mr President, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, there are other topics that clear the Chamber, but when either the social situation or detailed aspects of the harmonization of the European market are on the agenda we can be certain of an empty hemicycle. The reasons, however, are quite different.

As far as the social situation is concerned, it is presumably clear to everyone that nothing can be achieved, whereas when it comes to market harmonization it is assumed that the experts will take the proper action, since it is basically agreed that the market, the capitalist system in Europe, must be provided with better conditions.

These directives, some of which have been under discussion for years, or, as Mr Vetter pointed out, for a decade, do absolutely nothing to improve the lot of workers. They are simply classic examples of emergency brakes in a situation where workers' rights are threatened and attempts to prevent any too dramatic changes. Despite this, the Council consistently refuses to comment at all on these directives, putting forward various pretexts and reasons, some of which may in themselves be valid.

I personally think it would be better if the Council were to commit itself to rejecting these directives, instead of insisting all the time on the need to search for compromise solutions, or new approaches etc. The refusal to take a decision is also a decision. When in doubt, the Council should be prepared to take a stand, instead of evading the problem from one meeting to the next!

In my view, this time factor is of prime importance, particularly where the Vredeling Directive is concerned. An attempt is being made to create conditions without worker control, on which, in two or three years, when restructuring has already taken place, when there is a *fait accompli*, they will have the right of co-determination. This is a classic example of capitalism playing for time!

As far as the measures to create new jobs are concerned, my impression is that all that is happening is that what is already being achieved by the Social Fund — and this is very little — is being presented as if it were a question of new measures, and all the rest meets the demands of employers not of workers, namely, the introduction of new technologies and a more flexible job market . . .

**President.** — Mr Harlin, I am afraid you have exceeded your time and I must ask you to sit down. You have used up all your time and more. We are pressed for time and I must call the next speaker.

**Mr Vernimmen (S).** — (NL) Mr President, in December 1983 President Thorn of the Commission complained that decision-making in the Council had come to a virtual standstill. Only a few days ago his successor, Mr Delors, threatened to resign over the indecision of the same Council of Ministers. The European Parliament can certainly sympathize with the Commission's Presidents at feeling so discouraged. The Commission's President, or indeed the Commission, has not always been lacking in dynamism. Mr Delors has argued very cogently in favour of an ambitious and cohesive programme for European recovery. He has also breathed new life into the European social dialogue. But the Council of Ministers is very slow when it comes to taking decisions. Any number of proposals for directives have been awaiting a decision for years.

But the worst thing is that the Council is evidently still unaware of the European Community's responsibility towards its young people and particularly the young unemployed. It is nowhere near enough to approve resolutions and finance pilot projects. Young people expect the European Community to do its duty in every way. The Council has never yet done that. The social guarantee for young people that has been under discussion for so long unfortunately remains a paper guarantee for many hundreds of thousands. We personally feel that enough has been said about youth unemployment and enough studies have been made: the time has come for action. I therefore appeal to the Council to introduce as a matter of urgency a cohesive and effective employment and training policy specifically for young people. The European Community must be able to find the financial resources required, both within existing financial instruments and elsewhere.

Various financing proposals have already been put forward. A European employment fund has been proposed. There has also been talk of a large European recovery loan. Community money is available. But the Community must mobilize the money and inject it into the European economy to boost employment. It goes without saying that, apart from the specific employment and training policy, a general policy is still needed in this area. We urge that immediate decisions be taken to increase — in a coordinated way — public investment equivalent to 1% of GNP and to launch European infrastructural projects. These projects must be geared to the establishment of the European internal market, a genuine European monetary union, a policy of accelerated European development, with thousands of young people employed under European auspices, and an all-embracing but differentiated European industrial policy, under which more is done

to mobilize European research and production potential at European level. But I would add that this must be done without detriment to past social achievements, which represent a unique European cultural and moral accomplishment.

We realize that, if these ambitious proposals are to be implemented, the Council of Ministers needs the support and cooperation not only of Parliament but also — and I stress this — of the European employers' and employees' organizations. At its latest congress in Milan in May 1985 the European Trade Union Confederation promised total support for this policy. It is now for the European employers to prove that they too are prepared to translate into practice the ideals they frequently proclaim with so many words. Now that company profits have risen almost everywhere in Europe — which I think is a good thing — more money must be spent in Europe so that the adage that 'today's profits are tomorrow's investments and the jobs of the day after' may come true. We have waited far too long for the second and third phases of this adage.

(Applause)

**President.** — I have received two motions for resolutions with a request for an early vote to wind up the debate on the social situation:

- by Mr Didò and others (Doc. B 2-416/85);
- by Mrs Maij-Weggen and others (Doc. B2-429/85/rev.) on behalf of the EPP Group.

The vote on the request for an early vote will be taken at the end of the debate.

**Mr Chanterie (PPE).** — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the debate we are now having has come at the right time, just before the meeting of the Council of Social Ministers this Thursday. I have no doubt that the opinion on the Italian Presidency will be generally favourable, but we nevertheless look forward with interest to seeing what the Council of Social Ministers decides this week. I think it unlikely, however, that this Council's record will be regarded as favourable.

I have in fact heard quite a few sceptical comments during this debate and elsewhere. Why this scepticism? Firstly — and I would be grateful if the President-in-Office of the Council listened to what I was saying — because the directives to which various speakers have already referred face a difficult birth. I have just heard the President-in-Office of the Council say that we must ask ourselves whether we can make any progress with directives in the area of social policy. That is a very fundamental question, Mr President.

We have always attached a great deal of importance to the construction of a social Europe. In other words,

### Chanterie

the good done by a single, large European market must not be undone by social decline. The construction of a social Europe must prevent refuge being sought in social dumping. We therefore believe, Mr President-in-Office, and I hope you will tell your colleagues this, that the harmonization of European social policies must continue with European legislation, including these directives.

I shall not discuss the various directives in detail. Other speakers, including Mrs Maij-Weggen, have already done so on behalf of my group. However, I would remind you, Mr President, that we no longer need agreements like that on the Vredeling Directive or the OECD Code of Conduct. We do not need any new agreements of this kind because there has been sufficient evidence that they are not respected anyway.

As regards the structure of the *société anonyme*, I can do no more than endorse what has already been said by our Socialist colleague Mr Vetter. I should like to say rather more about the multiannual programme for the study of unemployment. Mr President-in-Office, you said that the multiannual programme you have proposed complies in every way with the resolution adopted by the European Parliament. In content it does indeed conform to this resolution. But apart from this, what you have done is make a declaration of principle without specifying what we have said so often in the European Parliament. The time has come for action, not for yet another declaration of principle. We expect you and your colleagues to establish a government programme, that is to say, indicate the priorities and the financial resources with which these priorities will be tackled.

You have referred to an experimental plan. Fine, but what money will be involved? Surely not the paltry 5% of the European Social Fund? I do not really think your address was worthy of this Parliament, Mr President-in-Office.

About ten days ago 500 young people from the European Young Catholic Workers movement had a meeting in this Chamber to round off a week of discussions on youth unemployment. They complained that after eleven years of economic crisis young people were still the first to suffer and that there was still no prospect of an improvement in their situation. If you, Mr President-in-Office, had made the same statement to these 500 young people, it would not have been followed by applause. We parliamentarians applauded out of courtesy.

The Council of Transport Ministers has been condemned by the Court of Justice for its failure to take decisions. I have the impression that we have reached the point where we might take the Council of Social Ministers to the Court of Justice on the same grounds. We called with considerable urgency for an emergency plan for the employment of the long-term unemployed among young people, some 2m of whom have been

out of work for a year or more. We cannot go on picking new plans out of a hat, Mr President. A cohesive approach must be adopted, as Mr Vernimmen said.

I will conclude with an urgent appeal to the Presidency of the Council. What you have said is best summarized by the words that begin an Italian song: *parole, parole, parole*. We now await the sequel.

**Mr Wurtz (COM).** — (FR) Mr President, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, you spoke to us for 21 minutes about the measures which are currently being considered with a view to combating unemployment, improving labour relations and upholding workers' rights. But we still know nothing concrete, except that this much-heralded meeting is going to take place on 13 June.

You in your turn have referred to the concept of a European social area, after the example of Jacques Delors, who spoke of a European collective agreement. Whenever I hear such talk, I am tempted to quote Goethe: *Am Anfang war die TAT!*

So what are the Council and our governments doing to combat unemployment, which has never before been seen at such levels in Europe? What are they doing about purchasing power, which is stagnating or being eroded in most of the Member States? What action are they taking against precarious employment, the low-skill, low-wage jobs which are proliferating to the detriment of stable employment in skilled jobs? The social measure which the Community was holding up so proudly for all to admire, the Vredeling Directive, is dead. Social rights are being flouted. Welfare provision is being eroded. And when workers have the audacity to defend their workplaces, governments, such as the French Government in the case of SKF, do not scruple to order the use of truncheons and tear-gas. It is time, high time, that we tackled the roots of the problem, which are to be found in the obsessive pursuit of financial profitability, the slump in productive investment and the massive export of capital in search of good investments abroad, at the expense of production, research and training in Europe.

It is time that we tackled this cancer, Mr President, before it is too late and the social harmonization called for in the Treaty of Rome becomes a reality — by the repetition of Liverpool's story throughout the length and breadth of the Community!

Some people will perhaps be thinking: 'You Communists are the only ones who give no credit for the efforts that we are making on behalf of workers'. I am happy to answer them. A week ago I attended the European meeting of the Young Christian Workers in Strasbourg. Believe me when I tell you that the 600 delegates did not mince their words in what they had to say about this crisis-ridden capitalist society which is

**Wurtz**

so harsh in its treatment of men and women alike, and young people in particular.

I have also studied the proceedings of the Congress of the European Trade Union Confederation. On the subject of flexibility, for instance, this fashionable notion which you have taken up, I find that the ETUC has this to say, and I quote: 'Flexibility leads in practice to a decline in real incomes, the accentuation of inequalities, greater insecurity of employment, and a reduction in social security provision. Such measures would turn Europe into a continent where the standard of living would be deteriorating, they would make no contribution whatsoever to the creation of jobs, and they would increase people's sense of insecurity'. That is what the ETUC says. It is also what the CGT in France is saying. They are right.

Mr President, would that these legitimate aspirations were heeded at the table of the Community governments' representatives. This is what we, for our part, are campaigning for.

**Mrs Lemass (RDE).** — Mr President, much has been spoken on unemployment in this Parliament during the course of the past year. During the term of each presidency many promises are made, but the situation does not seem to be improving. There were still 12.6 million persons registered as unemployed in the Community, excluding Greece, in April 1985, according to figures just released. This represents 11.5% of the civilian working population. The position has got steadily worse over the past five years. In 1980 unemployment throughout the Community rose marginally to 5.9%, but it was not until the following year that the job crisis really began to escalate. By 1981 it was 7.6%, in 1982 the figure was 9.2% and in 1983 Community unemployment exceeded 10% for the first time.

The rise in unemployment in recent years has hit harder in Ireland than in any other Member State, being almost half as much again as the Community average. The new Social Fund must be used, particularly in Ireland, in a constructive manner to tackle the unemployment situation that affects countless thousands, particularly in inner city areas. It must also be used for training that will lead to rewarding and safe jobs and for local employment initiatives.

Ireland has failed to tackle the unemployment problem. I wonder whether there are any indications why this should be so. I thank the President-in-Office of the Council for what they are trying to do, but it always seems that towards the end of a presidency ideas appear to flow; then onto the next presidency and we start all over again. Something definite has to happen about the employment situation, and it has to happen now.

**Mr Christensen (ARC).** — (DA) Mr President, the Danish People's Movement against Membership of the

European Community rejects any proposal for the European Community to interfere in the terms of agreements and settlements concluded between workers and employers. It is a new example among countless others to show that the European Community not only repudiates the Member States' own authorities but even plans to lay down working hours and other terms of agreements and settlements for workers in the private sector.

The Danish People's Movement has no faith in the ability of the European Community to fight unemployment. From 1973 to 1984 unemployment in the Community rose from 4.2% to 11.5%. In EFTA over the same period — i.e. from 1973 to 1984 — unemployment rose from 2.8% to 5.0%. This confirms that those countries of Western Europe which have retained their right of self-determination, and, can respond under their own authority to the influences which act upon them from outside, determine their own trade policy, their own foreign exchange policy and their own industrial policy, when no one interferes in their financial and monetary policy, let alone their incomes policy. Those countries have in practice shown that they are in the best position to fight unemployment.

**Mrs Lenz (PPE), chairman of the Committee on Women's Rights.** — (DE) Mr President, the questions to the Council and our welter of speeches are beginning to remind me of the sound of Tibetan prayer-wheels. However, I hope that, unlike the sound of Tibetan prayer-wheels, our words will not be lost in the wind. Our aim is to provide hope for the future to carry us forward to the year 2000, and we therefore strongly urge you to take these directives seriously and to adopt them.

As chairman of the Committee on Women's Rights, I lay particular emphasis on the directives which relate to working time and social security, but also on the special problem of unemployment among women. Youth unemployment is a further major problem area. Mr President-in-Office of the Council — my hoarseness is not from complaining, I have a cold — it would be very helpful if we could report on progress in the Community at the International Women's Conference, to demonstrate to other countries that European policies also include measures to benefit women and towards the creation of modern working environments.

If this were so, then the European Community need fear no reproaches from the International Women's Conference. The same applies to Spanish and Portuguese accession.

If we continue to put off all these decisions, there are bound to be further complications and I therefore urge you most strongly to take concrete action.

**Lenz**

Stay-at-home German husbands have just discovered how boring and soul-destroying housework is. Thank heavens they have concluded that this work should therefore be shared between husband and wife. This is a very positive development which opens up whole new dimensions in terms of part-time work.

Our present age needs people who are flexible, who accept responsibility for themselves and for other people. The Council of Ministers must take action and not continue to shelve issues for fear of the consequences.

I would remind you that the European Community's social achievements are a way of bringing Europe closer to our citizens and that this is a positive development. After all, women are not in the minority.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Welsh (ED).** — On a point of order, Mr President, before you close the debate I think I should point out that I understand that Mr Didò's wind-up

motion — which is Document 416 — is not available at the distribution counter. Therefore, I hope it will be possible to extend the time for tabling amendments at least till tomorrow so that Members can see what they are amending before they amend it.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Welsh, we note what you have to say.

We shall now consider the request for an early vote on the two motions for resolutions tabled to wind up the debate.

*(Parliament approved the request)*

The vote on these motions for resolutions will be held at the next voting time.

The debate is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 8.05 p.m.)<sup>1</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> *Agenda for the next sitting*: see Minutes.

## SITTING OF TUESDAY, 11 JUNE 1985

### Contents

<i>Mr Pannella; Mr von der Vring; Mr Tuckman; Mr P. Beazley . . . . .</i>	26	• Question No 2, by Mr Ford: Replies to questions for written answers: <i>Mr Andreotti; Mr Ford; Mr Andreotti; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Andreotti; Mr Ford . . . . .</i>	82
1. <i>Decision on urgency Mr Turner; Mr Tolman . . . . .</i>	26	• Question No 3, by Mrs Lemass: Meeting of EEC Health Ministers to discuss the drug problem: <i>Mr Andreotti; Mrs Lemass; Mr Andreotti; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Andreotti; Mr Cryer; Mr Andreotti . . . . .</i>	82
2. <i>1985 budget — Report by Mr Fich (Doc. A 2-65/85) Mr Fich; Mr Fracanzani (Council); Mr Christophersen (Commission); Mr von der Vring; Mr Christodoulou; Mr Curry; Mr Chambeiron; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Pasty; Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mr Cot; Mr Rigo; Mr Mizzau; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Alavanos; Mrs Ewing; Mr Bonde; Mr Ciccionesere; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Filinis; Mr Musso; Mr Gatti; Mr Lalar; Mr Fracanzani . . . . .</i>	27	• Question No 4, by Mr Cottrell: Bullfighting in Spain and Portugal: <i>Mr Andreotti; Mr Cottrell; Mr Andreotti; Mr P. Beazley; Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mr Andreotti . . . . .</i>	84
3. <i>Draft estimates for 1986 — Report by Mr De Vries (Doc. A 2-64/85) Mr De Vries; Mr Dankert; Mr Bardong; Mr Seligman; Mr De Vries; Mrs Scrivener . . . . .</i>	45	• Question No 5, by Mrs Jackson: Draft regulation on designations of milk and milk products: <i>Mr Andreotti; Mrs Jackson; Mr Andreotti; Mrs Banotti; Mr Andreotti; Mr Welsh; Mr Andreotti . . . . .</i>	85
4. <i>Italian presidency: Statement by the Council Mr Andreotti (Council); Mr Amadei; Mr Klepsch; Sir Henry Plumb; Mr Segre; Mr Bettiza; Mr de la Malène; Mr Christensen; Mr Romualdi; Mr Pannella; Mr Dankert; Mr Antoniozzi; Mr Møller; Mr Spinelli; Mr Romeo; Mr Van der Lek; Mrs Castle; Mr Starita; Mrs Hoffmann; Mr De Gucht; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Seeler; Mr Brok; Mr Iversen; Mr Christensen; Mr Herman; Mr Filinis; Mr Iodice; Mr Mallet; Mr Delors (Commission) . . . . .</i>	49	• Question No 6, by Mr Raftery: New technology: <i>Mr Andreotti; Mr Raftery; Mr Andreotti; Mr Van Miert; Mr Andreotti; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Andreotti; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Andreotti; Mr Alavanos; Mr Andreotti . . . . .</i>	86
5. <i>Question-Time (Doc. B 2-407/85): — Questions to the Council:</i>		• Question No 7, by Mr Van Miert: Severe smog in Western Europe: <i>Mr Andreotti; Mr Van Miert; Mr Andreotti; Mr Sherlock; Mr Andreotti; Mrs Weber; Mrs Schleicher; Mr Andreotti; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr Andreotti; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Andreotti . . . . .</i>	87
• <i>Question No 1, by Mrs Lenz: Nairobi World Conference in July 1985 ending the Decade for Women: Mr Andreotti (Council); Mrs Crawley; Mr Andreotti; Mrs Cinciari Rodano; Mr Andreotti; Mrs Tongue; Mr Andreotti; Mr Pannella; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Andreotti . . . . .</i>	80	— Questions to the Foreign Ministers: • Question No 39, by Mr Hutton: Chemical weapon disarmament: <i>Mr Andreotti (Minister for Foreign Affairs); Mr Hutton; Mr Andreotti; Mr Elliott; Mr Andreotti; Mr Bonde; Mr Andreotti . . . . .</i>	89

- Question No 40, by Mr Chambeiron: Activities of Nazi war criminals:  
Mr Andreotti; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Andreotti; Mr Ford; Mr Andreotti; Mr Ducarme; Mr Andreotti . . . . . 90
- Question No 41, by Mrs Tongue: Violation of human rights in Pakistan:  
Mr Andreotti; Mrs Tongue; Mr Andreotti . . . . . 91
- Question No 42, by Mr Elliott: Human rights:  
Mr Andreotti; Mr Elliott; Mr Andreotti; Mr Balfé; Mr Andreotti . . . . . 92
- Question No 44, by Mr Ford: Team Spirit 85:  
Mr Andreotti; Mr Ford; Mr Andreotti . . . . . 93

Annex (Formal sitting on the occasion of the visit to the European Parliament of Mr Sandro Pertini, President of Italy):

Mr Sandro Pertini, President of the Italian Republic . . . . . 93

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

*Vice-President*

*(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)*<sup>1</sup>

**Mr Pannella (NI).** — *(IT)* Mr President, first of all, many of us have not received the minutes, and, despite our searches, we have not been able to find them.

Secondly, Mr President, I should like to ask you to arrange for the discontinuation of a small but irritating, indecorous custom that is becoming established: Members of the European Parliament, on entering the IPE Building, are being obliged by the police and security services to show their identity cards on each occasion. I think that, when entering a Parliament building, we ought immediately to be recognized by our staff, since it is unseemly for Members — at the IPE of all places — to have to queue and have their identity established from their cards.

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, how fleeting fame is! No one would have failed to recognize Mr Panella during the last electoral period!

**President.** — I just want to say something on the two points raised. The minutes, I understand, have been distributed. It is unfortunate that Mr Pannella has not been able to get his copy. I see the Italian version up here.

I am conscious of the situation at the IPE Building. They do not know Vice-Presidents by sight either, Mr

Pannella, even after five or six years. However, I will take it up with the Quaestors.

**Mr Tuckman (ED).** — Mr President, to me security is more important than being known by sight. I am perfectly happy to show my card. I am sure many Members feel the same.

**Mr P. Beazley (ED).** — I share Mr Tuckman's view!

**President.** — I agree, Mr Tuckman, but we would be happy if our security people did get to recognize us in due course.<sup>1</sup>

#### 1. Decision on urgency

**Report by Mr Turner, on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(85) 113 final + final/2, COM(85) 145 final — Doc. C 2-17/85) for a decision on a preparatory action for a Community research and development programme in the field of telecommunications technologies — R & D in advanced communications technologies for Europe (RACE) — RACE definition phase (Doc. A 2-58/85).**

**Mr Turner (ED), rapporteur.** — Mr President, this definition phase of RACE is intended to start on 1 July. The Council is voting on it at the end of June. The Commission has asked for urgent procedure. It was adopted unanimously by the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, and the Com-

<sup>1</sup> For approval of the previous sitting's Minutes, see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

<sup>1</sup> For items relating to documents received and the announcement of motions tabled for the topical and urgent debate, see Minutes.

**Turner**

mittee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy delivered a unanimous opinion in favour. I must ask, Mr President, that we vote in favour of this urgency.

*(Parliament adopted urgent procedure).*

**President.** — This item will be placed on Thursday's agenda after Mr Seligman's report.

\*  
\* \*

**Proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(85) 182 final — Doc. C 2-34/85) amending Regulation (EEC) No 2969/83 establishing a special emergency measure to assist stock-farming in Italy**

**Mr Tolman (PPE), chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food.** — (NL) Mr President, I need hardly say anything about this proposal from the Commission. It merely concerns the entry of a different date, and I do not think there will be any objection.

*(Parliament adopted urgent procedure)*

**President.** — This item will be placed on Friday's agenda after the votes.

## 2. 1985 budget

**President.** — The next item is the report by Mr Fich on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the new draft general budget of the European Communities for the 1985 financial year, as amended by the Council on 22 May 1985 (Doc. C 2-35/85) (Doc. A 2-65/85).

**Mr Fich (S), rapporteur.** — (DA) Mr President, when the Council presented its draft budget for 1985 on 3 October 1984, we were very unhappy in Parliament over the very short time we had to deal with it i.e., from October to Christmas. Today, on 11 June, we now see that this budgetary procedure has been more protracted than we had ever expected. We have now been working on the budget for about nine months, and this is actually the fourth time we have debated the draft budget for 1985.

The reason why it has taken so long is, of course, that Parliament rejected the budget proposed by the Council in December 1984. I say today that the rejection of the draft budget at that time was well founded. I was one of the very few in Parliament who did not support it, but it did produce results.

One result of the rejection was the recognition that there are twelve months in a year. It was realized that the budget should provide resources for expenditure over 12 months, not just 10 months. Secondly, the rejection of the budget and the subsequent deliberations put pressure on the Council to allocate reasonable amounts to Community development aid, especially food aid. So, all in all it can be said that the rejection of the budget was justified and brought results.

The progress made after we rejected the budget was mainly due to the fact that an intergovernmental agreement was concluded to finance the shortfalls which were the reason why the Council had been unable to set a reasonable budget in 1984. On the one hand, Parliament was favourably disposed towards this intergovernmental agreement, because it made the necessary funds available, but at the same time Parliament has grave misgivings over any continued recourse to this facility, since intergovernmental agreements mean in effect that the budget procedure is turned upside down. By these means the amounts of money to be spent are laid down from the outset, without reference to the Treaty of Rome, which clearly lays down the procedures according to which the funds are to be used.

In order to express our dissatisfaction with such intergovernmental agreements, Parliament on Thursday intends quite simply to amend such an agreement by proposing to reduce the funds it provides with the substitution of a smaller amount.

Our discussions today, of course, relate mainly to the Council's second reading of the 1985 budget. I must say to the Council that, compared with past years, we are agreeably surprised by the Council's second reading. We have succeeded in convincing the Council that 116 million ECU more should be given in food aid, that an extraordinary sum should be provided for the integrated Mediterranean programmes, viz., 120 million ECU in appropriations for commitment, and that as much as possible of the deficit we carried forward from 1984 should be made good now.

In view of all this, there is good reason to take stock of our present position. It is such that we now have the resources needed for the EAGGF guarantee section, if it is administered sensibly and prudently. It is such that we have the resources needed for the Social Fund; we have the resources needed for the Regional Fund; we have by and large achieved what we wanted in respect of environmental policy; we have achieved most — if not all — of what we wanted for research policy. The demands we put forward in respect of transport policy have also been met, and we note that things have gone fairly well this year with regard to development aid. It does indeed look as though, by and large, reason has prevailed through the fairly long drawn-out procedure to which this budget has been subjected.

**Fich**

When I say that it is a reasonable budget — which I am bound to say here — I am only speaking in terms of existing Community legislation, for it is clear that there are some basic inconsistencies in the budget which have not been resolved this year. We still have a situation in which agricultural expenditure accounts for something like 70% of the total budget, and this of course is not acceptable in the long run. My assessment of the budget as a reasonable one, therefore, should be understood exclusively in terms of existing Community legislation.

I would stress one point on which Parliament is not satisfied with the action of the Council of Ministers: it is the question of financial aid to Turkey. Parliament voted by a large majority to reject the plan to give money to Turkey, both under the third and fourth financial protocols and in the form of special aid to Turkey. The Council of Ministers simply ignored these three proposals. I cannot help remarking that the Council of Ministers, which so often speaks of giving Parliament more power, did not on this occasion even take the trouble to listen to what a large majority in Parliament had stated its wish to be.

We dealt with the remaining problems surrounding the 1985 budget yesterday in the Committee on Budgets. The Committee on Budgets proposes that the revenue side of the budget be increased by 30 million ECU. This 30 million ECU consists of interest on the Community's accounts in the various Member States; it is not a sum which Parliament has simply invented. It is in fact a proposal from the Commission which the Council threw out. The reason why we want it to be reinstated is not just that we need this money: we also want to state a principle quite clearly namely, that in our view the Commission's assessment of the Community's own resources is what counts; it should not be subjected to manipulation by the Council of Ministers.

We want this 30 million ECU, which will accordingly appear as an additional sum on the revenue side, to be used primarily for development aid. We want to use 26 million ECU for long-term development aid since we all know that, even if we have achieved a satisfactory result for food aid, food aid alone is not enough. There must also be long-term development aid so that food aid eventually becomes unnecessary. This is the use to which we want the bulk of the money to be put.

Over and above this we want to allocate a smaller sum to strengthening the Commission's administration, and finally we want to provide two million ECU for support to private agriculture in Poland. These are the most important of the amendments which the Committee on Budgets adopted yesterday evening. We hope that these will be adopted by the full House on Thursday.

It is then absolutely vital that the Commission should administer the budget in the manner decided by Par-

liament. In the past, we have experienced situations in which the Commission seemed to take a fairly liberal view of the amendments adopted by Parliament and administered the budget as it thought fit, so that in a large number of items by no means all the resources available were actually used.

I should like to make it clear that, when Parliament enters a given sum for an item, that means that we want the sum used for the activity in question — not a larger or smaller sum, but precisely the sum we have entered. We do not want savings to be made in non-compulsory expenditure in order to finance possible problems in other sectors of the budget.

Mr President, I think that when we have completed our work on the 1985 budget — and I hope that we shall conclude the procedure this week — we shall be able to look forward to a couple of years of relative budgetary peace. We are expecting an increase in our own resources, and we know that the regulation on these resources will be ratified in due course. The conflict over repayments to the United Kingdom should therefore be out of the way, at least for a period. But it is clear that we must use this respite for something constructive and, in this connection, I should like to express support for the Commission's idea of introducing longer-term budget planning so that, over a period of years, we can achieve a restructuring of the budget in the direction we all want.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Fracanzani, President-in-Office of the Council.** — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are now engaged on the second reading of the draft general budget of the Community for 1985 — a second reading that is, in reality, the fourth, if we take into account the fact that there were two previous readings of the first draft budget, which was not adopted by this Parliament.

That is a measure of the great care with which the question is being considered, and the great detail that has been gone into, which reflects the importance that we all attach to a question of so fundamental a character as the budget.

This is no mere act of duty, nor is it a simple resumé of figures relating to individual policies, which are nevertheless important in themselves. In all its aspects it is a fundamental instrument of overall policy for building an integrated Community, seen not from the economic and social standpoints alone.

Dwelling for a moment on this aspect, we are aware that fundamental problems such as research, on one hand, and employment, on the other, can only be dealt with adequately if there is an adequate Community budget.

### Fracanzani

The two aspects, in fact, of research and innovation on the one hand, and employment on the other — which some people see as being difficult to reconcile in the short term — can in fact find positive solutions — not only in the long term — if our efforts are concentrated to a greater degree, through common policies and individual commitments based on the provisions of the Community budget. That is not contrary to the policy of budgetary strictness, which is undoubtedly more than ever essential today; indeed, it is part of the same approach.

Initiatives that are undertaken on a direct, joint Community basis not only cost less, for the very reason that they are less fragmented, but are in fact more productive. Take research, for example: we know that, altogether, the countries of the Community spend twice as much on research as does Japan; but the Japanese have acquired 40% of the microprocessor market, whilst Europe has barely 10% of the general market.

The same could be said — indeed, it must be said — where the fight against unemployment is concerned, which is very definitely a priority problem for us. If the fight against unemployment is carried out with increasing commitment at Community level, it can give more outstanding results, without the harmful side effects that sometimes can be produced by certain policies for employment if they are adopted fragmentarily, in isolation, by individual States. Look for example, at the sensitive effects that such action sometimes has on exchange rates and the balance of payments. We are therefore not merely aware of all this, we are fully convinced.

We have however to take into account, objectively, another factor. The 1985 budget is a developing budget, because, as we all know, from 1 January 1986 the increase in own resources becomes effective, and that will allow new important progress to be made in strengthening the budgetary policy of the Community.

Certainly, it is a developing budget, but it is not on this account that one is framed in passive, resigned terms — still less is it a purely bookkeeping exercise. What was legally possible for us to do, within the framework of the regulations currently in force, has been done with decisive political determination, with the aim of achieving the objectives already mentioned and making the budget an instrument of special relevance to the process of European integration.

We cannot, of course, go into all the details here, and it will be sufficient, in any event, to refer to a few of them.

Compared with the budget that Parliament rejected, the new budget shows a substantial increase that is represented by the intergovernmental agreement, which produced new resources amounting to 1982. Four million ECU, so as to allow the budget to cover in full the requirement for the whole of 1985.

With particular regard to the Guarantee section of the EAGGF, the credits have been increased from 18 000 million ECU to 19 955 million ECU, thus accepting in full the Commission's request and the reasons given by Parliament.

Further progress has been made, between the first and second reading of the new budget, with regard to the integrated Mediterranean projects — which now amount to 120 million ECU — and food aid for the developing countries, in respect of which the full amount asked for by the European Parliament has been accepted.

With regard to the Regional and Social Funds — which are essential instruments in the fight against unemployment — the Council has included higher commitments than those called for by the Commission.

We would also draw attention to the fact that the Council has taken a very favourable view of the European Parliament's initiative regarding aid for Polish agriculture. It has agreed to the inclusion of a new budget line, and has decided to enter a P. M. for that line, at the same time undertaking to approve a transfer to finance it. This transfer requires a suitable proposal to be made by the Commission and, in view of the political importance of the question — to which the Parliament rightly called attention — a formal decision, which the Council must adopt as a matter of policy. I would like to add that the Council is grateful to the Parliament for its proposal, its initiative.

As a final piece of information, I think it necessary to emphasize that this draft budget, the second reading of which we are now engaged on, exceeds the preliminary draft budget that was first presented by the Commission itself.

As an illustration of this, may we just quote the payments figures — 30 521.3 million ECU, compared with 30 258.4 million ECU.

These results have been achieved after discussion, after an informal dialogue, after constructive collaboration between the European Parliament and the Council. The promptings, the proposals, the priorities put forward by the Parliament were of fundamental importance, and, as such, were largely accepted by the Council. The part played by the Commission was also very important, and we take this opportunity of thanking that institution for what it has done in the matter.

I think we can now say something more: the progress that has been made in preparing the 1985 budget has not only been very important from the point of view of the figures and the specific policies — which, undoubtedly, are already very significant in their own right. It has also concerned questions of principle that are of fundamental importance, and I would like to refer to two of these.

**Fracanzani**

Firstly, the annual character of the budget. The inter-governmental agreement for 1982. 4 million ECU has avoided a situation in which revenue would have been inadequate to cover the financial requirement.

There is a second point of principle that is very important, on which decisive results have been achieved: it is what I should like to define as 'Operation Transparency'. The Council has in fact decided to complete the task of balancing the draft budget by entering on the revenue side the supplementary dues and levies referred to by the Commission in its amending letter. The Council is using this supplementary revenue to offset, in part, the deficit carried forward from 1984, leaving the question of covering any final deficit there may be in abeyance, until precise figures are available as to the size of that deficit. It will in any event be an infinitesimal proportion of the total budget, and remains a matter for routine administration.

It is now important, as the rapporteur said a short time ago, that this fruitful collaboration between the Parliament and the Council on the 1985 budget should be concluded in a positive way. It is important both in itself and as an instance of collaboration between the two institutions, which goes beyond the nonetheless highly important economic and social considerations and assumes considerable political significance.

Frankly speaking, we know that there are two points in particular on which a useless and, moreover, dangerous conflict can be avoided. The first concerns the amendment supported by the Committee on Budgets, which proposes that 30 million ECU of interest credited to the Commission's accounts with the Treasuries of Member States should be entered as revenue. It must be borne in mind that these interest payments are non-existent, which would make their inclusion in the budget a pure sham. This is proved by the fact that there is in existence a proposal from the Commission that is designed to ensure that these accounts will produce interest — even though this proposal was not adopted by the Council.

Apart from these specific technical aspects, which are very important, I should like, Mr President, to draw Parliament's attention to the very serious consequences that would follow the adoption of this amendment. The adoption of this amendment would have very serious implications for the conclusion of the budget as a whole, and would above all be diametrically opposed to that 'Operation Transparency' which we have all been working for. This 'transparency', as we pointed out, constitutes a cardinal point, an end result of a fundamental nature, not only in terms of figures but in terms of principle and correct budgetary management.

With regard to the commitment appropriations for the Social and Regional Fund, the Council did not accept Parliament's proposal in full. I should like to make it clear that this was not done for accounting reasons —

from any desire to adopt an indiscriminate axeing policy in order to keep specific amounts within certain stipulated overall amounts. It was because the Council had regard to the figures which the Commission itself indicated as being effectively usable; indeed, the commitments accepted by the Council exceed the Commission's proposals by 20 million ECU, in the case of the Regional Fund, and 40 million ECU in the case of the Social Fund, and it would therefore be useless to accumulate, in form only, commitments on certain lines that the Commission would have difficulty in using — as has been explicitly said — and which exceed the programme as envisaged. What is important is that we should resolutely pursue our aim to increase, in real terms, the Fund for the fight against unemployment which — we repeat — has absolute priority as far as we are concerned.

In any case, it seems to us that a dispute over these two points would have repercussions that would be out of all proportion to the importance of the points themselves; indeed, it would have very harmful effects, in general terms, at a time when, at least for these last six months, we have to get through the punishing régime of the twelfths. At a time when, moreover, the Parliament, the Council and the Commission must more than ever avoid wasting their energy on disputes and must commit themselves to the full to the work — which, we know, will be difficult, but which must be done — that simply must be got under way so as to progress towards European Union. That is what we have to concentrate all our energies on — that must be the commitment of the three Institutions.

We simply must not prejudice what has been achieved thanks to the goodwill and mutual understanding that have been so fully demonstrated by both sides and, in particular, by virtue of the intelligent, farsighted policy that has been followed by the representatives of the European Parliament in their meetings with the Council. That is something that we must acknowledge, not from any wheedling motives, but because it is a fact.

We have now before us the prerequisites for the adoption of a budget for 1985 that will not only automatically put an end to the restrictive effects — which are quite serious — of the system of provisional twelfths, but will also make possible the execution in full of the many programmes that all three Institutions want to see implemented, and that will constitute a basis for the next round of work on the budget.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission.** — *(DA)* Mr President, we are concerned today with what I expect to be the final reading of the budget for 1985. It may be worthwhile reflecting briefly on the problem which faced the Community and us here together at the start of the year, after Parliament had rejected the Council's draft budget.

**Christophersen**

In the Commission's view we have since then succeeded, through the sensible and responsible attitude adopted by the institutions, in changing the course of development which was in progress and initiating a process which has now brought us through to a situation in which all the institutions can be satisfied with the result now taking shape.

The Commission sees this as a very important and positive development, since it could easily have gone differently. We could — even today — have been stuck in a situation in which we still had no solution or in which we had a solution that was only satisfactory to one institution, while the other had fundamental objections to it. This is not the way things went. As I understand the interventions from both Parliament and the Council here this morning, both institutions are very happy with the outcome now emerging. I should like to point out on behalf of the Commission that we are no less satisfied for, if we look at the final result in relation to the draft we sent to the budgetary authority in February, we note that on five major points, it is very close to what the Commission proposed.

We proposed that a 12-month budget be implemented which would include adequate provision to enable the common agricultural policy to function through the entire year. Both the Council and Parliament accepted this view and entered our proposed figures in the budget.

Secondly, we proposed an increase in the appropriations for food aid to ensure that the amounts promised should not be reduced, even though prices had risen since our first budget proposal last year. The result the Council and Parliament have now agreed on corresponds broadly to what we proposed. I have already said — and I will repeat it here — that the Commission had wanted it to be a little higher. I hope that will not give rise to problems during the course of the year. If it does, we shall have to try to solve them together. Broadly speaking, the amounts for food aid match what we proposed.

Thirdly, the Commission requested that reasonable appropriations for commitment be earmarked for the integrated Mediterranean programmes and stressed the need for such provision. This wish was met by the progress achieved in the discussions between the Member States and the Council, and the result which is now emerging in this vital area is also very close to what we proposed. There is a shortfall of about 20 million ECU, but, in return, we have the kind gift of something we did not ask for, namely, a certain increase in the appropriations for commitment to the Regional Fund. If we look at structural expenditure and the structural policies together, we can say that there is a slight improvement. I therefore hope that the Commission will be allowed freedom to administer them in the common spirit. I say that because the structural funds also have to contribute towards

financing the integrated Mediterranean programmes. The Commission is satisfied on that point too, and would like to thank the two arms of the budgetary authority.

A fourth important point was the wish for the deficit from 1984 to be covered. This is where the Commission is least satisfied, because unfortunately it is now clear that part of that deficit will not be covered this year. We must take note of that, but I will gladly take the matter up again when we come to deal with the 1986 situation. The deficit will presumably be carried forward to 1986 and will thus restrict our freedom of manoeuvre more than otherwise.

It might be said — and this is the fifth point — that, if the Member States had taken the full consequences, they would have increased the intergovernmental agreement by 250 million ECU, and all the problems would have been solved. They did not do so, but they went a long way in the desired direction, and I think we should appreciate that. We may have an attitude of principle on intergovernmental agreements. The Commission also has one, and the Commission shares Parliament's view that the Community's budget should be funded by an increase in our own resources. But we all know that the situation we got into this year was a very difficult and unusual one. In view of this, the Member States have shown a great sense of responsibility, even though they did not go as far as we proposed, with the result that we have not completely solved the deficit problem.

Seen from the Commission's point of view, the substance of the draft budget, which we hope will now be adopted before long, is satisfactory, though I would echo what Mr Fich said: it will call for responsible and prudent administration. It renders it incumbent on everyone to exercise restraint in demanding new increases in expenditure and tolerance towards the Commission when it finds it necessary in some areas to apply a more restrictive administration of resources.

I shall not go into detail on the amendments on which Parliament is to vote on Thursday and with which this debate is also concerned, for well over 100 have been tabled. But those amendments which I regard as the key ones will not create any difficulties for the Commission. There are a few we did not ask for, but they will not give rise to political difficulties for the Commission.

The proposal on interest payments is in fact the Commission's own proposal. It was put forward by the previous Commission, but the present one upholds it. It is reasonable, after all, that the Commission should earn interest on its loans. There just remains the small problem that the Council may perhaps not approve the proposal. But, while it may not be accepted policy for the Community to take out loans, it is reasonable when the Community grants loans to Member States that the funds should return a fair rate of interest.

### Christophersen

The amendments which I expect to be adopted will thus not give rise to any problems for the Commission. We take some of them as political statements which we can endorse; others can be seen as practical amendments which we can absorb without difficulties, and there are a few which we did not ask for and could have done without — but they will not trouble us.

If I may be permitted to make a general point about the amendments, I think they constitute a worthy conclusion to the budget procedure for 1985 as a whole, for they display both moderation and a realistic appraisal of what is politically achievable. I therefore feel that the budgetary procedure, the 'budgetary exercise' for this year, will be concluded in a manner which shows promise that we may be able in subsequent 'budgetary exercises' to continue the dialogue which has been set up between the institutions individually and between them all in concert. That is something we shall need, for I should like to say a word about the tasks now facing us.

The Commission views budgetary policy for the coming years as a very difficult task. I think that Mr Fich was too optimistic in his speech when he said that one or two years of peace stood ahead of us in which we could reflect on our budgetary situation. Indeed, even if we get an increase in the own-resources ceiling from 1 January 1986, we shall still be faced with the need to remain alert and prudent in allocating priorities for our expenditure. Although the Commission is of course aware that we can administer and apply the expenditure policy within the new framework for some years to come, it does not really provide a great deal of scope. I therefore think that we must concentrate in the coming years on the more structural budgetary problems.

There is, to begin with, the question how we can eventually secure better balance between appropriations for commitment and appropriations for payment in the structural funds. It is clear that the budgetary authority has in recent years chosen the easy way of increasing appropriations for commitment without at the same time increasing appropriations for payment. Indeed, for the Social Fund they have even been reduced, with the result that an imbalance has set in which in future years may rebound on the Community. We shall suddenly be faced with the need to release very large commitments for payment. That is a structural budget problem.

Another structural budgetary problem is of course linked to the common agricultural policy: here, too, the problems have simply been carried forward, and, because there were difficulties purely in terms of appropriations, no more systematic and longer-term stock-reduction policy was pursued. Here, too, we shall be caught in a trap in future years or be faced with demands for more money to be spent on running down our stocks.

A third structural problem is, within the new framework, to provide scope not just for natural growth in the existing policy but also for the development of new policy. Examples are research and technology policy, in respect of which the heads of state and government have committed themselves to supporting the Commission's proposal that the Community's appropriations for this purpose should be doubled in real terms over a period of four years. How are we to make room for such an increase in appropriations with the limitations we have?

Finally, the fourth problem of a structural nature I would mention is that we still have the imbalances which, in the view of some Member States, the political composition of the budget has brought about in relation to them. As you know, there has been a great deal of discussion on this matter. There has been the British problem, and other countries also felt that there was an imbalance. Whether we agree with this view or not, it must be said that, if it leads to major political conflicts, the Community will have to try to resolve them by pursuing a more balanced expenditure policy. Here, too, there is the problem of how to make the necessary provision within the scope available.

Thus, even though I can share much of the optimism which has been expressed, I must warn or at least point out that we shall also be faced with very formidable challenges over the coming years. This will soon become apparent, since the Commission expects this week to complete its draft budget for 1986, which will be sent to the budgetary authorities with the slight delay resulting from the unusual course taken by this year's procedure. It was my intention, in order to give a more detailed account of the views which form the background to our 1986 budget proposal, to ask for an opportunity to make a statement on it when Parliament meets in Luxembourg in July. This would serve as an introduction to the tasks we shall have to accomplish together in the year ahead.

*(Applause)*

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group, I would like to summarize the position following these difficult budget discussions. In December, Parliament rejected the Council's draft budget almost unanimously, because the Council was not prepared to cover the expenditure, particularly on agriculture, for which it had a legally binding obligation. It had the temerity to ask us to agree to a ten-month budget, and we refused.

The Council's new proposals take full account of Parliament's position. I would like to thank the Italian presidency for supporting Parliament. Mr President of the Council, this was a new, quite unfamiliar and welcome approach by the chairman of the Budget Council. I would also like to thank the new Commissioner.

### von der Vring

The new Council proposals more than justify Parliament's position. In October 1984, the Council proposed a total budget of 26 billion ECU and this has now been increased by 2.4 billion ECU, following a second reading, which represents an increase of almost 10%. The lion's share — 2 billion — is again to go to agriculture. This meets with our demands, but I by no means wish to express any approval of the excessive expenditure on agriculture.

Our demand was simply that the Community should honour its obligations. We regret that the share of the budget allocated to agriculture has thereby increased still further. We also deplore the fact that the rate of increase, which symbolizes adherence to the *status quo* in Community policy, does not permit any real progress on new policies. The Community is virtually paralyzed by this low rate of increase. In this respect we are completely dissatisfied with the Council's general budget policy and I would advise the Commissioner to bear this in mind in his comments on future commitment appropriations which represent one of Parliament's political instruments.

However, within the limits of feasibility, we have achieved what was possible in terms of our main political aims. We have increased the commitment appropriations for regional transport policy by 10% over the 1984 budget, the payments for social policy by 4% — far too little in view of the scale of poverty and unemployment in Europe, and the payments and appropriations for research, development and industry by 7 and 8%. And most important, in the light of hunger in the world, we have pushed through an increase in development aid of 23% compared to the Council's first 1984 draft. This item has a very high priority in the budget. We have been able, in these four areas, to increase payments by over 300 million and commitments by over 500 million compared to the Council's proposal. I think we can be satisfied with this result.

There is not much room for improvement in payments, as Mr Fich has pointed out. The maximum rate and the 1% ceiling constrains us, but we intend to increase the commitment appropriations by a further 100 million ECU.

I would like to comment on the Council's decision to finance expenditure which exceeds revenue available from value-added tax by means of 'non-repayable advances'. I can hardly imagine a more drastic formulation than this for typifying the Council's attitude to the Treaties. Theoreticians may talk about 'an evolving constitution', or 'developing further the Treaty of Rome', but the truth is that, in view of the Council's sovereignty over expenditure in their legislative capacity, the privilege of the national Parliaments to control the Community's own resources no longer exists in real terms. It is high time that a reform of the system of financing transferred this right to Parliament. A genuine parliamentary privilege is being undermined.

We need a democratic system of financing and not the double-speak of 'non-repayable advances'.

As far as the form of the compensatory repayments to the United Kingdom is concerned, we consider the present method unsatisfactory and would stress that expenditure policy represents the appropriate instrument for a fair distribution of European resources. We will come back to this later. On the question of financing the 1985 deficit: here the Council has gone some way towards accepting Parliament's amendments, but we feel that the result is still problematic: aimlessly juggling figures is not the solution. Under no circumstances can we permit the budget to be balanced at the cost of our policies. This also applies to any increase in expenditure on agriculture. We have warned the Council of the risks inherent in the budget and its right to fix revenue means that the Council is responsible for any shortfall. We also deplore the fact that the Council has not accepted Parliament's proposal to freeze aid to Turkey. The Community should be concerned to promote the restoration of democracy in Turkey but it is failing to exert any pressure.

Two further aspects need to be mentioned: our margin of manoeuvre only enables us to provide part of the sums needed for aid to Poland and for the essential Commission expenditure on information. In the former case, we assume that the Council will provide the necessary funds, and in the latter case, Mr Commissioner, we urge the Commission to provide the funds required by a proposal for a transfer of appropriations.

In general terms, however, this budget, like its predecessors, does nothing for Europe. A budget that amounts to a mere 1% of the European social product can do nothing in terms of a common policy on employment with a significant impact on the level of unemployment in Europe, or a regional policy which could make a real contribution to convergence; or a transport policy which meets the requirements of the Treaties; or a technology policy to enable us to meet the challenges of international competition, and a development policy to fulfil our obligations to the peoples of the Third World in the fight against hunger. We can only repeat our appeals to the national governments for the means to create the Europe of the future. We may have a joint European 'kitty' but it is certainly not a European budget.

In conclusion, on behalf of my group, I would like to sincerely thank our rapporteur Ove Fich, whose report we fully endorse. He has tackled this monstrous, rushed budget procedure in a splendid manner. The second stage was rushed through in a way that gave Members no control. I saw the German version of the final Council draft for the first time yesterday evening in the Committee on Budgets. I hope that such a situation will not occur again.

Many thanks, Ove Fich, many thanks also to David Curry, who cast light on the jungle of staff budgets in

**von der Vring**

the other Community institutions. I hope that the proposals of the Committee on Budgets will find a majority in the House on Thursday.

*(Applause)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR NORD

*Vice-President*

**Mr Christodoulou (PPE).** — *(GR)* Mr President, the reasons why the budget for 1985 was rejected are known to us all. Parliament, considering that a budget which does not cover revenue and expenditure on a twelve-month basis is not acceptable, essentially compelled the Commission to come back with a new draft budget which provides for an increase in revenue capable of covering expenditure by the EAGGF — Guarantee Section, of the order of two billion ECU more than the amount provided for already. It would seem that at least on the technical level, the inflexibilities have been overcome. Thus, at a second reading, Council accepted that expenditure compared with the previous draft budget should be increased by 1.8% for commitment appropriations and 1.7% for payment appropriations, so raising the corresponding appropriations to 30 521 million ECU and 28 399 million ECU respectively. The presentation of a balanced budget, even involving the method of temporary deposits, limits our freedom of choice. Since the reason that compelled Parliament to reject the budget has been eliminated, we have no choice but to approve it. However, the obstacles remain. The inflexibilities of financial management on the economic scale of the Community cannot be overcome, either by hidden deficits or by temporary deposits. The obstacles exist, and will continue to do so for as long as the recession reduces the taxation basis of VAT, for as long as Parliament's efforts aiming to increase productivity and gross production are severely limited by decreasing resources and by the continually burgeoning CAP, which leaves very little room for new policies, and for as long as every escape from the recession that presupposes convergence of the economies to the point where their differences, instead of impeding expansion, will promote it, always takes place against many objections and obstacles. Finally, for as long as the matter of the Community's own resources remains devoid of a long-term and consistent solution so that the Community's development programme and the prospects offered by the budget can be placed on a sound basis. We must be quite clear about this. To vote in favour of the draft budget for 1985 does not mean that we entirely accept its basic structure. We are merely accepting a budget that is balanced, even though only in the technical and book-keeping sense.

Mr President, the rejection of the original budget is all the more justified by the fact that in the new draft we

see that Council is at last showing signs of comprehending Parliament's logic in determining the orientation of the budget. Thus, Council has accepted the increase in non-obligatory expenditure to a satisfactory extent. It has considerably improved the level of expenditure on food aid for third countries. It accepted the integrated Mediterranean programmes and has created the requisite legal framework for them to be financed, even though the sum finally earmarked is smaller than that proposed by Parliament after careful study and analysis. Besides, Council has written off the procedural deficits registered in the fiscal year 1984 and wrongly carried over to 1985. Here, however, some objections remain and extend to the use, for the purpose of covering those deficits, of revenue earmarked for non-obligatory expenditure. It should be noted that this device of the book transfer of deficits will have to be resisted, since we all understand, most of all Mr Christophersen, that such a ploy is a risky game to play.

I would now like to make two specific comments. The first concerns support for private agriculture in Poland. Of course the sum itself is meagre a token in view of the size of the problem.

The second comment concerns aid to Turkey, which as Parliament has declared, is not justified because of the contravention of human rights in that country.

Having regard to all I have said, the Group of the European People's Party will vote in favour of this balanced budget.

**Mr Curry (ED).** — Mr President, as I have not had the opportunity to discuss with my group the results of yesterday's Committee on Budgets, the comments of the Council and the remarks of the President of the Commission. I reserve the position of my group on all issues and have nothing useful to say at this stage in the debate.

**Mr Chambeiron (COM).** — *(FR)* Mr President, the first reading saw the majority in this House forgetting the commitments entered into in December 1984 and yielding to the Council over the compensation to the United Kingdom. This was largely the result of the defection by the Christian-Democratic Group, but should we still find it at all surprising when these political Dr Jekylls display such consummate skill in turning themselves into so many Mr Hydes?

Following this abject capitulation, the second reading of the budget becomes a mere formality. Abandoning its plans for a truncated budget full of uncertainties, the Council has been obliged to commit itself to a proper budget which, with advances from the Member States under an intergovernmental agreement, now covers twelve months. This is a positive outcome, a defeat for the manoeuvres aimed at using the farmers as hostages during the budgetary procedure.

## Chambeiron

Going back on its decision of December 1984, the Council has heeded the cries of alarm from the countries stricken by hunger, which we had echoed in the amendments that we voted on the first reading. It is gratifying that the appropriations for food aid have been put back to the figure of 507 million ECU. But we cannot accept the reduction as compared with 1984 in the amounts allocated to NGOs, since these organizations have demonstrated the effectiveness of their work in the field, both in combating malnutrition and in promoting self-reliant development by countries in the Third World.

The increase in appropriations for the IMPs decided upon by the Council could well prove illusory since it is accompanied by an appreciable reduction in the funding drawn from the ERDF and the Social Fund. The fears that we voiced are unfortunately being confirmed already, since the Council is not even taking account of the pledges given by the European Council at its meeting held in March 1985 in Brussels, according to which the financing of the IMPs was not to lead to any reduction in transfers from the structural funds to other priority or less prosperous regions.

The Council, which readily gorges itself on the issue of human rights elsewhere in the world, averts its eyes when it comes to the serious violations of basic freedoms which are developing in Turkey. In refusing to act on the amendments voted by the European Parliament on the first reading, and in maintaining all the appropriations for Turkey, is not the Council setting the scene for application of the fourth financial protocol, contrary to the wishes repeatedly expressed by this House?

The probable adoption of the 1985 budget will put an end to the system of provisional twelfths, although without dispelling the uncertainty about the future. What is the real cost of enlargement going to be? Is it not likely that the 1.4% VAT ceiling will be exceeded in 1986? What repercussions is budgetary discipline going to have on progress in building Europe? All these questions remain unresolved and they will necessarily be central to the debates on the budget for 1986. It will not be long, Mr President, before we come back to them.

**Mrs Scrivener (L).** — (FR) Mr President, I should like first of all to thank Mr Fich for the work that he has done. I know how difficult it was and can therefore tell what a good job he has made of it.

If you will, I shall come straight to the point. On Thursday, when we vote on the draft budget for 1985 on the second reading, we shall be closing a budgetary procedure which ultimately represents a success for the views to which Parliament has held and, more than that, substantially consolidates the position of our institution as the champion of a certain concept of the Community.

For the most part, the Council has agreed to what Parliament was asking for. We now have before us a proper budget covering expenditure for the full year. It is a budget which of course has its imperfections, but it is nevertheless a *communautaire* budget. That is the most important point because, disregarding the figures, the draft that we rejected last December contained the seed of the early destruction of our European budgetary system.

Of course, there are still criticisms to be made of the text which has been forwarded to us on this occasion. First, it has been necessary to make ends meet by resorting to 'non-reimbursable' advances from the Member States. Moreover, as we know only too well, certain items of additional expenditure could crop up during the year, and the problem will then arise as to how they are to be financed.

Then there is the bitterness that some of us feel at the withdrawal from one of Parliament's most firmly held positions. I refer to the correction of the budgetary imbalance affecting the United Kingdom on the expenditure side of the budget. Of course I share this disappointment, but at the same time I believe — and have argued — that in agreeing not to modify the Council's draft this year, the House has taken a wise decision since, if we are to be realistic, we could scarcely do otherwise, or we would have been responsible in the eyes of public opinion for causing the budget crisis to drag on for so long that it acquired an air of permanency. That could only have tarnished the image of the European Parliament.

When all is said and done, if we take stock of the fruits of our efforts, we can confidently conclude that we have achieved positive results. All the more so since we have got the amounts we voted for in a sector which was one of our fundamental priorities for this 1985 budget. I am referring to Title IX, which is concerned with development and food aid in particular.

The Liberal and Democratic Group is particularly gratified with the appropriation for this sector. When voting the draft budget on Thursday, we shall be bringing a procedure which has been very protracted to an end. Is it not the case that we have virtually had four readings of the same budget? Now, I believe, we are going to have to turn our full attention on the 1986 budget, the preliminary draft for which will very shortly be adopted by the Commission.

I hope — in conclusion — that we shall be all the stronger for having come through this budget crisis. We must make the best possible use of this situation when we turn to the next budget, which is going to take VAT revenue of 1.3% to finance, as we already know. Clearly, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are going to have our work cut out.

**Mr Pasty (RDE).** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have all but reached the end of the

### Pasty

procedure for drawing up the budget for 1985, which we started back in October last year. I do not propose to go over the ups and downs experienced by this budget. I should just like to make the point, simply and briefly, that, on balance, Parliament has come out of this long budgetary winter and spring very well and that adoption of this budget is the happy outcome of a very severe test of our mettle.

On Thursday we shall be voting on a realistic, balanced budget which covers the whole of the financial year and makes provision for the maintenance of common policies, notably the common agricultural policy, and for the development of priority expenditure in a number of sectors which have been recognized as being particularly sensitive. We really have come a long way since the end of 1984!

The positions taken up by Parliament and the Council at the beginning were irreconcilable. They were diametrically opposed. Today, the new draft budget with which the Council has presented us meets Parliament's essential requirements by making provision for an increase in non-compulsory expenditure of 237 million ECU, virtually the total amount of the margin of manoeuvre available, and increasing the appropriations for the chapters which we are agreed deserve priority: food aid, integrated Mediterranean programmes, research, development. Not only has the Council given recognition to budget priorities but, significantly, it has adopted Parliament's proposed amendment in respect of revenue by entering the 232 million ECU constituting supplementary resources, in line with the Commission's forecasts. By this stage, therefore, we consider that the budget dispute has been more or less settled, although there are admittedly a number of exceptions, some of which are important and have been raised by other speakers; the one that I would mention in particular is the problem of the United Kingdom's budget contribution. But it is right for us to continue showing the same concern for realism and budgetary equality and adopt a budget along the lines indicated by the rapporteur and the Committee on Budgets. In this connection, I take this opportunity to join earlier speakers in paying tribute to the thoroughly efficient job done by our rapporteur, Mr Fich.

I consider it important to recommend that the House does not exceed the increase in expenditure indicated by the Committee on Budgets, while making the necessary additional effort, for policies on development aid and the structural funds in particular.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am reaching my conclusion. This budget will serve as an example for the future since, with the difficulties that have been experienced in drawing it up, it illustrates the pitch to which a crisis has developed as a result of the present lack of any leeway in own resources and the sorry prospect of an impending shortfall. Nevertheless, in view of the solutions which have been found, it demonstrates the good that can come from adopting a

position which is realistic but at the same time true to the political commitments of the Community, which is the position to which Parliament has adhered consistently. At all events, it shows that the accusations of irresponsibility made against this House's budget votes were without foundation. With this budget we have furnished proof that moderation as dictated by circumstances is not incompatible with a measure of progress in Europe in keeping with Parliament's wishes.

**Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC).** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, a budget should be like a symphony in which every movement, every bar, blends harmoniously with the whole. By that standard, the budget brought before us falls lamentably short of expectations. The budget of the European Communities is inconsistent because it is the outcome of countless compromises struck by governments which could not be more varied in their political complexions and intentions, but above all it is a 'no change' budget. No change on the common agricultural policy, where only one risk has been taken and that is the risk of dissatisfying everyone (the problems have been put off until later, as has been acknowledged by Mr Commissioner Christophersen), no change on the energy front, as you were on industrial policy. There is progress, however, although minor, in the social field, in environmental policy, and development policy. But this is still a budget in which the keynote is industrialism, a budget which refuses to explore new channels.

But let us concentrate, if you would, on a few salient points. Who is going to be convinced by a budget in which the Council not only refuses, at item 3843, to enter the 2 million ECU proposed by Parliament or even the 1 million proposed by the Commission for measures aimed at reducing the agricultural surpluses, but does not even allocate a single ECU for this purpose?

Who is going to be convinced by a budget in which the Council eschews all Community action to protect the forests against fire and acid rain, whereas, in 1984, 5 million ECU had at least been allocated for this purpose? Why is the Council refusing to finance a special programme to combat hunger in the world, based on the commitments of 29 million ECU and payments of 16 million ECU sought by Parliament, even though its acceptance of additional appropriations for food aid in the budget is some consolation for Parliament? Who can subscribe to a budget which ignores the really very modest request from the Committee on Development and Cooperation to reduce food aid in the form of milk powder by 21 million ECU and to reallocate this amount to food aid substitution schemes.

Whether it be in the internal market, where the Council has struck out the miserable 1.5 million ECU that Parliament asked for redevelopment of areas affected by severe decline — I am thinking here of the steel industry in Belgium —, or in provision for research,

### Roelants du Vivier

where it has made a cut of 500 000 ECU in the contribution to desulphurization equipment for power stations, the Council has disappointed Parliament's hopes.

Can we really be satisfied when, in the energy sector, only 490 000 ECU are earmarked for technical research on nuclear safety, compared with the 580 000 called for by Parliament and the 530 000 actually made available in 1984? What satisfaction can we take from the reduction from 1 million ECU in the preliminary draft to only 700 000 ECU now to finance action under the policy on atmospheric pollution? Finally, how can we fail to be disappointed — to put it euphemistically — by the Council's rejection of Parliament's position on the financial protocol with Turkey?

With all these grounds for dissatisfaction, we do not line up with those who are able to support this budget on an overall view, because, as I have said, it reflects the serious differences among the ten governments of this Community. What coherence could there be, other than on the level of the lowest common denominator?

**Mr Cot (S)**, *Chairman of the Committee on Budgets*. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, may I first of all, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, express thanks to our rapporteurs, Mr Fich and Mr Curry, for the very considerable amount of work that they have put into this double budget this year, for they have been in harness ever since their election at the beginning of this term.

I should also like to offer very sincere thanks to Mr Christophersen, the Commissioner responsible for the budget, who, immediately on taking up office, has had to deal with this thankless task of making something workable out of unpromising material, and to Mr Fracanzani, who has done everything in his power since last autumn to ensure that we would have a more or less acceptable budget to vote on.

I believe that the attitude shown by the House throughout this debate has been both responsible and prudent, and that it intends to continue in this vein at this, I trust, final stage of the budgetary procedure.

It has been responsible of us to insist on a budget covering twelve months, and I am pleased to note that the Council itself is paying tribute to us on this point today, which is perhaps a little late but is nevertheless welcome. It has been prudent of us to insist on the main priorities, which by now, at the second reading, have been more or less safeguarded.

Granted, everything has not been safeguarded. Mr Roelants du Vivier has just been reminding us of our remaining grounds for disappointment. From the musical point of view, however, Mr Roelants du Vivier, all is not gloom, since if a budget is a symphony, the

100 000 ECU which we voted yesterday in the Committee on Budgets for the European Communities Youth Orchestra should add an element of harmony to our proceedings. The fact nevertheless remains that various budgetary lines have fallen by the wayside. If the corresponding appropriations had been at the European Parliament's disposal, for some margin was still available, the Committee on Budgets would without any doubt have proposed a number of amendments: for instance, young people and non-governmental organizations are examples which come to mind.

Unfortunately, the exhaustion of own resources, as we know, means that Parliament is left with no opportunity to find the corresponding funding out of the 1985 budget. It cannot oblige the Member States to change the intergovernmental agreement against their wishes, forcing an agreement upon unwilling national parliaments.

This said, I now wish to make clear where the responsibilities lie, since I have heard various people, even officials of the Commission, making such comments as: 'But why does not Parliament reinstate such and such a line on the second reading? Why is Parliament rejecting what we want to see done on such and such a point?'. I want to state clearly in this House that it is not a matter of Parliament having rejected certain amendments, but of the Council having refused them. I believe that, for their part, Parliament and its Committee on Budgets have acted out of a sense of responsibility. Of course we cannot vote lines for which there is no financial provision. But let there be no confusion as to where responsibility lies: if the Council had wanted, it could have included appropriations for these additional lines.

There remains one item on which we are still at odds: the 30 million ECU from interest on accounts. The Council is being difficult about this, as Mr Fracanzani has confirmed.

I have two comments to make on this subject, one legal and the other political.

Legally, Parliament continues to exercise its voting rights in respect of revenues. This is not at issue, and I do not need to dwell on it. Nor do I propose to go into the details of the regularity of our proposal in the light of the financial regulations. There are two points of view on this, the one held by the Commission and the one held by the Council. I imagine that it was not without due consideration that the Commission itself made the proposal, in its preliminary draft, that these 30 million ECU be taken into account. This proposal is to be found on page 44 of *Volume 1* of the preliminary draft, dated 15 June 1984.

I would add that, in its report of 19 April 1985, the new Commission reiterates its agreement with Parliament's hope that Regulation No 2891/77 will be

**Cot**

revised along these lines. Moreover, there can be no denying that the agreement of 30 June laying down rules for budgetary discipline between the institutions provides authority for this entry, taking a dynamic political view of the budget of the Communities. In the light of this, we accept the Commission's argument rather than the Council's. I would make the further comment in this connection that the Council is hardly in any position to point the finger at us when, for this selfsame budget, it was proposing to drive a coach and four through the fundamental rule of budgetary annuality.

Legally, this amount of 30 million ECU is unallocated. Politically, it represents an essential priority for Parliament: the campaign against hunger in the world. Over and above development aid, and given the tragic circumstances, we intend to devote to this cause an additional amount representing one thousandth of the Community budget. We have the right to do so and we are exercising it.

I am convinced that the Council is not going to incur the responsibility for setting its face, on such poor grounds, against the entry of these 30 million ECU. Mr Fracanzani, whom I thank once again for his cooperation, is absolutely right when he says that there are more important things to be doing on the eve of the Milan Summit. It is for this reason that, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, I pledge all our colleagues to follow the Commission's line on this issue.

**Mr Rigo (S).** — *(IT)* Mr President, with this examination of the 1985 budget, and the vote on it at the end of this debate, we conclude the very full analysis of the Community's situation that goes far beyond the question of accounts alone.

The surreptitious balancing of the 1984 budget, the limitation of the time-span of the 1985 budget, the inadequacy of own resources, the United Kingdom refund, the disputes over budgetary discipline, the cutting of agricultural expenditure and the freezing of non-obligatory expenditure have all been contradictory elements that are difficult to reconcile and put together within the framework of a systematic budgetary policy.

The vote of Parliament rejecting the budget at its first reading was of course a vote that was motivated by the failure to cover the proper span of twelve months on both the income and expenditure sides, but the debate, both in committee and in this Chamber, had shown the dangerous tendencies that had emerged in the months immediately following Fontainebleau, all of them designed to twist both the spirit and the letter of the Community Treaties. I therefore associate myself gladly with what Mr Van der Vring said regarding the Italian term of office, which has restored the Community's initiative and very strongly relaunched the

Community concept, not least where the questions of finance and the budget are concerned. For this, our thanks are due in the first place to Mr Fracanzani.

Having settled the majority of these differences of view by means of reciprocal concessions between Parliament and the Council, we can say that what we have is an honourable compromise, to which must be added the happy conclusion of the accession negotiations with Spain and Portugal, which finally makes these two countries full Member States of the Community from 1 January 1986.

Where the budget is concerned, in its form for the second reading, we see that the Council has accepted the fundamental principle of budget annuality. There are other improvements as well — the reinstatement of the proportion of agricultural expenditure that was deducted last year and at the first reading — according to the interpretation of this that was given by Mr Van der Vring in his speech — and the increase in food aid, in the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, and in the Regional and Social Funds.

There is one anomaly that I should like to draw attention to, regarding the information sector. The Commission had indicated a figure of 14 million in the budget for information and culture, compared with 12 million the previous year. Quite out of the blue, the Council reduced this figure to 8 million. The Committee on Budgets brought it back to 10 million. I must say very frankly that this limit is totally inadequate: we are even below the appropriation made by the Municipality of Venice for its cultural policy.

I therefore recommend the Committee on Budgets, and even more warmly the European Commission, to remove this item elsewhere, if the financial needs of the information sector cannot be accommodated.

There has also been a reciprocal concession between the Council and Parliament with, on the one hand, the acknowledgement of Parliament's right to decide on revenue as well as on expenditure, and, on the other hand, the entering of the refund to Great Britain on the revenue side. Taken overall, we approve, and will vote in favour on Thursday, even though we are against the inadequacy of present budgetary policy, which does not make it possible to work effectively for the achievement of better economic integration.

What long-term objectives, what new Community policies, are possible if we do not reform the present system of management of the Community's finances? This year, for example, total national contributions to cover the budget deficit have been set at 1 980 million ECU. That is a considerable amount — we are aware of this. But what is the sense of this assumption, when we know that farm prices have not yet been fixed? It is the same old story: the Finance Council does its work before it knows what the Agriculture Council will do, so that the lack of control over the growth of agricul-

**Rigo**

tural expenditure will inevitably lead to the breakdown of budgetary equilibrium in 1985 and to an increase in this deficit as in previous deficits, with the inevitable carrying forward of hidden deficits from one financial year to the next.

As a result, as Commissioner Christophersen himself pointed out, a multiannual budget is impossible, as is any planned policy in which the relationship between obligatory and non-obligatory expenditure forms part of a policy for the development and competitiveness of Europe.

**Mr Mizzau (PPE).** — (*IT*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it gives me pleasure to begin my speech with a reference to a statement made by Mr Fracanzani with which I perfectly agree. Mr Fracanzani said that the budget is a fundamental instrument, not only for economic integration, but for the entire process of political integration — and that is what it must be. He then mentioned a number of points that have been referred to by many of our colleagues.

The first, which is naturally the question of unemployment, is one of the subjects that torments, not only the European Community, but the whole of Europe. It has to be said very clearly that the question of employment, as far as financing is concerned, should be tackled with one fundamental rule in mind — the rule that says: less taxes and more investment. I should be happy if we could transfer funds from the national budgets to the budget of the Community, if these funds were then used solely for investment.

Some of Mr Fracanzani's statements deserve emphasis — those regarding respect for the functions of Parliament. We are convinced that progress will only be made with European integration if Parliament's powers are extended, because we were elected to this Parliament by universal suffrage, and we represent the will for the political integration of Europe.

There are two points that I am happy to emphasize — regarding the IMP and regional development respectively. As regards the IMP I am in perfect agreement, but something happened in the Committee on Regional Policy, when the lagoons that extend from Comacchio to Marano Lagunare were excluded from IMP aid. That, besides being unreasonable, is incomprehensible; I fail to understand how measures for the Mediterranean can be implemented if the classic Mediterranean areas such as those of the Lagoons of Comacchio, Venice and Marano Lagunare are excluded. I hope that, when we come to approve the regulation, Parliament will be in favour. In addition, the European People's Party will again take up an amendment for 10 million ECU to be used in the transport sector for the improvement of communications with Austria, since the Community needs to go through Austria, whether it is going to Greece or coming to Italy. Negotiations must therefore be put in hand. This is,

however, on condition that, alongside the question of improving communications through Yugoslavia, consideration will also be given to improving communications with Italy, for example the road between Trieste and Munich, which has to go through the Monte Croce Carnico tunnel. We approve the 10 million ECU, therefore, and we approve negotiations with Austria, but let us remember at the same time the road through Yugoslavia and the Trieste road, through Monte Croce Carnico.

Mr President, the two questions of principle are alright — the annuality of the budget, which is normal, and 'transparency'. I should like to conclude on this point, referring to the question of the 30 million ECU that ought to be forthcoming as interest. Mr Cot spoke of two conditions — one legal and one political. From the legal standpoint nothing can be done, because there are not the relevant regulations, and the governments have not the will. However, there is the political question, and, when he comes to reply, Mr Fracanzani might make a political statement that would take into account Parliament's requirements and the position of the Commission, so as to overcome this divergency of views. That would enable Parliament to give its approval — which it will do anyway — without this split on the question of the 30 million ECU.

**Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED).** — Mr President, I was one of those who did not vote for the rejection of the budget last year. I am still not entirely sure whether I was right or wrong to have taken that course of action. I looked back last night at the words that I spoke then and those of the Irish President-in-Office of the Council, and it seems to me that we now have virtually the same situation as we should have had in any event. However, perhaps there is more clarity now — more transparency, to use the current jargon here in Europe — and perhaps that in itself is a good thing.

Nevertheless, it is only a part budget, the result of an intergovernmental agreement which is outside the budget but, of course, has come back into it. That was what inevitably was going to happen and that was what the Irish President-in-Office of the Council said would happen. Indeed, it has.

This is the thirteenth year of budget debates that I have actually taken part in. It is a little disappointing and a little depressing to find us talking now about exactly the same sort of things — the same percentages of expenditure on agriculture and so on — as we were 12 or 13 years ago. The same difficulties are arising now as did then. The one really good thing and something I am glad about is that this debate and this year have not been dominated by the question of the British rebate. Thank goodness, that has not been one of the main themes of debate and one of the main themes of argument between us.

**James Scott-Hopkins**

That is an advantage, but there is still no will on the part of the Council — or does not appear to be — to advance along the lines of developing other policies outside of agriculture. This has been proposed by the Commission over the years, and yet we do not really seem to advance very far, except that there is, I must say, a certain improvement as far as the agricultural policies are concerned. Constraints are beginning to come in there. That is unfortunately very necessary, but it is very welcome as well.

However, I cannot help but be a little worried as to what will happen this year. We have got a very tight budget up to the 1% ceiling with the intergovernmental agreement. What is to happen if the Ministers for Agriculture fail to agree, or if they agree not to accept the Commission's proposal but instead go away ahead on cereals, for instance, which is the only outstanding thing and which could cost the Community and the CAP a very great deal of money? Will there be a supplementary budget? Will the President-in-Office of the Council give an assurance that under no circumstances this year will there be a supplementary budget because of over-expenditure on agriculture? If he does this, it will be binding on his colleague. However, if he feels that it would be right to do so, he should do so.

Apart from that, I think that we have, as a Parliament, achieved the main objectives that we set for ourselves in the first and second readings at the end of last year, particularly as far as food aid is concerned and the development side of things. We certainly have succeeded in that regard.

It seems to me that what we now have to do for 1986 is to try to move forward and develop new policies in the energy field, for instance, in energy research and development and in the social field. Never has there been a greater need for Europe to concentrate its efforts on those areas which will have an impact on our citizens in dealing with the employment situation throughout the Community. I do not believe the Council has paid sufficient attention to this, and I hope the Commission will do so in the coming year.

Mr President, my last word is about the 30 million ECU which we have added to the budget, though I gathered from the President-in-Office of the Council just now that this has not been approved so far. There is no doubt that this money either earns interest or allows the governments to earn interest because they have got it. The Commission has proposed that that interest should accrue to the Commission or to the budget and should be used there. It is an argument which is acceptable. It is something that should have been done years ago, and I can remember it being raised in debate about seven or eight years ago. It was certainly proposed last year. Even if we do not succeed this year in getting the Council to accept it, it really must accept it for 1986.

As Mr Curry, the spokesman for my group, said, we have not discussed these matters in our group. There-

fore there is no firm decision. However, I hope that my group will support what has been proposed by the Committee on Budgets and its rapporteur. I hope we shall take that decision and support this budget when it comes to the voting on Thursday.

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (GR) Mr President, in connection with Council's new draft budget for 1985, which is before us for its second reading, I would like to make the following comments on behalf of the Greek Communist Party:

Firstly, we cannot understand how Council feels justified in deciding to reject the European Parliament's amendments and offer the Turkish junta 26.9 million ECU from the third financing protocol, 4.5 million ECU from the fourth financing protocol, and 16.6 million ECU of special aid. I would like to ask: is this the way Council shows respect for democratic rights, especially when its decision coincides with the new law on greater powers for the Turkish police, which consecrates the abolition of the fundamental rights of the Turkish people, particularly after the great demonstration that took place — the greatest since the junta was formed — on Sunday in Istanbul in favour of the restoration of democratic rights?

Secondly, I wish to stress that the increase in appropriations for the integrated Mediterranean programmes to 120 million ECU is certainly a positive move, but that it falls short of the European Parliament's proposal for 140 million ECU.

Thirdly, the increase of food aid by 116 million ECU is again certainly positive, but to what extent does its structure contribute to the autonomous development of the developing countries? Finally, another problem is the matter of support for Poland in the private sector, and we ask: Don't the European Parliament and Council have enough budget problems of their own, without creating new problems in Europe in the sphere of East-West relations?

**Mrs Ewing (RDE),** *Chairman of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport.* — Mr President, if we do not make this Community real to our citizens, then we might as well all pack our bags and go home and leave this complicated, magnificent international structure we have built to crumble to ruins. The Citizens' Europe Committee recognizes that fact but the Philistines are at the gate, because they are proposing to cut the information budget from 12 million ECU to 8 million ECU. And that I absolutely protest against. I propose to tell all the groups the numbers of the amendments necessary to restore this disgraceful proposal back to the 13 million ECU that we say is the absolute minimum.

Secondly, this is Youth Year, and what are we proposing to do in Youth Year? Cut back the amount for

## Ewing

youth. What an indictment on this place! How can we show our faces back in the streets of our towns and villages if we do this? So I am proposing to pass to all the groups the numbers of the amendments necessary to protect this part of the budget.

**Mr Bonde (ARC).** — (DA) Mr President, the Danish People's Movement against Membership of the European Community is opposed to the Fich report and, together with the Socialist People's Party of Denmark, tables the following motion for an amendment:

Parliament rejects any attempt to legislate *via* the budget and to invent new sources of revenue in support of the election programme of the budget rapporteur's party and rejects any transfer of power to Parliament.

We hope that all Danish Members will be able to vote for the amendment, since it is in full accord with the policy on the European Community which was adopted unanimously in the Danish Folketing. There is not one member of the Danish Folketing who — at least publicly — is willing to participate in Ove Fich's constitutional battle to get more power for the European Parliament. He has a strong desire for it himself, but is obliged to put forward the usual succession of subterfuges in his attempt to shift power from the national parliaments and the Council of Ministers to the European Parliament.

As rapporteur, he has to promote altered classifications which may give Parliament the last word on matters concerning which the Council would otherwise have the last word. He must try to legislate *via* the budget and even interferes on the revenue side, where Parliament has no say. He also seeks to make changes in the intergovernmental agreement. Including the income from interest in the budget is quite ingenious, but Ove Fich goes further than the Commission and spends the money before it is there. We would have just as much right, legally speaking, to withdraw the interest from Ove Fich's bank account and buy ourselves hot dogs with it. Or perhaps we could get the Finance Ministry to pay his next salary in Monopoly money, with a proposal that it might perhaps be exchanged for proper notes in certain circumstances.

Instead of more Community expenditure, we recommend savings in Parliament's own operations. The Socialist People's Party and the People's Movement propose that Parliament refuse to pay travel and secretarial expenses to Members who declare expenses in excess of what they actually incur and refuse to pay out *per diem* allowances in excess of the rates applicable to officials. We call on all Members to support this self-evident proposal.

**Mr CiccioMessere (NI).** — (IT) Mr President, somebody said that our debate was 'disappointing'. The problem is to establish by what criteria: that is, if the

criteria are those that were indicated by recent discussions — and also by the Fich report — we might probably also say that we were satisfied, because the so-called 'contest of strenght' between Parliament, Council and the Commission has been solved to everyone's mutual satisfaction.

But I think, Mr President, that no budget discussion can be reduced to an accounting analysis, or to a comparison of different interests of a corporative, national, specific nature. Discussion of the budget ought, through the exchange of views between Parliament, the Commission and the Council, to allow a Community strategy to be developed — an overall strategy, a strategy that would be real because it was linked to budgetary decisions. No longer simply words, but what, behind those words, we are prepared to give backing to in terms of appropriations.

If, Mr President, apart from all the words, we had to specify what are the prospects that our budget offers, what the real priorities are apart from words, there is still one priority and one only — the Common Agricultural Policy, and that is all. Because, after that one priority, there is nothing. In committee we are in fact sometimes obliged to go so far as to discuss a few hundred units of account for the musicians, or for who knows what other undoubtedly important item, but the basic key questions of Community policy are not touched. They are not tackled because it is felt — no doubt rightly, from a realistic point of view — that they cannot be touched. Parliament's priorities were indicated, and they ought to have been different — the question of employment, the problem of co-operation with the Third World!

On the question of employment I have heard absolutely nothing, except words. I have not discovered, nor have I seen, nor have I been able to read in the figures, any real determination to make a move in any direction — that is to say, to come to a decision. I said as much in the previous debate — there is this ghost, this 'eureka' that is going around — not in our Chamber, because we cannot discuss it — and which is being debated; there is this comparison with the United States, and with Japan. There are the problems of technological research, and the challenge of our age. And yet these problems are beyond the realm of our Parliament, which is not called on to discuss these problems but must, instead, examine in detail the question of the musicians of Heavens knows what institution, or other such questions.

And so we come to the question of co-operation with the Third World. Mr President, we must have done with equivocation, where this question is also concerned! The charity that our Parliament has decided to hand out is somewhat narrow-minded. We know perfectly well that what we are talking about here is not aid in the proper sense of the word, since it is either for the most part given to the Western economies and the European economies or, in the case of genuine

food aid — as we all know — it is aid that is in the long term counter-productive: exceptionally, such aid may be of value in certain situations, but only if it is linked with wide-ranging infrastructural projects. In that way aid can be useful, but it is not useful if it is allocated solely as a shore-up operation. We know very well that it is aid provided by the producers of cereals, milk, powdered milk, oil, etc.

As far as the Community's effort is concerned — and this must be primarily a conceptual effort, a grasping of the fact that the problem of the Third World is not a problem of charity but a strategic problem, one which concerns the security of Europe and of the world — if we get away from words and look at the figures, and the budget discussion allows us to do this, we can see that not only is this overall approach to the question of relations with the Third World missing, but on the domestic side we have the wrong policies, we have policies that are inadequate as far as cooperation is concerned, together with a percentage reduction in the allocations fixed by Parliament and the other institutions.

And so, Mr President, under such circumstances, what other verdict is possible, what other verdict can we express on this discussion, this draft budget, other than a clearly, decidedly negative one; and that is in the first place because there is no real definition of basic political will, and then also because, whenever this will is manifest in words, the figures flatly contradict it, as I have endeavoured to show. That is why we shall vote against the budget.

#### IN THE CHAIR: MR ALBER

##### *Vice-President*

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — Mr President, I listened with interest earlier on when the President-in-Office, speaking about the new draft budget, said that we must use all our endeavours in pursuit of European Union and went on to say that this budget can lay down the basis for progress on a wide range of topics. Well, as far as my group, the British Labour Group, is concerned, it does not lay down the basis for progress on the wide range of topics that he suggested, and if this is the basis on which a European Union is to be built, then it is a European Union that I and my colleagues will steadfastly resist and oppose.

Equally, the Commission Vice-President, Mr Christophersen said that we now have a result which satisfies all institutions. It may well satisfy the institutions, but it does not satisfy some of the Members of this particular institution.

I want to deal briefly, Mr President, with some of the deficiencies of the new draft budget that we have

before us. In this document we still have a budget which reflects the failure of the Council of Ministers to curb agricultural spending. Agricultural spending will, during this financial year, rise to something like 73% of the total Community budget. It is a budget which does not bring satisfaction because of the failure of the Council of Ministers to adopt the price-cut for cereals which the Commission urged.

We are concerned in this debate that failure to cut cereal prices as urged by the Commission has in fact falsified the financial basis of the budget, because, as we were told by Mr Christophersen in the early discussions, both in the Committee on Budgets and in this House, the financial calculations of the Commission were based on the assumption that the Council of Ministers would adopt *in toto* the Commission's price proposals. The failure of the Council to do so, particularly in relation to cereal prices, has in fact falsified the financial basis of the budget.

The main problem concerning the citizens of Europe is the high and continuing level of unemployment in the Community. Although the President-in-Office said that that is the case and reaffirmed that it must continue to be the case, this budget is not so drafted as to address itself to that problem as the primary problem. If we go through the budget in detail and look at the manifestations of concern for the problems of unemployment in our Community, we find that they are precious few indeed by comparison with the concern for the interests of 12 million agricultural producers, many of whom are producing agricultural products that are now in large structural surplus. So we deplore not only the high and continuing levels of unemployment in the Community but the failure of the budget to provide adequate resources through the Regional Fund and through the Social Fund to deal with that problem which is in the forefront of the minds of the citizens of Europe. If we are to have any real concern for the citizens of Europe and their needs, those needs are much more fundamental in the field of employment and employment policy than they are in that of agriculture and agricultural support.

My party is also concerned at the inadequacy of appropriations in the budget to developing countries. Sure, there has been some movement in the budget in relation to food aid, but food aid is a temporary palliative as far as the needs of the Third World are concerned. This budget does not offer anything like adequate resources to the nations of the Third World for what is the real imperative, that of development assistance, which is the kind of assistance that will help the Third World to self-sufficiency and not this continued dependence on the charity of Western Europe in the form of food aid, some of which is by its very nature destroying the agrarian economies of Third World countries. Those are the problems that the budget fails to address itself to in the area of developing countries, and we regret that failure.

**Tomlinson**

In the vote on Thursday, we will express our opposition to the Council of Ministers, which has ignored the express wish of this House that the financial protocol with Turkey be blocked. Here again, where we have had a clear expression of political view from the directly-elected European Parliament, the Council of Ministers has in its wisdom deemed fit to ignore that advice and guidance.

So, Mr President, I shall be advising my colleagues in the British Labour group not to tinker further with this budget but to vote for rejection of the budget in its entirety as a clear message to the institutions of Europe that they have got to do better on behalf of the citizens of Europe.

**Mr Filinis (COM).** — (GR) Mr President, it is certainly appropriate that further progress should be made over the budget with its second reading by Parliament. Yet we think that the following comments are necessary and essential:

Firstly, the increased appropriations in various sectors certainly represent a positive development. Nevertheless we view with concern the restriction to 120 million ECU of the overall sum of 140 million ECU originally proposed by Parliament for the IMP's. This sum is already below a lower limit of safety, and its effectiveness has thus been rendered problematic.

It is also a very serious matter that Council went ahead with the re-registration of 26 million ECU for Turkey, despite the fact that Parliament had rejected this at first reading. Such acts always embolden dictatorships, as was proved only yesterday by the draft law by the Turkish junta granting additional excessive powers to the police, such as uncontrolled telephone tapping and censorship of citizens' private mail, the power of arrest on suspicion, and the power to disband associations without recourse to legal decision.

**Mr Musso (RDE).** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as our spokesman Jean-Claude Pasty has announced, we shall be voting according to the recommendation of the rapporteur and the Committee on Budgets. At last we have a proper budget, one which, thanks to Parliament's efforts, is drawn up according to the correct principles.

There are nevertheless shortcomings which, even if we cannot rectify them, must not be allowed to pass without comment. Shortcomings in the structural funds: granted, there has been an increase, but not big enough for the peripheral regions, which need these structural funds, especially when enlargement is taken into consideration.

Finally, there is the case of the IMPs, where the amount allocated by the Council could scarcely be more out of line with the undertakings that it had

given, and is even less than the amount proposed by the Commission.

What I want to stress once again is the Council's incoherence, its dereliction, and even, from a certain point of a view, its surrender.

**Mr Gatti (COM).** — (IT) Mr President, the Italian Communists will vote for this budget because considerable changes have been made in it compared with the situation from which we started last year, and some by no means negligible results have been achieved. Expenditure has been covered in full, especially agricultural expenditure; the financial allocations for certain structural items — including the Regional Fund, the Social Fund, the IMP measures, and some research projects — have been increased, albeit modestly, and these are significant items, even though they have still not been adequately covered financially. In addition, the appropriation for food aid has been increased. In short, over the past few months, in a situation of financial near-asphyxiation, a budget has been produced for the Community that — whilst it is undoubtedly a very modest one, as a number of colleagues have pointed out — still leaves the way open for further development in future years.

Having said this, however, we must point out that in this budget there is one feature that we continue to consider harmful and potentially dangerous for the balanced evolution of the Community. I am referring to the manner in which a solution has been found, albeit for a transitory period only, to the question of the British refund. We have endeavoured all along to insist that the arrangement should be transitory, and to fix beyond all question the expiry date for the mechanism that was agreed at Fontainebleau. Our efforts unfortunately did not meet with success, but that is no reason in our view to shelve the question. We think it should be re-opened in the context of the increase in own resources — and I note in fact, that the 1.4% VAT, which should come into force on 1 January 1986, will be used up during that same year. It is necessary once again, therefore, as a matter of great urgency, to open negotiations for a further increase in VAT, and it is in that context that the anomaly of Fontainebleau can finally be put right.

In conclusion, therefore, our vote in favour of this budget, which we are aware has some serious deficiencies, is a sign of goodwill, so that those elements in it that are still weak but are nonetheless there, and which could lead to fresh progress with European integration, can be strengthened.

**Mr Lalor (RDE).** — Mr President, throughout the entire budgetary procedure my group has strongly condemned the Council's disgraceful financial planning by presenting an annual report that only covered a nine-month period. On this occasion I must say that

**Lalor**

I am pleased, at least on this point, that the Council has come to its senses and reinstated in the EAGGF, Guarantee Section, the necessary amounts to cover on-going expenditure for the next 12 months. I am proud to say that the Group of the European Democratic Alliance has been associated with this amendment from the outset.

While I agree with the importance and the necessity of the Integrated Mediterranean Programme and its financing, particularly in view of the imminent enlargement, I am extremely disappointed that the additional 50 m ECU in commitments for these programmes was found by reducing the commitments to the Regional and Social Funds. I need scarcely remind my colleagues of the extreme importance of those two policies in terms of both creating employment and also reducing unacceptable imbalances between the rich inner circle and the poor outer periphery of the Community, which is by no means limited to the Mediterranean area.

Mr President, people are losing confidence in Europe. We have heard a lot of talk in recent times about European Union and a new Treaty. In my view, it will get little support when people recall the failure of the existing Treaties. I hope that we have learned from the political posturing of certain Member States over the past few years, particularly in relation to budgetary matters. If not, the future is very, very bleak. Let us hope that this is not the case and that we can make progress.

Finally, may I say that unless there are significant and, indeed, massive transfers of appropriate resources from the inner circle to the outer triangle of our Community — to use the words of one of my noted colleagues — there will be genuine cause for concern for the continuation and for the very existence of this Community.

**Mr Francanzani, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (IT) Mr President, I rise only to collect together the further constructive indications and contributions that have come from this debate, and to say how much the Council wishes to uphold the role of Parliament at all times, a role that it considers to be absolutely essential in the different fields, but especially where the budget is concerned.

In the report we emphasized our grounds for satisfaction with the progress that has been made with this budget, on three counts.

The first is that the figures for significant, fundamental priority policies have been substantially increased. The second is that, taken overall, the budget has been strengthened, not only in purely accounting terms nor even in economic and social terms, important as these are, but as a fundamental instrument with a contribution to make to the process of building Europe, which

is something that must be carried forward very much more quickly.

The third reason for satisfaction is the fact that, as the progress of drawing up this 1985 budget has gone on, so has the role of the European Parliament developed. We hope that, by virtue of fixing short-term deadlines, Parliament's budgetary role has been extended. There have in fact been positive signs of this during the process of preparing the 1985 budget.

Having said this, I note that, as some members have pointed out in this Chamber, Parliament takes a favourable view of this budget, but not a completely favourable one. The same can be said of the Council. In fact, I spoke of a 'developing' budget, not a perfect one. Everything that is possible within the limits of the regulations as they stand at present has been done in this budget, and beyond those limits neither the Parliament nor the Council can go. I would say, though, that we have done something more, because if we take into account the intergovernmental agreement, we have to some extent made up for the failure to increase own resources with effect from the beginning of 1985. We hope, of course, that from 1986, with the increase in own resources, the progress that will be possible with future budgets will be more decisive and more swiftly effective where the process of building Europe is concerned.

This applies particularly to the question of the 30 million ECU interest which was considered by the Council at some length, and on which various Members have spoken with authority. Views on this subject may differ, and I do not want to go into the pros and cons regarding the payment of interest on these Treasury accounts. However, one thing is certain; there is no doubt whatever that, to date, no regulation has been approved that provides for this, which means that, even though theoretically our position might be in favour of such interest payments, if there is no legal basis we cannot legally make such an entry in the budget for 1985. There is no question, therefore, of our being insensitive, where important questions such as aid to the developing countries are concerned. It is not insensitivity that makes us adopt a certain line with regard to this question of the 30 million interest. Quite the reverse! It is because it is legally impossible to enter an item that is so far not authorized by any rule or regulation. Such a phoney entry would have repercussions on the budget in general, at the very time when I think that there is a virtually unanimous view that this budget, compared with the budget as it was initially, is undoubtedly a good one and deserves to be adopted.

In view of this distinction between what is legal and what is politically desirable, even though many of us would like to be able to do certain things, that is impossible if there is not legal authority for so doing. And until this authority exists, no matter what we may

**Francazani**

wish to do, we shall be unable to turn our hopes into deeds.

However, to emphasize that the reason that has led us to reject the inclusion of the 30 million is purely based on legality and not political reasons or insensitivity, I will undertake, in response to Mr Mizzau's request, to take back to the Council the Commission's proposal regarding the payment of interest on Treasury deposits, so that the Council can examine the problem afresh. Naturally, this could only affect future years, and cannot have any retrospective effect for 1985.

Having said this, I wish also to emphasize one final point regarding the view, that was expressed in several speeches, that where the policy of aid for developing countries is concerned we have done everything that was legally possible. That this is so is confirmed by the fact that, at the second reading, the Council accepted Parliament's amendment on food aid in full.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The vote will take place at 10.30 a.m. on Thursday.

### 3. Draft estimates for 1986

**President.** — The next item is the report by Mr De Vries, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the draft estimates of revenue and expenditure of the European Parliament for the financial year 1986 (Doc. A 2-64/85).

**Mr De Vries (L), rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, democracy is a precious and a costly asset. The European Parliament's draft estimates for 1986 amounts to around 300 m ECU. In relative terms, that is not very much, about 1% of the total Community budget. If Parliament's budget is divided among the 320 m Europeans who will be living in the Community from 1 January 1986 onwards, European democracy costs less than one ECU per citizen. But in absolute terms, 300 m ECU is a substantial sum. Public money must be used carefully and economically, in the Community no less than in our Member States.

I am therefore happy to be able to present today draft estimates which the Committee on Budgets and the Bureau believe meet these financial management requirements. On the face of it, it might seem obvious that both the Committee on Budgets, responsible for appropriations, and the Bureau, responsible for the establishment plan, should approve the draft. But this has not always been the case in the past: the Bureau and the Committee on Budgets have sometimes been at loggerheads over the draft budget. The Assembly then usually sided with the Committee on Budgets. In practice, however, the Bureau quietly went its own way. If the administration could not manage on a

given amount, an addition was simply requested, and it was not as a rule hard to obtain.

To put an end to this schizophrenic situation, it was decided last year on a proposal from my predecessor, David Curry, to set up a consultative body embracing the Bureau and the Committee on Budgets. The negotiations in this body have been tough. Both sides have had to climb down considerably, the only way, as Members know, to achieve acceptable results in negotiations.

I must admit, Mr President, that during this process I sometimes felt like Honoré de Balzac, who laments somewhere in *'La peau de chagrin'*: *Nous ne manquons jamais d'argent pour nos caprices. Nous ne discutons que le prix des choses utiles ou nécessaires.* But both parties can live with the outcome of these discussions.

I have also carried on from where my predecessor left off in another way, Mr President. As David Curry said in November of last year:

I think what we have to do now is to move from the principle of financial repression to a principle of reform through structural change. I also think we have to move to reform through a certain self-discipline on the part of the Members and more effective working methods, which is perhaps the same thing, on the part of the administration.

As regards self-discipline on the part of the Members, I have made four proposals. The most important is the one that concerns a new arrangement for the settlement of expenses. I call for a clearer system that takes account of actual costs and of trends in purchasing-power by a method of calculation that already applies to the judges at the Court of Justice and the Members of the Commission. I also think it is a disgrace that the Members of this Parliament do not all receive the same pay but the same as their colleagues in the national parliaments. European parliamentarians all do the same work, but they do not all receive the same pay. The Irish and Luxembourg Members are particularly hard hit by this arrangement. I urge the Council of Ministers to waste no more time in adopting a Community arrangement to put an end to this discrimination.

I have proposed reforms through structural changes in two areas, Mr President. Firstly, the mobility of Parliament's administrative staff must be improved. Secondly, Parliament must organize its activities more efficiently and more effectively. Parliament has enough officials, but their mobility has for years left a great deal to be desired. To encourage mobility, I propose that the Secretary-General should be given a clear mandate. The upgrading and conversion of posts must also be governed by clearer criteria.

In view of the accession of Spain and Portugal, a temporary increase in the staff complement is acceptable.

**De Vries**

At the end of this session of the European Parliament, however, the staff complement must be reduced to the present level by natural wastage and the like. This also applies to the staff of the parliamentary groups.

The organization of our own proceedings is also in need of reform. There must be an end to the inflation in resolutions. Excessive use of this weapon is not only costly: it also makes it less effective. Steps must also be taken to combat the fragmentation of the powers of our Parliament: the number of committees, subcommittees, working-parties and delegations must not be allowed to go on growing if Parliament's influence is not to be jeopardized.

Finally, Mr President, a single seat for Parliament must be decided once and for all. The waste of public money as a result of the Council's refusal to do its duty in this respect can be estimated at just under 30 million ECU. To this must be added the cost of renting and furnishing buildings in three cities, transport costs, mission expenses and so on.

Mr President, Parliament regularly criticizes the attitude of the Council of Budget Ministers, and rightly so, but if we want to be taken seriously, we must also be prepared to take a critical look at Parliament's budget. We also rightly criticize decision-making in the Community, and here again we must be prepared to ensure that our own activities are organized effectively and efficiently, and I call on Parliament to do this.

It merely remains for me to thank the staff of the Committee on Budgets for the help they have given me as rapporteur *ad interim* in place of Hendrik-Jan Louwes. I should also like to thank the many Members with whom I have had the privilege to work constructively and fruitfully in this budgetary procedure despite our different party-political convictions.

**Mr Dankert (S).** — (NL) Mr President, Parliament's estimates amount to over 300 million ECU this year, and that is a great deal of money. It is an extremely large amount when we consider the increase over last year. In the past, we have succeeded in keeping the increase in this budget very low and the percentage utilized high. This means in fact that this budget marks the end of the cuts it has been possible to make in the past. Even I felt that a substantial rise, partly due to the cost of enlargement, was inevitable, because a policy of major restructuring or economies can no longer be pursued with our estimates alone. Thus, on the one hand there is nothing more in reserve and, on the other, there are the costs due to enlargement, particularly staff costs, including the growing cost of the translation problem that will follow enlargement, which I believe still cannot be expressed in figures, and also the effect the increased number of parliamentarians will have.

For years parliament has tried to comb these estimates, to adjust them and to keep them down. I call on Parliament to look at the budgets of the other institutions in the coming years, because I believe what we are doing to ourselves still needs to be done to those institutions.

Mr President, 300 million ECU is a large amount. How can Parliament help to ensure that a budget of this size is further stabilized? I believe this is one of the main tasks to be tackled in the coming years. I do not think there is any point in going through all kinds of minor items with a fine-tooth comb again. This stabilization will only be possible if the necessary steps are taken at policy level and by the Bureau to keep rising costs and further explosions in costs under control. This should be done — and Mr De Vries has made a number of suggestions along the right lines, I think — by taking a hard look at the major categories of expenditure: staff costs and spending on parliamentarians, plus a number of associated items of expenditure.

Staff costs account for about 52% of this budget, with additional costs caused by the enlargement. The plan is to remove this additional item in three years' time. But if the Bureau does not consider the necessary restructuring measures this year, there will be no going back in three year's time. In other words, something must also be done about the staff policy and the structure of this Parliament if the agreement between the Committee on Budgets and the Bureau is to be implemented.

I have just mentioned the language problem. It is not yet clear what will happen when we have nine instead of the present seven languages. It is not only a question of the costs involved. I feel the Bureau must undertake a study of the other effects the increase from seven to nine languages will have, because I am afraid that after 1 January 1986 this increase may make the work situation extremely difficult in Parliament, which even now is not noted for being able to react quickly to developments because of the seven languages we have to cope with. I believe the problem will become very serious when we have nine languages, and that this, plus the cost element, should be looked at more closely by the Bureau.

I also feel that a number of problems connected with the staff situation should be considered carefully when the review of the Staff Regulations is discussed next year. Parliament should take initiatives in this respect. The rapporteur has referred to mobility. My view is that the present Staff Regulations make mobility too difficult for it to be effective and that the measures that can be taken under the present Staff Regulations should be joined by new provisions on this aspect, because there must be mobility if there is to be reform. On that I agree with the rapporteur.

The rapporteur referred to the need for the Rules of Procedure to be revised. Particularly where Rule 47 is

## Dankert

concerned, I feel the flood of paper must be stemmed, because it is very damaging, both politically and financially. I also feel quite a few changes are needed throughout this parliamentary budget as regards the passion for travel and such status symbols as parliamentary clubs.

We must see where the money goes. All the various allowances amounted to 30 000 ECU per Member in 1979. In 1980, they rose to 55 000 ECU per Member, and in 1981 to 73 000 ECU per Member. At the moment, with all his various allowances, including those paid to his staff, a Member of Parliament costs 103 000 ECU. That is a threefold increase in costs per Member since the direct elections to the European Parliament in 1979. This is something which I feel must be looked at more closely to see if changes are possible in this area too.

In order to put a stop to some of these excesses, the Committee on Budgets has now made a number of proposals concerning distances for the purpose of calculating travelling expenses and also fixed exchange-rates: for Dutch Members, this would mean a 10-15% loss of income in real terms; but I think this kind of reform is necessary, because the present arrangement has resulted in Members' being treated differently even where they incur exactly the same expenses. That is unacceptable. I hope that the Christian-Democratic Group, which was not overcome with enthusiasm for this kind of measure in the Committee on Budgets and did no more than criticize the cost of Parliament, will also reduce this cost somewhat by limiting this expenditure. That is always to the good, Mr Cornelissen.

Those are the most important comments I have to make. The estimates cannot be used to keep rising costs under control. Drastic action must be taken with regard to policy measures — and the report makes a number of proposals with respect to the future Secretary-General — or it will not just be a question of these estimates being too high: Parliament will become ungovernable.

**Mr Bardong (PPE).** — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! If a Parliament is to do its job it must have the facilities and this costs money. At all levels of policy, Parliament's facilities are inferior to those of the executive, but Members should and must demonstrate greater personal commitment. This will remain the case and there is no harm in that. If we compare the expenditure of the European Parliament with that of national parliaments, it is not particularly high, although the European Parliament has higher costs because of its many languages requiring translators and interpreters and its travelling expenses.

It has already been pointed out that there are expenses that could easily be avoided in the long run, if we could agree on Parliament's place of work. But this is

a matter for the Governments of the Member States: it is for them to decide, in accordance with the Treaty, on the question of the seat of the European Parliament. It is up to our administration to improve the working conditions for Parliament now by a better distribution of staff among the various places of work. The expense would be relatively moderate. However, we must bear in mind that the basic remuneration of the Members of the European Parliament is still paid by the Member State parliaments. The Council of Ministers must finally take a decision on a common statute of the Members of the European Parliament.

At the same time we cannot wait for others to take decisions on our working conditions; we must act ourselves.

Spanish and Portuguese accession and an increase in the number of Members from 434 to 518 makes expansion essential: the Members from the new Member States must be able to exercise their mandate on the same terms as all the other Members. The number of official languages of the twelve Member States will increase from seven to nine. No one disputes this, but we must consider whether the increase in costs can be justified.

In 1983 200 million ECU, in 1984 220 million ECU, in 1985 236 million ECU and in 1986 — according to current estimates — 301 million ECU. These are figures which give pause for thought, particularly those for 1986. Initially, the rapporteur hoped and tried to restrict the increase in costs to 275 million ECU. No doubt this could not be done but the result of the consultation between our representatives and the Bureau — we are grateful to Mr de Vries for taking over this task — needs further correction, as it is hardly a model of economy. There is an increase of more than 25% compared to the budget for 1985, of which a mere 10% is accounted for by the costs of enlargement.

If we individual items, for example the number of posts, it has been agreed that a staff level of 3 000 is to represent a long-term maximum level which is not to be exceeded. Additional recruitments for new Members must be provided for *now*.

We must hope that a further reduction will be possible during this electoral period by means of transfers, natural wastage and staff reductions as well as, for example, through greater use of new methods of word processing, which will only take effect in the long term.

However, I do not feel that staggering recruitment over three years, the compromise that was reached in the consultation procedure, is the ideal solution. Nor do I feel that freezing some of these appointments in anticipation of this development offers any guarantee. If it is intended, by the end of this electoral period, to revert to the present number of posts, i.e. to ensure

**Bardong**

that the number of posts are reduced, then, in my opinion, there is no point in establishing some 50 new posts for 1988 when this process was to start having an effect. I fear that this aim will remain merely a declaration of intent unless safeguards are provided at the outset and we find it very hard to endorse this solution.

The rapporteur's report on the results of the consultation procedure did not reach us until yesterday. This was not the rapporteur's fault, since he took over this major task as a substitute and was very pressed for time, but we have only had the report for a day and must reserve the right to table amendments within the deadline.

We question the need for appropriations to be earmarked for promotions, as in the past promotions have always been covered by the normal budget appropriations. This time a separate heading has been created. We also question whether an increase in appropriations for auxiliary staff of almost 30% is justified. At all events, a further increase in the amount of overtime is to be discouraged. We view with misgivings the considerable increase in the costs for free-lance interpreters and feel that a 70% rise in the number of translations sent out to free-lance is certainly too high.

An increase in the use of modern tele-communications techniques ought to make it possible to restrict the number of staff missions. No doubt offices are needed in the new buildings, but we question whether an increase of 22% for rents is necessary, even allowing for new buildings and annual rent increases.

Thanks to the watchful eye of the Committee on Budgets and its rapporteur over the last few years much of the padding has been removed under this heading and others, but a careful check is still called for.

Despite all these restrictions and any others that may be possible, some increases are necessary, for example for staff for the Groups and for visitors. Visits from remote parts of the Community have hardly been possible. The Quaestors' proposal is very high, even if it is based on sound calculations and given the present financial climate we cannot accept it. We propose an increase of 600 000, although we recognize this is very low if visitors are to be able to come from the remote areas. And it will certainly not be possible to pay their full travelling expenses, quite apart from the fact that the proposal is only for one group per Member. But we might at least consider the possibility of partially refunding air fares.

Parliament can delegate tasks to other organs, such as the Bureau and the Committee on Budgets, but the House retains its full responsibility and powers even for subsequent changes. My Group therefore reserves the right to table amendments in the areas about which I have been speaking.

**Mr Seligman (ED).** — Mr President, I want to talk briefly about the amendment concerning Item No 6615, which proposes 50 000 ECU for the Commission to *commence* a study on Community action to coordinate Member States' activities in the field of animal protection and welfare — only to *commence* a study of this problem. It will make very bad publicity for the Community that Parliament and Council should have both turned down this very small amount to start work on animal welfare, and I want to object strongly that it has been so badly mishandled.

As a co-chairman on animal welfare, I regret that the rapporteur on the budget did not agree to re-table all amendments automatically, as has been the practice in the past. He apparently chose certain amendments and rejected others. I think that was very wrong and very unfair. We regret that the Council decision on the amendments came too late for MEPs to know that the matter had been rejected, therefore precluding us from re-submitting an amendment in time. I hope that the rapporteur, Mr Christodoulou, will look favourably on this amendment in the next budget in 1986. Millions of citizens are very anxious for Parliament and Council to act and to start doing something on animal welfare. I think it is in our interests to make sure that this amendment is properly handled in the next budget.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Seligman. It is always a pleasure to hear you, but this time I am afraid you were barking up the wrong tree.

**Mr De Vries (L), rapporteur.** — Mr President, may I just inform Mr Seligman that we were talking about the parliamentary budget. I will do my utmost to see to it that the parliamentary animals are taken care of, but I am afraid that animal welfare in the entire Community is slightly out of the purview of our deliberations of this morning.

**President.** — Precisely. That's why I said the wrong tree.

**Mrs Scrivener (L).** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by thanking Mr de Vries, who is to be congratulated on his considerable feat of familiarizing himself with a subject as complicated as the parliamentary budget in so short a time.

Parliament welcomes the consultation procedure which has been arranged between the Bureau and the Committee on Budgets. This is a good thing. This is a course which should be pursued further. In fact, the budget should be the reflection of Parliament's activities. Of course, attention must be paid to discipline and sound management, and I believe that we are all moving in that direction. But we must avoid 'discipline for discipline's sake', since that would in fact somehow

### Scrivener

stifle Parliament. We must be on our guard against this, since it has tended to be the approach adopted in past years, as we must admit.

What we really need is coherence, and this means that we should be looking at the activities which Parliament has chosen to pursue and then supporting the corresponding appropriations. I would add that, if in future we are going to be looking to reduce Parliament's expenditure, which after all would perhaps be a good thing, we should concentrate on reducing travel other than travel to and between the three regular meeting-places. This in particular would be the way to achieve significant savings, since all other savings would involve 'cheese-paring' which would mean that Parliament could not carry on its business under satisfactory conditions.

In conclusion, Mr President, we must avoid doing the very thing that we criticize the Council for: embracing ideas, recommending activities, and then not making the effort to find the financial resources with which to put them into practice. We shall of course be supporting Mr de Vries's report.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The vote will take place at the next voting-time.

*(The sitting was suspended at 11.55 a.m. and resumed at 3. p.m.)<sup>1</sup>*

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*President*

#### 4. Italian Presidency: Statement by the Council

**President.** — The next item is a statement by the President-in-Office of the Council on the activities of the Italian Presidency during the first half of 1985.

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, It will not have escaped anyone's notice that this discussion on the prospects for developing our Community should be taking place a few days before the European Council's meeting in Milan.

Today's meeting between the Presidency and the freely-elected representatives of the people of Europe is, in my view, of particular significance, precisely because we are approaching a deadline whose import-

ance we all appreciate; it forms part of the efforts which the Community Institutions, especially the European Parliament, have been making for some time now in order to make the European revival as practical and as constructive as possible.

I am certain that this debate will lead to confirmation of the forward-looking message which you delivered in February 1984 with the approval of the draft Treaty establishing European Union.

I should like to pay tribute here to this Assembly's vital rôle of providing a stimulus which, always ready to uphold the democratic development of the European enterprise, it is continuing to perform with ever-increasing commitment.

This morning, President Pertini, with the authority and the standing derived from long involvement in the battle for democratic ideals, indicated the basic issues which we shall have to confront.

I want to consider here the progress which has been made recently and the positions we have managed to establish; these are not finishing-lines so much as starting-points for achieving objectives which may appear to be ambitious but which are necessary if we want to make the qualitative leap forward awaited by everyone.

My task today is also to explain why I consider that the objective preconditions of the European revival have now been established.

However, I do not think it will be possible today for me to take stock of the work that has been done during the current six-month period. The balance-sheet cannot be drawn up yet because an essential item is missing — namely, the conclusions that the twelve Heads of State or Government will reach in Milan.

I say 'twelve', because Spain and Portugal will be taking part at the next European Council meeting, even though their accession to the European Community does not become effective until 1 January 1986.

It seemed logical, nonetheless, that the drawing up of directives implementing the idea of European Union should be done with the involvement of the countries of the Iberian Peninsula as well. I would add that the meetings I had last week in Madrid and Lisbon confirmed my impression regarding the desire and determination of the applicant countries to work to strengthen European integration.

The first observation I have to make is that the aim of transforming all the relations of the Member States into a single European Union is one that all Community governments are conscious of. This was declared at the Paris Summit of 1972 and formally reaffirmed at the European Council meeting in Stuttgart in June 1983.

<sup>1</sup> A formal sitting was held from 12.15 p.m. to 12.55 p.m. on the occasion of the visit of the President of the Italian Republic, Mr Sandro Pertini. (See Annex.)

**Andreotti**

The European Council meeting in Milan actually represents the finishing-point to a long debate and, if you like, an attempt to put into effect the terms of that undertaking.

I would say straight away that we must be very clear about the instruments needed to achieve that objective, instruments which this Parliament has identified in a draft Treaty.

We intend to work to ensure that the completion of the internal market — that is, the creation of a vast European area without any kind of barrier — becomes a reality by 1992, as proposed by the Commission.

We also intend to ensure that Europe is able to meet, and meet successfully, the great technological challenge that is facing us.

It is our desire that, through a strengthening of the mechanisms of European Political Cooperation, the external policy of the Member States should eventually become a common policy.

In order to do all this, we are convinced that it is necessary to make the European Community's action more effective. In other words, we must proceed boldly down the road indicated by this Parliament, carrying out the appropriate institutional reforms.

The position which this Presidency has defended, and which it intend to go on defending and carry further, is neither utopian nor over-ambitious. We are not asking the impossible, but we do ask not only that the talks in Milan should confirm the desire to move forward, but that this desire should be translated into practical decisions, aimed at achieving early progress towards integration.

The need for a united Europe is rooted in a real situation. Above all, it corresponds to the aspirations of the people of Europe, not only in the Member States but in the applicant countries as well.

I shall return shortly to the question of the third enlargement of the Community. I am concerned here to point out that the achievements of the Ten, especially in the sphere of European Political Cooperation, demonstrate without a shadow of a doubt how strong the universal demand for Europe is today.

One only has to reflect here on the interest China is showing in Europe, a practical expression of which was to be seen last month in Brussels with the signing of the economic cooperation agreement with China.

As could be seen from the recent visit to Moscow by the Italian Prime Minister and myself, it appears that the Soviet Union, too, is paying particular attention to Europe, not only recognizing the international influence of the Community but also becoming aware of the political rôle of the Ten on the international stage.

Nor do I wish to omit, in this connection, the considerable attention which the countries of the so-called Third World, especially those in areas of crisis, are continuing to give to Europe. I am referring to the Middle East and in particular the recent events in Lebanon, concerning which, on 29 April last, the Ten made a declaration, which I had the task of personally explaining to President Gemayel and to the Syrian Vice-President, Mr Khaddam. I would emphasize that during my talks in both Beirut and Damascus I found confirmation of the importance which the leaders of those countries attach to an active rôle for Europe in overcoming that difficult and complex crisis.

In another sensitive area, namely Latin America, the action of the Ten, aimed at supporting existing peace efforts and promoting the restoration and consolidation of democratic régimes, has received wide appreciation and general interest. The Italian Presidency has in particular encouraged the sending of a high-level mission to all the capitals of Central America and the Contadora countries, one practical result of which has been the organization of a meeting in Europe next November along the lines of the one held year at San José in Costa Rica.

The Ten have strong cooperation links with Africa, which find fundamental expression in the Lomé Convention, itself enhanced by the accession of Mozambique and Angola, and Africa has received special attention from the Community both in the form of humanitarian and emergency aid for famine victims and as regards developments in the situation in southern Africa and in Sudan.

In Asia, the Ten are continuing to watch with concern the developments in the two major, and still unresolved, crises in Afghanistan and Cambodia.

Europe's rôle in the world is one of moderation, a rôle in keeping with its tradition and culture. If this rôle is to be performed fully, Europe needs both the will and the courage to strengthen itself.

Our continent is being strengthened in two ways: enlargement, to embrace all the countries which share with the founder-countries of the European Community the same principles of democracy and liberty, and intensification, which in the last analysis means promoting the political and economic integration of Europe.

Enlargement and intensification are not mutually exclusive, even if the events of recent decades have highlighted the considerable difficulties of adapting the common policies provided for in the Treaties to the more complex reality of the transition from the Europe of Six to the Europe of Nine, and subsequently of Ten.

But it is also a fact that if today, in the first half of 1985, we are able to outline with sufficient clarity the

**Andreotti**

scenario of progress to be made to achieve European Union, we owe it to the conclusion of the negotiations on the third enlargement.

During the last five-and-a-half months, the Italian Presidency has endeavoured to unravel the difficulties in the negotiations with Spain and Portugal; to compensate, through the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, certain countries that will have to bear considerable burdens as a result of enlargement; and to restore the European Community to a situation of sound financial management in which the relative commitments can be properly planned.

The directions in which we must now move are manifold. European union must be given substance, starting with the creation of a fully integrated internal economic area in which there are no obstacles to the free movement of persons, goods and capital. Community jurisdiction needs to be extended to other areas for which individual Member States are at present responsible. And the European Union needs a strong, consistent image in external matters, such that it can express an independent position on the main topics of international politics.

To do this, we need the appropriate instruments, i.e., the powers necessary to ensure that the object I have just outlined are actually achieved.

I should like to make a few brief points on these objects and on the means of action.

We are convinced that significant progress needs to be made towards the completion and strengthening of an effective, single European market, a genuine integration of the economic area in Europe, these being the essential conditions for restoring to our undertakings that flexibility and competitiveness which at present are limited by the fragmentation of national markets and which are needed in order to face the competition from our industrial partners.

However, I have to admit that, despite repeated assertions of political goodwill by the Member States, and despite the Commission's commitment, the results obtained in this area have not matched expectations.

Some objectives have, of course, been attained. I refer to the Council's adoption of the 'new approach' to standardization, which means it should be possible to make substantial and early progress towards a common system of production and recognition of technical standards.

This is not enough. Despite as many as three *ad hoc* Council meetings, and despite the commitment of the Presidency and the Commission, it has not been possible to arrive at the results we expected as regards rights of establishment, frontier controls and regulations to help develop cooperation between undertakings.

I have the impression that it is precisely in this sector, whose importance is unanimously acknowledged, that we encounter, in its most obvious and serious forms, the difficulty of translating into effective decisions the statements of principle and general expressions of political will. Governments need to give due consideration to contradictions of this type: otherwise, we may endanger the credibility of the European Community itself in the eyes of the public.

I realize, of course, that the building of a properly integrated internal market is a long-term objective which is not always easy to achieve. But steps need to be taken to ensure that the recognition of this fundamental objective becomes a criterion on which the Member States' action can be based whenever a decision has to be made between the protection of a particular sectoral interest and the overall strengthening of European integration.

The areas of intervention where action is necessary are well-known. With a view to the European Council meeting in Milan, the Commission will submit a programme document, which should contain a precise timetable for the commitments to be honoured in order to complete the internal market by 1992.

It will, of course, be difficult for the internal market to be gradually completed and an integrated economic area created in Europe unless determined steps are taken towards ever-greater convergence of economies, a strengthening of the European Monetary System and a wider use, both public and private, of the ECU.

A clear political position will be necessary in the coming months to unravel the basic problems still holding up progress in this direction, from the inclusion of sterling and eventually the drachma in the EMS exchange mechanism, to the harmonization of fluctuation margins between currencies, the removal of obstacles to the unrestricted use of the escudo in private markets and the granting of foreign-exchange status to the escudo itself throughout the Member States. At the same time, there will have to be a move, if only a gradual one, towards greater liberalization of capital movements, with the aim of achieving the closest possible integration of the European financial market.

Similarly, a decisive political commitment can lead to positive results as regards the convergence of Member States' economic policies, through, among other things, an improvement in the consultation machinery and more effective supervisory action by the Community Institutions.

We must not forget that this is one of the objectives laid down in the Treaty of Rome and, above all, one of the essential conditions for creating an integrated economic area in which joint action to reduce existing disparities can establish the conditions for harmonious growth in the weaker regions.

**Andreotti**

Another instrument fundamental to the cohesion of Europe and to the improvement of European industry's competitiveness in international markets is the strengthening of the technological base.

Innovation is one of the main factors for stimulating progress in the economy; it would therefore be a serious mistake of political shortsightedness to reject a joint commitment to ambitious research and development programmes designed, among other things, to bring about a recovery in Europe's production and its competitiveness in the international market. For these reasons, I believe that the European Community should promote any form of cooperation which may prove necessary for the developing of technologically advanced sectors.

President Mitterand recently made a proposal to this effect, which we consider to be of great value and which we hope can be examined in all its aspects in order to become the operational basis for a European programme of research in leading areas.

I am also aware of the interest with which this topic is being followed by the President of the Commission, Mr Delors, and I believe that, on the basis of the proposals which will be submitted by the Commission, the European Council meeting in Milan should give a precise indication of Europe's political determination not to draw back from this challenge, where success will to a large extent determine the very future of our Continent.

If we want the Community to play a constructive part in this area, to act as a catalyst to national efforts, we shall also have to examine patterns of cooperation that will be sufficiently flexible and will meet the interests and demands of all the member States. We shall have to seek to overcome excessively restrictive ideas concerning the financial implications of joint research programmes, given that the preparation of ambitious cooperation programmes and projects runs the risk of proving at best over-ambitious unless the necessary financial resources are available.

The Presidency considers this objective to be highly relevant, and I should like to point out here that, precisely in order to emphasize the importance of a joint effort in a strategic sector such as telecommunications, the Presidency took an initiative — in agreement with the Commission, of course — as a result of which the first Council meeting entirely devoted to the various aspects of the Community cooperation programmes on telecommunications was held at the beginning of June.

A sector to which we have committed ourselves fully, with encouraging results on the whole, has been environmental protection. This is a sector which will be included among the new areas on which common policies will have to be formulated.

The most significant agreement was without doubt the one reached last March on the measures to be taken against pollution caused by exhaust gases from motor vehicles.

I should also like to mention the approval given after more than five year's work to the directive on the assessment of the environmental effects of certain public and private projects.

These new rules provide for ways of informing the public so that anyone interested can state an opinion on individual projects in full knowledge of the facts. Thus they form part of the most up-to-date and much-promised scenarios of environmental protection policy, to be undertaken as a preventive measure in other words, without waiting for harmful or at least undesirable environmental effects to be ascertained.

More generally, I am certain that on this matter the European Parliament, which has always shown itself to be sensitive and attentive to topics relating to environmental protection, will continue to play a useful part in stimulating action by the Council.

Still on the question of the new fields of activity, I think it important to draw to your attention the commitments we have entered into since the Fontainebleau European Council meeting concerning a People's Europe.

I believe there is a broad consensus among the Member States on the need to bring the European dimension home to the people who actually live in Europe; to translate the reality of the Community from the abstraction that all too often characterizes our debates and discussions on Europe, into a reality accessible to everyone, so that the image and credibility of the European Community itself are reinforced.

The European Council meeting in Fontainebleau set up a Committee which has been chaired by a former Member of this Parliament, Mr Adonnino. The Committee submitted to the European Council Meeting in Brussels a series of measures for immediate application concerning, in particular, the free movement of citizens, right of residence and establishment and the free movement of goods within the Community. Other measures will be examined by the European Council in Milan.

I have to say, however, that in regard to these proposals, there has been — and this is a harsh observation — a hiatus between agreeing to do something and actually being prepared to put the measures concerned into practice. In my capacity as President-in-Office, I raised this problem at the last Council meeting, when awareness and also concern were expressed. It will be necessary for the next Summit to give an undertaking aimed at removing the last remaining obstacles and overcoming the indecision that still persists.

**Andreotti**

I should now like to speak about European Political Cooperation.

As you know, European Political Cooperation was born and developed in the 'seventies', at a time when the Community spirit was weakening. It therefore suffered from the method of inter-governmental cooperation, although, over the years, in the search for consensus on the main topics of international politics, it eventually borrowed its procedures from the Treaty of Rome.

Today, for reasons which I have mentioned already, and which testify to a strengthening of the rôle and the presence of Europe on the international stage, it seems to me that the institutionalization of European Political Cooperation by means of a Treaty could represent a step towards the final goal, which is to establish a genuine common external policy.

We shall, of course, have to consider the question of creating an effective structure that is responsive and unencumbered yet provides the necessary technical back-up to ensure links with national governments and guarantee an external image for Europe that as far as possible is unified and hence consistent.

Lastly, what seems to me to be worth emphasizing is a greater willingness on the part of governments to consider broadening European Political Cooperation to the economic and political aspects of security.

I should like to spend some time considering the institutional aspects.

The main point of this debate concerns the powers of the European Parliament. Here, there seems to me to be a considerable amount of unnecessary controversy and a corresponding confusion of ideas.

What I mean is that strengthening the powers of the European Parliament in no way implies any desire to limit or to dismember the sphere of individual national sovereignties. Rather it is a matter of achieving a better redistribution of powers already possessed by the European Community.

The call for a restoration of balance is not arbitrary, nor can it really be said to be dictated by any particular ideological considerations. Rather, it is the natural consequence of the intensification of European integration. And as an integrated Europe extends its powers, becoming a European Union, as it comes close to the people of Europe, taking on the areas of culture, the campaign against drug abuse and every other form of organized crime, environmental and health protection, it is right, it is logical to subject it to certain guarantees i.e., the same guarantees as underlie our own national structures and give them legitimacy.

The consensus of the people, for whom you provide a voice, is an essential factor in developing European

integration; at a time when we are deciding on transition to European Union and expanding the areas in which its powers will have to be exercised, the common Institutions will have to be developed in a truly democratic way.

The only possible way forward is to increase the powers of the European Parliament by granting it a joint decision-making power with the Council. Some may question whether the time is right for such a change; some may suggest that a gradual and cautious approach should be followed in setting in motion and accelerating the process of re-setting the institutional balance. But we must be aware that lack of progress at institutional level makes it impossible to propose any transition to European Union.

*(Applause)*

It is precisely because two new countries are about to join our Community that we must give serious consideration to this question.

By what is definitely a happy circumstance, we are today on the eve of the formal ceremony to sign the Treaties of Accession of Spain and Portugal.

We have worked with commitment and determination to ensure the success of these negotiations. We have done so because we are profoundly convinced of the essential contribution which Spain and Portugal have to make to European integration; we have done so because that is what Europe's founding fathers intended when they decided it was to be open to all countries which shared with the founding countries the principles of freedom and democracy; we have done so, finally, because we are deeply convinced that the accession of the two Iberian democracies will help to strengthen Europe's external image.

The result we can see today represents, in the last analysis, the triumph of reason and hope, especially for those who believe in the future of Europe. It is a result which has been made possible by ensuring that political considerations prevailed over sectoral calculations which had caused the negotiations to be entangled in an intractable web of mutual vetoes.

I should like to pay tribute to this far-sighted attitude on the part of the governments of the Member States and also of the applicant countries. I should also like to express the Presidency's gratitude for what this Parliament has done to promote and support the entry of Spain and Portugal.

I am certain that, at such a sensitive time as the present, the entry of two genuinely European-minded countries cannot fail to give the Community the energy and the impulse required for a genuine revival.

However, care must be taken — by drawing on past experience — to ensure that in the phase immediately

**Andreotti**

following accession the re-emergence of particular interests does not endanger this scheme, and that the disparities and divisions within the European Community are not accentuated.

I believe that the debates which will take place in the national parliaments during the procedures for ratifying the Accession Treaties can provide an important opportunity for confronting the issues, especially if those debates can establish a united and dynamic image of the Europe of Twelve.

The very fact that we shall soon be Twelve ought to impel us to speed up the introduction at Community level of decision-making machinery that is more responsive, more effective and more rapid than we have at present.

It is being said in some quarters that if decision-making powers were given to the European Parliament it would take longer to formulate Community legislation. I personally do not believe the prophets of doom, especially when those prophets, having stubbornly entrenched themselves to defend government prerogatives to the last, affect to be unaware of the current defects,

*(Applause)*

... which relate to the exceedingly lengthy delays involved in the wearisome search for a compromise between opposing interests.

In a Community which is being enlarged and intensified, there has to be a limit on the areas in which unanimity is required; just as it is necessary, in order to protect the people of that Community, to strengthen the democratic guarantees deriving from a new and greater importance which will have to be given to the discussions of the European Parliament.

I should like to point out that a redistribution of the decision-making powers of the Community not only satisfies the demand for a better institutional balance, but also meets the need to ensure that prominence is given during discussions to the common interest, which it is not always possible to arrive at through skilful negotiations aimed at mediating between national interests that only partially coincide.

We are less than two weeks away from the summit meeting of Heads of State or Government in Milan.

The first task in Milan will be to reach definitive conclusions on the report submitted by the Committee of personal representatives of the Heads of State or Government, chaired by Senator Dooge, which, in accordance with the spirit and the method of the draft Treaty approved by this Parliament, has confirmed the urgent need for transition to European Union.

We believe that transition to European Union basically entails accepting a much broader and more demanding

conception of the Community than that obtaining in the existing Communities. In other words, it means actually making the qualitative leap forward demanded of us by those Europeans who are the most vigilant and most sensitive to the needs of our time.

This aim, as I believe is indicated by the considerations I have put forward here, cannot be attained except through two parallel yet closely inter-related developments. I refer, on the one hand, to the extension of Community jurisdiction to new fields and sectors of activity and, on the other hand, to strengthening of the Institutions which is needed to enable them to effect that extension of the Community's sphere of action in the best possible way.

In achieving these aims, we come up against a very practical problem of time, because some national timetables would not enable genuinely significant progress to be made if our work were to go on for too long (and, whatever happens, beyond the end of this year.)

Hence the need for agreement to be reached at Milan on a very precise mandate which sets out future action for implementing what is eventually decided, and which above all leaves no room for going back and re-examining the measures which have been decided on.

Only thus will it be possible to give a constructive direction to the results of the European Council's meeting and to determine the procedures for the conference which, the Presidency intends, is to mark the foundation of European Union.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in conclusion, I would just like to emphasize one point. Our commitment has been, and continues to be, to put into practice the oft-repeated wish of this Parliament, a wish long shared by the Presidency, which is supported in this by the general consensus in the Italian Parliament concerning the Treaty establishing European Union.

*(Loud applause)*

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, to wind up the debate on the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council, I have received the following four motions for resolutions:

- by Mrs Veil (Doc. B 2-462/85);
- by Mr Arndt and others (Doc. B 2-478/85);
- by Mr d'Ormesson and Mr Romualdi (Doc. B 2-492/85); and
- by Mr Didò and others (Doc. B 2-493/85).

The timelimit for tabling amendments to these motions has been extended until 6 p.m. this evening.

We now proceed with the debate.

**Mr Amadei (S).** — (*IT*) Mr President, Mr President of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, only after the Milan Summit, which will take place at the end of this month, will it be possible to assess in full the results of the commitment, the efforts and the hard work that has been put in in these six months of the Italian presidency.

It is already possible today, however, to draw conclusions, form first opinions and make initial appraisals.

As President Mitterrand said recently, for the second time since the end of the Second World War, Europe must take charge of its own destiny.

The Community has succeeded in putting an end to certain disputes that had appeared during the present stage of integration, and at the same time it has decided to welcome two new Member States, thereby showing great political vitality and confirming that it still remains a powerful source of attraction.

The Socialist Group has therefore followed with great interest the implementation of those great ideas that were announced in Mr Andreotti's programme speech in January, and on the implementation of which largely depended the qualitative 'leap forward' that the Community can and must make.

It seemed as though the Community's dynamism had lost its way in the maze of small interests and motivated disputes. Finally, at the Fontainebleau Council, agreement was reached on a set of measures whose adoption was to have made possible the laying of firm foundations on which to build the Community plan of the future.

We can confirm today that those measures have been in part translated into concrete decisions, and that the ground has been cleared of many obstacles.

Undoubtedly, the most important results can be seen in the conclusion and imminent signature of the Treaties of Accession, in the resolution of budgetary problems, and in the will shown by the Italian presidency to achieve progress with European Union at the next European Council meeting in Milan.

Europe of the Twelve, as President Craxi has already declared to this Assembly, will call for 'even more intensive mediation in order to prevent the disparities and divisions within the Community becoming more acute. The Mediterranean element will be strengthened, but that must be seen as an enlargement of Europe's presence and function in the world'.

Action must be taken to ensure that all Member States feel themselves part of the same political plan, and feel themselves associated with the same programme, which the implementation of that plan makes necessary in the common interest.

Europe of the Twelve looks substantially different from the Europe of the Six and the Europe of the Ten, as far as the degree of regional homogeneity is concerned.

In future, the options in the various sectoral policies will be substantially different, depending on which of the two great European regions they have to be implemented in — the Mediterranean region or the Northern region.

This, then, is why it is so necessary and so urgent to achieve European Union, as envisaged by the draft Treaty drawn up by the European Parliament, and due for discussion by an inter-governmental conference.

Mr Andreotti has delivered to the President of the European Parliament the text of a preliminary draft mandate for an inter-governmental conference. I should like to mention that, as far as procedure is concerned, the draft says that the conference will present its conclusions before 30 November 1985, so as to allow the Heads of State and Government to approve the necessary decisions at the European Council meeting to be held on 3 and 4 December 1985.

It would appear that the implementation of European Union and, *a priori* the mandate to prepare resolutions for adoption at the Milan Summit, regarding the calling of an inter-governmental conference, do not enjoy the political support of certain Member States, who are apparently being joined by other Member States, which makes it more difficult today to call, urgently, an inter-governmental conference, which not only must take place but must also actively involve the Parliament.

At this point I should like to remind Members that any action designed to delay what has moreover already been agreed on the setting up of the European Union would cause irreparable harm. Any doubt or any hesitation could have the most serious consequences, since the situation as it now stands following the enlargement of the Community does not allow any time for postponements or afterthoughts.

We ask the governments of Member States today whether or not they want to create Europe, whether or not they want to implement the European Union. The European Parliament represents a political balance whose centre of gravity, after the accession of Spain and Portugal, will move quite considerably to the left. I should like to remind those governments and political groups who are hesitating over European Union that, by postponing decisions to sometime in the near future they are in danger of seeing decisions to this effect taken by an even more Socialist Europe, which is what it will be after enlargement, and which will be given the great credit for having moved forward to European Union.

Another success that deserves mention is the ending, in this session, of the controversy over the budget, with

**Amadei**

acceptance of the majority of the European Parliament's requests.

I should like in particular to mention the approval of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, which have been framed in quite a new way, especially having regard to the fact that the funds will be allocated to programmes direct, and not split up into portions for individual countries, thus avoiding the appearance of 'charitable aid' that marked the old proposal.

In addition the commitment credits, which amount to 120 million ECU instead of the 70 million approved by the Council at the first reading, and the 140 requested by the Parliament, will enable the Directive to be put into effect without delay.

I should like also to mention the decision on food aid, the fund for which has been allocated an additional 116 million ECU. The Community is making a contribution to the problems of hunger and drought, which are not, for the countries affected, short-term problems but are problems so immense as to demand adequate action.

Whilst serious problems exist outside the Community, we must obviously not forget those that afflict the Community on its domestic front, and have done so for many years.

I refer to the problem of unemployment, which stands in the Community at an unacceptable level — over 10% — and which can be dealt with by direct measures, but which, in addition, and above all, needs preventive action.

Concerted action is also necessary to protect European interest rates from American influence, thus allowing the economies of the Community to develop, at least to some extent, more independently.

The need for a monetary conference of the industrialized countries can only be recognized and supported by everyone.

In conclusion, I should like once more to express my appreciation of the work of the Italian presidency. The European ideal, which it has unfailingly supported, reflects and bears witness to the firm belief in Europe that has always been expressed by the citizens of my country.

Where European Union is concerned, I particularly wish to say, on behalf also of the group that I represent, that the presidency of the Council must strive to achieve, not so much 'what can be achieved with everyone's agreement', but, rather 'what must be achieved in the interests of Europe and its Member States', even in the face — if so be it — of opposing opinions or resistance.

We therefore ask the Italian presidency and the Council, and the Commission too, to act without hesitation

for the implementation of European Union, as has been solemnly affirmed by this Assembly.

Along these lines the Italian presidency will have our full support.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Klepsch (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! On behalf of my Group I would first like to thank the Italian Presidency, in particular President Andreotti. During the Italian Presidency of the Council, you, your staff and all your ministerial colleagues, in short the whole of your government, have worked to solve the problems of the Community, demonstrating great patience and a sense of proportion and you have achieved great success.

It is not for me to list all your successes, but I would like to refer to three points: the successful conclusion of negotiations of Spanish and Portuguese accession will give the Community a new dimension. With your help, the difficulties over the budget will be surmounted to the satisfaction of Parliament and thirdly your Council Presidency gave us new insights into possible solutions to the problems of the Mediterranean area. The most striking aspect for us, however, was the spirit in which you and your government carried out your Presidency, which represented a genuine attempt to promote European Union, for which you deserve our full thanks.

*(Applause)*

President Andreotti, the nearness of the Milan summit gives all the political groups in this Parliament an opportunity to put their view on the decisions to be taken and we are fully aware of its importance. The Milan summit has long been planned as the breakthrough to further development of the European Community and must not be allowed to degenerate into one of the usual summits where some progress is achieved, but by and large the *status quo* is maintained and vague possibilities for a future that may one day become reality are discussed.

Our Group was very strongly in favour of a governmental conference following this summit, as you have proposed, i.e. a conference with a specific deadline and a clear agenda and guidelines for its decisions. For the sake of clarity, it must be accepted that not everyone may wish to participate initially, but we must not allow ourselves to be prevented from finding a joint approach to the way ahead.

We would remind you that Parliament has consistently expressed its view on certain basic points and that we can all read what governments, heads of governments and many others have said over the last few years prior to this summit.

**Klepsch**

The people of Europe and their politicians will judge governmentals on how these words are put into practice. On behalf of my Group I would like to detail a few essential points that we wish to see resolved at this summit and others we would like considered.

I am sure you will not be surprised that I begin with the further development of the democratic structure of the Community. Almost too much has been said on all sides about an increase in the rights of the European Parliament. These words must be followed by deeds. My Group feels that at least two points must be made quite clear. All those areas for which the Community is responsible under the Treaty, responsibilities which have, in practice, been taken away from the national parliaments, must be transferred to the European Parliament. We must share on an equal basis the right to legislate with the Council, which to date has had exclusive powers in this respect.

Moreover, any international treaties concluded by the European Community must be submitted to the European Parliament for ratification. This matter was touched on at the Stuttgart summit. The European Parliament has frequently demonstrated its maturity when it comes to decision-taking. I might even venture to say that it would not be difficult to find examples of Parliament being more forward-looking than the Council, which has subsequently followed Parliament's recommendations.

However, I would like to emphasize: the important thing is not simply to tell the voters who elected us that we intend to give Parliament greater powers in future, but that we receive these powers!

We are also convinced that the European Community urgently needs to overcome its paralysis, by which I mean the decision-making process in the Council of Ministers. In our view, the Treaties provide for decisions to be taken on a majority basis. We appreciate, and our draft constitution takes account of this fact, that we need a method for a long transition period which takes account of the so-called vital interests of individual Member States, but this must be done openly and in accordance with a formal procedure. Except in such cases, majority decisions should be the rule.

This includes decisions on the further development of the internal market. We are grateful to the Commission for drawing up a concept in time for the summit to complete the internal market. Our Group is prepared to accept the Commission proposal to a large extent.

We must, however, also ensure that a clean sweep is made so that the internal market can function efficiently, forming a properly functioning base for example for our employment policy or our competitiveness in international markets.

In our view, it would be sensible to reconsider some of the provisions of the Treaties which call for unanimity on questions affecting the internal market with a view to applying the majority ruling. Careful consideration should be given to whether it is sensible to submit to Parliament proposals for regulations covering 107 or 110 pages defining the sort of roll-over bar which can be manufactured and marketed in the Community. That remark was addressed to the Commission. We do not feel that Parliament's primary task lies in these fields; this sort of thing represents the excessive bureaucracy in Community institutions. I appreciate the zeal of industrious officials, but there is no need to go to such lengths!

It is also vital for the Community to be given new responsibilities, in particular in the fields of research, technology and most especially protection of the environment. We would like to see the Commission's independence restored and for the Commission to need the political confidence of the European Parliament at all times.

We suggest that the financing of the EC needs to be fundamentally rethought. It must be firmly based on its own independent resources which must therefore be contractually guaranteed and the Community alone must be responsible. It is quite clear to all concerned that the present system cannot work for much more than the next one or two years.

Finally, we would like to see further development of cooperation between Member States in the areas of foreign policy and security policy, with the gradual incorporation of EPC into the Treaties. We believe that convergence in economic policy must go hand in hand with the further development of the European Monetary System, and that all our efforts must be put into achieving this convergent economic policy.

We would like to see the sphere of European law expanded, along the lines expressed by President Andreotti towards the end of his speech. On behalf of my Group I would like to emphasise that we wish the Italian Council President the best of luck for the Milan summit, where we are sure that our point of view will be represented. We, the representatives of our European constituents, are aware that further development of the Community is essential if Europe is to maintain its position in the world and we sincerely hope that the proposals by the Italian Government to the other Community governments will form the basis for a fruitful decision. I assure you of the full support of my Group.

*(Applause)*

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO  
CERRETTI

*Vice-President*

**Sir Henry Plumb (ED).** — Madam President, first of all I join with my colleagues in thanking Mr Andreotti for his statement. Of course, any of us who have read the Treaty of Rome will know that it is the founding charter of a dynamic organization. The European Community is an organization which sets itself ambitious goals and which seeks new ways of ordering the relations between the peoples of Europe. Because it is of its nature a dynamic organization, our Community is condemned either to go forward or to retreat. It can never remain in a state of equilibrium; otherwise old habits of mind, old petty nationalisms, old jealousies will reappear. Nobody could claim that over the past ten years the Community has advanced in the way that we would have hoped. It has rather stood still, and the widespread European pessimism and cynicism about the future development of the Community are the result.

It is against this background that we should judge the Italian Presidency which we have been privileged to have had described to us today both by Mr Pertini and by Mr Andreotti.

Has the Italian Presidency given us a hope for the future that we did not have six months ago? It was your country, Mr Andreotti, which gave Europe all of its history and most of its culture. The real achievement of the past six months has been the completion of the negotiation on Spanish and Portuguese accession to the community. The achievement which is yet to come is the meeting in Milan of the European Council.

Portugal and Spain are two of the historic peoples of Europe, historic peoples of the Roman Empire. With their accession, the European Community is both more European and more of a Community. The hours of negotiation in the Council will tomorrow find their fruition in the signing of the Spanish and Portuguese Treaties of Accession. Nobody doubts that our Community will now have to face new challenges with Spanish and Portuguese accession. But he who wishes the end wishes the means. The terms of accession finally negotiated are fair and reasonable. Spain and Portugal belong to Europe, and it is now up to us and to them to make their integration into the Community work.

I cannot resist pointing out in passing that some of the problems — for instance, in the common agricultural policy which Spanish accession exacerbates are exactly those problems to which my group has repeatedly drawn attention in this House. The arrival of Spain and Portugal will force us to look again at many of our existing arrangements. Self-criticism can only be healthy. Welcome, therefore, to our Spanish and Portuguese friends and congratulations to the Italian Presidency for having locked up the Council of Ministers until they finally agreed the terms of accession! In the Middle Ages it was a custom to terminate papal elections by cutting off the food supplies of the cardi-

nals who were taking too long in their deliberations. I am delighted to see that this continuity in Italian administrative arrangements still holds good as far as the Council of Ministers is concerned.

Now I turn to the coming European Council in Milan. This Council will take and set in train decisions having profound consequences for the sort of Community Spain and Portugal will join. If Spain and Portugal were to join the Community in its present state, there are many who rightly fear that the decision-making process of the Community would disintegrate. The need to reconcile twelve conflicting national or pseudo-national interests would be under present arrangements a sure recipe for complete anarchy and stagnation.

At the centre of the Council's discussions will be the Dooge report. Had I been called upon to draft the Dooge report, it would not have read exactly as it does. Had I been called upon to draft Spinelli's treaty on European Union, it would not have looked exactly the way that it does. However, both Dooge and Spinelli have the supreme merit of asking the right questions. It is the task of the Milan Council to set about answering these questions. Milan can only be a beginning, and this Parliament and the peoples of Europe will not allow the Heads of State and Government merely to meet to compose a flowery declaration and then forget about their fine words. Milan must be the start of a progress which gives a decisive impetus to solving the grave institutional problems of the Community.

So there are four main questions to which the Council and the discussions following it should address themselves: the powers of the European Parliament, the abuse of the national veto, the internal market, and European political cooperation. The European Court of Justice's recent decision condemning the Council's failure to act in realizing a common transport policy as laid down by the Treaty of Rome reminds us of the central rôle that the European Parliament can, and should, play in the Community's development.

At the moment, the Parliament is a curious and an illogical creation. It has the democratic endorsement of direct elections in the Member States, but the powers given it and the rôle it plays in the Community do not reflect its democratic mandate. There is a certain amount that could be done to improve the Parliament's effectiveness within existing practice. The conciliation procedure, for instance, could be improved, and own-initiative reports of the Parliament could be agreed before-hand with the Commission and thus have the effect of promoting Community legislation. But these cannot be enough. The Parliament has at the moment no direct power over appointments to the Commission. It has understandably been reluctant to employ its ultimate sanction of dismissing the whole Commission. Why should the Parliament not appoint the President of the Commission, possibly from a

## Plumb

short list submitted by the Member States? We may well appoint the same team, Mr Delors, but at the moment the Parliament is entirely dependent for membership of the Commission upon the nominations of member governments.

Another matter on which Parliament is humiliatingly dependent upon member governments is its place of work. Why should the Parliament not have the power to fix its own working place? This working place need not be the seat of other institutions.

In all parliaments throughout the ages, budgetary powers have been crucial to their development. The present distinction between obligatory and non-obligatory expenditure is a recipe for intellectual and political confusion. It cannot last. Rationalization of the Parliament's budgetary powers is necessary and is inevitable.

All Community governments pay lip-service to the principle of more majority voting in the Council of Ministers. We have had, however, recent examples of the unwillingness of certain member governments to accept majority decisions which seemed to be going against them. The untrammelled right of individual governments to establish for themselves what they regard as being of vital national interest is a standing invitation to abuse: any government which finds itself momentarily embarrassed at home will take the cowards's way out of invoking the national veto given it by the Luxembourg Compromise. I am not personally hostile to the idea of a national veto. There are many cases in which the Treaty of Rome in effect gives such a veto by demanding unanimity. I would urge two principles on the general question of voting in the Council: there must be a way in which matters are more often brought to the vote and the right of unfettered national veto must be drastically pruned back. I am not, incidentally, convinced that changes in this direction would need a Treaty amendment. The Luxembourg Compromise, after all, is not to be found in the Treaty itself.

One of the principal advantages of a greater use of majority voting will be the facilitation of a genuine internal market. We have spoken often enough of the importance of this topic in this House, but it is worth recalling that it is shortsighted, sectoral interests which have held up the realization of this genuine internal market. If we are sincere about the internal market, then we shall see the overwhelming need for reform of the Community's present decision-making procedures.

Finally, a word about European political cooperation. I was much struck by the recommendation of the Dooge report to give a more institutional character to European political cooperation. It has been a weakness of European political cooperation that it takes place outside the institutional framework of the Community. It is merely a multilateral arrangement between the sovereign States, not essentially different from the

United Nations or the Andean Pact. So to bring European political cooperation firmly within the ambit of the Community institutions is a great stride towards a common foreign policy.

It is the long-term goal of the European Community, set out in the Treaty of Rome and reiterated as recently as the Stuttgart Declaration of 1983, to establish a European Union. To different countries, with different historical and administrative traditions, the words 'European Union' conjure up different images. So one of the tasks of the discussion which will follow the Milan Summit will be to bring together and integrate these various conceptions.

I do not believe that in one year's time or even in 10 years' time we shall have a fully realized European Union. Progress will always be slower than the most enthusiastic would wish. My group has no doubt where it stands upon the successful development of the Community. We, of course, wish the Community to grow, we wish the Community to advance and bring more closely together the peoples of Europe, and we reject entirely any minimalist view of the Community and endorse wholeheartedly the underlying inspiration of both the draft Treaty and the Dooge report. How men and women of goodwill, at Milan and afterwards, will succeed in translating that inspiration into reality must remain for the time being a speculative question. So the important thing is that they try enthusiastically and sincerely, and their enthusiasm and sincerity will always find an echo with us.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Segre (COM).** — *(IT)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it will only be possible after the Milan Summit — about which, especially after Stresa, there remain many quite substantial question marks — to give an overall verdict on the six-months term of office of the Italian presidency and the results that have been achieved, over and above enlargement, which has finally come about.

But today, already, we think we can emphasize the commitment with which the presidency has acted in the belief — which is generally shared in Italy and has just been referred to by Mr Andreotti — that either we make some real progress with the building of Europe or not only will this Europe of ours be unable to meet the challenge of the United States, Japan, and the newly-emergent areas, but we shall go forward into the next century and the next millenium as an object only in the history of mankind, and no longer as a subject that is now the focus of attention from many different quarters.

Today, in fact, we are deciding what tomorrow's world will be like, and how we shall unravel, for better or for worse, the frightful contradictions on which the whole of international society rests. We have only to

### Segre

think of the macroscopic contrast, which was emphasized yet again this morning by President Pertini, between the present armaments race — which treats above all to experience a new geometrical progression, extending beyond the very limits of this Earth — and the needs of a world where hunger and underdevelopment are a tragedy that weighs daily on our consciences.

The only way to stop this headlong rush towards all that is worst is through dialogue, negotiation and the patient building of a pattern in which the points of convergence grow increasingly broad, in the conviction that there is only one world. Europe has something to say about this; it has a rational policy to put into effect, and interests to sustain. The gulf that persists between Washington and Moscow makes this responsibility still greater, and gives greater importance to this function, which only a Europe that is capable of becoming a real political entity, a Union, can properly discharge. Much — very much — will depend on the outcome of the Milan Summit. That is why we consider it the duty of this Parliament to look solemnly to the governments of the Ten, and now the Twelve, to face up to this historical challenge, and not to run away from their responsibilities.

But, at the same time, we are well aware that this task also involves the responsibility of all political parties and all social and cultural sectors, and that the parties of the Left — if they really want to be an instrument of progress — cannot remain passive, hostile spectators, but must play active parts in this process and in this struggle, in all its political and cultural facets. This has been the message, and this has been the line of action — if I may be allowed to recall the fact, with a reminder of the commitment of the Italian Communists to a greater, united Europe — of two men who have honoured our Group and, we think, our Parliament: Giorgio Amendola, whose memory we have recently observed on the fifth anniversary of his death, and Enrico Berlinguer, the first anniversary of whose death it is this very day.

In the wake of this message and this line of action we will do everything to make Milan a success such as will mark a decisive stage on the road to European Union, and the building of a Europe of peace and progress.

*(Applause from the benches of the Left)*

**Mr Bettiza (L).** — *(IT)* Madam President, Mr President of the Council, ladies and gentlemen: the 'Unfinished' — that is what I would call the Italian presidency in this first half of 1985. Of course, much has been done and done well, and Mr Andreotti has been unstinting in his intellectual and physical commitment. Some excellent results have been obtained but, perhaps, the final touch, that would have given this presidency a different quality from the others, was lacking.

This 'qualitative jump' — if I may recall a concept that has already echoed around this Chamber — is still possible. In two weeks time, at the end of the term of the Italian presidency, there will be a European Council meeting in Milan which, by proposing and, hopefully, obtaining approval for the calling of the Intergovernmental Conference, could break with the disappointing tradition of Summit failures that have been the pattern since Athens and Fontainebleau. I should be happy if I, too, could say as the German Foreign Minister, Mr Genscher, said, that European Union must start from Milan.

President Delors is at all events right when he states that Europe often languishes because those who decide its fate do no more than talk, and never get down to action. Delors did well to *secouer le cocotier*, to use his own words, going so far as to threaten to resign if the green light is not given at Milan for the institutional, technological and commercial re-launch that we are all waiting for.

It was again President Delors who openly reproved, in his well-deserved philippic, the German delegation to the Council, entrenched behind the threat of the veto on the question of cereals. It was also possible moreover to detect in the words of Delors a note of criticism of the Italian presidency for having pursued at all costs a form of agreement that is often synonymous with failure to act, instead of putting our German friends with their backs to the wall, and finally accepting a majority vote. On this point there is in existence the estimable precedent of two years ago, when the Belgian presidency, which was in office at the time, overcame the British veto by allowing the farm prices for the 1983-1984 campaign to be approved by a majority.

The Liberal and Democratic Group now expects the European Council in Milan to specify and strictly limit the cases where a unanimous vote is necessary; it expects furthermore that the co-decisional legislative powers of this Parliament will be strengthened, since it is absurd to elect an Assembly such as ours, by direct universal suffrage, if that Assembly is then denied some of the elementary functions of a parliament. Our Group also demands that the executive dignity of the Commission be restored, since there is no point in having such a well run-in, well-oiled engine if you then keep it idling, as has often been the case in recent years.

Where the Community's institutions are concerned, a decision of some kind — simple, but precise and exact, such as those that we have just listed — would help to bring new life to this Community, which is out of breath, but on which our hopes for the economic recovery and political revival of our continent still depend. Paradoxically, the present situation of stagnation in which we find ourselves contrasts oddly with the high esteem in which we are held, and which Mr Andreotti himself emphasized — the prestige that,

**Bettiza**

despite everything, the Community now enjoys internationally. I, too, would quote the example of the Chinese: the Chinese People's Republic in fact expresses confidence in our role for moderation and balance between the Great Powers, as was apparent at the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the agreement for cooperation between us and Peking. The Latin American countries are urging us to institutionalize our reciprocal links and step up mutual cooperation. And only last week the authoritative voice of Gorbachov, who called the Community an objective reality that has to be taken into account, was added to the chorus, and represented a revision of the previous Soviet line: it was of course a motivated revision, probably an instrumental one, but, nonetheless, it is interesting. The meeting between Gorbachov and Mr Craxi, the President of the Council, marked a break and a turning point in relation to the previous Yugoslavian patterns that relegated the Community to the rank of a simple instrument of American capitalism in Europe. There is no doubt that this turning point opens up a different, broader horizon for the Community, and, personally, I shall not fail to take this into account in the report that I am preparing on relations between the European Community and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

All recognition is welcome, from whatever party it comes, but we must avoid clutching at straws, and we have to assess realistically the content of this new view of Europe by the Kremlin. There will be an opportunity for this next week, on 20 June, at the meeting between Mr Andreotti, the current President of the Community, and the Polish Foreign Minister, Mr Olszowski, who is the current President of Comecon.

Before I finish I must say that the resolution tabled by my Group at the end of this debate proposes the adoption of the necessary measures for the institution of an effective policy for high technology. In this connection, the agreement in principle concluded at Luxembourg last week, on the RACE telecommunications project, appears to augur well. The Liberal and Democratic Group's resolution also emphasizes the need to approve without delay the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, since the initial period, during which their existence has been concealed, has not helped to improve the Community's prestige. Public opinion has indeed been struck by the intransigence of President Papandreou who, with the threat of blocking enlargement, has taken the lion's share at the risk of changing the essential qualities of the IMP, which were conceived expressly to limit the harmful effects of enlargement on all the Mediterranean regions of the Community.

Very much to the credit of the Italian presidency are a set of achievements that go beyond ordinary administration. One great achievement, undoubtedly a historic achievement, was the settlement of the enlargement question, thereby giving the Community its final configuration in geographical terms as well. We now hope

that this step will be finalized by the necessary ratifications. And finally, the action of the presidency in launching the new draft budget — a budget which takes account of the views expressed by Parliament — deserves our highest praise. A good presidency, therefore, especially from the technical and diplomatic standpoints. Unfortunately we cannot yet see the end of the long tunnel, the light of political and institutional revival in the Community — unless the proper instruments and the right emphasis is forthcoming at Milan, together with that surge of pride in Europe that has been so long awaited.

*(Applause from the benches of the Liberal and Democratic Group)*

**Mr de la Malène (RDE).** — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the time for a stocktaking has come round, as it does, by convention, every six months. It is not lost on me that the Italian presidency has been skilful in so arranging matters that at the end of the six-month term there is still hope, in the shape of Milan, and, to some extent perhaps, we can use that as an excuse or take it as consolation.

I would nevertheless not wish to forget that we must congratulate and compliment the Italian presidency on the purposeful industry that it has displayed throughout these six months. I shall use the very short time allocated to me to make a rapid review of events during these six months.

To my mind, there are in a way two levels on which European activity over these past six months can be viewed: the level of our traditional activities, and then the level of realities.

To begin with the traditional activities: we have had our measure of speeches, good speeches, your speech, Mr President of the Commission. We have heard expressions of good intentions, as usual. In particular, there has been the undertaking to make an effort to change the Community's decision-making methods. We have also had the Councils of Ministers which — thanks to your efforts, Mr President — have succeeded in finding some new revenues. Not enough revenues. We are very short of money with which to make progress in building Europe. But you have at least managed to find some. This has enabled us, enabled you, to draw up a viable budget. Since we had not had one before, we regarded this as a success. And so it was, but it is still a mediocre budget. There is not much, if anything, for farmers' incomes; I refer here to agricultural prices. There is not much for the IMPs. There is not much for the structural funds. There is not enough, in our view at least, for research, not enough for development. But, after all, we now have a budget where we had none before, and that is a step forward in itself. And then, still on the level of traditional activity, we have also had a meeting of the European Council, the one in Brussels, since the other

**de la Malène**

is yet to come at the end of the month. And something was achieved by the European Council in Brussels: completion of the enlargement negotiations. There was a time when the whole of Europe was working towards this end, and this enlargement was the objective — at almost any price, I would say, because it was a political goal, whatever the cost in economic and technical terms — and you have attained it.

We said, at the time, that we felt that these proceedings had got off on the wrong foot and were not being well conducted, that not enough groundwork had been done on the institutional, political or financial aspects. It was going to be necessary for the North to pay for the South. We have something along these lines, the IMPs, but there is little prospect that they will be enough. You have carried this enlargement through, but it is my fear — our fear — that the debate is really only starting and that the new situation created by this further enlargement is going to be debated day after day, month after month, year after year. This was something that we got out of the European Council. But we got nothing for the internal market, and this we found very disappointing, deeply disappointing. We got nothing for research and development, nothing for technology. We were told: you will see all these things in Milan, and in particular you will see the decision-making machinery and institutional progress in Milan. So much for the first level on which European activity has developed over these past six months.

This brings me to the second level, which I have called the level of realities. First there was the inconclusive debate on farm prices. This is another instance of failure to reach an essential decision, which is serious for the farmers and is also serious for the light that it throws on the commitments given so liberally on majority voting and institutional reform. Worse than this failure over agricultural prices was the Bonn meeting where, confronted with the proposals from our American allies, European unity fell apart. On the strategic defence initiative and its corollary — or its concomitant or competitor — Eureka, on European security, in the background of these research programmes, on the prospective GATT negotiations and their implications for what will remain of the common agricultural policy, if it is not to be called into question completely, on all these fundamental issues, European unity seems to have fallen apart.

There are two levels, therefore, on one of which we find our traditional activities, and on the other the realities. This is causing considerable confusion among the public, of that there is no doubt. Why Milan, heralded with such advance publicity? Why these commitments on the institutions and, we hope on technology, if European unity collapses at the first difficulty? What is the use, if there is disagreement on so many substantive issues, on so many points of detail? There is not much time left before Milan. We have had Stresa, yesterday and the day before; let us hope that the farm

prices have been agreed by the time that Milan comes round.

An effort has been made to recoup the situation. Well and good, we are in favour of that, Mr President. An attempt has been made to say, you have attempted to say, that it would be possible after all to pursue both the SDI and Eureka. That, if I may say so, is something of which we cannot approve.

We are aware of all the difficulties, but we do not like false pretences. We cannot afford, we are told, to give Europe enough money to cover everything for which Europe should be responsible. And yet you have just told us that the technological and financial capacity will be available to do both these things, to participate in the American research effort through our companies and at the same time to conduct a European research effort commensurate with Europe's needs with the cooperation of the selfsame companies. This we cannot accept. Europe must come first.

A choice has to be made in all fields of European activity. A choice has to be made, and we want nothing to do with false pretences, with recourse to false pretences, I repeat, to cover up disagreement.

In Milan, apart from the SDI and Eureka, there will be the institutional problem. You have had a meeting at Stresa. Not much has filtered through about what happened there. Nevertheless, it would appear that there is little agreement among the Twelve on a number of specific points and that the President of the Commission — who will not mind my drawing him into this — has shown some concern at certain proposals because it now seems, curiously, that the enlargement to twelve members which has now been agreed upon means that, if we wish to move forward, the next stage will have to be contraction. What a strange paradox. But let us hope that Milan will sweep away the disappointments and anxieties.

I want to say, by way of conclusion, that we are neither indignant nor shocked at these difficulties which are besetting Europe. We know what the situation is in Europe, we are aware of the difficulties, we know that enlargement means heterogeneity — and that is something we have to live with. We know that Europe will not be created by *fiat*. The same applies to solidarity. We know that, although it is regrettably common practice in this House, it serves no constructive purpose to put the blame on governments and their administrations, whether the governments be of the left or the right. Moreover, while they are blamed here, they are supported elsewhere. But we really should appreciate that there is nothing to be gained by this. We know that Europe is indispensable, and so do the governments — they are no less intelligent than we are — but they also know the difficulties which they have to overcome day by day.

If we are to allocate blame where it is deserved, however, we should direct our criticism at double-talk,

**de la Malène**

from whatever source. We should be critical of the obsession with pressing ahead, without thought for the consequences. We should criticize the false pretences, the false hopes, the creation of the impression that the solution is just around the corner, the romantic illusions. The dramatization of summit meetings is also to be condemned.

I am, for my sins, the Member with the greatest number of years' service in the European Parliament, and over the years I have seen any number of crises and any number of last-chance summits. It has not escaped my notice that when a last-chance summit has come to nothing, it has been followed by another, also described as the last-chance summit. This is why I believe that it is not good for our standing with public opinion to dramatize these meetings, which have become an almost traditional component of our Community machinery. After every summit — rest assured, ladies and gentlemen — there will always be another in the offing. Europe does not need to be romanticized or dramatized. What it needs is tenacity, it is determination, it is unremitting effort. What it needs as far as the market or technology are concerned is the effort on our part required to overcome the real difficulties, without any attempt to conceal or disguise them. Since there is no alternative to Europe, and since we all know this, on all sides, ladies and gentlemen, I believe that if we show tenacity and determination we shall be giving ourselves the best chance of keeping to the right course.

*(Applause from the centre and right)*

**Mr Christensen (ARC).** — *(DA)* Madam President, at the meeting of Foreign Ministers in Stresa, it was agreed to set up a common secretariat for foreign and security policy and in other respects to develop a common policy in these areas. The Ministers also agreed that the right of veto should be strictly limited in practice, particularly with regard to the wide-ranging question of the establishment of the internal market, i.e., the complete removal of all so-called technical barriers to trade, the total uniformization of indirect taxes and the effective invalidation of the national rules of the Member States on security, health, veterinary requirements, the environment, industrial health and safety, etc.

The Danish People's Movement against Membership of the European Community notes that the wide-ranging decisions in prospect here are fundamentally at variance with the Danish Constitution, since what is at stake is not a transfer of sovereignty in a clearly defined area but one which is unlimited in scope. It is a violation of the Danish Constitution, because the Government and the Danish Folketing are apparently not willing to apply the rules of the Danish Constitution on the transfer of sovereignty and to give the Danish people an opportunity by referendum of stating their views on this radical extension of European

Community powers. It is a repudiation of the solemn promises made to the Danish electorate that there would be a referendum in the event that cooperation in the Community was to be extended to new areas. And last but not least, it flouts the wishes of the Danish people, of whom, according to the latest opinion poll, only 6% support European Union with a common foreign and security policy.

The Danish People's Movement speaks out on this important issue, not just as the spokesman for all Danish opponents of the EEC but also for the overwhelming majority of the Danish people, who are against the participation of our country in European Union. This must, and will, have political consequences if the Government does not stand firm against the powerful pressure the leading Community countries aim to put on our country, of which the Italian presidency has served notice. I should like to ask the President-in-Office of the Council what consequences he thinks it will have for Denmark if the Government and the Folketing do not bow to the demands of the majority in the Community?

**Mr Romualdi (DR).** — *(IT)* Madam President, it really is not easy — and I think that Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council, himself appreciates this — to give an entirely favourable verdict on the Italian six-months' period of office — the results achieved, and the prospects that have been opened up during these six months — without making allowance for the political and propaganda build-up that it has been constantly given — especially by the party currently in power in Italy and, obviously, the personalities and the large and small political parties which, *bon gré* or *mal gré* constitute its majority. *Bon gré* or *mal gré* or *oborto collo*, Mr Andreotti — as the three or four million electors of the majority who moved over to the opposition yesterday or the day before yesterday when voting in the referendum, and who were certainly not very zealously dissuaded by the men and parties that have influenced them hitherto, very clearly show.

They certainly did not do this out of any love for the Communists or the members of the MIS, but simply out of lack of confidence in the government, which is the same body that has for six months filled the presidency of the Council of the Community, and the repercussions of whose activities, in this important sector, cannot fail to influence the judgement of our electorate, not least because there has been a lot of talk of socialism here. And I say this in order to emphasise that, like all the other policies that this socialist government is attempting, pro-Europeanism, which the socialists have done a little too much shouting about, is the pro-Europeanism of the Sunday-afternoon orators — as the last President of the Commission, Mr Thorn, said — the pro-Europeanism of those who have a lot to promise, almost nothing to boast about and little or nothing to reap when harvest time

**Romualdi**

comes round and idle talk and subtle, crafty arguments are no longer sufficient, but what is necessary are facts, things, projects achieved and policies completed and thoroughly prepared for the most immediate developments.

All of this, Mr Andreotti, does not prevent me from recognising the good work done by the presidency, and especially by you yourself, with regard to the final stage in the accession agreements for Spain and Portugal, which will be signed tomorrow. The negotiations have been long drawn out and full of obstacles and difficulties of every shape and form, and the finale, marked by the inevitable trials of endurance, was undoubtedly a political, diplomatic and technical success. We are delighted, even though ratification, in Portugal, Spain and many of the ten countries in the Community, may be less easy, less quickly achieved than people think. The recent crisis in Portugal will also complicate things. But we can only wait, and hope for the best.

Then there is the question of the draft treaty of Union, and, arising from this, the problems of the forthcoming Milan Summit and the great conference that must follow it.

There are a great many other questions for attention, but the most important is this: will the Conference get off the ground? How? At what level? With what firm prospects? And what should be and will be the role of our Parliament, which, in the most direct manner of all, represents the sentiments and the interests of the people whose destiny is being discussed?

Or will nothing in fact be done, leaving it to the Dooge Committee to continue with its work, its speeches, its futilities? In this connection, the informal meeting of Foreign Ministers at Stresa did not tell us very much. As usual, Mr Andreotti, you are quite optimistic. We are glad about that. But in fact not many foreign ministers replied 'yes' to the questions you asked them in your letter of two weeks ago — which, by your courtesy, the Enlarged Bureau of the Parliament was able to see in advance.

The Milan Summit, despite the spectacular preparations attending it, starting with the thousand municipal banners which, together with a large number of folk groups and other sources of local culture are to descend on the *Piazza del Duomo*, threatens to open somewhat in the dark. We really do not know very much about the when, the where, the how and the how far the Heads of State and Government are prepared to commit themselves to the Treaty for Union, which is of fundamental importance, in our personal view, for any real economic and political integration, as it is for freedom, the enlargement and consolidation of the internal markets, the development of new technologies — which you referred to — and the increase in own resources so as to be able to balance our budgets and, at the same time, to take the necessary steps to

strengthen other policies that are indispensable for any programme of recovery. And it is fundamental for the strengthening of the powers of Parliament, and for tackling — on firm ground, without any socialistic whining or demagogy — the problem of unemployment, and above all, youth unemployment, which is the most heartrending and, at the same time, the most dangerous sort.

All of this, and more besides, has been duly said by the Group of the European Right in an urgent resolution, so as to spell out the conditions under which progress could best be made, with the greatest certainty of success, towards Union, which is also a question that concerns security and relations with the world.

We ought at this point to say something about the Community's foreign policy, but we have not the time for more than a few brief points. You and Mr Craxi have done a great deal of travelling around in these six months, especially in the countries of the East and those which are nearest. You went looking for the olive branch, the emblem of peace, which you are convinced must be growing there. Perhaps you were deceived by the amiability of Gorbachov, as though the ways of communism depended not on the reasoning of the party, but on the character of its exponents. And so it was a vain, useless and often compromising quest.

We are in total disagreement with all this, just as we disagreed with the opposite, racist line you have taken in regard to the questions of African policy and the Third World — a line which is much favoured by the communists and the Left in general, in other peoples' domains, where there is hatred and discord to be sown. But it is a line that has proved itself disastrous for the political and economic development of those peoples, and for the development of their food production; disastrous, also, for real peace, which is not the sort of peace that is about to be made a present of to the Lebanon and the Palestinians by the Syrian Government, Mr Andreotti, which on its own and other people's account bears the greatest responsibility for the martyrdom of those peoples and those countries. This peace bears a sinister resemblance to the peace and democracy of Warsaw, Prague, Budapest, Sofia — in other words, to the *pax sovietica*, a peace and a democracy that none of us should wish upon anyone, and that we all have a duty to reject.

**Mr Pannella (NI).** — (IT) Mr President of the Council, this morning about 80 or 90 Members of the European Parliament signed a declaration drawn up by Italian Liberals and Republicans which, in the space of only two hours — and that is not easy — has been signed by responsible people of standing belonging to every political sector in this Parliament. It is undoubtedly a declaration of concern and, to some extent it is a warning, albeit a polite one so as to avoid any clash, which would be a serious matter for everyone concerned.

**Pannella**

We have undertaken, quite informally, to deliver this declaration to you. When I signed it, and knowing as I do the time it takes for this Parliament to consider and reflect, I thought it might get a further 10, 15 or 20 signatures. This declaration — which, as I have just said, has instead about 80 or 90 signatories from all parties — expresses concern that, in Milan, what you announced to us in January — and we have the text here — will not come to pass. Nor do your statements today put our minds at rest. The Inter-governmental Conference and the requests put forward by Mr Croux in our Parliament have received only a reticent, passing mention which, Mr President, may reflect understandable caution on the part of an executive, but is not on that account necessarily justifiable nor deserving support. Will the Inter-governmental Conference be called, even without the unanimous vote of the governments? Will the Parliament be formally and fully associated with the work of the Conference, for the conclusion of the new treaties, or not?

Mr President of the Council, I may unjustly have caused you some surprise, perhaps, in January, when I emphasized the absolutely positive and innovative nature of the declarations made by the Italian presidency at the start of its term of office. Moreover, I do not despair of still being able, at the end of the day, to do as much. But, more frankly than ever, I have to tell you that I am very worried. At best, your prudent reticence worries us, and perhaps we should say to ourselves, Mr President, that prudence today is in danger of becoming imprudence, if it is no more than prudence for prudence's sake.

There is a historical necessity that we have to recognise. We all know, if we are sincere with ourselves, that it is nonsense to talk of the 'Eureka' or similar projects — a technological Europe, that is — if there is not a politically sovereign, democratically founded body such as Parliament has envisaged.

On our return to Italy, Mr President of the Council, we shall immediately — despite certain events that will, I think, complicate the workings of our Parliament — start up a debate.

We welcome, on this occasion, certain points that the Commission has singled out. I think that the President of the Commission has also understood that the line that he appeared to want to follow in January — the line of an excessively minimalistic evaluation of what was possible and what was necessary in terms of European progress — needed correcting. The Commission is prudently demanding a great deal, because it is aware that, if it asked for little, it would perhaps not even receive that much — or if it did, it might be short-lived.

A further criticism, Minister, concerns the way of handling the North-South problem — that is to say, from the prevalently East-West point of view which colours and has coloured not only the Italian presidency but

European presidencies generally. This time there is no reticence whatsoever about the reference, in his terminal report, to action for the interdependence of the North-West and the South, which is moreover one of the vital needs for the life of Africa, the Third World, and also Europe. That reference is unquestionably hard!

We hope that in the next few days, or the next few hours, perhaps even in your reply, Mr President of the Council, you will understand perhaps that, on the resolutions of Parliament, on the Croux resolution, on the declaration that I referred to today, and on the resolution that was signed by a great many members of other groups against hunger in the world — a document that I commend to your attention, because it is one of the four that this Assembly produced for its debate — more precise indications are necessary. I will not say more courageous ones, because that is not the case, but perhaps, to some extent, more farsighted ones. I think, Mr President of the Council, that if you have properly understood that, unless Milan produces what we have every right and, indeed, duty, to expect from it, this Parliament is absolutely determined to oppose the other institutions, you may perhaps feel able, realist that you are, to promise very much more than what you said in your report, which was not enough.

**Mr Dankert (S).** — (NL) Madam President, I always find it difficult to say something when the term of office of a Council Presidency comes to an end, principally because it is, of course, an impossible situation that the administration, the leadership of the Community, which is very important for its citizens, should change every six months. That this happens at governmental level may just be acceptable. I believe this is a political fact we must live with. But it also happens at all lower levels, and I believe this is another of the things that may well hamstring the Community, and perhaps some institutional reform is needed in this respect in the foreseeable future. I must say even now that, as we take stock of what the Council Presidency has achieved, we have the feeling that it was a sin for one or other country to take on this job for six months, because another six months have been wasted, but I note with great satisfaction that the Italian Presidency has made what it could of the last few months — and that has been more than some people expected at the beginning. At the beginning of the Italian Presidency, there were serious doubts about the possibility of Spain and Portugal acceding by the proposed date. The Treaties of Accession will be signed tomorrow, and I believe this is largely due to the Italian Presidency.

The whole problem of the Community's own resources and what goes with it has been settled for the time being. I admit this has done no more than defer the problem for a while, but at least the Community did not come to grief over a problem that

### Dankert

might have been its undoing because of the lack of clarity left by the Fontainebleau summit. I am certainly grateful to the Italian Presidency for that too. Mr Pandolfi, who has done his best to reach a reasonable agreement, cannot be blamed for the fact that Mr Kiechle is making progress impossible in the Council of Agricultural Ministers. Here again, what the Italian Presidency has so far done in this respect is much appreciated.

At the same time — as Mr Andreotti has himself said — there is the major question that is still unclear: what will happen in Milan? President Pertini said in this Chamber this morning, and I quote from the French translation: *'Milan ne sera peut-être pas le rendez-vous avec l'histoire.'* When I hear what has been said by previous speakers — Mr Pannella and others — I think there is a fairly general feeling here that there may be some disappointment after Milan. Mr President, I will not discuss Milan in any greater detail, because other members of the group will be concentrating on this question; but I will express some disappointment with regard to Milan. Disappointment about the outcome of Milan may destroy a very great deal of what has been achieved in the Community in the last few months. There is, for example, the enlargement of the Community. Tomorrow there will be celebrations in Madrid and Lisbon to mark the signing of the Community agreements.

Madam President, the accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community is without doubt a *'rendez-vous avec l'histoire'* for these countries at the moment. It signifies the emergence of the Iberian peninsula from centuries of isolation and a basis for the Westernization and modernization of these countries. But if the Community is unable to improve its decision-making procedures in Milan, if the Community is incapable of controlling what it has itself agreed to do, what will be surrounded with so many festivities tomorrow may also, as it were, turn against these festivities and have politically dangerous consequences. That is why Milan is so terribly important. These new Member States must be given a good reception, and I do not see how that can be done without changing the decision-making procedures in the Community, because there will otherwise be no basis for them to have faith in the future of this Community and thus in their own future.

I should also like to say something about the financial situation, which is again indirectly but closely connected with what happens in Milan. Mr Christoffersen, the Commissioner responsible for the budget, referred to three constraints regarding future financing here this morning. Two of them are very serious: the fact that the Community's commitment appropriations exceed payment appropriations by about 12m ECU, if my calculation is correct, and the fact that the agricultural surpluses and the opportunities for disposing of them plus the American policy, which is at present opposed to any such moves, will cause us major financial difficulties in the coming year.

Madam President, it was decided in Fontainebleau to raise the VAT limit to 1.4%, subject to any number of conditions. We are already seeing how difficult it is likely to be for the Commission to keep the budget down to 1.4% of VAT. This means that decisions to this end are forcing the Commission to adopt a stagnation course, the alternative being an immediate financial crisis. That is unacceptable in view of the problems raised by accession and also by technology, and in my opinion it means the financial problem must not be left until all the money has been spent: there really ought to be initial discussions in Milan on how the problem is eventually to be tackled. If this is not done, I predict we shall have another financial crisis next year or the year after, and it will take years to resolve. This Community will then continue to stagnate, and I have not yet mentioned the European Parliament's budgetary powers, which have in fact been substantially undermined, now that we have had a deficit for a few years, followed by inter-governmental financing, a situation which — after a year's interlude thanks to the increase to 1.4% — is likely to recur in the very near future. And this, I believe, is a stab in the back for the efforts to achieve parliamentary democracy in Europe.

Madam President, those were the most important things I had to say. There were others, but I do not want to exceed my speaking-time and cut my colleagues short. So I will leave it at that.

**Mr Antoniozzi (PPE).** — *(IT)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, usually, with rare exceptions, at the end of a term of office, Parliament has always listened to the report of the President of the Council with courteous attention, and has always listened very sceptically to the criticisms on how far the programme as announced at the beginning of the presidency has actually been implemented.

Wishing to have the facts at my fingertips I collected together — and shall perhaps publish them with a commentary — all the speeches made by Presidents of the Council to date, and I must say that the political assessment of them is interesting.

Mr Andreotti's speech here today sets down what has been achieved in six months full of activity, initiatives and proposals and committed, convinced determination to make further progress with the development of Europe as a political body.

Parliament can only be pleased with all of this, not least because it has been aware, as has rarely been the case in the past, that in these six months the Council has tried to move in line with the clear indications that have come from our Assembly. The European Parliament, interpreting its own function in accordance with the democratic mandate given it by the citizens of Europe, prepared and has approved the draft Treaty for European Union which represents the basis for

**Antonozzi**

concrete action to which the Council has also finally addressed itself today.

The problems are neither simple nor few in number. No-one underestimates them, but no-one must pretend, when we talk about making Europe progress towards the goal of political Union, that they are unexpectedly faced with new or unknown factors.

All the Member States of the Community have subscribed, by parliamentary vote or even with referendums, to the preambles of the treaties — preambles that have clearly outlined, right from the start, the road to take, the road to political Union. Our Danish friends, who every so often have strange things to say on the subject here, should remember this!

The Committee on Political Affairs and the Committee on Institutional Affairs have worked along these lines with an important set of proposals for improving the management of Europe within the treaties — as Mr Andreotti has reminded us — and for its development with the new treaty.

The six-months' period of office that is ending has the enlargement of the Community to its credit, so that the EEC, in the twelve years 1973-1985, has grown from Six to Twelve European Member States — a clear demonstration of its vitality. The Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, the attention devoted to institutional evolution and the dynamic commitment to political cooperation have all involved the presidency of the Council in questions relating to large areas of the world, including Africa, Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, China, the Soviet Union and Comecon.

The forthcoming Intergovernmental Conference will perhaps be the fundamental time for further decisions. Institutional development requires political courage and new procedure, including the system of decision-making, thus strengthening the Community's position *vis-à-vis* the rest of the world.

The presence of the President of the Italian Republic today has strengthened our proposals for a Europe of freedom, peace and development. The Commission's position yesterday and especially today, the Dooge Report, the Adonnino Report, the other numerous, authoritative documents — from the Tindemans Report to that of the group of other personalities who met in Bonn with Mr Colombo — contain important guidelines for a new, stronger, qualified Europe. That is what our peoples, the young, the women and the elderly, ask for; and it is what Parliament calls for as the democratic representative of the Europe of today and the perhaps greater Europe of the future.

Minister, your speech is not only a favourable report, it is also, above all, a set of proposals rich in possible prospects, for which the first important stage is the forthcoming meeting in Milan. I thank you sincerely

for this. You have given us not only an almost final speech about the six months of the Italian presidency but, with your firm pro-European enthusiasm, you have above all given us so much hope, which is this time founded not only on sentiment but on realisable expectations that your commitment will do everything to further.

Mr Bettiza, with his great musical background, spoke of the 'Unfinished'. But there is a substantial difference. Here we have seen President Andreotti working actively and generously. He will certainly be able to complete what has been started. These are our hopes for him, for Italy, for Europe, for the international balance of peace and development in freedom.

**Mr Møller (ED).** — (DA) Madam President, Mr President-in-Office, as we have heard in the debate, it is mostly tributes which are due to the Italian presidency for the half-year which has elapsed. I think that substantial results have been achieved, significant progress for the European cause. Where there was failure to make progress, it was not due to lack of skill on the part of the Italian presidency but to the magnitude and difficulty of the problems. Nationalist dissension among the various peoples can be so great that it is virtually insurmountable — certainly over a period of half a year.

I should like, as other speakers have done, to draw special attention to the enlargement of the Community. These negotiations have been in progress for over eight years, and we did not hold out any great hopes that they would be concluded in this half-year. But the treaties with Spain and Portugal can now be signed tomorrow. The Community will then increase its population to 320 million and will become a region great in geographical size and rich in human potential. It is a long way from Gibraltar to the northern tip of Denmark, the Skaw, but the Italian presidency has run the distance and has succeeded in overcoming the opposition voiced in certain countries. Heartfelt thanks are due to the President-in-Office of the Council for that — from me at least. I believe it is a significant event that the Iberian peninsula, with its traditions and history, is now connected to our Community and is set to become a vital and valued member.

I also want to thank the President-in-Office for the fact that we now have a budget: the threat which hung over the Italian presidency when it took office, the budget crisis unleashed by Parliament's rejection of the budget for 1985, has now been overcome and we can reasonably predict that the budget will be adopted. That, too, will aid our progress, for it helps to create a better atmosphere. This better atmosphere is due in no small measure to you, Mr President-in-Office: your firmness in regard to realities but flexibility in the matter of form has made it easier for Parliament to make contact with the Council of Ministers.

**Møller**

The threatened crisis which also hung over the Italian presidency when it took office, due to the increasing impatience of Parliament with the Council of Ministers, was to a large extent eased and averted, so that it did not go as far as a clean break. I should like to thank you for that, Mr President-in-Office.

It is very important to smooth over troubled waters between the institutions, since it is cooperation which in the final analysis has to carry Europe forward to new progress.

On one matter it was not possible to achieve as much progress as should have been possible — namely, grain prices. This is not due to any lack of flexibility on the part of the Italian presidency. It is due to the implacable obstinacy of the German Government in this matter. You know better than I from your own history that your capital, the beautiful city of Rome, was not built in a day, and I thank you for working like Romulus, step by step, finally to achieve positive and good results.

We must reconcile ourselves to the fact that what we want cannot be achieved overnight. It takes time and patience and more time before we can break through to tangible results. We hope that the Milan meeting will be a success, the last success for you, Mr President-in-Office, since you will be chairing the meeting, and I hope that it may lead to a relaxation of the right of veto. I heard one of my countrymen, Mr Christensen, expressing his anger over the possible relaxation of the right of veto. But, while it may be a truism to say so, you cannot break a treaty by fulfilling it. I think in reality that the right of veto must disappear, and I would ask you, Mr President-in-Office, to use your best endeavours to that end. The right of veto must disappear in the interests of implementing a treaty which has been approved in a referendum — approved by the Danish people, the Folketing and parliament — namely, the Treaty of Rome. It has been approved, but it has not yet finally come into force. Every single matter concerned with the implementation of a treaty entered into cannot be subject to the right of veto of each individual country. From 1 January on we shall have a membership of twelve states, and that means that the right of veto will be a virtual millstone around our neck in the future development of the European Community. I therefore urge that we now acknowledge that only when action is proposed outside the Treaty, which the Danish people have in any case approved, will there be any need for de Gaulle's right of veto or any discussion on its retention. In all other respects, de Gaulle's shadow must be banished from Europe. It is a long one indeed. Tall buildings cast long shadows, and de Gaulle was no dwarf. We are all well aware of that.

But, Mr President-in-Office, I wish you success and good fortune in your last efforts, and I hope that for your sake — you and the Italian presidency deserve it — the Milan meeting will be such a success that it will

be possible to say that in the term of this presidency a real improvement took place, a fundamental improvement towards the European Community we all want.

**Mr Spinelli (COM), Chairman of the Committee on Institutional Affairs.** — (IT) Mr Andreotti, I shall offer you neither compliments nor good wishes — not for lack of courtesy, but simply for lack of time. I should like to concentrate in this speech on a single subject — the conclusions that the Milan Council should reach with regard to the Intergovernmental Conference on European Union. It is the fourth time that this Parliament has come back to this subject, not only with debates but also with precisely formulated motions that have been approved by large majorities, and so far we have not been able to have a precise answer to what we are asking.

I should like to recall what are the crucial points today, on the eve of the Milan Council. They are not so much concerned with the extent of the power of Parliament, the power of the Council and the power of the Commission, nor the extension of powers, but rather with the drawing up of a procedure for achieving all these objectives. We have asked, and continued to ask, that at Milan a decision shall be taken, not on the content of the Union, because that would be asking too much, but a decision to call on international conference to start negotiations. And we also ask that an end be put to all thoughts of additional protocols, or of more or less solemn declarations, of which the history of the Community is full.

Secondly, we ask that the Conference be called with a precise mandate which will permit work to go on quickly, and changes to be made. We are making clear the objective. We recognise the right to make changes, but we are setting limits — respect the spirit and method of the Parliament. The result will be a mandate that will make it possible to believe that, within a year, a definitive text can be arrived at.

The third thing that we ask for is that the Conference will be held even though all of the Governments may not wish to take part, since the only way to get them all probably present, or almost all, is for the majority to say: 'We shall make a start, even though you are not there'. If, instead, we continue to leave any doubts about this, I am convinced that the Conference will not happen, or if it does, it will no precise objective.

Fourthly, we ask for the Parliament to be associated with the drawing up of the final form of words, but we have not been able to obtain any assurances regarding this. 'Associating' the Parliament, as we understand it, does not however mean having one of those kinds of inter-institutional conciliation which we all know to be so laughable: they are meetings where the Council listens to what certain representatives — who are said to be representatives of the Parliament — have to say and then, having listened, bids them goodbye, sends them

**Spinelli**

packing, and decides on its own as to what it wants. At most, it informs the Parliament. 'Associating' the Parliament means, as we have said and repeated time and again, that when the Conference comes to the first reading, after a certain amount of formulation has taken place, this must be discussed by the Parliament in accordance with normal parliamentary procedure — that is to say, with its work in committee and its decisions taken in plenary session. And if there are to be changes in the text there will be appropriate conciliation procedures, as is always the case when two sets of proposals have to be reconciled in order to arrive at a joint text. And only when a joint text has been arrived at will that text be submitted. I should like to emphasise that this request is not due to any vanity on the part of a Parliament that wants to be in on everything. It is simply logical, because, whilst on the one hand this draft is a Treaty, which must therefore be discussed by the representatives of the different governments, on the other hand it is also a constitution, and as such it must be prepared by the representatives of the citizens of the Community that is being formed — in other words, by this Parliament. From the political standpoint we have to remember that within the Conference there will undoubtedly be good European ministers who, when they can find a few hours — excluding the hours when they sleep — to deal with European matters, will deal with them. But then they have to deal with the problems of national life, and they will leave the European matters to their administrations, their diplomats. And we have seen them at work in recent months, all the diplomats without exception: they were the sharks that I referred to in my speech. They it was that set about trying to emaciate this draft and reduce it to a paltry affair. I am sorry to have to say that even in the Commission's own administration there have been instances of this kind, when instead we should have expected the very opposite.

Parliament's participation is a guarantee that ordinary citizens — just like all the other citizens of all Europe — who have been given a representative mandate, can succeed — thanks to the way in which this institution works — in secreting — if we can put it like that — the supranational element and engendering the creation of a genuine common will. That is why we think it is fundamental that Parliament should be associated in a real way with the drawing up of the final text.

Now your report, Mr Andreotti, is vague about precisely these points. And yet it will be these problems on which decisions will be taken in Milan, and on these decisions will depend the verdict whether Milan has been a success, a new chapter in the building of Europe, or whether it has been yet another chapter in the process of chipping away at the Community. You will not dodge this dilemma at Milan. I ask you to bear in mind that it is the fourth time that the Parliament is asking you — and tomorrow it will ask you solemnly again, with a resolution that I am sure, will be adopted by a very great majority. These are the

requests that the Parliament is now putting forward. On this basis we shall have all the time, later on, to discuss whether this or that institution shall have greater or lesser powers, and how wide or how narrow shall be the new competences to be given to the European Union.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Romeo (L).** — *(IT)* Since I have only one minute in which to say what I think, I will simply remind the President-in-Office of the Council that this is the time to act on behalf of the government that he represents, because now, after the documents that the Italian government has sent to the other governments in the Community, and after what the President of the Italian Republic has said this morning in this Parliament, the Italian government has no choice but to do what it promised with regard to the calling of a conference for the purpose of approving the Treaty of European Union. Foregoing this conference would amount to a diplomatic defeat, a worse humiliation than any defeat resulting from an unsuccessful action: because it is possible to lose and even lose gloriously, but losing without even attempting to fight, after the Parliament has been looking for a whole year to the Italian government to take this action, would be something that — I think — would not only the history of Italian diplomacy but also the moral history of our country, which has committed itself so deeply along these European lines.

I know very well that there are on the other hand many in this Parliament — for example, Mr de la Malène — who say that this is the usual talk, that nothing will happen at Milan and that everybody knows this already. However, I also know that the best way to make a person miss a train is to tell him that the train has already left, so that he stops running, and will thus lose the train for certain. The truth is that in this Parliament the Danish movement against the European Community should really be bigger. It could even be called the Franco-Danish movement against the Community, and perhaps some other Members, of other nationalities, might even join it. Why not?

At all events, what is certain is that we do not want any impotent committees set up at Milan, any secretariats that will then come under ministries, which will effectively have the power of decision. We expect Milan to tackle the question of the powers of the Parliament, and to tackle the question of majority voting, to which there may even be exceptions, but these exceptions will be very precisely defined and not worded in the form of general reservations that can be interpreted as individual Member States think fit.

If the Parliament, which — as Mr Spinelli has just said — has worked for over a year with this in view, were to see its proposals defeated along with the resolutions that it has so often adopted with such a large majority, it would be a humiliation, a defeat, that would be the

**Romeo**

'negation of the authority bestowed on Parliament by elections by universal suffrage. We should have to face our electors and tell them that we have not been able to discharge the mandate that they gave us. To prevent that happening we shall try to use every means in our power to prevent this Parliament from being regarded by the governments as an object of derision that they can do as they like with.

(*Applause*)

**Mr Van der Lek (ARC).** — (NL) Madam President, it is impossible to analyse in five minutes what has happened in the last few months. It is a remarkable process. In psychology we have the expression 'seeking refuge in attack', which means that, when someone is in difficulty, he does not adopt a different approach but tries to succeed with the same methods.

Madam President, it is very nice to see the European Parliament being played up to at the moment. We are told that we are to have genuine powers. Who knows, we may even become a genuine Parliament! But, Madam President, there is no guarantee that the European Union as such will be more democratic than the individual Member States, and in the Member States there is no economic democracy at the moment. There is a wide gap between the rich and the poor, high unemployment and no involvement of the vast majority of people. In these various European countries the regions have hardly any say, and instead of an improvement in democracy in the present Community, we now have the policy of grand gestures. We are to create a European Union, and that will solve all the problems.

Madam President, we for our part have no faith in any of this. Integration is not the answer to everything. In itself it may be useful, but the real issues are peace and handling the earth's resources in responsible fashion. It does not go without saying that a Western European bloc — because it, too, is a bloc and it, too, may become nationalistic — will make a contribution in this respect. It all depends on the bloc's objectives. And what are they? The European Union is to make us more competitive with the United States and Japan. But, Madam President, competition is now destroying Earth. It is becoming a kind of new European mercantilism. The aim is one Community market. That may sound good but, as we all know, it will become an area for the multinational undertakings, and they know what they are doing.

And what we find particularly displeasing is that there is more talk than ever of the political dimension of Western Europe, of the Western European bloc, European Political Cooperation and even of a defence policy. This has been underlined in Mr Andreotti's draft mandate, it has been enthusiastically welcomed by the majority of Parliament, but certainly not by us,

through the reply given by the President of this Parliament, and this means that the Western European bloc is going to concern itself — and this was not what was agreed — with security policy, defence, arms production, arms exports and so on. In our opinion, this will be a fresh contribution to the polarization of East and West.

Madam President, we appreciate what Mr Andreotti said about cooperation between East and West and the resulting promotion of peace, but we have no confidence in the European Community in its present form becoming involved in security policy. I do not doubt Mr Andreotti's judgment, but I am thinking of the present situation. We believe that this policy will aggravate the East-West conflict and that, as a new superpower, Western Europe will not contribute in any way to *détente* in the world.

And then, Madam President, the decisions concerning the environment. I am sorry, but I find this a very poor example. After all, the Environment Ministers did not even find it in themselves to agree on the minimum that could have been done to preserve our forests and our agricultural land and, let it not be forgotten, to prevent acid rain, the standards needed to control the exhaust gases of cars, as in the USA, the technically feasible purification of sulphur dioxide and state-of-the-art standards to control air pollution. If agreement cannot even be reached on such things and when we now hear that what has already been achieved may be reconsidered and made even less effective, we are under no illusion about the real benefit of this highly-praised strengthening of European cooperation. We are not against cooperation, but we believe that what is intended at the moment must be opposed.

Madam President, we shall continue to resist integration imposed from above without economic democracy, the growth of inequality and above all a security policy that involves the use of weapons and does not include a vision of real peace in the world. Our priority, Madam President, is not to make Europe a superpower but the protection of the environment, peace throughout the world and a socially peaceful Europe for everyone who lives in it.

IN THE CHAIR: MR FANTI

*Vice-President*

**Mrs Castle (S).** — Mr President, I am sorry to strike a discordant note in the middle of this complacent debate, but I am afraid I cannot congratulate the Presidency on its sense of priorities. Here is the Presidency seeking to plunge the Community into a protracted and abortive wrangle about institutional change when nothing, absolutely nothing, should be distracting us

## Castle

from the real problems of the Community, and we all know what those real problems are. They are economic and social problems. They are the mounting scandal of unemployment. They are the growing inequalities between rich and poor regions and rich and poor people. They are the existence of 30 million people below the poverty line in our Community. I believe the Treaty of Rome certainly needs reforming, but the most important changes we need in the Treaty of Rome are first and foremost to end the dominant position of the common agricultural policy in our expenditure, our thinking, our obsessions and our aims. Is it not an astonishing phenomenon that the only piece of compulsory expenditure in our budget should be on agriculture? And as a result of that and an almost open-ended commitment it is again this year taking over 70% of our budget, starving the Regional and Social Funds, and leaving us powerless to tackle the problem of industrial unemployment in what is primarily an industrial Community.

The second major reform we need is to end the dominance of the crude and inflated free-market philosophy in the Treaty of Rome, which, as it implies — and I am in favour of an extension of free trade — puts insurmountable obstacles in the way of planning and carries to absurd lengths the policy of harmonizing everything. That kind of harmonization is round, as we know, the lowest common denominator. To change the Treaty to allow us to deal with these problems, which is what British Labour Members of this Parliament want, is the only Messina Conference in which we are interested. We are certainly not interested in the proposed mandate or in the intergovernmental conference which is proposed. What does the mandate do? It calls for the rapid dismantlement of any instruments of planning that may remain to us. It wants actually to strengthen — not reform, but strengthen — the existing agricultural policy. It wants to extend Community policies to new areas, including health, thus stirring up an absolute hornet's nest of political controversy. Surely every Member of this Parliament knows that the British people have an entirely different form of health care from any of the rest of you, financed out of taxation, free at the point of use, and we totally resist any idea of being brought into line with the private-insurance health policies which dominate on the Continent.

Instead of advocating the reforms of the Treaty which we really need, what has the British Government done? It has produced a package of proposals which, in fact, leave it free to ditch the veto. That is what its suggestion means when it says that Heads of Government should abstain from voting on policies they do not like, rather than veto them. That is really a move to majority voting under another name. It could provide the British Government with a useful alibi, by pretending it has been a good *communautaire* member by not vetoing; nonetheless, because it is merely abstaining, it will be forced to accept harmonization, for example of VAT, which it wants to do and is already

on the way to doing. And yet it can blame the Community when it falls into line. It would not be averse to harmonizing our national health service with Community insurance systems, because, of course, that is the policy in which they believe.

I am interested to see that the European Democrats are associating themselves with a resolution which welcomes the intergovernmental conference and the mandate. I was interested when Mr de la Malène said that what we don't like is talking with double tongues. Well, I wish the British Conservatives would start to talk with a single one. They say one thing here and another thing at home.

As for the powers of the European Parliament, I tremble to think what use this Parliament would make of joint legislative powers. It would not use those legislative powers to reform the Common Agricultural Policy. Who are the people who rode roughshod over the Commission's desperate recommendations for farm price control this year? This Parliament! I would not trust it with any legislative powers at all. There are other people who talk with double tongues. There is the Government of the Federal Republic. We are told that Mr Kohl is all in favour of abolishing the veto, and he is busy vetoing the reduction in cereal prices as hard as he can! Oh yes, there is a great deal of hypocrisy, and I want to say to this Parliament that to imagine that a move to majority voting in the Council or an extension of the powers of this Parliament would solve the real crisis of the Community is to believe in moonshine. Majority voting by political cowards or reactionary economists accomplishes merely disaster. Let us keep a few national points of sanity! Let us drop all this talk of more and more integration behind the wrong policies and concentrate at last on getting the right policies!

**Mr Starita (PPE).** — *(IT)* Mr President of the Council, I should like to express my satisfaction with your report, illustrating as it does the positive results achieved during these six months of the Italian Presidency. We must hope that the Milan Summit will be successful, and that the calling of an Intergovernmental Conference will make a fundamental contribution to the creation of a European Union.

Amongst the questions arising I think emphasis should be given to certain declarations made by you regarding the role of Parliament, its powers of decision-making, and the need for a different balance in the relationship between the institutions of the Community — or rather, a different balance between their powers — unlike the existing tendency in the Council, which should be changed.

I should like to dwell briefly, if time will allow, on some of the questions that you dealt with, Mr Andreotti. There is no doubt whatever that appreciable progress has been made with the utilisation of public

### Starita

and private ECU, but a substantial development of the EMS is still desirable, with the gradual freeing of the capital market. Great importance has been attached to the consolidation of the internal market, and the Commission has been made responsible for drawing up a programme to achieve this aim by 1992. The adoption of directives, which you referred to, for harmonising the right of establishment, and the simplification and facilitation of frontier checks and formalities within the Community, are other important, urgent aims.

The Council has also tackled the question of small and medium sized undertakings, asking the Commission to prepare a report on the national and Community measures that are envisaged to assist their development and to simplify the administrative side. I must say that this question deserves great attention and prompt action. Against this background, therefore, the various economies need to be brought increasingly close together, in a homogeneous economic environment, with the implementation of the internal market, the removal of the existing obstacles, the creation of a technological Community, the strengthening of the EMS, and the implementation of a common policy for transport and the infrastructure: all of these are objectives that must be achieved if there is to be real, effective progress within the Community.

In conclusion, may I be allowed a brief reference to the question of the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal. During the debate following your declaration of 16 January in this Chamber, some members asked the Italian Presidency to be brave. Judging by the results — and in this I am strengthened also by the views of members of other Groups that have been expressed today — it seems to me that that indication was accepted, despite the threats from the opposition and the many difficulties that existed. In this connection I should like to say immediately that this event, which is of such historical magnitude — and I do not want to over-emphasise — marks a victory for statesmanship over the narrow and sometimes obtuse game of pursuing national interests, big and small alike.

May I compliment you, Mr Andreotti, in particular on the commitment and great political determination that you have shown, which led to the achievement of this important result. I think it is also right to acknowledge the spirit of collaboration shown by the governments of Member States to the Italian presidency. I should also sincerely like to congratulate the Commission on its intelligent preparatory work and, in particular, to recall the contribution made by Commissioner Natali. To these words of appreciation I would like to add my sincere thanks to you personally, Mr Andreotti.

**Mrs J. Hoffmann (COM).** — (FR) Mr President, the preparations for the Milan Summit fill us with misgivings. Efforts are to be made to strengthen the Com-

munity, but in what direction? The first objective is to strengthen the institutions of the Community, or even to draw up a fresh treaty in which the rights of individual Member States would carry less weight. Do you believe that this would make the slightest difference to the lack of political will that the Community is currently displaying?

Secondly, the formation of a military alliance features in the forefront of many plans. The Dooge report, the first official report to propose European concertation of defence research and joint projects, an agreement on strategic objectives, has met with approval from France, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Similarly, many individuals in senior official positions in those three countries are on record as not excluding the possibility of the Eureka project taking on a military dimension. There has even been talk of coupling it with the 'star wars' project. From this viewpoint, the expressed intention of certain States to develop such projects on the basis of agreement among some only of the Member States makes us more convinced than ever that the aim envisaged is indeed the development of an *à la carte* military Europe.

This is a dangerous trend in the Community. At a time when our peoples are taking to the streets to demonstrate that they want the Geneva negotiations to succeed, when disquiet is being expressed on all sides at the lunatic 'star wars' project, the last thing that the Community should be thinking of is the construction of a military bloc in a world in which weapons already proliferate.

Action to tackle the real problems of the Community is what is needed. It cannot be said that the Italian presidency has been particularly active in this respect. What, for instance, has been done to create a real technological community serving exclusively non-military purposes? What has been done to stem the rising tide of unemployment? At its last congress, the European Trade Union Confederation highlighted the real consequences of the 'flexibility' which has become so fashionable in Europe. This flexibility means an increase in job insecurity, in 'low-tech' jobs, and the eradication of hard-won workers' rights. Regrettably, it is precisely the strategy proposed by the Commission and the Council. In parallel with the use of these methods to build more flexibility into the labour market, entire sectors of industry are being destroyed and the common agricultural policy is being undermined.

In this connection, one cannot but note the total absence of any significant reaction by the Community to American aggression on the trade and monetary fronts. I am referring to the onslaught on the CAP, a recent example of which has been the contract between the United States and Algeria, the maintenance of conditions encouraging the export of European capital to the United States, which we have pro-

**J. Hoffmann**

posed to limit and tax, and the preparations for a further round of GATT negotiations.

On all fronts the Community is in retreat before the Americans, whereas on the other side of the coin it is exerting pressure on the developing countries to agree to this new round of negotiations.

Finally, Mr President, I take the strongest exception to the Council's decision — under your presidency — to restore part of the financial aid to Turkey which Parliament had blocked on account of the deterioration in the human rights situation in that country. As long as the Community fails to tackle these various problems, the promises made month after month of the regeneration of Europe will be a waste of breath.

**Mr De Gucht (L).** — (NL) Mr President, anyone who has opened the newspapers in the last few months will have read that the Milan conference is our last chance, that Milan will be, or should be, a historic conference.

I believe that, while this is something of an exaggeration, there is an element of truth in it. Such exaggeration might result in the disappointment afterwards being all the greater, and the reference to a historic conference has also created the impression that the European Union is something that will simply be decided at a conference, something that will simply be created, whereas it can only be the outcome of a process of evolution, as I think we are all agreed in this Parliament.

But there is also an element of truth in this statement. If the Milan meeting does not achieve certain results, I believe we cannot consider the implementation of any major projects for the next five years. The combination of these elements, Mr President, must lead us to go to Milan with a practical but future-oriented project, in which, as we see it, three aspects must be central.

The first concerns the economic sphere: the establishment of the internal market. I know, the Community's economic base is one and indivisible, it cannot be split into pieces, but it seems to me that the only thing in which there is any momentum at the moment is the internal market. The Council's and Commission's intention to come forward with an actual plan and a final date is also a reference to the European Community's past achievements.

The second aspect, Mr President, concerns the political sphere and more specifically peace and security. We have evidently not exhausted all the possibilities with the Euro-missiles and, as we now find, we are constantly faced with problems, the choice being between being regarded as unreliable by the United States and weak by the Soviet Union. In our present position we are inevitably confronted with this *imbrog-*

*lio*. The only solution is to establish a European security policy, and I want to make it very clear that I mean a security policy, not just a military policy. But we must not forget either that at a given moment it will form an indissoluble part of a security policy.

Finally, Mr President, the institutional aspect. We cannot make any further progress in Europe. It has already been said several times during this debate that we must also try to take practical steps in this field practical steps both as regards majority decisions in the Council — one practical step might be for the Council and Commission to call for a clearly defined commitment at the summit meeting in Milan to take all decisions on the programme for the internal market by a majority — and with respect to greater powers for this Parliament.

We must be under no illusion. The Council will never agree to Parliament's having joint decision-making power straight away, but the first step in this direction might be that we have the right to be involved in decisions on Community legislation, the directives. If we can combine these three points to form a package for Milan, I believe we can take a reasonable step forward.

**Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC).** — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall confine myself to a few comments I feel I should make as a European federalist and regionalist on the Dooge report which is to be discussed at the summit meeting in Milan. I, too, hope there will be an early government conference with a specific mandate to set the Community's stationary machinery in motion. The Dooge report will, of course, form a basis, but a very vague one, in my opinion. There is talk, for example, of an increase in powers in such fields as security, social policy and environmental policy, but what direction this must in effect take remains so vague that any direction might be taken in the formulation of policy. Even the text on development cooperation is obviously still ensnared in too restricted a view of the relationship between North and South. We see the Dooge report as a step forward but in no way as the ultimate objective, mainly because absolutely no account is taken of the regional dimension. President Pertini referred to a strategy of impatience and of a people's Europe. But how can the people be reasonably involved in the European Community if the European Union soon to be proposed to them does not include a new vision of democratic decision-making? Of course, there must be further upward delegation of powers, but downward delegation, to the regions themselves, is needed as well and at the same time. The regional governments will be meeting next week to decide on a joint approach in a dialogue with the European institutions on the many subjects of immediate interest to them. Taking account of the regional dimension thus amounts to building a better democracy. I am afraid that this democracy will be overlooked at the summit conference in Milan, and yet this is a problem of fundamental importance to our citizens.

**Mr Seeler (S).** — (*DE*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! In his speech President Andreotti referred to the importance of the Milan summit. It is quite true that the supporters of the European ideal expect fundamental decisions from the heads of state and governments that will free the Community from the lethargy, not to say resignation that exists in many spheres. Cordial, fine-sounding, but ultimately empty phrases are no longer in demand. We need political initiatives comparable to the decisions taken in the fifties and sixties.

There are any number of unfortunate examples of the state our Community is in, which might well be termed depressing. Parliament was obliged to institute proceedings against the Council at the Court of Justice because the Council had failed to take any action whatsoever on transport policy, thereby contravening the Treaties. The decision of 22 May this year by the Court of Justice came down largely in favour of Parliament and confirmed the right of Parliament to a degree of control over the Council. This ruling also makes it quite clear that the Council is no longer capable of making decisions and taking action.

However, there is another example which is far more depressing. In Geneva, the USA and the Soviet Union, two major world powers, are currently discussing disarmament and detente in Europe. They are discussing our security, European security, a vital aspect of our future and not one single responsible European politician is taking part in these discussions. The fate of Europe is being decided without Europe! It would be impossible to demonstrate more clearly that Europe — and this applies to all Member States without exception — has only one choice: either we withdraw from the world stage dreaming of national independence and let others take the decisions for us, or we strengthen the European Community so that it becomes a power in the world when it comes to discussing peace and security in this world of superpowers.

Parliament has made concrete proposals in its draft treaty as to how the Community could be reformed and developed further. An important consequence of this draft treaty, which is often overlooked, is the current intensive discussion in all Member States on the Community and its future. I would even assert that without Parliament's initiative no Dooge committee would have been set up in Fontainebleau, nor would the parliaments and governments of the Member States be discussing this matter, nor would it appear on the agenda for the Milan summit.

On the basis of many conversations, I feel able to say that there are representatives of a realistic, pragmatic view in all Member States who feel that a decision must be reached on what powers should be transferred to the European Community because certain matters can better be dealt with at Community level than national level. A further separate question involves decision-making procedures within the Community, to

enable it to function optimally. In my view these are the central questions raised in Parliament's draft treaty and in the Dooge report, to which the heads of state and governments must find an answer in Milan.

The vast majority of my Group feel that the problems in Europe, such as unemployment and all the others mentioned by Mrs Castle, can no longer be solved by national measures in each Member State, but either at Community level or not at all. It is essential to give both Parliament and the Community more freedom of action to solve these problems. It is not so much a question of achieving agreement on all the powers we suggested in the draft treaty and attaining political union, it is more a question of Member States being able to agree on the subsidiarity principle as set out in the treaty. A reform of the decision-making process within the Community is likely to cause far more problems.

It ought to be relatively easy to reach agreement on the activities that should be transferred to the Community. But how these activities are to be carried out, and how Parliament and Council are to cooperate: these are matters that are likely to cause problems. One thing is quite clear: the Community can only be effective in as far as it functions to the satisfaction of its citizens and the Member States. A major factor of all reforms is a sensible solution to the problem of cooperation between Parliament and Council.

The Members of this Parliament have been given a mandate by the peoples of the Community. If this Community is to be democratic, then Parliament must be granted the right to legislate, full budget rights, as well as the right to political control of the European executive. The Council's task is to represent the interests of individual governments within the Community. Concern has been expressed in many capital cities in the Community that abolishing the right of veto would prevent vital national interests from being safeguarded.

I believe that many Member States are simply afraid of entrusting their own fate and future development to the European Community, where individual decisions would no longer be possible. The conflict is clear: conviction of the necessity for cooperation, for a transfer of sovereign rights, but fear of the consequences. Member States wish to enjoy the advantages of such a partial Community while continuing to act as before, as a fully sovereign state. The suggestion made by the British foreign minister a few days ago highlighted this conflict — the desire to benefit from the advantages of the Community while at the same time preserving the individuality of decisions. Probably a solution will only be found at the end of a long process, which will require far more patience than we realise. The first step could be an attempt to define vital national interests precisely, and to draw up a list of those issues where Member States can retain the right of veto in the Council.

### Seeler

The main point, however, is for the Council to reach a decision at all, whether negative or positive. At the present time there are some 800 proposals from the Commission to the Council and approved by Parliament years ago, awaiting decision, simply because the Council is incapable of arriving at a consensus, and also because it lacks the courage to say 'no'. This is not a question of the right of veto, it is quite simply a sign of the inability to take decisions and it is this we cannot tolerate.

In conclusion, on behalf of my Group, I would like to thank the Italian Presidency. Great efforts have been made to promote the necessary institutional reforms, as demonstrated by Foreign Minister Andreotti's proposals for a mandate. I appeal very strongly to the Italian Presidency to do its best in Milan to ensure that their efforts culminate in success. This is perhaps the last chance for Europe to establish its position in this world of superpowers in such a way that we and not others decide on our own future.

**Mr Brok (PPE).** — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! I would like to begin by thanking the Italian Presidency, in particular President Andreotti, for their intensive efforts over the last few months.

However, if we consider the institution over which he presided for the last few months, there are more negative than positive aspects. The European Community is governed by a working party of national governments who do not shun blackmail and the suppression of democracy.

One government insists that Spanish and Portuguese accession must depend on financial guarantees, another wants its money back, a third cannot agree to agricultural prices and a fourth rejects simplified border controls because this will mean loss of control over the movement of capital.

When we speak out against this, which we have done hundreds of times, we are confronted by the so-called 'realists' in the capital cities, governments, parliaments, the ministerial bureaucrats who laugh at what they call our dreams and say that we cannot achieve economic union because there is no monetary union, and that we cannot have monetary union because there is no economic union. This is the usual argument which ends by saying we have nothing.

The Community is quite simply denied the means to achieve its ends. Like Mr Seeler, I would like to say to Mrs Castle and some of the national governments: of course we must combat unemployment, of course we need progress in the field of modern technology, in the field of environmental protection, the European internal market and a People's Europe. But this can only be achieved if we give the European institutions the instruments they need.

It is dishonest and devious to ask for results while withholding the means. The result is to make the citizens of Europe who would like to see the European Community made a reality cynical and anti-European and this has led to major problems over the last few weeks. We ourselves must take care not to fall into this way of thinking.

What happens at Council meetings? First of all, impressive statements of intent are made. Negotiations take place, but then ministers hurry out of the room and tell the waiting journalists from their own countries that they have made mincemeat of the others. This impression is reinforced by the official press spokesmen who present their leaders as the great hero who has out-smarted all the others. The main result is a strategy of survival by national governments, so that successes can be celebrated at home with an eye to the next elections. All this is destroying the ideal of European unity.

When governments fail, they often excuse themselves by claiming that European policy has failed. Everything that is positive is the result of national policies, and when something goes wrong, the wicked European Community is at fault.

One of the major instruments is the question of a clear definition of majority voting and the matter of Parliament's legislative rights. These are matters essential to the existence of the European Community.

If we do not find a way to solve the crucial problems of European internal, economic and social policies, including European security policy — Mr Seeler rightly mentioned the Geneva conference — we will destroy the future of the European Community because we cannot see beyond our limited horizons.

Mr Andreotti, I hope that you will achieve a miracle in Milan and that my pessimism will not be justified. If we do not achieve any success this year, then, for a variety of reasons, there is little hope of success in 1986 and 1987 — and under these circumstances the outlook for our common future will be very black indeed.

**Mr Iversen (COM).** — (DA) The other day the West German Foreign Minister said that the Milan summit would be the moment of truth for future Community cooperation. The summit indeed has some weighty and wide-ranging matters to discuss. The Italian concept is like a varied menu from which each country can choose its own meal *à la carte*. It is clear, following the Stresa meeting, that political cooperation will be formalized. In my party we favour a development in which the Commission's rôle in the Community is progressively reduced. If the agreement achieved at the Stresa meeting in this area presages such a development, it is a positive result.

**Iversen**

Another item on the agenda for the Milan summit is the European view on such matters as the French Eureka project. I should like to take this opportunity to ask Mr Andreotti three questions in that regard. To begin with: will the research cooperation be entirely civilian, without any military aspects? Secondly: does the Italian presidency agree that the Commission should not be involved in any way with the project? Thirdly: will the cooperation be open to all countries in Europe, hence also to Norway and Sweden?

Finally, I should like to hear whether Mr Andreotti agrees that the Eureka project should not be financed through the budget of the European Community.

**Mr Christiansen (S).** — *(DA)* Mr President, Mr President-in-Office, colleagues, in January I warned the presidency against emulating the character in Greek legend, Icarus. He, too, set himself high objectives, so high that he lost contact with the earth and was burned by the sun. No practical results were achieved, apart from the myth and a star in the firmament which today bears his name, as a warning to others. The European Community has no interest in either myths or stars. Let us stick to cooperation geared to practical results. What Europe needs is concrete, lasting and binding activities which will enable us to raise the standard of living of our populations, improve the competitiveness of our industries and develop our civilization and our democracy.

I therefore regret to observe here, as the period of the Italian presidency comes to its close, that great visions will once again end in small realities. The much — vaunted conference of governments which is planned following this month's Milan summit, in which the Italian presidency has invested such energy and prestige, will not yield any definite results. How do you propose to restrict the right of veto, for example, when the country which has always been the strongest advocate of this expedient, the Federal Republic of Germany, only last month made use of that right on the question of grain prices? When one of the most reform-conscious Member States goes to such lengths in pursuing national interests at the expense of the Community, how can you imagine that a conference of governments will be able to agree on fundamental institutional reforms or, against all expectations, agree to restrict the right of veto? How do you suppose that decisions taken against the express wishes of a Member State will be faithfully implemented in that Member State?

Do not forget that effectiveness and good cooperation consist of elements each of which is as important as the others: good decision-making, readiness and ability to implement decisions and verification to ensure that the decisions have been correctly implemented. It is my firm conviction that, if the Community undertakes the proposed institutional reforms at this point in time, effectiveness will be diminished. Good decision-

making will be impaired if the European Parliament is given increased powers. We shall in fact be acquiring one more body with the power to impose a veto. We already know that even the implementation of decisions taken on the basis of consensus shows much to be desired in certain Member States, and implementation will be further exacerbated when it is known in advance that a Member State is categorically against the decision in question.

Any sober and objective assessment of the efforts of the Italian presidency over the past half-year must therefore be: it has endeavoured to make cooperation effective by not drawing upon all resources to fulfil the existing Treaty. The Treaty of Rome carries all the provisions necessary to bring Europe back to a position level with the USA and Japan, to restore high employment, to improve the competitiveness of industry and secure its expansion and to check the deplorable pollution of our environment. Objectives have been set for institutional reforms which have little chance of being achieved and which therefore carry the risk that the Community will be plunged back into depression and despair. The effects of this depression will in all probability recoil on practical cooperation, with the result that the Community will be even less well equipped in the future to take up the challenges.

Finally, the object which the presidency set itself is not good for the Community for, if the unlikely happens and reforms are actually put into effect, the effectiveness of cooperation will be diminished. No, step down from Icarus' chariot; there is still time. The time is not yet ripe for the nations of Europe to launch into foolhardy experiments of a supranational nature. The time will come only when we have proved to ourselves that we are capable of cooperation, when we are able faithfully to implement the decisions taken and monitor their implementation.

**Mr Herman (PPE).** — *(FR)* Mr President, during our debate in April on the conclusions of the Dooge or Spaak II committee, we expressed the fear that the constructive conclusions formulated by a substantial majority of that committee would be reduced to shreds in the course of the bilateral meetings going on between the months of March and June.

We also expressed the hope that the Commission, the custodian of the Treaties and the Community interest, would use the short time available in the interval to improve the drafting of the terms of reference to be given to an intergovernmental conference.

Our fears have been borne out and our hopes of the Commission — the Commission collectively, not its President, whose convictions are known to us — have been dashed.

In a piece published on 3 April under the headline 'Mrs Thatcher wins again', the *Financial Times* gave

**Herman**

an account of what is described as the highly successful persevering efforts made by the British diplomatic service to persuade its continental opposite numbers of the futility of pursuing the Dooge committee proposals and holding this intergovernmental conference.

The deterioration in Franco-German relations following the Bonn Summit and the spectacular inconsistencies in the German Government's European policy greatly facilitated this destructive work carried on behind the scenes by traditional British diplomacy. There is very little time left in which to repair the damage.

Mr President-in-Office, we know that you did your best in Stresa, and we are grateful to you. But what is to be said of the Commission? For some time now it has had very little to say about the institutional problem, whereas it is the main victim of the institutions' loss of direction, whereas it has itself delivered major speeches in this Chamber announcing that, if no solution was forthcoming from the Council, it would make its own review of the proposals.

It seems, however, that the Commission has also made the tactical error of diverting the Milan Summit from its main purpose. However justified and judicious the proposals on the internal market and new technologies may be, they will of course be manna to the Heads of Government or State, giving them an easy opportunity to agree on things in which they have always professed to believe. Who could be against the internal market? Who could be against technological Europe? But this releases them from the painful duty to sort out their differences on the real obstacles to European progress. As though there were any prospect of developing the internal market, a common currency and advanced technology when the Council is incapable of taking decisions, when the Commission no longer has any independence, having become the secretariat to the Council!

If, as I have heard say, the Commission has decided to confine itself to proposals which do not divide the ten governments, then this is capitulation.

The Commission has a duty to defend the interests of the Community, which far outweigh the sum of the national interests of the ten States. And its greatest ally in its struggle is this Parliament. That is why we find it so difficult to understand or share the misgivings which some people in the Commission feel about entrusting greater powers to Parliament. Of course this Parliament is a democratic institution, and of course it makes mistakes. Of course technocrats have great contempt for parliamentarians. We know all that, but Europe, political Europe, will not be built without this Parliament, it will not be built unless the Commission and Parliament join forces and remain united until our proposals for reform are carried through.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Filinis (COM).** — *(GR)* Mr President, we consider it our duty to acknowledge the painstaking efforts made by the Italian Presidency, and its contribution to all that has been achieved.

Yet, the failure to solve certain problems is having an adverse effect on the Community's development. So far as the IMP's are concerned, there is a danger that the regulation governing their implementation may not be approved until the end of June. This is linked to the effects of some groups to modify the very nature of the IMP's by embodying them in other Community Funds, whereupon the IMP's would lose their additive character, which has nevertheless been judged essential if the problems of enlargement are to be dealt with.

Secondly, the matter of necessary institutional changes is being faced in a way that ignores the need for convergence between the regions. I need mention only one characteristic example. In the Spinelli plan which our Parliament approved, Article 73 very correctly provides for the establishment of some system of financial equalisation aiming to eliminate the great economic inequalities between various regions. Yet, in the report by the *ad hoc* committee there is no mention of any such system. It is obvious that with such a mentality the very aims of European Union are being undermined.

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES

*Vice-President*

**Mr Iodice (PPE).** — *(IT)* Madam President, I think that the debate so far has highlighted the merits of the Italian Presidency, the success of which is linked, in the first place, with the great event of the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal. The accession of these two countries — it must be said immediately, not least for the sake of brevity — which was prepared with care and energy, does however bring with it consequences from the social aspect, because we have to consider that a further three million are being added to the 13 million unemployed we have already, with new difficulties in the market for jobs in the agricultural sector, especially in the South of Italy.

The presidency has worked intelligently for institutional reform, giving full support to the Treaty of European Union and the work of the Dooge Committee and the Committee for the People's Europe.

Enlargement and institutional reform allow us to speak of the start of a new stage in the process of building the Community, which must, in our view, progress towards the creation of a social environment that is no abstract concept but a reality of plans and

## Iodice

programmes for employment. Hitherto, excessive nationalistic or party pressure has introduced decision-making mechanisms that cause paralysis not only where political decisions in relation to the question are concerned, but also with regard to important directives such as those regarding equality of treatment for men and women, temporary and part-time working, and so on.

But differences in the social sector in Europe are not only to be found in relation to the question of employment or the way work is organised; they lie also in the causes of territorial and sectoral imbalance, in relation to the disadvantaged areas of the Community — including the South of Italy — and certain sections of the industrial sector and the crafts and small industries sector respectively. But we might well consider that, within the Community, there are projects and signs of coordination and cooperation in the fields of technology and research that were not apparent in the recent past. If we value these trends, and are determined to strengthen the institutions of the Community, to the extent that we can believe in the reforming aims of the Treaty of Union, then much can be achieved in the social sector, within the existing institutional framework.

This Parliament is committed to the implementation of a special plan for employment, comprising precise measures and directives for the creation of jobs, with productive investment in sectors where new jobs can be created, in the field of new technology, and with incentives in areas with a high level of unemployment. We must stop wishing and get down to more concrete action, and the Italian presidency must still make a move in this direction at the next Council on Social Affairs so that a decision of that Council, in the form of a resolution, can then be accepted, with political determination, at the forthcoming Summit in Milan.

During the six months that are coming to an end the Italian presidency has done what it could, and the successes that it has obtained, which have been widely recognised, should be measured in relation to the difficult internal commitments, as well as against the international scene.

To round off your mission, Mr President, one final effort is still possible to ensure that the Summit gives a firm, decisive answer to the expectations and hopes of the peoples of the Community for progress and development.

**Mr Mallet (PPE).** — (*FR*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I subscribe to the tributes paid, with good reason, to the Italian presidency of the Council and to your personal contribution, Mr President. But I would also add that the hardest part of your task is yet to come, and that is making a success of the Milan European Council. You have two weeks left. We know that you are determined to make a success of it.

We understand the difficulties which you are having to face and have yet to face.

What is meant by making a success of the Milan Council? Of course it means the avoidance of an obvious failure, which would be taken very badly by European public opinion and would have serious implications for the Community and the future of Europe, but it also means having nothing to do with the sham of general political declarations which contain no specific undertakings and are not backed up by the commitment of any resources. This meeting is exceptional. President Pertini said so this morning, emphatically: this is a crucial moment, a decisive turning point in the history of the European Community. It is soon to be enlarged to include Spain and Portugal. Their accession is a positive development, but it is going to make the already imperfect functioning of the Community all the more difficult. And Europe is facing serious challenges calling for new forms of common action, the most dangerous of these being its technological decline which, because it is undermining the competitiveness of its economy, is a major cause of unemployment.

On the objectives, a broad measure of agreement should be possible among the countries of the Community. These objectives, as you have reminded us, are ambitious. In order to attain them, there must be a clear awareness of the importance of what is at stake, of the absolute need to advance faster and further, as Mr Paul-Henri Spaak used to say, in the direction of political union in Europe. Secondly, there must be the will to overcome the obstacles — of which there are many — and to demonstrate imagination and courage, such as used to be seen during the 1950s.

What will professions of good intentions be worth if they are not going to have the backing of institutions which have been renovated and strengthened? Europe is in greater need than ever of efficient, democratic institutions capable of taking decisions and acting on them, involving the European Parliament closely in the legislative process in all the fields, old and new, falling within the competence of the Community. That, as you have said, requires a qualitative leap forward.

At Fontainebleau the European Council set up the Dooge committee, which has since drawn up a constructive report, drawing inspiration from the spirit and method of the draft treaty on European union. In Dublin it was decided that the next meeting, in Milan, would be devoted primarily to examination of this report. On the basis of this report, you have recently sent the governments draft terms of reference for an intergovernmental conference, the contents of which meet with our approval. The important day is now very close; the dossier has been thoroughly prepared, and the time has come for decisions. The credibility of the European Council is at stake. We are worried, I must admit, by the mood of pessimism and scepticism which has spread through the European institutions in

## Mallet

recent weeks. Is the surprise that we were promised in Paris going to turn out to be an unwelcome one? I am inclined to remind our government leaders of the message that the Comte de Saint-Simon asked his valet to repeat to him each morning: 'Wake up, Monsieur le Comte, you have great deeds to accomplish today'.

The European Council meeting in Milan provides the opportunity, perhaps a unique opportunity, to make decisive progress towards the European Union. Let us hope that it is not going to be missed.

**Mr Delors, President of the Commission.** — (FR) Madam President, with permission from the President-in-Office of the Council, I should like very briefly to clear up a couple of points. I have my friend Mr Herman to thank for the opportunity.

There have been three or four speeches in which implied criticisms have been made of the Commission on two points. First: 'In proposing such ambitious projects as the enlarged market and the Europe of technology, you are distracting the attention of the European Council from the central issue, which is the institutional issue, and giving those who are reluctant to discuss it excuses for not doing so'. Secondly: 'The Commission has no ideas on the institutional issue or, if it has, it is keeping them to itself'.

I wish to reply to these two criticisms.

First of all, how can it be thought inappropriate or distracting of the Commission to have carried out the very important work aimed at translating the enlarged market into reality and creating a Europe of technology?

Ladies and gentlemen, the life of the Community involves more than simply holding an historic or dramatic summit meeting from time to time. It is a task which goes on every single day, a task involving everyone. The life of the Community is also a matter of honouring the pledges given by the Commission on the occasion of the investiture debate. Among these, we put special emphasis on four points: the enlarged market, achievement of economic competitiveness by making up the technological leeway, monetary cooperation, and convergence of our economies. The fact is — and I could illustrate this for you whenever you like — that the differences among the Member States on the last two of these points (monetary cooperation and economic convergence) are so great that the Commission would have been wasting its time making proposals.

We therefore addressed ourselves, doing a great deal of work in a short time, to the two objectives which you considered very important at the time. Although our proposals for scientific and technological cooperation had aroused very little interest at the Brussels European Council, it was only a few days later that the dossier came back to us in a blaze of publicity, because others, outside Europe, had set the scene.

Who, then, could criticize us for having seized this opportunity to present our proposals for laying the foundations for a real technological community?

Secondly, how can the thought that has gone into the institutional aspects of these two proposals be considered a waste of time? When you have had an opportunity to examine them, you will acknowledge that, having proposed two policies, one on the enlarged market and the other on technology, in two separate papers, we indicate the institutional means required. In each case it is clearly demonstrated that the task cannot be undertaken with all the necessary vigour and efficiency within the narrow limitations imposed by the existing Treaty.

That is a demonstration based on facts. This is the most convincing kind.

Thirdly, I have explained to President Andreotti that it was the Commission's express wish that these two proposals should not be discussed on the first day of the conference, since the first day should be given over to a discussion announced by the Heads of State or Government themselves, on two straightforward questions: how far do we want to go together and how do we intend to get there? The two proposals presented by the Commission must under no circumstances be allowed to overshadow this discussion, which will take place because the Italian presidency has made up its mind that it will. However, the difficulty that the Italian presidency is having to contend with, which several of you have dismissed rather lightly, if I may say so, is that the differences among the Member States over the *affectus societatis*, over what we want to do, are much greater than you are suggesting. In the interests of clear debate, it would be desirable if you defined your position for the benefit of all concerned. This at any rate is what we for our part are inviting the governments to do. For instance, one cannot on the one hand claim to be in favour of enlargement and on the other now refuse to apply the three key principles of the Treaty — unity of the market, financial solidarity and Community preference — to the enlarged Community.

That is the central difficulty. There must therefore be a frank discussion, and we shall then see who wants to do what. At all events, our two proposals will not come until after this major, essential debate.

Finally, when this debate is held the lessons are drawn from it, the Commission, or at least the President of the Commission will reaffirm that he is personally in favour of a treaty on European union. He will have proposals to make on the two essential points: improving the efficiency of the process of decision-making and action, and involving Parliament more closely in this process. However, this is easier said than done. I shall be proposing solutions which reconcile greater efficiency with greater democracy. As yet I have

**Delors**

neither heard nor read many realistic proposals for attaining this twin objective.

It may be thought that the Commission is showing little sign of life to the outside world. But what is happening to us is just the same as what happened to the previous Commission. Over the past four months we have, I believe, done good work: we have helped to advance the enlargement process; I have been able to secure adoption of a proposal on integrated Mediterranean programmes; we have achieved progress on the environment and on steel; for the first time we have had a discussion on the future of coal. All the Heads of Government whom I have seen have congratulated us. But as soon as I raise my voice, some people — only some — criticize us for it.

It is therefore necessary to appreciate the conditions under which the Commission has to operate. Believe me, I said it at the very first and I repeat it today, if we had started our term with four or five 'critical successes', we should have been happy, we could have gone home satisfied. But would there have been any concrete achievement? It is better to look at the work done, the progress achieved in the past few months. And I take it that everyone will take satisfaction from the knowledge that there are on the table concrete proposals holding out the prospect of progress for Europe.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The vote on the four motions for resolutions will be taken at the next voting time.<sup>1</sup>

### 5. Question Time

**President.** — The next item is the first part of Question Time (Doc. B 2-407/85). We begin with the questions to the Council.

Question No 1, by Mrs Lenz (H-201/85), which has been taken over by Mrs Crawley:<sup>2</sup>

Subject: Nairobi World Conference in July 1985 ending the Decade for Women

1. Can the Council indicate the attitude it will adopt at that Conference with regard to the critical examination and assessment of the progress made and difficulties encountered in achieving the aims and objectives of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace, and with regard to the three subsidiary topics of employment, health and education, bearing in mind the directives given by the World Conference of International Women's year held in Mexico and by the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women held in Copenhagen?

2. Can the Council also indicate the attitude it will adopt at that Conference with regard to the implementing strategies for the future aiming at improving the situation of women in society by the year 2000 and specific measures to overcome the obstacles to the achievement of the aims and objectives of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace, and to the implementation of the recommendations concerning the subsidiary topics of employment, health and education, bearing in mind the international Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade and the establishment of a new international economic order?

**Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council.** — *(IT)* The Community has not yet adopted a formal position with regards to participation in the Nairobi Conference.

We are collecting together the necessary views, and, following the system of debate within the organs of the Community it will be possible for us to adopt a position as soon as we have in our possession the text of the communication that we have been promised by the Commission.

**Mrs Crawley (S).** — I wish to pursue the second part of the question further. In order that lip-service is paid to implementing future strategies for women, how will the President-in-Office persuade the Council of Ministers on 13 June to do all in their power to adopt the following long-overdue policies affecting millions of European women: equal treatment for men and women in occupational social-security schemes; equal treatment for men and women in self-employed occupations, including agricultural work, parental leave and leave for family reasons; voluntary part-time work, temporary work and reduction and reorganization of working-time?

Further to that, with regard to women in developing countries, will the President-in-Office ensure that the Council insists that any existing form of discrimination in law in those countries, such as dowries, disposal of property and custody of children, will be eliminated?

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* I think that in Milan — seeing that the Summit will only last for 2 days — it will not

<sup>1</sup> For the announcement of subjects to be taken for the topical and urgent debate, see Minutes.

<sup>2</sup> Former oral question with debate (0-10/85), converted into a question for Question-Time.

**Andreotti**

be possible for us to dwell specifically on these problems. I have noted all the requests. The Council will be able to deal with them in another way.

I think, moreover, that if — as I hope, and as we shall do everything in our power to ensure — we are able in Milan to adopt positive resolutions on the problems on the agenda, this will be very useful for both men and women, without distinction.

**Mrs Cinciari Rodano (COM).** — *(IT)* I should like to ask the President of the Council a supplementary question.

There are a very great number of draft Directives regarding the situation of women in the Community. I am referring to the questions of part-time working, parental leave, equality of treatment for social security purposes, and equality for self-employed women workers.

Does not the President of the Council consider that the Community would be in a better position at Nairobi if, at the next Council on Social Affairs, these directives were adopted by the Council?

My second question. Does the President of the Council intend to put down, as a matter for the joint consideration of the Community's delegation to Nairobi, the question of a clear declaration against apartheid, which so clearly hits South African women?

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* The majority of the questions raised by Mrs Cinciari Rodano are being examined by the Council of Ministers of Labour. This Council is due to meet on 21 June, and I will make a point of hastening the examination of these questions.

**Mrs Tongue (S).** — Can we have the assurance of the President-in-Office of the Council that it will in fact be ministers that attend the meeting in Nairobi and not simply male civil servants?

I would like to ask the Council what course it intends to steer at the conference in Nairobi in order to concentrate on the problems of equality, employment, health and education rather than allowing the conference to get bogged down in the East-West conflict, which is in fact insoluble in this forum.

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* We shall also recommend governments to send delegations at the highest level possible. I can confirm that the Italian delegation fully meets this description.

**Mr Pannella (NI).** — *(IT)* Madam President, it is only now that we realise that there will not be, or there apparently will not be, any reply to the debate

that we had earlier, by the President of the Council of Ministers. I should only like it to be quite clear, Madam President — and I hope you will forgive me — that I do not think that this can be put down to any refusal by Parliament to change its timetable if necessary, since a reply from a President of the Council is the natural, parliamentary conclusion to a debate such as we have had today.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, as I understand you, you are asking Mr Andreotti to reply to the debate that we had earlier. I have had no request for the President-in-Office to make that reply. Mr Delors spoke on behalf of the Commission and we have now moved on to another item on the agenda, so this is not the time to raise that matter. If you have any complaint, perhaps you will put it in writing to the President of the Parliament.

**Mr Pannella (NI).** — *(IT)* Put like that, in fact, the question is unexceptionable. It is the President of the Council that decided not to reply — there is no question of our not having allowed him to.

**President** — Mr Pannella, I would point out that I have given you an answer on behalf of the Parliament and I hope that you will be satisfied with that answer. If you wish to make any complaint on the conduct of this sitting, would you kindly write to the President of the Parliament? We are now in the middle of Question-Time and I hope we can get on with it.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE).** — *(NL)* The Nairobi conference was preceded by two other conferences, one in Mexico in 1975, the other in Copenhagen in 1980, and I attended both of them. At both conferences an address was given on behalf of the Council of Ministers, in which it was announced that good progress had been made in the European Community. In 1980, three directives of which the Council could be justly proud were adopted, but we now find that decisions have yet to be taken on five directives. How can the Council give a positive address in Nairobi before developing countries when it is unable to adopt legislation in its own territory? On Monday, we heard Mr De Michelis say that the Council of Social Ministers will not be approving any directives at its next meeting. Mr President, how do you intend solving this problem in Nairobi?

**Mr Andreotti** — *(IT)* I think the best proof of the need to alter our way of working and make both institutional and structural changes is the fact that a very great many resolutions are still pending in the files. Otherwise, there is a danger that we will become a filing body, rather than one that makes decisions.

With regard to the remark made by Mr Pannella, if he does make a written complaint I shall be glad if it can

**Andreotti**

be brought to my attention, so that I, too, can explain that there is no question of my having been refused the opportunity to speak: I have simply kept to your timetable. If I had not done so, I should have been taken to task, perhaps by Mr Pannella himself, for not having answered questions at Question-Time.

**President** — I hope that Mr Pannella, whom I am happy to see in the Chamber although not in his seat, will have heard and taken note of the reply of the President-in-Office.

Question No 2, by Mr Ford (H-108/85):

Subject: Replies to questions for written answers

Can the Council detail the average time in days per year taken to reply to questions put down for written answer over the past five years? Can they indicate the number of questions for each year that have not been answered over the same period?

**Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (IT) Our rule is to endeavour to reply within the time allowed by the Rules of Procedure.

According to the information given me by the departments, 1135 questions were asked over a five-year period. The number of replies given is almost identical. I should like to point out that the procedure for obtaining the necessary information is somewhat complex. For the Council's part, we will endeavour as far as possible to speed up the procedure so as to be able to provide replies not only within the two months allowed under our Rules of Procedure, but if possible sooner, seeing that they are frequently problems of an urgent nature.

**Mr Ford (S).** — I would like at least to comment in the sense that my question was not actually answered. There were two specific parts to my question which had been accepted by the tabling office, the first of which was to detail the average time in days taken to reply to questions put down for written answer — and those Members present will be aware that that part has not been answered — and the second was to indicate the number of questions in each year that have not been answered over the same period. We have been told by the President-in-Office that, in fact, almost all of the questions have been answered. Will he tell us exactly how many questions have not been answered in that period of time? Can he give us the time in days? As a Member here who is dubious of the value of consensus politics, I rarely speak with a majority of this Parliament behind me, but from conversations I have been having with Members of this Parliament over a period of time I think that on this question there is probably almost unanimous agreement that the amount of time it takes for us to get written answers is

far from satisfactory. In my own case some are almost historical archive material by the time I get an answer! So may I ask whether urgent and serious measures will be taken to try and improve the record of answering questions and, at the same time, can I have an answer to my question itself?

**Mr Andreotti.** — (IT) I must say that, if I were in the position of the member who asked this question, I, too, would express my dissatisfaction with the reply. I will, however, undertake to have prepared a written statement showing, year by year, the number of questions asked, the number of replies given, and the number for which replies are still pending. It will give me great pleasure to read this, and I will send a copy to the member who asked the question.

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — The President-in-Office has said that the procedures are complicated and must be speeded up. Would he accept that while making these procedures less complicated and more speedy he must also do away with the practice of circulating the answer around the Member States in order to arrive at the most anodyne common denominator that they can find between them? All this makes many Members of this House wonder whether the effort of tabling the question and the delay they have to go through in waiting for the answer makes it worthwhile when they get an answer of any sort at all?

**Mr Andreotti.** — (IT) I would like to say that this is a matter that is the subject of the same complaints in our own parliament — I do not know about the others.

As I said earlier, since I wish to be able to provide an exact answer, year by year, I will undertake to do this in the next few days, with the assistance of the offices concerned. I cannot give a figure off the top of my head.

**Mr Ford (S).** — On a point of order, Madam President, I would like to ask you to refer to the Quaestors the fact that we are not getting answers to our questions. This question was tabled in good time, yet no attempt has been made actually to answer the question as set down. Truly we are wasting our time here. Can I ask that the Quaestors, or the appropriate authorities in Parliament, have a word with the President-in-Office of the Council?

**President.** — Mr Ford, that is, as you fully realize, not a point of order. The best way for you to deal with this is to write directly to the President of Parliament with your complaint so that it will come before the Bureau and can be considered by the Bureau and the Quaestors.

Question No 3, by Mrs Lemass (H-98/85):

**President**

Subject: Meeting of EEC Health Ministers to discuss the drug problem.

Following the informal meeting of EEC Health Ministers on 29 November last, it was stated that the Health Ministers had given a commitment to hold further meetings at ministerial level and that the first such meeting should take place in the first half of 1985.

Will the Council now indicate when it proposes to convene such a meeting for detailed discussion on the problem of the increase in drug abuse, and will it also give a commitment to reach decisions on EEC action without further delay?

**Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (IT) The meeting at which the Health Ministers examined the question of drug abuse took place in Venice on 3 and 4 May. There was unanimous concern, accompanied by the desire to pool all resources and experience in an attempt to tackle this scourge of modern times. In addition, support was reiterated for the international agencies that deal with this sector, particularly the United Nations International Narcotics Control Board in Vienna.

**Mrs Lemass (RDE).** — I have had that same reply on more than one occasion in this House. Would the Council agree that following the sensational report presented to the British Prime Minister, which stated that drugs were the most serious peace-time threat facing Britain, and the report published recently in Vienna by the United Nations International Narcotics Control Board, which described the situation in Europe as 'grim and deteriorating', ruthless and draconian measures must be implemented without delay in all the Member States to combat this menace?

Will the Council consider initiating such proposals without further delay? I am not at all satisfied that this problem is being tackled in a satisfactory way, and I am very disappointed that I receive the same answer each time there is a meeting of Health Ministers. I honestly believe that they have not gone one inch further in the last 12 months, and the situation is becoming desperately serious in all the Member States. Would they please do something immediately?

**Mr Andreotti.** — (IT) I would ask Mrs Lemass not to be disappointed, because she asked a very precise question: she asked whether the undertaking given by the Health Ministers on 29 November 1984 to hold further meetings had been met, and I replied that these ministers held their meeting on 3 and 4 May. For her peace of mind I can however add that we share her very great concern over this problem, and we have co-ordinated the work not only of the Health Ministers but of the Ministers of Justice and the Ministers of the Interior.

There have been *ad hoc* meetings of these Ministers, so as to be able to draw up a global programme, because it is a subject that involves not only the Health Ministers but, clearly, questions of law and public safety, monitoring at the frontiers, etc. The Council is therefore very much in touch with the overall picture, and has given it its closest attention in recent months.

**Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED).** — Will the President-in-Office accept that there has been a vast increase in the drug trade throughout Europe and indeed the world and that it is still increasing? What he said is satisfactory as far as it goes, but what is needed is further action. Will he consider, for example, setting up a European narcotics bureau which could achieve much better coordination than is at present the case? At the moment most police chiefs say they cannot cope with the trafficking which is going on, not only in Europe but at the source where the drugs come from.

**Mr Andreotti.** — (IT) I can say that in addition to the meetings, especially of the Ministers of the Interior, on this subject, we have attempted to work in two directions. Firstly, we have endeavoured to improve very considerably contacts with the United States Government on this question, because there are agencies there that are specialized in dealing with this problem, which is of course very considerable.

The other aspect that we have also followed very closely is the question of aid to the special Control Board in Vienna. With quite considerable aid from some of our Member States the Board has been able to step up its work, which is aimed at convincing the peasants in a number of nations — particularly Bolivia, Colombia, Peru and Burma — to change their way of life and grow maize and other forms of grain instead of opium-bearing plants. It is a very hard battle, because those whose interests are involved react strongly. In recent months there have also been a great many deaths amongst these peasants through attempts to intimidate them, but it is an approach that is being attempted because, if the production of opium-bearing products and products that are converted into drugs can be very considerably reduced at the source, we shall have undoubtedly found one of the most effective ways to fight this scourge.

**Mr Cryer (S).** — Would the President-in-Office accept that we are faced here with two apparently irreconcilable propositions? One is that all internal barriers inside the Common Market should be removed, including customs barriers. The other is that something drastic must be done about the drug trade, about which the President-in-Office has expressed his concern very clearly today. Does he accept that monitoring at national frontiers, which is the phrase that he used, necessarily involves the retention of customs barriers if we are to crack down on the drug trade?

**Cryer**

Amsterdam, for example, is reputedly the biggest centre of the drug trade. Those people therefore in the so-called Kangaroo group who want to leap across frontiers are absolutely absurd in their aims, because we shall have to have this continuing scrutiny if we are concerned about the welfare of our people.

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* I do not think that our aim of having a single, external frontier for the Community is irreconcilable with the need for caution and care where possible drug-traffickers are concerned. Moreover, I think that a considerable part of the drug traffic does not travel through normal channels, and that this process of easing controls at the frontiers within the Community — which I consider to be a very desirable thing — will not weaken our defences where the drug traffic is concerned. We have to create a stronger, increasingly more specialized system, with contacts with the various bodies that are concerned with this problem in other countries on both sides of the ocean, and this will work for, rather than hinder, the just hope of being able to eliminate the concept of national frontiers within the Community.

**President.** — Question No 4, by Mr Cottrell (H-111/85):

Subject: Bull-fighting in Spain and Portugal

Is the Council aware that the highly sensitive and emotional issue of bull-fighting is bound to pose serious difficulties for both Spain and Portugal on assuming full membership of the European Communities? Would it not have been better to consider the implications of this issue during the accession negotiations, based on the virtual certainty that a proposal to ban bull-fighting on grounds of cruelty will emanate from the European Parliament in the very near future? What will the Council's reaction be to such a proposal?

**Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council.** — *(IT)* I think that, truly, the question of bullfights is not one with which we should really be concerning ourselves. I must say that, if we had had this problem as well, the difficulties that we already had in connection with fisheries, wine and a great many other things would perhaps have become insurmountable. I do not think that we should be doing the image of Europe very much good if, on the eve of the signing of the Treaty of Accession, we told the Spaniards that they have to abolish bullfighting. Let us leave this to the fullness of time, without including this problem amongst the real problems of the Community, because, in all truth, have we not also seen that sometimes it is not bulls that cause trouble at sporting events, but men?

**Mr Cottrell (ED).** — We have had a reference already during this Question Time to the anodyne

nature of some of the Council's replies to our questions. Sad to say, this is yet another example, although perhaps the Council has read the political signposts clearly, because the President-in-Office has admitted that raising the question of bull-fighting *would* have caused political difficulties over Spain and Portugal joining the Community.

The question of animal welfare is becoming an increasingly potent political issue in this Community, and neither the President-in-Office nor the Commission nor any Member of this European Parliament can ignore it. It is a certainty that pressure will be brought on Spain and Portugal to end what can only be described as a system of mediaeval torture of animals akin to bull-baiting, cock-fighting, dog-fighting, all banned — yes, and fox-hunting too.

The last part of the question is the important one, since there is going to be a proposal from this Parliament. What will the reaction of the Council be? Many people outside this Parliament will listen very carefully indeed, as indeed shall I, to what you now say.

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* I think that one can commit many sins of omission, but this is not an omission. You are entitled to your opinion regarding bullfighting, just as I am entitled to mine. Moreover bullfighting in Spain is different from bullfighting in Portugal, because in Spain the bull is killed, whereas in Portugal it is attracted away by a cow; at least, that is the procedure as I understand it.

At all events, you have said that there will be proposals submitted and when that happens they will be examined by the presidency that is then in office.

IN THE CHAIR: MR DIDÒ

*Vice-President*

**Mr P. Beazley (ED).** — If any proposal does come up on the subject of bull-fighting, could we make a clear distinction between Portuguese and Spanish bull-fighting, because they are completely different? In Portugal, the traditional form of bull-fighting is on horseback and the bull is not killed. There is an umpire and a trumpeter, but I will not go into the details. However, before we have to consider this in any further detail, I would be grateful if the Council and the Commission would acquaint themselves thoroughly with the details of the matter.

**Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC).** — *(FR)* Does not the President-in-Office think that, before handing out lessons to others, we should perhaps be putting our own houses in order and dealing with fox hunting in Eng-

**Roelants du Vivier**

land, trapping in Belgium and turtle-dove shooting in France? In this vein, does not the President-in-Office consider that the most important point is whether Spain and Portugal are committed to complying with the European regulations on the environment and wildlife conservation?

**Mr Andreotti.** — (*IT*) As far as our regulations on the environment are concerned, it is clear that those countries who are candidates for accession have accepted the *acquis communautaire* and they will therefore be expected to observe the regulations. As regards a more detailed, wider ranging control — one that would be kinder to animals in general — we can discuss that at the proper time, when there are proper proposals before us.

I do not think that here, this evening, we can go into this, and it would be difficult for me to say whether, if the role of the *banderillero* is lawful, then so is that of the *picador*, or whether it is only the *matador* that should be banned. I am totally unqualified to speak on this subject. I do however appreciate people's sensibilities where animals are concerned, and I also understand the comparative difficulties that have been pointed out. Personally, I am a very simple man. I love cats which, fortunately, do not present problems of this kind.

**President.** — Question No 5, by Mrs Jackson (H-123/85):

Subject: Draft regulation on designations of milk and milk products

Can the Council state what consideration it has given to this regulation in its working-parties and in the full Council meetings, and whether consideration has been given to the European Parliament's recommendations contained in its report adopted on 15 February 1985?

**Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (*IT*) It cannot be said that the Community is not very much concerned about milk and butter: on the contrary, if a file were kept, it would be seen that this is one of the subjects to which most attention is given. The proposal of the Commission to which the honourable member refers has been discussed on a number of occasions by the Council's working parties and by the full Council, and the European Parliament's recommendations have been taken into account. No final decision has however yet been reached. The Council has examined the problem within the framework of the proposals on prices and related measures for the 1985–1986 milk and milk products campaign, and has adopted the following position: the Council asks the Commission to examine the question that was raised regarding the freedom to develop certain products to replace milk, in view of the imposition of a

quota on the production of milk and milk products, and to submit, if necessary, appropriate complementary proposals so as to allow the Council to come to a decision by 1 April 1986.

**Mrs Jackson (ED).** — It is only with great difficulty that I can bring myself to thank the President-in-Office for that reply, which was not very helpful. I am interested that he should say that the Council took account of the European Parliament's opinion on this draft regulation. If it really took account of our opinion on the draft regulation, it would have changed its shape entirely, because this was an issue where the Parliament was in favour of an amendment to an existing directive and rejected the regulation out of hand. So I do hope that the Council is indeed taking account of what we have said.

My question is that it is extremely difficult for this Parliament to follow what happens in the Council. Would the President-in-Office not agree that there is a case for our having a period in every part-session where the Council reports to Parliament on action taken and on discussions under way in the Council, on the model of that period which we are to have tomorrow afternoon where the Commission will report on the action it has taken on our opinions? If we do not have this from the Council, quite honestly we have no opportunity whatsoever of following up.

**Mr Andreotti.** — (*IT*) There are some matters that have a certain technical character: when we say 'the Council' we know that, in reality, there are different Councils of Ministers for different sectors. In this case, we are talking about the Council of Ministers of Agriculture. I am in principle in favour of everything that can be done by working together for the more effective, more timely exchange of information. We have to examine how we are to implement this in practice.

**Mrs Banotti (PPE).** — Would the President-in-Office not agree that given that there were such misunderstandings and misapprehensions about this regulation, for instance in both my own country and in Britain, people believed that it would outlaw such well-known and well-loved products as cream crackers and cream sherry simply because they were known traditionally by these designations? Would he not also agree — and in this I am very happy to back my colleague Mrs Jackson — that it would be a very good idea for the Council of Ministers to report regularly to the Parliament, as she has suggested?

**Mr Andreotti.** — (*IT*) I repeat that, in principle, I am in favour of providing and having other people provide the necessary information. What we cannot do is provide, on the occasion of Question Time, with the relatively restricted time available, all the details concerning crackers and sherry. It should be mentioned in

**Andreotti**

passing that, at great expense of time and effort, we have defended the right to use the term 'British Sherry' in the negotiations with the Spaniards, so that you would have no worries on this account. I ought to have found a means of providing all the relevant technical details, but to do that one would need an encyclopaedic President-in-Office, and I do not know of one.

**Mr Welsh (ED).** — I think Mr Andreotti has made rather an important statement and I would like to press him a little further. In answer to Mrs Jackson, he said that he would favourably consider the idea of the Council reporting to Parliament on action it had taken on Parliament's proposals. Unfortunately, however, Mr Andreotti is an outgoing President. So can we have an assurance from the Italian presidency that they will ask the Luxembourg presidency to put this matter on the agenda of the next Council meeting and report to the Parliament appropriately?

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* When handing over to the Luxembourg President of the Council, I will pass on this request and this wish.

**President.** — Question No 6, by Mr Raftery (H-135/85):

Subject: New technology

Will the President-in-Office confirm that the Council will fully consider at the earliest possible opportunity the important Commission proposals on the reinforcement of the technological basis and the competitiveness of Community industry? Will he provide a timetable for their implementation?

**Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council.** — *(IT)* The Council is at present continuing to give maximum priority to measures to strengthen the technological basis and the competitiveness of Community industry. Some concrete proposals in regard to one of the six main objectives singled out by the Commission in its recent communication to the European Council are already being actively examined. For others, an immediate discussion is planned as soon as Parliament has expressed its opinion. Thus, for example, the new recommendations by the Commission on the question of standardization have given rise to an intensive work programme that is about to be concluded.

Whilst awaiting Parliament's opinion, the Council will start examining the RACE programme which, in the Commission's view, constitutes the first stage in the implementation of the industrial policy for advanced telecommunications. The same can be said of the proposals in regard to the field of biotechnology where medicaments are concerned, on which Parliament, again, must give its opinion.

The President of the Commission has informed the European Parliament and the Council of his institution's intention shortly to draw up an overall proposal to allow the Community to make a 'qualitative leap forward' where technology is concerned. He declared that, at present, there is a trend in favour of action and, for my part, I confirm the determination of the Presidency to achieve decisive progress in this sector. As we have heard, and as we all know, Milan should see the creation of instruments and the platform for effective rational progress in the field of technology.

**Mr Raftery (PPE).** — I am very happy to hear from the President-in-Office that this matter has been treated as a matter of urgency by the Council. I should like to know whether the Council will give consideration, in some way or other, to helping to commercialize the findings of research. Again and again we have heard in this House that the Japanese only spend half as much on research as we spend; yet we see their high-technology products swamping our markets. So I think we need to help companies commercialize research findings, either with seed capital or venture capital, and I am asking the President-in-Office whether the Council could give consideration to this very important matter.

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* Undoubtedly, the programmes for strengthening and supporting our industrial system include not only those regarding research and development, so as to keep products abreast of improvements that are being made in so many other parts of the world, but also those relating to the question of commercialization. We know — to keep to the example just given — the importance of a study on commercialization, in order to penetrate the Japanese market. We are in fact often faced, not with legal difficulties or impediments of an objective kind, but with the inability to have an adequate marketing structure. I think this is an essential aspect to which the Community must give careful attention.

**Mr Van Miert (S).** — *(NL)* Can you say what you think of the French Eureka project in this connection? What is your opinion on this?

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* I will give my opinion in capsule form, because otherwise I should have to hold a small conference. I think the usefulness of the project lies in two essential aspects. First of all, there is the disappointment which was felt in the last European Council when, at the presentation of a serious report by Jacques Delors, a position was adopted that was purely one of courteous attention, with the reservation that a more detailed study would be undertaken at a subsequent meeting of the same Council. But, in the meantime, the thing that made the study credible — that is to say, Jacques Delors' proposal to double expenditure on research — was immediately vetoed.

**Andreotti**

Now it is clear that, by not examining the study on its merits, and not agreeing to increase the funds for research, the European Council's answer was extremely disappointing. Within this framework, it seems to me that the French Government's EUREKA project is a positive new proposal for scientific research and technology, in which we have a common interest.

The other observation that I should like to make — and I shall limit what I have to say to these two points, because this is neither the time nor the place to go into the question in detail — regards the relationship between the EUREKA project and what we call the 'technological Community' — a term taken from the Dooge Report, which will be one of the documents that the Commission will submit for the European Council in Milan. It is a problem that is still in the discussion stage. I think, however, that we can perhaps sum up as follows what I consider to be the right attitude — namely that EUREKA, whilst not being an institution of the Community, must however be an institution in the Community. I think that it is along these lines that we have to build our positive answer to a need that cannot be postponed for six months at a time, unless we want the suicide of our entire industrial structure.

**Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED).** — Would the President-in-Office accept that that is one of the more encouraging replies we have heard on this subject? However, at the end of the day it comes down to whether the funds are going to be available or whether the Council in Milan or wherever will take the necessary steps to provide the funds to do this, and also indeed to keep the control within the Community.

**Mr Andreotti.** — (IT) I think it is essential for funds to be available, and I think that we could all make a very great effort to convince the governments along these lines. Perhaps Sir James, for his part, could make the same useful attempt to convince his government.

**Mrs Viehoff (S).** — (NL) On the subject of the possible participation of European firms in the SDI programme, Dutch newspapers have strangely reported that the Commission has already invested 4.5m guilders in the optical computer project and that American firms are gratefully making use of this money. Is that what European research money is intended for? We are constantly concerned about our competitive position. I certainly do not consider it a good thing for the Commission's research money — and 4.5m guilders is quite a sum, considering how difficult we sometimes find it to have small amounts allocated to research projects — to be benefiting the Americans, if that is the case.

**Mr Andreotti.** — (IT) When projects are prepared for EUREKA or for the technological Community — and

I hope that will be soon, because otherwise there is a danger of being overtaken by other initiatives — account will naturally be taken, since funds are not unlimited, of the need to concentrate on the most effective sectors and projects, and not to duplicate what has already been done elsewhere. As for the rest, the whole question of the American ADS project is still very open, and needs examining in close detail; for that reason, it would be inappropriate to attempt that this evening.

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (GR) I would like to ask a supplementary question concerning the second answer that the Acting President of Council gave about the 'Eureka' plan. I would like to ask: What guarantees exist at this time that the plan in question operates exclusively for peaceful purposes and does not also include sectors of military production, and secondly, to what extent is it a plan that competes with the efforts of the United States rather than supplementing them, because a few days ago Americans responsible for the strategic initiative on defence declared that with the 'Eureka' plan, European countries could certainly contribute to the satisfaction of the United States' demand for the development of space-wars technology.

**Mr Andreotti.** — (IT) Firm plans for EUREKA have still not been established, and it would therefore be difficult to offer an opinion, because they have not yet been announced. I hope they will be very soon, because of the very real urgency that I mentioned previously.

As far as the 'purpose' of the project is concerned — whether it is for civilian or military purposes — I think that 'purpose' is a term that concerns a set of projects and research taken altogether, but that individual research is almost always of a mixed character. Is research in the computer field, that is designed to increase the working speed from ten million operations a minute to forty million operations a minute, in itself military or civilian research? Undoubtedly it is both at the same time. I would add, with a few everyday examples, that other research in the past — space research, for example, putting men into space — has produced a whole lot of civilian 'fall-out'. The watches with their red figures that we have all seen spreading through the markets everywhere, or coffee in pills, are the 'fall-out' from chapters in a space programme that was originally designed to put man into space. It is difficult to say whether the coffee or the watches are for a military or a spatial application. I think therefore that it is still very difficult to make such a distinction. What matters is that the overall purpose of our research programmes should be civilian in character, because that is the direction in which we are moving.

**President.** — Question No 7, by Mr Van Miert (H-651/84):

**President**

Subject: Severe smog in Western Europe

In January 1985, Belgium and the Ruhr, amongst other areas, were for several days affected by one of the most persistent forms of air pollution ever recorded. On 16 November 1984, the European Parliament passed resolutions in favour of European directives on air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide and the limitation of emissions of pollutants from large combustion plants. Why were these two draft directives not approved at the meeting of the Council of Ministers for the Environment in December, and when is the Council going to take a decision on them?

**Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council.** — *(IT)* On the basis of the opinion expressed by Parliament on this subject, the Council adopted the directive concerning air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide in the session on 7 March 1985 devoted to the environment. This directive fixes the maximum concentration of nitrogen dioxide in the air, which Member States must observe. It also sets indicative levels for reference purposes for certain specific zones determined by Member States.

With regard to the draft directive on the limitation of emissions of pollutants from large combustion plants, work is actively continuing within the Council, particularly on the basis of the modified proposal presented by the Commission, on which the Parliament is preparing an opinion.

The Council is aware of the importance that the Parliament attaches to the proposal, but because of its far-reaching potential effects and its financial repercussions in particular, I cannot at the moment indicate how long it will be before the directive can be adopted. The Council, which is very concerned with the fight against pollution of the air, concentrated its work during the two sessions held in March on another major source of pollution — exhaust gases emitted from motor vehicles. It made considerable progress on this subject towards a Community system, and agreed in particular to translate that progress into law as soon as possible. The presidency will do all it can to see that the necessary regulations are adopted at the meeting of the Council on the Protection of the Environment which is set for the end of this month. I should like to emphasize how very important these conclusions are for the Community, from both the economic and the ecological standpoints.

**Mr Van Miert (S).** — *(NL)* What I should also like to ask you is whether the Italian Presidency intends to make a special effort in connection with the second directive, which has yet to be adopted. Can we assume that this second directive will be approved some time this year?

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* I have not sufficient information available to enable me to reply to this question. I can take note of what you have said, and bring it to the urgent attention of the competent person.

**Mr Sherlock (ED).** — Cannot the President-in-Office, in view of the extremely limited area which suffered this most distressing phenomenon, feel in his soul and conscience that it is attributable more to local effects than to long-range, long-term and long-distance effects? Does he, in fact, not feel that the Ruhr Valley itself conspired towards its own distressing days and that, for example, the 70% increase in sulphur emissions made by his own nation in the years between 1970 and 1980 is hardly even relevant to the topic?

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* The opinions that he asks for presuppose scientific knowledge of the subject, if one is to give a valid answer. I only graduated in law, and that was 44 years ago, so that even in that field I should perhaps not be at my best. Not to mention a question such as this, on which it is certainly not possible to improvise.

**Mrs Weber (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, do you have answers available for the other questions on today's agenda, some of which relate to the same matter? You yourself have pointed out that pollution by nitrogen dioxide is not only caused by large-scale incinerators but also by motor vehicles. The Council has discussed this. I would therefore like to refer you to question No. 23 and to ask you whether the Council had any information on the effects of nitrogen dioxide pollution and how it was able on the basis of a lack of information to make proposals on what should be done by the Community?

What figures did the Council have on pollution by nitrogen dioxide? It sounded as if there was no information, so that I am somewhat surprised at your reply.

**President.** — Mrs Weber, you will receive a reply in writing.

**Mrs Weber (S).** — *(DE)* Why, Mr President? I protest: the President-in-Office has just pointed out the connection between these two subjects, and I am asking him for the figures he has for nitric oxide.

**President.** — Mrs Weber, as I have just said, you will receive a reply in writing.

**Mrs Schleicher (PPE).** — *(DE)* Since we are discussing the regulation on large-scale incinerators, I would like to ask the President of the Council whether he is aware that both the Commission and the Council

**Schleicher**

asked for urgent debate of this topic by the European Parliament last autumn, so that this directive could be adopted as soon as possible. Given that the Council asked for urgent procedure last year, I would like also to ask whether this matter has become any less urgent and whether the Council President feels that further discussion is permissible. If the matter is in fact still urgent, I would like to ask the Council President when he intends to exert pressure on the Council to reach a decision.

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* I will undertake to look into this question and give an answer in writing.

**Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S).** — *(NL)* In its report on nitrogen dioxide and air pollution caused by sulphur, Parliament urged the Council to have talks with the East European countries, because one of the sources of air pollution in Western Europe is heavy industry in Eastern Europe. Has the Council had any such talks?

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* On this point also, in order to give as objective and well-documented a reply as possible, I shall have to give it in writing.

**President.** — We proceed to the questions addressed to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — Mr President, on a point of order, in Question Time today we have discussed a total of seven questions. Six of them were questions that appeared on the agenda for previous part-sessions and were referred to today's agenda because they were not reached. We have had one new question tabled today and that, we are told, we cannot have an answer to because it is to be given in writing. I fully understand the reasons for this, but can we refer to the Bureau and to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions the whole question of how we conduct Question Time because the progress we make is totally unsatisfactory?

The question are much too long-winded and the answers even more so.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Mr Tomlinson, the matter is being examined in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure. As regards the distribution of time in relation to the questions, it was decided earlier today that at 7.45 p.m. we should proceed to the questions addressed to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* I should like to be quite clear about this last remark because, if I am asked whether

agreements are under way, or contact has been established with the countries of Eastern Europe, to investigate this pollution, I have the right and the duty to call for the necessary information and answer in writing. I certainly cannot improvise or answer off the top of my head.

If, on the other hand, the remark was of a more general nature, then, since there are still a number of questions unanswered because of lack of time, I should like to say that, if it does not upset your timetable, I am perfectly prepared to stay here — although I have to leave for Lisbon, I can perfectly well leave an hour later — to answer all the questions on the agenda.

**President.** — On behalf of the House, I thank the President-in-Office for placing himself at our disposal. Nevertheless, since there are a large number of questions left, devoting an extra hour to them today would not resolve the fundamental problem. This is being studied by the parliamentary Committee on the Rules of Procedure, which will have to take a decision on the matter.

I therefore propose, as already announced, that we proceed to the questions addressed to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

Question No 39, by Mr Hutton (H-4/85):

Subject: Chemical weapon disarmament

To what extent have the Foreign Ministers of the Ten taken a common political position on the proposals from the United Kingdom and the United States on chemical-weapon disarmament within the Conference on Disarmament, bearing in mind that the United Kingdom stopped producing chemical weapons in 1956, that the United States stopped producing chemical weapons in 1969 and holds only a small and ageing stock, that NATO holds no stocks and that the Soviet Union holds very large stocks estimated at a minimum of 300 000 tonnes of nerve gas?

**Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council of Foreign Ministers.** — *(IT)* We have on a number of occasions expressed our approval for the banning of chemical weapons, and our readiness to speed up the negotiations that are taking place. We consider that this has become even more urgent following the use of chemical weapons in the conflict that is going on between Iraq and Iran, which shows that the problem, far from being a purely theoretical one, is also, and above all, a practical problem. I may add that, in all of our discussions on the subject, there has never been any disagreement. It is our firm intention to contribute as effectively as possible to the conclusion of a treaty for a total ban on chemical weapons.

**Mr Hutton (ED).** — In view of the willingness of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation to see the speeding up of negotiations, could the President-in-Office say whether they have considered taking any joint steps on behalf of the Foreign Ministers of the Ten, rather than only supporting those taken by the United Kingdom and the United States?

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* So far we have not discussed any independent proposal on the part of the Ten, but we have shown our firm determination, and full agreement, in supporting proposals designed to achieve as quickly as possible a total ban on chemical weapons.

**Mr Elliott (S).** — With regard to this desperately important matter of chemical weapon disarmament, have the Foreign Ministers studied, not only the small and aging stocks to which the question refers, but also the serious consideration being given in governmental and military circles in the United States, Britain and possibly other NATO countries to the development of so-called binary chemical-weapon systems, in which you have two chemicals, each of them innocuous in itself when separated but capable of being combined to form a lethal chemical weapon at the point of use? These proposed new weapons open up a very serious new threat to the well-being of humanity, and I would like to know whether these have been included in the discussions of the Foreign Ministers.

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* My answer to that is that they have. When we had to examine together the undertakings not to supply arms to countries at war — precisely for the fear that chemical weapons would be used — we very definitely included the supply of chemicals that may be considered innocuous in themselves but which can be combined in some form or other to become chemical weapons.

The problem is therefore having our attention, and we share the questioner's concern.

**Mr Bonde (ARC).** — *(DA)* I understand from the answer of the President-in-Office that matters such as arms reduction, arms control and confidence-building measures are now subjects which can be discussed within the framework of European political cooperation.

I should like to ask the President-in-Office to specify in more detail what is covered by the new definition of security policy which was discussed at the meeting in Stresa last weekend. Where does the dividing line lie which separates off the military aspects, and what are the practical implications of the progression from the earlier definition of the political and economic aspects of security policy to the broader application of the security concept? Can the President-in-Office give a

few examples of questions which do not fall within the scope of European political cooperation in this area?

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* There are two separate questions: one is the general question of the extent of the Community's competence where security is concerned. Moreover, in the Committee on Political Affairs of the European Parliament, questions have often been raised regarding security problems. According to established practice, therefore, the political aspects of security problems — not their technical and military aspects — are matters of common concern, and, as such, are the subject of political consultation amongst us.

When, for example, it is decided not to provide military supplies for a particular country, we have of necessity to make a detailed analysis to ensure that materials are not supplied that, even if they are not of a military character, could be used for military purposes, especially for chemical warfare. I explained this earlier.

**President.** — Question No 40, by Mr Chambeiron (H-7/85):

Subject: Activities of Nazi war criminals

What steps have the Foreign Ministers taken or do they intend to take, in the spirit of the resolution adopted by the European Parliament, to speed up the process of finding and convicting certain Nazi war criminals who are still at large, in particular J. Mengele and Alois Brunner, in order to ensure that their crimes do not continue to go unpunished?

**Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council of Foreign Ministers.** — *(IT)* We have not had occasion, meeting in political co-operation, to discuss specifically the points to which the questioner refers. I must however say that the problem is so important politically and morally that I think none of our countries considers itself exempt from the duty to collaborate. They are in fact crimes for which there is no deadline within which the perpetrators must be brought to justice, and nothing must be done to prevent those responsible from being justly punished.

**Mr Chambeiron (COM).** — *(FR)* Mr President-in-Office, I have no doubt of the goodwill of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, but I would like to hear something other than declarations of good intentions because this question has not come to you as a surprise. It was already on the agenda a month ago and was carried over.

What I should like to ask you is this: what steps do the Foreign Ministers really intend to take in order to pick up the trace of certain Nazis whose whereabouts are perfectly well known; will they be obtaining the

### Chambeiron

instruments needed to have them extradited or punished locally, because the European Parliament has been absolutely clear on this problem. On any number of occasions it has expressed the depth of its feeling about the fact that certain war criminals whose whereabouts are well known are going unpunished.

Mr President-in-Office, while giving you the time — which I imagine you will need — to prepare a reply, I give notice that I would still like a more detailed answer, whether from you or from your successor, on the action which the Foreign Ministers intend to take on this matter.

**Mr Andreotti.** — (IT) Saying, with regard to the whereabouts of these criminals, that they are 'perfectly well known' is perhaps not very accurate, since, according to the press, where Mengele is concerned, it is not even known if he is really dead or not. However, if I have to answer the question whether our governments are available to collaborate, through their police organizations and so forth, and assist in the process of finding and duly punishing Nazi war criminals, then in my view the answer is 'Yes' and, therefore, everything that can be done in this direction certainly will be done.

**Mr Ford (S).** — I would like to follow up Mr Chambeiron's supplementary question and ask what attempts have been made to obtain material from governments within the Community that might actually facilitate the location of these individuals, particularly Mengele. There was a recent statement from Mrs Thatcher that there was material available on Mengele and on Klaus Barbie — although he has obviously been caught now — that had not been released and which obviously might give some idea as to where these people are hiding. What representations have been made specifically to General Stroessner about the outrageous treatment of Beate Klarsfeld in Paraguay recently when she was trying to find Mengele?

**Mr Andreotti.** — (IT) I think that the best way will be to give Interpol all the information that may come into the possession of each of our countries, so that the competent bodies can make effective use of it in the course of their duty, to find those responsible and hand them over to the competent courts.

**Mr Ducarme (L).** — (FR) I fully appreciate why the President-in-Office has replied to us in this way but agree with Mr Chambeiron that we should try to obtain an answer in this context. However, looking beyond questions concerned specifically with the Mengele case or the Brunner case, and in the light of the last answer given by the President-in-Office, when he said that the information should be given to Interpol, I should like to ask him the direct question whether he does not consider that it would be appro-

priate to arrange for this to be included as a specific item on the Council's agenda, since I feel that this is what this question is really driving at.

Is the President-in-Office of the Council prepared to ask his colleagues to agree to this subject being included as a specific item on the Council's agenda, so that it can be discussed by the Council of Ministers? I think that this is the essential point.

If you are able to tell us that you will be adopting this course, Mr President, I believe that Parliament can look forward to appropriate action on the resolutions that it has passed.

**Mr Andreotti.** — (IT) I can unquestionably answer in the affirmative, and I will have this subject placed on the agenda for the first meeting in political co-operation.

**President.** — Question No 41, by Mrs Tongue (H-17/85):

Subject: Violation of human rights in Pakistan

Given that the Community has recently signed a cooperation agreement with Pakistan, the Council must surely be aware that a systematic and widespread violation of the United Nations Charter on Human Rights is taking place in that country. A specific and urgent case raised by Amnesty International is that of Raza Kazim, a civilian lawyer, suffering from ill health, who has been held *incommunicado*, in a military prison without charge, for one year. There were also allegations of torture and ill treatment. Mr Kazim is now undergoing trial by secret military court, without legal representation.

Could the Ministers support the Amnesty appeal and request the Government of Pakistan to bring Mr Kazim to trial before an open court with full legal safeguards, including regular access to his lawyer, in accordance with Article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; and urge that he be given proper medical treatment and access to his family? In the absence of a satisfactory response, and since this is not an isolated case, would the Ministers consider a suspension of the agreement?

**Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council of Foreign Ministers.** — (IT) According to the most recent information Mr Raza Kazim, the lawyer who is at present undergoing trial by a military court for attempted conspiracy against the government, has recently been admitted to the Mayo hospital in Lahore for treatment in connection with a heart illness.

The Ten are following with great attention the question of human rights in Pakistan, and recently, even,

**Andreotti**

they intervened with the competent authorities in Islamabad with a plea for clemency on humanitarian grounds.

**Mrs Tongue (S).** — The agreement with Pakistan is not yet ratified and it has not as yet come before this Parliament. I would like to have the assurance of the President-in-Office that before it goes any further he will make direct representations to the Government of Pakistan to uphold all rights and liberties which citizens of any civilized country cherish. I would like to draw his attention to Parliament's resolution of 13 April 1984 which called for

...the creation of a framework for dialogue to foster observance of internationally accepted stands of rights in the European Community and those countries with which it has close ties.

What steps has the Council taken to follow the recommendation of this resolution?

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* Whilst repeating what I have already said, to the effect that the Ten have agreed to monitor the problem of human rights in Pakistan, I can give an assurance that, so far as the specific request that has just been made for further steps is concerned, I will undertake to put that forward, the more so as the Pakistan Foreign Minister was a prisoner-of-war in Italy, and we might therefore have a special relationship with him.

**President.** — Question No 42, by Mr Elliott (H-31/85):

Subject: Human rights

In order to assist in promoting the principles of civil liberty enshrined in both the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and the European Convention of Human Rights, will the Foreign Ministers be prepared to urge that all countries, and in particular the governments of the EEC Member States, ensure that their police and other law-enforcement agencies are fully publicly accountable for their actions to the communities they serve and are under the control of local democratically-elected bodies?

**Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council of Foreign Ministers.** — *(IT)* This is a somewhat complex question. We have to remember that the Community is founded on democratic principles and respect for human rights, and therefore in all Member States as indeed in every democratic country the police forces and all other law enforcement agencies are fully accountable for their actions to the communities they serve, to their governments and their courts.

This is the general rule. We do not see what special initiatives are called for in this respect.

**Mr Elliott (S).** — I understand the answer I have received, and it was not unexpected. However, what I would ask the President-in-Office to concentrate on is not the question of detailed administration. I am not suggesting, and the question did not imply, that there should be any kind of administrative control of the police at Community level. I am opposed to a national police force in Britain: I would hardly want a Community police force of law-enforcement agency. The thrust of the question is related to human rights and the need to ensure that all state organizations which have a law-enforcement rôle should be publicly accountable to democratically-elected bodies. We have had a very recent case in the United Kingdom of what appears to be extreme police overreaction in a particular situation. There have been other instances. I would ask that consideration be given to urging that all law-enforcement agencies, police and others, should be accountable for their actions. That is a situation which does not always obtain, and I wish it did.

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* Mr Elliott, there can be no doubts as to the principle involved; that is to say, there is no section of the public — whether we are talking about the police or not — that is beyond the law or unaccountable for its actions if it infringes human rights or civil rights. But as far as the rest is concerned we have then to see what the individual systems are, because in some systems law enforcement agencies are responsible to democratically elected local authorities and in others this is not the case. The essential point is that they should all be accountable, both for what they do and for what they do not do, because, for example, on a number of occasions — and we have seen this recently — if some of the police had been more efficient, tragedies might have been avoided. In this case there was an excessive respect for the human rights of those that ended up by being assassins.

**Mr Balfé (S).** — The President-in-Office may be aware that at the next part-session in July, when, regrettably, he will not be in office any longer, we shall be debating the report on human rights in the world. I would ask him to confirm that an integral part of human rights in the world is the recognition of such rights within this European Community, because if we do not deal with human rights and the respect for them within our European Community, we can hardly start to preach to the rest of the world. I hope that the Foreign Minister will find that an agreeable proposition.

**Mr Andreotti.** — *(IT)* We are concerned with human rights; we must also concern ourselves with human rights in our own countries, bearing very much in mind, however, that human rights are the rights of every citizen, and we must not therefore privilege those who sometimes, in the name of human rights, trample over others.

**President.** — As the author is not present, Question No 43 will be answered in writing.<sup>1</sup>

Question No 44, by Mr Ford (H-110/85):

Subject: Team Spirit 85

Can the Foreign Ministers state their views on the dangers to peace in the Far East created by Team Spirit 85, and were these views conveyed to Prime Minister Nakasone, President Reagan and President Chun Doo Hwan?

**Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council of Foreign Ministers.** — (IT) Team Spirit 85 is the last in a series of defence manoeuvres that have been carried out every year from 1976 onwards in South Korea by the joint Korean and American forces. These exercises, of which advance notice was given to the military Armistice Commission, were conducted like previous ones on the basis of the defence and mutual assistance treaty signed by South Korea and the United States in 1954. Moreover the question, since it essentially concerns military aspects of security, would not be one of the subjects dealt with by European Ministers meeting in political co-operation, and at all events has not been discussed by them.

**Mr Ford (S).** — Is it not recognized that the scale of these exercises in South Korea has been increasing year by year and that the whole area of the Far East around the Korean peninsula is a highly sensitive one and may be a flashpoint for the future? Is it not felt that this is an area to which the European Community in its external rôle should pay particular attention, and can we be told whether any views were expressed to the relevant authorities in Japan, South Korea and the United States?

**Mr Andreotti.** — (IT) By its very nature the problem does not come within the terms of European political co-operation. What does, however, come under those terms is the hope that the dialogue which has been resumed between the two Koreas can lead to a successful conclusion, which we would all hope to be the case, not least in relation to the 1988 Olympics, which we hope will take place in a certain atmosphere of cordiality between the two Koreas, that would allow all nations to take part.

**President.** — On behalf of the House, I thank the President-in-Office for his courtesy in placing himself at our disposal, and, of course, we wish him *bon voyage* for his appointments in Spain and Portugal in connection with an official act that is awaited with so much expectation by the Community.

The first part of Question Time is closed.<sup>1</sup>

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

## ANNEX

### Formal sitting

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*President*

(*The formal sitting opened at 12.15 p.m.*)

**President.** — Mr President of the Italian Republic, welcoming you on behalf of the European Parliament, I have the honour of welcoming not only the Head of a Member State of our Community which is at present charged with the burdensome task of presiding over the Community's Council but also one of the most eminent figures in the European resistance movement against Fascism.

(*Applause*)

The values for which you have fought, Mr President, both in prison and in exile and later in active politics, are today the foundation of a Community resolved to build the future of its peoples in union, peace and liberty, and it is on behalf of the elected representatives of these peoples that I welcome you today to Strasbourg.

You have experienced the trenches of the First World War and the dramas of the Second World War. Your presence among us is both a symbol and an encouragement. It encourages us to press on along the road towards an ever more profound solidarity among our peoples, towards a unified Europe that shall guarantee the essential values of our society — values to which you have devoted your life and your work.

I ask you, Mr President, to take the floor and speak to our Parliament.

(*Loud applause*)

**Mr Pertini, President of the Italian Republic.** — (IT) Mr President, I thank you for your kind words and I thank you, Members of the European Parliament and representatives of the other Community institutions, for your warm welcome, which I shall

<sup>1</sup> See the Annex giving written answers to those questions that could not be answered in Question Time.

<sup>1</sup> See the Annex giving written answers to those questions that could not be answered in Question Time. For the next sitting's agenda, see Minutes.

### Pertini

long remember with great pleasure. I am glad to have this opportunity of telling you in person of the Italian people's high esteem for this Assembly and the fundamental role it plays and will play even more in the future in safeguarding and promoting European ideals.

This is the third time, during my seven years as President, that I have given a speech on the subject of European unity. The first time, I spoke to the Assembly of the Council of Europe in this Chamber in 1983. The second time was in Lausanne in 1984, when I spoke to the Coudenhove-Kalergi Foundation. On this, the third occasion, I should like my speech to be seen above all as an expression of my deep personal conviction. Today I shall be talking about Europe and to Europe as the European citizen I have felt myself to be since long ago in 1941, when I was involved in the Federalist initiative of the Ventotene manifesto. Altiero Spinelli — who, with his flowing beard, now seems a patriarch, the patriarch of the United States of Europe — was a forerunner of European unity and may perhaps regret that period of our youth.

(Applause)

But his whole life shows that in spite of the passing of time that ideal has not aged, as men have aged, but is ever young and will live until it becomes reality. I must also make it clear that I am not here to express yet again our mutual dissatisfaction with the slowness of the process of European integration. It was already obvious that it would be an uphill struggle when, after rejecting the EDC, we opted for the long road to economic unification which was to lead to political unification at a later stage. We decided to adopt a realistic and gradualist approach and a 'strategy of patience', while promising ourselves that we would never lose sight of the ultimate objective. My chief purpose is to reassert that we have now reached a crucial moment and a decisive turning-point in the process of European integration.

The importance of this phase should not, however, lead us to believe that little has been achieved so far. The history of our continent covers 2 000 years, the history of our Community about 40 years. We should appreciate the historical grandeur of this undertaking. The EEC is only the beginning. For a long time, the history of our continent was one of a succession of empires and the subjugation of peoples, followed by the fragmentation into nations and finally the glorification of nationalism, which culminated in slaughter and genocide, thus following Grillparzer's tragic sequence 'from humanity *via* nationality to bestiality' (*von der Humanität durch die Nationalität zur Bestialität*). It has never been — apart from the case of Switzerland — a history of the voluntary association of peoples. This is perhaps the first time in the history of the world that different nations, despite their past memories and the fact that they were long rivals, have sought to unite a continent not by force, but by mutual

consent, respecting one another's individuality. If we compare ourselves today with how we were in the past, we must see that the age of conflict within Europe is at an end, that the reconciliation between our countries is irreversible and that a repetition of war amongst ourselves would be inconceivable.

(Applause)

However, the light of peace — which had barely begun to shine again — faded once more soon after the last war. The world, civilized society and international order have undergone profound and sometimes abrupt changes over the last 40 years. There has been a gathering together and confrontation of gigantic forces which have their clearest demarcation line here in Europe. In the farthest corners of the earth, petty nationalisms are on the move and eager to develop and clash with other forces. The threat of war and a nuclear holocaust has soon reappeared, this time all over the world; it thus also affects us here in Europe. The clash of opposing forces has created here once again the divisions which we had to suffer for so long. One section of the continent has been separated from us. The foundations of civilization, both material and spiritual, and the basic principles underlying human society are changing. Industrialized societies are becoming increasingly uncomfortable, beliefs, ideologies, rules and traditions are rapidly being undermined. Confusion, conflicting influences, existential crises, selfishness and the conflict of interests and groups are making the quest for new values strenuous and difficult, sometimes impossible. While the world is in a state of crisis, technology is working miracles, uniting the world and increasing mankind's power. While the developing countries' expectations of progress are growing uncontrollably, the traditional sources of prosperity for the most highly developed countries are being brutally cut off or are drying up. The result is twofold: the destinies of the two halves of mankind are inexplicably linked and mutually dependent, and there are new obstacles to maintaining rates of growth and realizing the dreams of deliverance and a more human existence. All this fuels the conflict both within our separate countries and at international level.

In a situation of this kind, European unification became imperative. I am not suggesting that we return to the economic and gradualist approach of 40 years ago nor I am thinking of an abrupt transition to the 'strategy of impatience', but we should not miss the opportunity to reaffirm our original purpose of political unity, which we have never abandoned and to which economic unity was considered, right from the beginning, as subordinate and as a means to an end. Things being as they are, no distinction can ultimately be made between the various parts of the European equation. Economic, strategic, cultural and technological aspects are also political and need to be transformed into a common political will. Political will will surely come, above all from our awareness; but we

## Pertini

should not deceive ourselves — it will also be in some measure the inevitable result of the prevailing objective situation. It is true that sometimes it is difficult for even the brightest visions to find a place in darkened minds which hesitate to face reality. But it does not take a great intellectual effort to realize that Europe has reached a point where, if reason does not prevail, the force of circumstances will act as the impetus towards unity, the alternative being a fatal decline. Europe is assailed with demands, cajolery, pressure, blackmail and threats from all over the world and by challenges which may soon become intolerable, in its present state of fragmentation. To prevaricate as a result of self-interest, petty calculation or fragile compromise may tomorrow prove to be a fruitless and worthless exercise.

*(Applause)*

It is therefore time to act. The means will not be revolutionary but the results will be. It was, incidentally, the Ventotene manifesto which stated that a united Europe was the only form of revolution possible today. In order to achieve this aim, the procedural machinery set up over the years must certainly remain, but from now on it will be fired by a new political will and the decision-making process will have to be gradually reformed, from the bottom upwards. This will bring Europe nearer to the people and the people nearer to Europe. What is more, there are still many problems inside our countries and they should be solved before we unite fully, one good reason being that union will not provide a solution to them and will involve changes and adjustments which are not always painless. But the events of the last few years have shown that the contrary is also true; that problems are sometimes more easily solved in a European framework than within a narrow national one. 'Non-Europe' has slowed down and dissipated efforts in various sectors. It is fair to conclude that Europe is now an urgent need, not only because of challenges from the outside which cannot wait until our national problems are solved, but also because of internal challenges which it may help to meet.

This dual national and European approach may be used to tackle almost all the main problems of today. As far as unemployment is concerned, we can no longer go our own separate ways but we must set a 'European pattern' for employment policy which, without either ruthlessness or overprotectiveness, may reconcile the demands of efficient production and social solidarity which are inherent in this continent's civilization.

*(Applause)*

Nor will it be possible to overcome this state of crisis and guarantee growth unless we coordinate our economic, monetary and commercial policies more effectively, unless we complete the creation of the common market, unless we establish a framework for

production on a European scale, unless we create a real European currency and a single financial market, unless we restore the essential conditions for ensuring stability for production and investment and unless we strike a balance between protecting jobs and maintaining the mobility of the labour market — which will be more flexible the more European it is — and technological development. It will not be possible to close the technology gap unless we unite our efforts, firstly in the cultural field — the aim being a single European school at all levels — and in basic and applied research and advanced technology, along the lines recently indicated by President Mitterand. It is true that technology has repercussions on employment, but it is also true that, in this sphere too, Europe can help us, since the advanced technologies which are to be developed in the Community will surely create new jobs in related sectors. Any sort of 'neo-Luddite' attitude would be out of place. What is needed is more vocational training.

Europe is also an urgent need in the sector of international politics in the broad sense, where it can play a fundamental rôle in the field of security and defence as well as disarmament and development. Once today's diplomatic cooperation has become political cooperation in the truest sense of the word, Europe will reap the benefits, in terms of credibility and political influence, of the example of North-South collaboration which, from Yaoundé to Lomé III, it has managed to set the rest of the world. This will facilitate broader European involvement in the Third World's economic problems based on the interdependence of growth and development, and in its political problems, by aiming at moderation and balanced mediation and bringing about progress and peace. The steps we are already taking to relieve famine and disease will inevitably benefit.

Europe can continue its efforts to strengthen peace within the framework of East-West relations. It is quite clear what has to be done. If peace continues to be simply the absence of war, it is an empty vessel or a vessel with dubious contents. Peace consists of dialogue, trust, *détente*, agreement, disarmament and, finally, the possibility of cooperation in an ordered international framework agreed on by all those involved.

*(Applause from the left)*

Peace cannot be based for long on the balance of terror. It is true that since the bomb came on the scene peace has prevailed; but this paradoxical example of a purpose being achieved by unlikely means, of Good being safeguarded by Evil, does not really explain the absence of war in the past, nor can it guarantee it in the future.

*(Applause from the left)*

Moreover, the small-scale conflicts which have arisen and are arising all over the world and which do not fit

**Pertini**

the classical pattern of world war continue to cause destruction and grief and the persisting suspicion that the worst may happen. The balance of terror is also unreliable because of the danger of technical 'hitches'. It is not only inefficient, but also counterproductive, since it merely means that the weapons become more terrible and more destructive, so that they are more credible and act as a deterrent against war. There can thus be true peace only without terror and away from this negative spiral. Even if this is not possible, there is nothing to stop those who are interested in peace to work, under the protection of deterrents, for *détente* and the control or reduction of instruments of death, until they are totally banned.

*(Applause)*

A united Europe — without indulging in impossible dreams incompatible with reality, the balance of forces and loyalty to its commitments — can and must set in train a sound joint security and defence policy within the framework of the Atlantic Treaty, in order to increase its responsibility and the weight it carries within the Alliance, its influence in NATO planning, its participation in disarmament negotiations and its contribution to maintaining dialogue and furthering the progress of negotiations, in the interests of the Alliance's defensive aims. More than a separate entity, Europe should be able to count as a genuine partner who can be consulted and listened to and not content itself with mere passive solidarity, and it should be capable, in the interests of peace, of speaking out if and when it holds a different view or interpretation of problems. A united Europe, more influential and more answerable for its own security, could not fail to live in peace with everybody, especially with its neighbours. For us, Helsinki already represents a firm commitment, but it would become even more the keystone of and philosophy behind our system of security and cooperation with the East and the political side of the Atlantic military defence system. No one could doubt this.

Europe has only one means of achieving these objectives: closer unity. Recently, its enlargement to include Spain and Portugal convincingly proved the European Community's ability to allow reason and hope to prevail over individual interests when it so desires; once again it has demonstrated its vitality. This well-balanced agreement, which we are glad to say was concluded during the six-month period of our presidency and will be signed tomorrow, lays down the preconditions for the creation of a market with a population of 320 million, more than the United States and twice as many as Japan. It will also open up a whole range of prospects and opportunities for Europe in the Latin American continent, which will now look towards the Atlantic as well as towards the Pacific.

It remains for us to take the next step in the Community's political and institutional life. We hope that the Milan Summit will culminate in a decision to call

an inter-governmental conference to draw up a draft treaty on European Union.

*(Applause)*

The draft mandate has already been submitted by the Italian presidency and has been published. I shall therefore only mention one of the subjects to be considered at the Milan Summit: the possibility of giving Parliament broader powers.

*(Applause)*

By readily adopting the Spinelli report, this House showed that it was fully aware of the need to speed up European integration. It could not be otherwise. The European Parliament is the only multinational assembly in the world directly elected by sovereign peoples, with political and not national groupings. It therefore ensures that the present and future process of European integration will be democratic. A European Union which aims to safeguard the very values of democracy in the world cannot continue to have, at its centre, a Parliament with severely reduced powers.

*(Applause)*

The legislative powers transferred from the national parliaments went to the Council of Ministers, which represents individual governments and combines executive powers and political affiliation without being answerable either to national parliaments or to the European Parliament itself for Community matters. The Council's work is also hampered by the disparities between national Community policies, of which there were previously ten and will now be twelve. If Europe wishes to equip itself to draw up wide-ranging and far-reaching joint policies, using democratic methods and meeting the demands of its peoples, it obviously needs a genuine parliament.

*(Prolonged applause)*

The draft therefore makes provision for adding to the consultative and supervisory powers and right of censure which the present-day Parliament enjoys, other joint decision-making powers designed to create a balance between it and the Council of Ministers. It would also be a good thing if, in the meetings of the Council of Ministers, the rule of unanimity with its crippling effects were abolished and voting by a qualified majority were adopted, since this is the only way of ensuring rapid decision-making and that supranational decisions are taken.

*(Prolonged applause)*

The draft mandate for the conference, submitted by the Italian presidency, was cautiously formulated and is not entirely what Italy would have wished. But what matters is that the questions are posed without the slightest ambiguity, in the hope that the maximum

## Pertini

consensus can be achieved on the decisions to be taken. Europe, like Rome, cannot be built in a day, nor will it be created by an invisible hand. It will be shaped by real forces working from within and from without and by our determination. Milan may perhaps not be a historic occasion, but it will be the confirmation of this determination. Let us not be discouraged and let us not give way to pragmatism or the currents of counter-reform, which always appear whenever a qualitative leap forward is being made. The creation of Europe is indeed irreversible, but we are only half-way there and we must go on. Let us not deceive ourselves: we must expand much in order to achieve little. This is not a rear-guard battle for the future, a vital future. There is no time to wait for European unity to happen naturally, in the same way as glaciers or coral-reefs are formed. Europe today is split and weak and may be at any time both the cause and the victim of some new crisis. As Colorni used to say, in the period of the Ventotene manifesto, the battle for Europe, is 'a battle to be fought now'. After the war we missed our opportunity and found ourselves on a longer path. Up to now we have described Europe, now we must transform it.

(Applause)

Europe is no longer there to be discovered or invented but simply to be desired. Only last month, President Reagan, speaking on this platform said that Europe was 'a moral success'. To this I would add that we must also be a political success.

(Applause)

If we set ourselves a clear aim, which of course cannot be achieved overnight but must be pursued resolutely, of passing from the economic sphere into the sphere beyond and developing from a large-scale market to the beginnings of a genuine super-nation, this success will be within our reach.

We may be spurred on by the memory of the Resistance, which was a European as well as a national popular movement. It knew no frontiers. Everyone fought for a common cause: the defeat of Nazi-Fascism and the triumph of freedom and democracy in Europe. That was the dawn of European unity. However, we must make it clear that to adopt this proto-Europeanist ideal does not mean continuing moral discrimination against Germany, which has been and always will be part of the European fatherland. If we are Europeans, we are also Germans.

(Applause)

Europe cannot forget the debt it owes to the United States and the Soviet Union for the blood they shed for us: for the second time, Americans crossed the Atlantic and died for a free Europe, leaving countless cemeteries with white crosses on our continent to bear

witness to their genuine sacrifice for us and our freedom.

The Soviet Union paid a higher price than any other nation ever paid in a war: 20 million dead! This means that 20 million Soviet citizens also died for our freedom. The victory of Stalingrad was the decisive battle in the struggle against Nazi-Fascism.

(Applause)

If this high price had not been nobly paid by the two nations, we would never have been able to celebrate the victory of Good over Evil in Europe on 8 May last. We shall never forget — neither we nor the Germans — the crimes of Nazism. We shall never forget the crimes nor forgive the guilty, since the remission of sins only encourages the guilty to sin again. But we shall remember the past, in order to promise ourselves that it will never repeat itself.

Having said this, however, we must look to the future. The Germany of today is not the Germany of yesterday. It is no longer excited by visions of war. Its state of mind is symbolized by Willy Brandt kneeling in the Warsaw ghetto and by the wise, noble and deep-felt words which President Weizsaecker spoke last month on the fortieth anniversary of the end of the last war.

(Applause)

They evoked the tragedy of a divided nation but rejected any idea of revenge. I would say more: his words not only show us the Germany we have loved and still love but also Europe. A divided Germany means a divided Europe. Its tragedy is also our tragedy. But love for the lost fatherland does not shake the German desire for peace, just as the distress we feel for the part of Europe cut off from us does not make us wish to wage war. We shall not neglect our security, but we shall never harbour aggressive thoughts towards anyone nor shall we ever renounce the aims of dialogue and peace.

The Foreign Minister Mr Genscher recently stated with enlightened wisdom, 'we shall undertake to look into the possibilities of collaboration between the EEC and the COMECON countries'. I would also say that Europe does not stop at the *Spre* but reaches as far as the Urals. Time and peace — not war — will solve the problems and heal the wounds. We are convinced that a new order achieved through peace and upheld by peace, will end up by uniting that which a wall is not enough to divide today. This is our *Ostpolitik*. This will be our way of 'reversing Yalta'.

Such intentions should in my opinion govern the continuing process of European integration, until the grand design of the founding fathers is complete. Out of this will inevitably come a Europe which, though it may no longer be the centre of the world, will not be pushed out to the edge and will still be able to partici-

**Pertini**

pate actively in world society. We Italians are convinced that this kind of Europe will come into being and that the world will offer this new united political entity ample scope for making itself useful. Italy, too, needs Europe. In Europe we are not seeking an identity to replace our own, of which we are proud, but additional strength and a wider range of opportunities and prospects for playing an active rôle. Europe will not detract from but adds to our history and the spiritual heritage of our forefathers. Together with Europe and with the help of Europe, we, too, will find scope in the world for action and for sharing the fruits of civilization with others, especially those who have suffered from misfortune or at the hands of other human beings. We shall be able to defend and spread the eternal values of mankind: freedom and justice, the right to life and the quality of life, respect for the individual, solidarity and secure peace for mankind as a whole and for each individual. Above all, we shall be able to offer future generations a worthier existence. More than for us, Europe is for the young, for the Europeans of tomorrow.

*(Applause)*

During my seven years as President of the Italian Republic, I have met 700 000 young students of all ages from every region of Italy and from abroad. I have never bored them with speeches but have engaged in open and sincere dialogue with them, as if we were old friends. Woe betide old people who lie to the young!

The questions these young people asked me clearly showed their anxiety about nuclear war and their desire for peace.

They are right: they want peace because they want a future of work and love. We must act today to ensure that our young people are not tragically disappointed.

I shall say again what I have said elsewhere and in other circumstances: we shall never have secure peace under the shadow of missiles.

*(Applause from the centre and the left)*

I always remember the wise warning given by a great American writer, Lippman, who said that nuclear war could break out as a result of a technical or political miscalculation. And, I would add, this would be the end of humanity.

This is why I am in favour of total and controlled disarmament. I do not care if they call me a dreamer, I am interested in the salvation of mankind.

*(Applause from the centre and the left)*

The enormous sums of money squandered nowadays on nuclear weapons which, if they happened to be used one day, would mean the end of humanity, should be spent on combating hunger in the world. The problem of hunger can be solved not by occasionally sending food to the afflicted areas but by creating lasting sources of life in those areas with the help of modern technology.

*(Loud and prolonged applause)*

This is what Italian peasants did many years ago when they transformed the Libyan desert into fertile farmland.

Mr President, friends, the time has therefore come for commitment. Let us disperse the blanket of fog enveloping Europe, which is sometimes assailed by doubt. Let us not give up. Let us carry on doing fearlessly what seems right, whatever happens. Let us do it with trust and joy. The same joy which inspired Schiller's immortal verses set to music in Beethoven's Choral Symphony, which has now become the anthem of a United Europe.

*(The House rose to its feet. Prolonged applause)*

**President.** — Mr President of the Republic, this House has listened to you with attention, respect and admiration. You have given us valuable encouragement. On behalf of all my colleagues, I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

*(Prolonged applause for the President of the Italian Republic, followed by applause for the President of Parliament)*

*(The formal sitting closed at 12.55 p.m.)*

## SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 12 JUNE 1985

### Contents

- |  |     |   |     |
|--|-----|---|-----|
| 1. <i>Approval of Minutes</i><br><i>Mr Lalor; Mr Musso</i> . . . . .   | 100 | 8. <i>Question Time (Doc. B 2-407/85) (contd)</i>   |     |
| 2. <i>Ethiopia — Oral question (Doc. B 2-184/85) by Mr Christopher Jackson and others, to the Council</i><br><i>Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr Fracanzani (Council); Mrs Schmit; Mr Provan; Mr Howell; Mrs Banotti; Mr Welsh; Mr Kuijpers; Mrs Lehideux; Mr Ulburghs; Mr De Gucht; Mr McGowan; Mr Christopher Jackson</i> . . . . .  | 101 | • <i>Questions to the Commission:</i>   |     |
| 3. <i>Internal market — Public supply contracts — Roll-over protection on tractors — Reports (Doc. A 2-50/85) by Mr Patterson and (Docs. A 2-38/85 and A 2-37/85) by Mr von Wogau</i><br><i>Mr Patterson; Mr von Wogau; Mr De Gucht; Mr Rossetti, Mr Seal; Mr Bèsse; Mr Abelin; Mr de Ferranti, Mrs De March; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Carignon; Ms Quin; Mr Patterson; Ms Quin; Mr Anastassopoulos; Mrs Oppenheim; Mr Bonaccini; Mr Wolff; Mr Lalor; Mr Rogalla; Mr I. Friedrich; Mr Cassidy; Mr Alavanos; Mr Visser; Mrs Van Rooy; Lord Cockfield (Commission)</i> . . . . . | 105 | • <i>Question No 62, by Mr Pasty: Community gas desulphurizing project:</i><br><i>Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Pasty; Mr Narjes; Mr Seligman; Mr Narjes</i> . . . . .   | 130 |
| 4. <i>Right to petition Parliament — European driving licence — European passport — Obstacles at intra-Community borders — Interim report (Doc. A 2-41/85) by Mr Chanterie and oral questions with debate to the Commission (Doc. B 2-324/85) by Mr Rogalla and others; (Doc. B 2-387/85) by Mr Adamei and Mr Chanterie; (Doc. B 2-325/85) by Mr Rothley and others and to the Council (Doc. B 2-323/85) by Mr Seefeld and others</i><br><i>Mr Chanterie</i> . . . . .   | 126 | • <i>Question No 63, by Mr Vandemeulebroucke: Periodical 'Europe Information', External relations:</i><br><i>Mr Ripa di Meana (Commission); Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Ripa di Meana</i> . . . . .   | 131 |
| 5. <i>Accession of Spain and Portugal</i> . . . . .  | 128 | • <i>Question No 64, by Mr Wijzenbeek: Inland navigation:</i><br><i>Mr Clinton Davis (Commission); Mr Wijzenbeek; Mr Clinton Davis</i> . . . . .  | 132 |
| 6. <i>Calendar 1986</i> . . . . .  | 128 | • <i>Question No 65, by Mr De Vries: Accession of the Community to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms</i><br><i>Mr Cheysson (Commission), Mr De Vries; Mr Cheysson; Mr Nordmann; Mr Cheysson; Mr Wijzenbeek; Mr Cheysson</i> . . . . . | 132 |
| 7. <i>Action taken on the opinions of Parliament</i><br><i>Mr Normanton; Mr Metten; Mr Varfis (Commission); Mrs Ewing; Mr Varfis; Mr Cryer; Mr Varfis; Mrs Boot; Mr Varfis</i> . . . . .   | 128 | • <i>Question No 66, by Mr Lalor: Motor tax:</i><br><i>Mr Clinton Davis; Mr Lalor; Mr Clinton Davis; Mr Cryer; Mr Clinton Davis; Mr Wijzenbeek; Mr Clinton Davis</i> . . . . .  | 134 |
|  |     | • <i>Question No 69, by Mr Zahorka: International agreement on flags of convenience:</i><br><i>Mr Clinton Davis; Mr Zahorka; Mr Clinton Davis; Mr McMahon; Mr Clinton Davis; Mr Wijzenbeek; Mr Clinton Davis</i> . . . . .  | 135 |
|  |     | • <i>Question No 73, by Mrs Lizin: Steel pipe exports to the USA:</i><br><i>Mr Narjes; Mrs Lizin; Mr Narjes; Mr Hindley; Mr Narjes</i> . . . . .  | 136 |

- Question No 74, by Sir James Scott-Hopkins: *The UK in information technology field*  
Mr Sutherland (Commission); Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Sutherland; Mr McMahon; Mr Sutherland; Mrs Caroline Jackson; Mr Sutherland . . . . . 136
- Question No 75, by Miss Tongue: *Inspection policy of nuclear installations in EEC Member States under the Euratom Treaty*:  
Mr Mosar (Commission); Miss Tongue; Mr Mosar; Mrs Lizin; Mr Mosar . . . . . 138
- Question No 77, by Mrs Lemass: *Dublin Bay Pollution*:  
Mr Clinton Davis; Mrs Lemass; Mr Clinton Davis; Miss Tongue; Mr Clinton Davis . . . . . 139
- Question No 78, by Mrs Rabbethge: *Commission statistics on the European Social Fund*:  
Mr Sutherland; Mrs Rabbethge; Mr Sutherland; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Sutherland . . . . . 140
- Question No 79, by Mr Wolff: *Commission decision on exchange controls*:  
Mr Sutherland; Mr Wolff; Mr Sutherland; Mr Cryer; Mr Sutherland . . . . . 141
- Question No 81, by Mrs Giannakou-Koutsikou: *Stepping up research into solar and wind energy*:  
Mr Narjes; Mrs Giannakou-Koutsikou; Mr Narjes; Mr Cryer; Mr Narjes . . . . . 142
- Question No 82, by Mr Van der Waal: *Use of the official languages in the Community*:  
Mr Christophersen (Commission); Mr Van der Waal; Mr Christophersen; Mr Fich; Mr Christophersen; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Christophersen; Mr Rogalla; Mr Christophersen . . . . . 143
- Question No 84, by Mr MacSharry: *Grant aid for Connaught Regional Airport*:  
Mr Varfis (Commission); Mr MacSharry; Mr Varfis . . . . . 144
- 9. *Right to petition Parliament — European driving licence — European passport — Obstacles at intra-Community borders (continuation)*  
Mrs Vayssade; Mr Visser; Mr Fracanzani (Council); Mr Rogalla; Mr Rothley; Mr Ripa di Meana (Commission); Mr Adam; Mrs Braun-Moser; Mr Rogalla; Mr C. Beazley; Mr Coste-Floret . . . . . 145
- 10. *Votes*  
Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Welsh; Mrs Faith; Mr Marshall; Mr Herman; Mr Pannella; Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti; Mr Croux; Mr Pannella; Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr De Vries; Mr Cornelissen; Mr Beumer; Mr De Vries; Mr Arndt; Mr De Vries; Mrs Scrivener; Mr De Vries; Mr Langes; Mr Van Miert; Mr Cicciomessere . . . . . 153
- Annex* . . . . . 159

IN THE CHAIR: MR NORD

*Vice-President*

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

1. *Approval of the Minutes*

**President.** — The Minutes of yesterday's sitting have been distributed. Are there any objections?

**Mr Lalor (RDE).** — Mr President, while the Minutes record the fact that I presided at the opening sitting yesterday morning, they do not record me as being present according to the attendance register which I overlooked signing owing to the presidential pressure.

I would be grateful if you could arrange to have that omission rectified.

*(Parliament approved the Minutes)*

**Mr Musso (RDE).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to make a comment about the organization of meetings.

I am the chairman of an inter-group which is due to meet this morning at 10.30. This meeting should have been listed in yesterday's notice of today's meetings. I do not know who has the authority to refuse to list a meeting of Members of this House even though the meeting was scheduled and the notification was sent to Members.

I would ask you, Mr President, to see that that does not happen again, that the staff of the secretariat are informed and that in future the decisions taken by

**Musso**

Members of Parliament, in accordance with our Rules of Procedure and the Bureau's authorization, are applied.

**President.** — We shall look into exactly what happened, Mr Musso, and make sure that in future we adhere to our Rules of Procedure and to the decisions taken by the Bureau in this connection<sup>1</sup>.

## 2. Ethiopia

**President.** — The next item is the oral question (Doc. B 2-184/85) by Mr Christopher Jackson and others to the Council on Ethiopia.

**Mr Christopher Jackson (ED).** — Mr President, this debate is about famine and war in Ethiopia where at least 500 000 people have died in recent months as a result of starvation. It is particularly about the effects of the long-running civil war and the action that the European Community should take to help Ethiopia.

It is estimated that in northern Ethiopia, in Eritrea and Tigre over two million people are behind rebel lines largely cut off from aid supplies. Food trickles through from the Sudan but the Ethiopians bomb the supply routes, not least because those same routes can also carry arms. A ceasefire in the civil war has been called for but denied. Two United Nations offers to distribute food behind the lines have been refused. Reports talk of food being made available in resettlement camps but denied to those who want to stay in their own home areas.

We place the highest priority on getting food through to those people in rebel areas who are now being denied it and who are starving. But we have a long-term concern as well. Ethiopia is one of the world's poorest countries yet it spends a very high proportion of its income on arms and war. The cost in terms of human suffering and resources is too high. Living standards in Ethiopia have been in decline for over a quarter of a century. Each succeeding famine tends to be worse than its predecessor.

Does it make sense for us in the European Community annually to continue to give large sums to Ethiopia for development while they use even larger sums to maintain the largest army in Africa and get poorer all the time?

*(Applause from the European Democratic Group)*

We are a partner with Ethiopia in Lomé. As partners and in a spirit of friendship we have a duty to be frank. We recognize the three great achievements of the

revolutionary government: reform of the feudal order, redistribution of land to favour the peasants and, above all, the successful literacy campaign. But these achievements are overshadowed by the civil war and its terrible effects. We cannot be a silent party to starvation by neglect or by denial of food. We have to say to Ethiopia 'Enough is enough'. It is time to try another tack — that of reconciliation with those who are fighting. Of course it will not be easy. In Eritrea the struggle has gone on for over 20 years. Promised federation and autonomy by the United Nations, Eritrea has been denied it first by the Empire of Haile Selassie and now by the Dergue. It must be time, as international jurists have said, for a re-examination.

In Lomé III substantial funds are earmarked for Ethiopia. We should be willing to supplement and increase those funds to help build the peace, but while unremitting war continues we should examine with the greatest care all proposed uses of this potential aid, having regard to the human rights implications.

Our aim is to save lives and to help Ethiopia build its future. That is why we call for a ceasefire. That is why we call for safe conduct for food. That is why we call for talks to resolve the civil war. I believe that the European Community has an important role in this in helping Ethiopia. That is why the questions in my name and others have been set down for reply by the Council.

*(Applause from the right)*

**Mr Fracanzani, President-in-Office of the Council.** — *(IT)* Mr President, we can only speak on the basis of the information provided to the Council and Parliament by Vice-President Natali following his visit to Ethiopia.

From what Vice-President Natali has told us, the food aid which has reached Ethiopia so far has been distributed according to procedures which, in his view, can be regarded as satisfactory, considering the logistical difficulties there.

Still according to Mr Natali, the opinions he has received from the coordinator of the United Nations and of the non-governmental organizations operating *in loco* endorse this.

Furthermore, according to Mr Natali, no irregularities emerged when the documents relating to the distribution of the aid supplied to the Government of Ethiopia were checked.

Lastly, his visit to the distribution centres in the north of Ethiopia enabled Mr Natali to establish — so he has told us — that the aid is being distributed in line with the needs of the people.

In general, as a matter of principle, the Council believes that political considerations must not interfere

<sup>1</sup> Documents received: see Minutes.

**Fracanzani**

with strictly humanitarian measures, such as aid for people suffering from starvation, and in this context it wants to emphasize the important role played by the non-governmental organizations in Ethiopia.

Therefore, the Council firmly hopes that the Community aid is reaching its targets, the targets the honourable Member asked about.

Similarly, as regards the aspect of finding a political solution to the problems mentioned by the questioner, the Council must stress the strictly humanitarian nature of such aid, which is designed to respond to the needs of all the people hit by famine.

Taking these factors into account, and in the light of the resolution adopted by the European Parliament at the last part-session, following the recent dramatic events in Ethiopia, in its conclusions of 23 May 1985 the Council once again urged the governments of the countries in question to do their utmost to ensure that the food aid and emergency aid reaches all the regions concerned and can benefit all the people concerned.

Naturally, an appeal to this end has also been made — and must be followed up — to the Government of Ethiopia, with special reference to the problems of transport and distribution.

**Mrs Schmit (S).** — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, during the three minutes or so for which I shall be speaking at least 285 people will die of hunger and of the effects of malnutrition not only in Ethiopia but throughout the world, irrespective of political systems, and chiefly in countries where the armed forces have the upper hand in politics, which includes Ethiopia.

It is a sign of the sinister anti-social and anti-egalitarian attitudes which are still widespread that almost all the victims are children, women and the elderly, whilst the men, the fighting men, do not seem to shrink from the possibility of turning famine into an extension of civil war by other means.

As a member of the Committee on Development and Cooperation I signed the oral question under discussion together with colleagues from other political groups, but that was to show first of all that we Members of the European Parliament must refuse to be party to turning the Ethiopian tragedy in general and the suffering in Eritrea and Tigre in particular into another chapter of the cold war between the United States of America and the CIA on the one hand, which go so far as to misuse the non-government organizations, and on the other hand the Soviet Union which supplies the belligerents with arms and munitions instead of continuing to concentrate its assistance on long-term development projects.

Secondly, we wish to show that we, as Members of the European Parliament, must refuse to become involved

in neo-colonialist reflexes, as foolish as they are offensive, by demanding for example the intervention of a so-called 'peace centre made up of senior civilian and military officials'. Quite the reverse! The European Parliament must show confidence in the Commission's humanitarian aid and inspection visits, in particular as represented by Mr Natali. The European Parliament must urge the Council of Ministers, particularly the Foreign Ministers and the diplomatic corps of each of the ten countries of our Community, to convince the government in Addis Ababa that there is neither weakness nor humiliation but greatness and human generosity in accepting, at least under international supervision, a ceasefire for the famine.

**Mr Provan (ED).** — Mr President, I do not want to take part in the debate, but I think it is absolutely disgraceful that the President-in-Office of the Council is no longer with us, having made what I consider was one of the most disgraceful statements that I have heard from the Council. I would put a request to you, Mr President, that you ask the President-in-Office of the Council to come back, or at least have the Commissioner present for what is one of the most important issues facing the European people at the present time.

(*Applause*)

**Mr Howell (ED).** — Mr President, further to that point of order, it is pointless our continuing this debate unless the President-in-Office of the Council returns to the Chamber. I would suggest that a message is sent to him to return so that we can continue.

**President.** — As you can see, your suggestion has already been acted upon. I consider the incident closed.

**Mrs Banotti (PPE).** — Mr President, I welcome the return of the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers to the Chamber, so that we can continue this very important debate.

Much has been said both in this Parliament and in the press in criticism of our response to the tragedy in Ethiopia and the Sahel. Indeed, it must be acknowledged that our response often came too late and was often insufficient to meet the great crisis. That being said, I am happy to hear reports from many of the NGOs — and I am sure the President-in-Office will also be happy to hear this, since he mentioned it in his speech — that they are now much more satisfied with the Community's response. In fact, they have made a very special point of informing me that they have had great cooperation from Community personnel in the field. They pay tribute also — and I am happy to pay this tribute in this House as well, because I know there is a great deal of criticism being voiced about the res-

**Banotti**

ponse to the needs of Ethiopia — to the flexibility of our EEC aid programmes in Ethiopia. I must say I find this very good news, as we have often in the past been accused of excessive bureaucracy.

Our contributions have responded to the real practical needs of the people, unlike the aid donated by some of the other great powers where political rather than pragmatic considerations are paramount.

My group wholeheartedly supports the urgent calls made to both sides in this long-running civil war to agree to a ceasefire so that the food aid can reach those who so badly need it. Civil war, as many of us know to our cost, is the most bitter and debilitating tragedy that can afflict a nation. How much more painful it is for all those involved to see the effects of this kind of war exacerbated by this terrible famine. Both sides are involved also in a propaganda war, with food as well as guns in their respective arsenals.

My group calls also on the Council of Foreign Ministers to do all it can to help solve this civil war whose roots go back over 30 years — another Thirty Years War, Mr President — to 1952. It is not appropriate here to judge or comment on decisions made by the OAS at that time, which may have laid the foundations for current political tensions in that area. That being said, we cannot, in a phrase that has become immortal in my own country, stand idly by. Like it or not, East and West must now accept that they both bear a moral responsibility for reaching a solution to the tragedy in Ethiopia.

Resettlement remains a regrettable but unfortunately necessary measure to help with the feeding of such vast numbers of people. We regret the manner in which some of these resettlement programmes have been implemented. However, that being said, we call on the Commission as a matter of urgency to assist with food and development aid in these resettlement areas.

We deplore and condemn, in common with our colleagues, the fact that grain donated by the Community has been sold openly on the market by unscrupulous dealers. Understandably, reports of such practices both anger and depress our own citizens who have contributed so generously to the Ethiopian Fund.

Infrastructural and transport facilities continue to be totally inadequate to deal with the massive task of getting aid to those who need it. There are, I regret to say, still instances of short-sightedness in some of our aid programmes. In fact, one of the Member States, I am informed, donated 75 lorries for transporting grain, but they consisted only of the cab and basic structure and were therefore of no use whatsoever, as facilities for adapting these sophisticated vehicles simply do not exist in Ethiopia.

Finally, Mr President, I would like to pay tribute to the Commission and its staff for the work they have

done in past months. It is known and appreciated by the other aid organizations with whom they have worked in Ethiopia. I am also happy to say that finally the Government of Ethiopia has begun to respond, inadequately but appropriately, to the situation. As far as this response exists, we welcome it.

My group is pleased that we have had this debate and urges the Council and the Foreign Ministers to respond with alacrity to our motion for a resolution.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**Mr Welsh (ED).** — Mr President, Members of my group heard the answer to this question from the President-in-Office with considerable alarm. They do not think it does justice to the seriousness of the subject and those of our colleagues who have been to Ethiopia and to Tigre have severe doubts as to whether Commissioner Natali actually saw the whole scene. This is a matter we shall continue to pursue until it is satisfactorily resolved.

I would like to draw attention to a petition I have received from the town of Blackpool in my constituency of Lancashire. It was signed by 668 citizens and I would like to read it to you. It says:

We entrust the following petition to you to be read at the next session of the Parliament. The request is simply that more grain be released from the grain mountain to Ethiopia. Many consciences are being troubled by our apathy and affluence in the West when our brothers and sisters in the Third World are starving.

That petition came from Blackpool. I suspect it could have come from any town in the European Community. I know the Commission are doing their best. I know it is not as simple as people think, but I also know that on the whole the ordinary people of Europe do not think we are doing enough and I think their voice should be heard.

*(Applause from the European Democratic Group)*

**Mr Kuijpers (ARC).** — *(NL)* Mr President, in 1952 the former Italian colony of Eritrea was granted the right of self-determination by the United Nations. Haile Selassie's regime did not recognize this, and the present Mengistu regime does not recognize it. Civil war and food aid have been used as weapons during the period of British and American colonization and during the present period of Soviet domination. What is our position on this? We must put this question to the Council. Must we go on tolerating this oppression? I should like an answer to this question. With all due respect for the statement by the Commission and Commissioner Natali, I have found during several on-the-spot investigations that food aid simply does not reach 85% of Eritrea. I have not yet received an

**Kuijpers**

answer to my letter to the Council and to the evidence I have produced.

**Mrs Lehideux (DR).** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of the European Right is proud to have been the first to ask last October for aid to be given to Ethiopia. We in fact requested that airborne divisions be set up to distribute the Community surplus foodstuffs to the inhabitants of Ethiopia. Of course the million or so Ethiopians then at risk have since died amid general indifference similar to that shown for the Lebanese Christians dying at this moment.

The Group of the European Right supports, as you know, a North African policy and a policy supplying all possible aid to all those countries. Naturally it must be acknowledged that Ethiopia is under threat chiefly from its own government, a government which does not concern itself with its people, a government headed by a dictator. The Ethiopian people are threatened not only by climatic conditions but chiefly by their own government.

We therefore issue an urgent call for action. We condemn acts of barbarity. We condemn in particular the Ethiopian government for its policy of deportation, for the action of the Soviet army which we demand should leave at once. We also demand the intervention of the United Nations troops in Ethiopia, the organization of free elections under international supervision, the introduction of a large-scale anti-famine plan in Ethiopia under the auspices of an international body working in collaboration with the new government resulting from free elections.

We place on record our indignation and anger at the slaughter of the Ethiopian people perpetrated by the present regime. We propose the immediate organization of a European programme of solidarity for the survival of Ethiopia in order to transport as quickly as possible the 500 000 tonnes of foodstuffs needed to avert the worst disaster.

We should not delude ourselves that it is all the fault of the climate of the country — it is chiefly the fault of the government and we must ask for an aid policy to be implemented as a matter of urgency.

**Mr Ulburghs (NI).** — (NL) Mr President, the distribution of food to the hungry in Ethiopia may be working at the moment, but I should like to underline the dramatic situation now developing in that country. Firstly, I must emphasize the crippling effects that the growing militarization of this region is having. For example, transport is used first and foremost for military purposes rather than the movement of the food that is so desperately needed. We should therefore like to ask if Ethiopia is willing to enter into negotiations with the freedom movements in Eritrea and Tigre and

make peace with Somalia so that top priority can be given to the distribution of food and the establishment of a peaceful economy to enable food to be provided for this country and these people. Pending the outcome of such negotiations, aid should, of course, continue.

I would also remind the House of other causes of this famine. The tragic shortage of food is primarily the result of a natural disaster, but this disaster is aggravated by economic and political factors. In the past these East African countries have repeatedly been hit by such natural disasters as drought: the Old Testament describes how periods of drought and famine alternated with periods of plenty. But in those days precautions were taken. And now? We find, for example, that Ethiopia is still exporting meat. Fertile land is overgrazed by cattle, which then have to be exported to the West so that Ethiopia can obtain the foreign exchange it needs for military purposes. In Ethiopia, as in most Third World countries, we also find monocultures, which are conducive to deforestation and desertification. We propose that food aid should also be used to stress the need for such factors to be eliminated once and for all.

**Mr De Gucht (L).** — (NL) Mr President, on a point of order. What is happening here is unacceptable. After an initial intervention we succeeded in ensuring that at least one representative of the Council was here, and now we find that he is not even listening — unless, of course, he is a linguistic genius. It is surely reasonable to expect a representative of the Council to pay at least some attention to what is being said.

**President.** — Mr De Gucht, I don't think we should make suppositions about the linguistic abilities of the representatives of the various institutions in this Chamber. You have to assume that everyone knows all the languages.

**Mr McGowan (S).** — Mr President, in February of this year I was in northern Ethiopia. I flew into Tigre with the RAF Hercules when food and medical supplies were being delivered. I found the situation there very grim indeed. I have experience of famine victims in other parts of Africa, but I have never seen such human and environmental devastation. I met workers from the International Red Cross and the United Nations, including their coordinator, Kurt Janssen. I met NGO members including Oxfam and Save the Children Fund people from my own country and the Ethiopians' own Relief and Rehabilitation Commission and had interviews with the Foreign Minister and the Planning Minister.

I have to say that I arranged the visit myself with collaboration from the NGOs in the UK, some assistance from the Foreign Office and advice from the Commission. I was not a guest of the Ethiopian Government

**McGowan**

nor was I a guest of any of the liberation organizations in the north of Ethiopia. I have no partisan obligations nor have I any partisan axe to grind. The purpose of my visit was fact-finding. I wish we could start dealing with facts.

I have to say that nearly a year after the world community has demanded action on Ethiopia this Parliament has not yet sent an official fact-finding delegation to Ethiopia. One is, in fact, going next month but it is a disgrace and a shame after all this time that we are not seeking real facts through an official delegation. I found that millions of people are at risk — up to a quarter of the population. The famine, as I have reported before, will be long-term. There is still a shortage of food and medical supplies, especially supplementary food, high calory biscuits, enormous shortages of trucks. It is important in Europe to remember that in Ethiopia, like most of Africa, they do not have roads as in Europe. There are enormous distribution problems, there is a civil war. It is a security nightmare.

We are getting food and other supplies there in the form of emergency aid and food aid through the United Nations, the International Red Cross and other ways. But this, of course, is not adequate. What I have to say is that I am appalled that the plight of so many people is still being used for Cold War propaganda by people in this Chamber. That has been encouraged by the United States and has been encouraged by Members this morning. We have, of course, had reports from Mr Natali who has now made two visits to Ethiopia. I think he has substantiated some of my previous reports but when we can raise so much money in my country through jumble sales, more than Member States are raising, I think we should stop the hypocrisy, stop the Cold War and start dealing with the facts about the plight of so many millions of lives that are at risk.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Christopher Jackson (ED).** — Mr President, I am speaking pursuant to Rule 42(2) to make a brief comment on the answer given.

I am in some difficulty in thanking the President-in-Office for his answer. It is clear that considerable efforts are being made in Ethiopia, and I pay tribute to the work of the Commission and of Mr Natali himself. Equally, it is clear, as Mr McGowan has just emphasized, that these efforts are not enough — and that is largely due to the war.

That brings me to what I can only call the non-answer concerning political action on a cease-fire. I do not blame the President-in-Office for this personally — I know that his hands are tied — but I have to say that this disgraceful answer well illustrates the problems of European Community political cooperation and the

need for progress to be made in Milan later this month. It is clear the Foreign Ministers acting in political cooperation have not seriously addressed themselves to this problem.

*(Applause from the European Democratic Group)*

I ask the President-in-Office to take back to his colleagues our view that the case of Ethiopia deserves their full attention if the European Community is to discharge its responsibilities. Public concern about this matter is increasing. It is high time that we gave all the help that we can to those affected by the war; and it is high time that the Foreign Ministers acting in political cooperation developed a coherent approach by the European Community to this problem.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I have received the following motions for resolutions with request for an early vote to wind up the debate, pursuant to Rule 42(5) of the Rules of Procedure:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-412/85) by Mr Jackson and others on Ethiopia,
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-430/85) by Mrs Lehideux and others on the famine in Ethiopia.

*(Parliament agreed to the request for an early vote)*

The vote on the two motions for resolutions will take place at 7.30 p.m. tomorrow.

The debate is closed.

### 3. *Internal market — Public supply contracts — Roll-over protection on tractors*

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

- the report (Doc. A 2-50/85) by Mr Patterson, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, on the consolidation of the internal market
- the report (Doc. A 2-38/85) by Mr von Wogau, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, on the communication from the Commission to the Council on public supply contracts (COM(84) 717 fin. — Doc. C 2-9/85) — conclusions and perspectives
- the report (Doc. A 2-37/85) by Mr von Wogau, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 400 fin. — Doc. 2-1283/84) for a directive on the approximation on the laws

**President**

of the Member States relating to roll-over protection structures incorporating two pillars and mounted in front of the driver's seat on narrow track wheeled agricultural and forestry tractors.

**Mr Patterson (ED), rapporteur.** — On a point of order, Mr President. I understand that the Commissioner responsible, Lord Cockfield, is on his way and will be here in a few minutes. I think it is particularly important in the internal market debate that we do have the Commissioner here when we begin. A large proportion of my remarks will be questions addressed to the Commissioner. Could I therefore request a short adjournment until he arrives?

**President.** — Mr Patterson, it would seem to me that it is not for the Assembly to suspend its sitting in order to wait for a Commissioner. I think it would be better for the Commissioner concerned to be here straight away. I must ask you now to address the House and produce your report.

**Mr Patterson (ED), rapporteur.** — Mr President, this morning's newspapers are full of historic events taking place today in Madrid and Lisbon whereby the European Community will become a common market of 320 million people with a gross product of over 3 000 billion ECU a year. Yet, every one of us in this Parliament probably has files of letters from firms — especially small firms — and individual Community citizens complaining precisely that we have failed so far to create a true common market in Europe. The proof of this can be seen in the questions tabled by Members and in the petitions which are dealt with in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. The petition which perhaps summed it all up for me some years ago concerned a Christmas cake sent from Denmark to Strasbourg, the *carrefour de l'Europe* which was confiscated because it did not conform to regulations.

The Alber and Ball report described the situation as non-Europe and they put the economic cost as being equivalent to a surcharge of approximately one week's work per year for every family in Europe. It is one of the principal causes of Europe's lack of competitiveness compared with the United States and Japan, particularly in the field of new technologies. The cost of surmounting internal barriers to trade is particularly damaging for small and medium-sized firms.

These two points have a special significance. New technologies and small firms are seen as the greatest source of new employment for the future. In other words, Mr President, non-Europe costs jobs. However, it is not just a matter of economics. Many of the letters I receive from constituents end ironically and bitterly 'I thought we were supposed to be in a common market'. The removal of all those petty barriers which affect the daily lives of citizens is going to be as

important for our political future as the removal of trade barriers is to our economic future.

We in the European Parliament and especially those of us who have supported the Kangaroo Group — I see there are quite a number of us in the Chamber today and in the gallery — have long been campaigning for a real common market.

What has to be done is very simply stated. First, the internal Community frontiers must be swept away. Secondly, there must be common technical and legal standards for industry and commerce and thirdly, we must develop common policies like that for transport and for external commerce.

Mr President, there are some very real signs that something is going to be done. The last European Council went so far as to name a date for the completion of the internal market — 1992. The Commission has made a pledge to put forward the necessary proposals. I read in the papers that my own government has recently even suggested bringing forward the date to 1990. So I have a feeling that we are all at last on the same side.

Let me now turn to some specific points. The document which my committee first considered is the so-called consolidation programme of last year, in which the Commission listed some 120 proposals which had to be adopted by the Council. The Commission was perhaps over-ambitious in setting the target date at the end of this year. Members will see from Annex I to my report that only about one-quarter of these proposals have so far been adopted by the Council.

Here comes my first question to the Commissioner — which I hope someone will pass on — my committee would ask the Commission to state whether or not it is still committed to all the proposals in the consolidation programme. My committee voted for that proposal. However, I understand the Commission is now going beyond a mere list of projects. I believe it will later on today be adopting a white paper laying down a detailed timetable of measures to be adopted up to 1992. This is something which Parliament has been calling for for a long time and, in particular, of course, in the von Wogau report one year ago.

So far so good. However, it will then be up to the Council and the national governments to put their votes where their mouths are, so to speak. This raises the first controversial issue, the decision-taking power of the Council. We welcome the readiness of all governments expressed in the report of the Dooge Committee to make more use of majority voting. We believe that this should especially apply in case of decisions affecting the internal market. Even where the Treaty calls for unanimity, there is apparently a willingness on the part of governments to use abstention

**Patterson**

rather than a vote against, so avoiding the veto. This could be of enormous significance.

A few remarks now on the programme itself.

First, we would like to emphasize, yet again, that the objective is abolition and not merely the simplification of internal frontier controls. We have before us the awful example, do we not, of Brussels Airport where we used to have to queue for five or ten minutes, perhaps a quarter of an hour, until they installed computers. Now we have to queue for anything up to half an hour while the man types the passport numbers into the computer. So, simplification is not necessarily what we want, it is abolition.

Secondly, as far as people are concerned, this means moving steadily from the adoption of the frontier control directive — and here I would like to ask the Commissioner to report on progress on the frontier controls directive — to full rights of movement and residence based on the concept of Community citizenship.

In the case of goods, we already have major progress in the form of the single administrative document. But, again, this must only be a first step. Quite soon all documentation must be replaced by a system in which data are directly exchanged between computers, and these computers must not be based on the frontiers either. I would ask the commission to confirm that the Caddia and CD projects do not involve that. We must not replace customs officers with customs computers, because the Brussels Airport analogy shows that they will be even worse.

Next, there is the question of the customs service itself. My committee believes that in the short term there must be a code of conduct so that regulations are interpreted in a consistent way by different national customs services. By 1992 there should no longer be any customs offices at internal Community frontiers. Instead, there should be a Community customs service operating at the Community's external borders.

When we come to services, the situation is very depressing. The service industries have nearly 60% of employment in the Community, yet the Commission notes that little progress has been made on the common market in services. We have first of all the scandal of the Community's common transport policy, or rather the lack of it. Parliament's victory in the Court of Justice will, we hope, prove decisive here. Nothing brings the Community more into disrepute than coachloads of tourists waiting at frontiers while their fuel tanks are measured or a supplementary VAT is levied.

This brings me to the next controversial question. That is the extent to which the internal market employs fiscal harmonization. It is clear that since there are no tariffs, the existence of different VAT and excise duty rates is a major reason for the continuance of internal

frontier controls. In the short term it is important that these controls are moved away from the frontiers. In the case of VAT the solution proposed by the Commission was that of the 14th VAT Directive whereby tax is paid after the goods have been imported. Here I would like to ask the Commission what progress it foresees in implementing the 14th VAT Directive.

Since recently, however, there is an alternative solution, apparently, whereby VAT would be paid in the country of export and then credited to the exchequers of the country of import through a clearing system. This would avoid a lot of problems, and I shall be very interested to hear what the Commissioner has to say on this subject.

In the long term, however, there is the bullet of tax rates and tax coverage which national governments are going to have to bite. There is, of course, always the Irish solution. When customs posts have been removed from the border or where they do not exist, people vote with their feet and take advantage of the lower VAT and excise rates in the northern part of Ireland to go and buy goods there. It then falls to the Irish Government to reduce its rates. Maybe the abolition of frontiers will produce fiscal harmonization by that mechanism. Maybe that could happen on the Danish-German border and on the Dutch-German border as well.

It is not necessary to align rates completely. We know from the United States that there are big differences. Certain countries will have problems. For example, Denmark has a VAT rate significantly higher than others and the United Kingdom subjects far fewer goods and transactions to VAT than others. There will be revenue effects from approximation. So we look forward to the promised Green Paper from the Commission that will study these questions.

Then we have the question of standards. Here the Commission is to be congratulated on the new approach. The new approach would sweep away all the technical annexes from these directives — and Mr von Wogau will be talking about this in a moment — and leave that job to the standards institutes. This could be a great step forward.

There is the question of financial services and the capital market and qualifications. As Parliament's last rapporteur on architects, I was pleased to see that the Council has at last adopted the architects directive — only 18 years late. We have the question of insurance, mortgages, the role of the ECU and cross-frontier currency controls.

Let me conclude on two points. First of all, I agree with those who emphasize that the internal market on its own is not enough. There must be policies for economic growth and there must be policies for convergence, for example, for training and investment in infrastructure. And there must be policies for competi-

### Patterson

tion as well, particularly on public purchasing and on State aids.

Finally, what should be the role of this Parliament? I go back to Annex I. The last column in my Annex I answers the question: who are the guilty ones? In other words, which governments, having said they are in favour of the internal market, are nevertheless blocking the practical measures which will ensure that that internal market comes about.

I call on all Members of this Parliament, in particular the fellow-kangaroos I see around me, to help Parliament to locate the guilty ones by open information and, if necessary, by obtaining secret information from Brussels. I ask the Commissioner, who I see has now come, to cooperate with Parliament in doing this — and even the Council of Ministers. Secondly, I call on all Members of this Parliament, when the guilty governments have been located, to go back to the national capitals and put pressure on them. I emphasize that all national governments have signed a piece of paper saying they are in favour of the internal market by 1992. They must be kept up to their mark.

So let us keep firmly in our minds and in the minds of our governments the vision of a real barrier-free Community, where it is no more difficult for any one of the Community's 320 million citizens to move between France and Germany, Denmark and Greece, buy a house and live there, work there, set up a company there, move goods, borrow capital, invest savings, take out insurance or a mortgage in any currency in any country, have their qualifications recognized, receive benefits if unemployed, raise a family, retire, than it is today between Scotland and England, Bayern and Baden-Württemberg, Tuscany and Emilia Romagna or Normandy and the Ile de France. That, Mr President, is a vision worth fighting for.

(Applause)

**Mr von Wogau (PPE), rapporteur.** — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. Today when we discuss the realisation of the common market by the year 1992, I find that one thing has changed substantially in the five years that we have been pursuing this objective. At that time it was only a very small group of active kangaroos that was concerned about this question. Today we have at least succeeded in getting Parliament, the Commission and the Council to give this subject the priority it deserves. It is certainly one of the successes of this Parliament that everywhere in the Community it is understood that the realisation of the common market is an essential preliminary if we are to become capable of competing against Japan and the United States and an essential prerequisite if we are to be armed for the fight against unemployment in Europe.

Our aim is to create an open common market by the year 1992; the Commission's concrete proposals for

this will be on the table in Milan. In my view it is particularly important for us to create a common market for advanced technologies, with common standards, mutual recognition of certificates, the continued development of the European patent, the development of a European trade mark law and Europe-wide procurement, because that is a prerequisite if small and medium undertakings, which are particularly innovative and do create more jobs than anyone else, are to be able to take advantage of the opportunity offered by the wider market from the beginning.

Allow me to speak briefly on the subject of common standards. Our Parliament is calling for the standards institutes CEN and Cenelec, which are already in existence and operational, to be expanded to form an efficient European standards institute which is largely self-financing, must be staffed by outstanding specialists and should be independent of day-to-day administrative work. In our opinion the technical details for arrangements on a European basis must be evolved within this framework and not, as hitherto, by the Commission's services. In the past we have repeatedly seen hundreds of pages of technical directives flutter down onto the Community table, giving the cartoonists repeated opportunities for amusing themselves with the European Community.

The Commission has already agreed in principle that we should set out along the new way which is very much more flexible, cheaper and better. That was why we were particularly surprised — and ask ourselves whether the Commission's right hand really knows what the left is doing — when once again one of these elaborate documents, concerning roll-over protection structures on tractors fluttered onto the table — 105 pages. In future Parliament will no longer condescend to concern itself with things like that. It will simply refuse, because in our view there is no room for this kind of thing in a directive or legal text. In every other State and society this kind of thing is done by standards institutes and therefore Parliament will call on the Commission to withdraw this proposal. It will in any case refuse to give an opinion.

You know of course that according to the judgment of the European Court of Justice a directive cannot become effective if the European Parliament has not given an opinion. In this way we should ensure that this kind of excessive bureaucratic zeal, which has repeatedly been a source of irritation in the past, will no longer be possible in the Community in future. That is why I should like to ask you to support these proposals from the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

I believe that Parliament should take this opportunity of starting a campaign against European bureaucracy. If we set out along this new road, today alone we shall have saved 105 pages of superfluous legal text in the European Community.

**von Wogau**

If in addition we undertake to reduce by half the length of legal texts issued by the Community, the aim seems to me to be entirely realistic in view of the opportunities available, and we should carry on along the same road.

But we also have to ask ourselves, what is needed overall to realise the open common market for people, goods and services? I have to tell you that there are some things which in my view can be realised easily and others which require a big political effort.

Basically I see four baskets, which contain various things which have to be realised by 1992. In the first basket we have the Europe of advanced technology, which I have already mentioned, with common standards and mutual recognition of test certificates. It is in fact also very important for an undertaking which wants to market a product throughout the European Community to be able to gain actual access to all countries of the European Community with a single test certificate.

Then the continued development of the European patent. There is one member country which has been blocking this development for many years, and in my opinion this is a case for a two-speed Europe. If it is that country's view that it would gain nothing from a European patent, we should take a step forward without that country. The same applies to the realisation of the European trade mark. The Commission's and Parliament's proposals are already on the table and should be passed as quickly as possible.

Now to the question of European procurement. We have rules in the European Community about tendering, but they say, for example, that calls for tenders for more than 200 000 ECU — in the building sector, more than 1 million ECU — must be on a European basis, which means that if a school is to be built in Bavaria, there is a Europe-wide call for tenders. The same directive does make exceptions however, for the energy, post and telecommunications sectors, as well as defence, and the billions of investment employed in these sectors is not advertised on an European basis. Albert and Ball, whom Mr Patterson has already quoted, have estimated that in that way alone there are possible savings of 40 billion ECU which are not being realised. In this sector therefore we are not allowing the common market to get off the ground and therefore one of the greatest efforts to be made in the immediate future is to convince the ministers for posts and the other ministers concerned that they have to open up their markets and radically alter their purchasing policies.

The second basket is the taxation basket. It is my opinion that we in Europe will never have identical tax burdens and uniform rates of tax. Even in America that is not the case. There, in individual cases, there are differences in turnover taxes of up to 6% between neighbouring states. Nevertheless it will be necessary

to bring about the approximation of tax rates. The situation in Europe is such that a tax of 200% is levied on a car purchased in Denmark, whereas in Luxembourg it is only 12%. With such glaring differences it is not possible to open up the frontiers without some harmonization. It is a very difficult political task however, so that the real question which has to be asked is which direction are we to take and where should the greatest political effort be made.

Thirdly: the Europe of services — I do not really understand what obstacles still stand in the way of allowing services in certain sectors to be Europe-wide — and undoubtedly also the creation of a European monetary area. I have repeatedly pointed out that every year 2.4 billion ECU is spent on foreign exchange alone. The barriers to trade and the trading uncertainty which this generates also undoubtedly damage trade within the European Community to some extent. The continued development of the European monetary system is therefore also one of the basic conditions for the realisation of the common internal market.

Let me come to one final point, the last common basket. If we do create this European internal market, again and again we shall come up against the difficulty that cooperation between the authorities of the individual member countries even today is still extraordinarily complicated. For example, if an authority in the Federal Republic of Germany wants to obtain information from the parallel authority in France, it has to take the complicated route through the regional government, the government in Bonn and the foreign ministry there, the foreign ministry in France, the competent ministries there and then back down the whole administrative ladder, so that in practice information and administrative and legal assistance of that kind can only be gathered via enormously complex routes.

If we want to realise the common market we have to create the conditions under which horizontal communication between the competent authorities of the member countries is possible, and I consider it to be the duty of this Parliament to seize the initiative here and to place practical proposals on the table, because I have not seen any so far. This horizontal communication exists between the Customs authorities, but it is still not possible between the security services or between any other authorities. It would be possible to take very large and important steps forward with a small amount of money and relatively little political effort.

And now to conclude. There will be various questions on the table in Milan, such as the cooperation of Parliament, which I think should be strengthened in this field, and the question of the majority rule. I believe it could be a very pragmatic way of taking a look at the White Paper which the Commission is laying on the table, and then deciding jointly that all the points con-

**von Wogau**

tained in it, or at least the majority of them, can only be decided by a qualified majority and that the governments of the member countries undertake not to use the veto on these questions. It is my opinion that the unanimity rule not only has negative effects, because it delays decisions — sometimes a slow and carefully prepared decision is even better than a short, sharp one — but that it is responsible for the Community's being so enormously bureaucratic nowadays. If in Council working parties the civil servant concerned can be sure that even where tiny regulations are involved he can hold up any directive, if his personal hobbyhorse, his personal wishes, are not taken into account, the result is monster directives, which is what we keep complaining about. This is the second proposal for ending bureaucratisation of the European Community which I should like to lay before you today.

(Applause)

**Mr De Gucht (L)**, *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights.* — (NL) The Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights fully endorses the contents and spirit of the Patterson report and the contents and spirit of the programme for the consolidation of the internal market. My committee wishes to make two specific and important contributions to this debate on the basis of two motions for resolutions drawn up by Mr Barrett and Mr Turner.

The Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights feels that Parliament must leave the way open for the same action as it has taken over the common transport policy. At a given moment the European Parliament went to the Court of Justice and obtained satisfaction. This is not to say, Mr President, that we envisage doing this in the immediate future. But it does mean that after a thorough study we have come to the conclusion that, unless the Council and the Commission take appropriate steps, we again have the necessary material to bring an action before the Court of Justice and to succeed. I would even go so far as to say that we would be even more successful than with the action relating to the transport policy because the Council and Commission have entered into specific commitments in the programme for the consolidation of the internal market, specific commitments with a date attached, and that element was entirely missing from the transport policy action.

The second contribution the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizen's Rights wishes to make, Mr President, concerns the subject raised by Mr Turner in his motion for a resolution on the attitude of customs officials. While not fully agreeing with Mr Turner when he calls for a Community directive on the conduct of customs officials at internal frontiers, we do feel that the Commission should make a study of the codes of conduct that apply to customs officials in the

various Member States. The Commission should come to Parliament with the findings of this study, and they might serve as a basis for a recommendation to the Member States with a view to introducing certain minimum standards, a Community agreement on the way in which citizens must be treated at the Community's internal frontiers. Not a directive then, but a recommendation to the Member States directly from the Commission. In other words, the Council does not need to be involved in our humble opinion.

I also hope, Mr President, that at the Milan summit meeting the Council and Commission will take all their decisions by a majority, at least where the programme for the consolidation of the internal market is concerned. I believe this is an ideal time for the Council to give an assurance on this. There is a clear-cut programme which the Commission and Parliament approve. That is evident from the Patterson report. There is a clear time-limit: we want this before 1992. If we are to succeed, we must also have an assurance from the Council that in this area at least decisions will be taken by a majority. If the Council is not prepared to accept this, I believe we must be under no illusion about the Council's willingness to establish a genuine internal market by 1992.

Finally, Mr President, I would point to the failing, in a sense, of the directive on public contracts. As things stand, we offer firms, even multinationals, the advantage of ten national monopolies rather than requiring them to operate and compete with one another in an internal market. We are the ones who pay the price for this. As a result, the prices of all these products rise. This is an entirely unacceptable situation, and I believe that here again the Commission must come forward with a proposal in the very near future, put the Council on the spot and throw open the market in public contracts.

**Mr Rossetti (COM)**, *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Transport.* — (IT) Mr President, on the question of the internal market, the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Andreotti, affirmed yesterday that the results obtained in this sector

were not up to expectations, in spite of the repeated affirmations of political goodwill on the part of the Member States and the activities of the Commission.

I believe I can say something else which confirms this view: there is one Community sector of the internal market, transport, on which the Council has not only not even made affirmations of goodwill but, rather, is in default, which has led this Parliament to go before the Court of Justice and the latter to issue a judgment some days ago, which is a historic one in a sense, condemning the Council of infringement of its obligations under the Treaty of Rome in the transport sector.

The Council must therefore create the appropriate conditions within a 'reasonable' period of time,

**Rossetti**

according to the judgment — 'rapidly', we would say — to achieve by a series of harmonizing measures the effective liberalization of the transport market and thus effectively to consolidate the internal market in this sector.

Parliament's line is clear. The proposals before us are not new. As this Parliament affirmed three years ago, we must achieve a common transport market which is as free as possible; that is one of the conditions for achieving an effective global internal market.

In the opinion which it delivered on the matter, the Committee on Transport wanted to emphasize that need strongly: it is difficult to speak of a unified market if at the frontiers there remain barriers and wearisome formalities — at the frontiers of my country, for example, lorries are forced to wait as long as three days to complete the necessary formalities; the economic integration of the Member States is not also promoted by an adequate infrastructure and communications policy; if nothing is done to overcome the marginal nature of some areas; if we do not make rational use of 'territory' and energy factors.

So that presupposes an adequate transport policy and more substantial funding behind it. Obviously this must be done in the framework of planning, to harmonize the different conditions pertaining in the transport sector in the various countries, in order to avoid creating problems.

We are waiting to hear a little more about the master plan for transport announced by the President of the Transport Council, honourable Members.

Meanwhile, the Committee on Transport urges the implementation of the measures listed by the Commission for this sector and considers it useful to express its vigilance and its support for the Commission's activities and also to specify, by means of a few amendments, the most significant and urgent proposals. It trusts that Mr Patterson, the rapporteur, will understand the constructive spirit in which these amendments to his report have been presented and that Parliament can therefore endorse them.

**Mr Seal (S)**, *Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy*. — Mr President, I should like to make a few comments to the Assembly which I feel may influence some of the following speakers. We decided that we would adopt grand themes for the plenary sittings of this Assembly, and I feel it right that the internal market was considered and accepted as such a grand theme. The reason why it was put on the agenda of this particular part-session was so that it might enable the House to have some influence on the summit in Milan, and for this reason the report was rushed through the committee stage and put on this agenda.

That was an aim which was logical, laudable, and one which I supported fully, but unfortunately, some very serious problems have arisen. The first one is that if we are trying to influence the summit we can do so by influencing the Commission, since the Commission prepares documents which go to the summit. The Commission is at the stage of preparing a white paper on the internal market. We had hoped that this white paper would be available for discussion in committee and at this part-session before we made our recommendations. Unfortunately, the white paper has, I understand, been prepared but not yet been issued, which means that whatever we say here today will not influence the Commission — because they have prepared their document — and will, unfortunately, not influence the summit. So some of the aims have already been lost — and I regret that very much!

Secondly, in order to get this item on today's agenda, we did have to rush it through the committee stages. We dealt with over 90 amendments in a very short time in the committee. Because of that I feel we did not have the proper depth of discussion that we should have had on such an important issue. I regret that very much. I regret also that the political groups have not had the chance to discuss this item in the depth that it needed because the report was not available in sufficient time, and the Assembly has lost because of this.

It may be that because of the lack of time to discuss this report some of its aims are unrealistic. I would remind the Assembly of the words that were uttered in this House yesterday by the Italian President when he warned us not to have impossible dreams that are incompatible with reality. I feel that this report, unfortunately, falls into that category.

Here are two types of Members who are supporting this report. There are people like Mr Rogalla, who entertains idealistic dreams of a people's Europe, and I support those very much.

*(The President urged the speaker to conclude)*

I will conclude, Mr President. May I say that this report, because of the regrettable lack of time for discussion, has not touched the issues of regional policy, social policy, industrial policy and of how we need the trades unions to work together. I am sorry that there has not been more time for debate in the political groups or in this Assembly. I urge all of you — all of you in your political groups — not to deal in the impossible, not to deal in dreams: face reality!

**Mr Besse (S)**. — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, first of all I should like to express my full agreement with what Mr Seal has just said on the preparation of this report. A year after the adoption of the well-documented report by Mr Moreau and Mr von Wogau on the need to create the European internal market, Parliament is considering the matter once again.

### Besse

Just the brief space of a year, from one legislature to another, so Mr Patterson's report on consolidation of the internal market which we are now considering reflects the will of the European Parliament.

In recalling Parliament's intentions, the essential nature of a real market and the cost of a 'non-Europe' — 15 000 million ECU for formalities at intra-Community frontiers — and in its support for the Commission's aim of achieving a single market by 1992, the Patterson report is altogether timely. As timely and complete as possible given the list of tasks to be carried out for the creation of the internal market. A hundred paragraphs with more than a hundred amendments made in committee. . . This attention to detail should be matched, we believe, by certain factors — no more than three in my opinion — which together are very important for bringing this great enterprise to fruition.

Although there is a need to remove physical, technical, legal and fiscal barriers to trade, we would be failing to exploit the potential of the situation if we did not introduce what the Moreau and von Wogau report had already pointed out more clearly, that is, consideration of the purposes of the internal market.

There is no point in having a list of essential tasks unless we first set out the objectives we are pursuing. Completion of the internal market seems essential only if we undertake to do three things: to pursue a Community industrial policy for the sake of competitiveness and employment, to follow a decisive external trade policy and to practise regional and social solidarity.

First, an industrial policy. It is essential to simplify and harmonize technical standards for the purpose of collaboration in the setting up of a Community industrial strategy. To make it easier for European firms to operate it is important on the one hand to provide them with legal and tax conditions for increased cooperation and on the other hand to eliminate the partitioning of public markets as in the case of telecommunications, so as to increase industrial efficiency. The promotion of a standards policy, the progressive opening up of markets in the public sector and the facilitation of legal cooperation are merely conditions — the background required for the launching of large-scale joint programmes in industry wherever it appears that such programmes have a genuinely expansionary effect.

If budgetary resources, Community financial resources and State or company resources too are insufficient and are not allocated to the large-scale technological programmes which are decisive for our future in data processing, telecommunications or biotechnology, for example, any adjustments to the internal market will be pointless. The Community will have to bow more and more to the economic and political pressures of foreign strategies in which it will play the role of a mere casual sub-contractor.

Secondly, external trade policy. The historical rise of the United Kingdom in the seventeenth century, then

of the United States and Japan was in fact based on a large-scale internal market, fortified by a vigorous commercial policy. Although there is no doubt a need to arrange for the readaptation of industries which are losing ground, it is also just as essential to ensure that the Community's industries and services have conditions in which they can develop. This commercial policy is essential for the emergent strategic industries. It is also essential for resisting the unfair practices of our competitors on the international market.

It is for the Commission, which has powers conferred upon it by the EEC Treaty, to proclaim this external commercial policy. It pays to be firm, as we have just seen in the steel negotiations now under way with the United States. We must also stand firm against dumping, fraud and restrictions on exports of high technology materials. We need to stand firm in the future also when the new round of trade negotiations opens under GATT.

What we are asking for is a commercial policy which is tailored to and compatible with the aim of opening up the EEC, a policy which is consistent with its internal strategy. Adopting a new instrument of commercial policy is already a start, but I must point out here that the construction of a big market also implies that it must be capable of self-defence.

Third: regional and social policy. The complete opening up of the Community market will without doubt be beneficial to the Community as a whole, but it is based on the assumption that many firms and sectors will have to adapt, restructure or regroup themselves or perhaps in a few cases disappear altogether. It is an ambitious and laudable aim to achieve this by 1992, but it will depend upon the implementation of effective common policies for the benefit of those regions and sectors which are in difficulty. We need to draw up a time-table on this too. It would also be pointless and intolerable even to open up a market if such action led to an aggravation of the disparities between regions or economic sectors and would bring out clearly the emergence of a two-speed economy, a dual economy unfair in social terms.

Solidarity is essential. That is the message of the final document adopted in Milan by the European Trade Union Confederation. On page 11 it states that in Western Europe it is essential to strengthen the internal market, to remove customs barriers and difficulties at frontiers and to promote harmonization and standardization.

But the European Trade Union Confederation emphasizes three preconditions — first, measures to develop the internal market must be accompanied by macro-economic policies ensuring that there is a general increase in economic activity and employment; secondly, any measures taken regarding the internal market must be accompanied by measures for the development of the European social area; thirdly and

**Besse**

lastly, industrial policies must be developed simultaneously.

Finally, then, it would be wrong to think that all we need do is to remove the present obstacles to a large-scale market. An increase in facilities on a national scale can be beneficial only if resources are mobilized together with broad Community industrial and commercial strategies. We should indeed open up a vast economic area but we must also make sure that it does not provide a period for rest, for *laissez-faire* or for the decline of Europe which would become even more marked. My group's amendments reflect that concern.

(Applause)

**Mr Abelin (PPE).** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Patterson and von Wogau reports, which are coming into their own just a few days before the Milan Summit, propose that the desire of the European Parliament and of public opinion in the various Member States to turn the Community into a real common market of 320 million people should be clearly and strongly recorded. That would be an extraordinary potential asset for our firms and our citizens as compared with the American market or the Japanese market — only just over a third of the size. But it is an asset of which unfortunately they cannot yet take advantage.

As regards taxation in particular, the distortion is becoming more and more alarming. Whether we look at VAT or corporation tax, harmonization proves to be all the more urgent since reforms currently in progress across the Atlantic will make it necessary for us to modify our own systems in one way or another. It is clear what line we should take: a harmonized tax system on a European scale with simple and limited extensions, broad bases of assessment and moderate rates.

In general it is not necessary to illustrate further the advantage of a single market. Whatever the estimated cost of a non-Europe owing to the absence of an internal market or to very limited access to public supply contracts on a Community basis, whether it amounts to 40 or 52 thousand million ECU as pointed out in the Albert and Ball or the Moreau and von Wogau reports, the cost is considerable and is a serious handicap to the competitiveness of our economies.

The list of problems still pending sometimes seems overwhelming in the light of the work still to be done, but we must regard it as an added incentive to forge ahead without delay and adopt as soon as possible the proposals before us — namely, a timetable, a method and a decision-making process.

A timetable is required for each programme so that the target date of 1992 does not seem just another pipe-dream, a proposal without a future, so that govern-

ments cannot indefinitely put off taking certain decisions which do not suit customary procedures or interests on the pretext that not enough progress is being made in other sectors.

A method: so far as possible the method based on packages which makes it possible to gather together proposals which are in some way related and which imply mutual concessions.

Finally a decision-making process. In this field as in many others, though perhaps more than in other fields, in which too much attention seems to be paid to vital interests for very minor points, unanimity voting acts as a brake on progress; this is unreasonable and qualified majority voting should become the rule.

We might nevertheless wonder whether this major institutional problem really belongs here, at the risk of giving the impression that the majority rule could be applied only in the sector we are dealing with today, even though it falls within the scope of a much broader institutional re-examination.

I would add in conclusion that the advances proposed in the Patterson and von Wogau reports are meaningful only within the context of a real Community. Beyond a stronger regional policy, consolidated monetary stability and greater harmonization of economic policies, there are no internal markets without external frontiers and without a real commercial policy *vis-à-vis* the outside world, otherwise the advances we wish to see might result in greater penetration from without and a weakening of this Community, which would thus rapidly become a soulless free-trade area.

Today, following the Patterson and von Wogau reports, after the white paper we are expecting from the Commission, it seems even clearer that what Europe most needs now is not fresh ideas or fresh policies and not even fresh funds but a genuine political will. The diagnosis and the treatment are clear. The question now is whether the patient has the will to recover or whether he still prefers to continue treating his anæmia with words and aspirin tablets.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

**Mr de Ferranti (ED).** — Mr President, I must place on record my regret that the chairman of our committee should have misused the procedure of this House to put forward points of view which were supported by only two of the membership of the committee, namely himself and one other person.

The prize for which we are striving in this debate and in Europe as a whole is not just the 8% on the retail price index which we would be able to reduce if we were to accomplish the objectives outlined in this report. It is more competitiveness, and more competitiv-

**de Ferranti**

ity means more orders which in turn means more jobs. We are not just looking for an improvement in living standards. We are looking for work for the people of Europe which is so badly needed. It also means a move towards that greater dream of unity in Europe to which we all subscribe but which we can only achieve by getting the details right. I think it is because of that that the thanks of this House and, indeed, the people of Europe should go to Ben Patterson who has done such a marvellous job in this report, and also to Mr von Wogau, not only for his reports today but for the von Wogau/Moreau report which we had last year, which laid such an important foundation for the work today.

We very much hope and believe that the thanks of Europe will go to Lord Cockfield, the Commissioner. We have not seen his white paper but we have heard him, we know that his heart is in the right place and we are confident that the report will give us clear indications of how we can proceed in the future. If I may, I should like to thank Kangaroo supporters everywhere for a really remarkable achievement in getting the subjects as far as we have.

What are we up against — apart from the clock? Who are these guilty governments to which Mr Patterson referred? Who are the people who are denying Europe the benefits which we are talking about, and, in effect, ripping off all the consumers of Europe to the extent of 8%? Who are the guilty governments? Why are they guilty? I suspect the biggest single reason why is sheer ignorance and sheer inertia, coupled with, every now and again, somebody's little empire somewhere which he is trying to protect.

Let us face it, there are very real reasons why some governments are being cautious. Interests are affected. People's jobs are affected. It is right that there should be proper concern, expressed as it has been by a number of speakers, about the need to ensure the right social and economic and regional policies to make sure that the particular details are dealt with. That means that everyone of us in this House has a responsibility to follow the decisions that are being taken in the Council of Ministers and to make sure that when a particular government has got a problem individual MEPs go and see the Minister concerned and find out what the problem really is. I am sure each of us as MEPs has a real responsibility in our own capitals to make sure that the issues are understood in relation to all the internal market problems and properly followed up.

I believe that with attention to detail and continued efforts we could actually achieve a real common market by 1992.

*(Applause from the right)*

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO  
CERRETTI

*Vice-President*

**Mrs De March (COM).** — *(FR)* Madam President, as regards an internal Community market by 1992 as proposed by the Commission, we might be in favour if it were merely a question of making it easier to cross borders or of improving transport — which is more than necessary — of creating Community standards, of making life easier for our citizens, our regions and indeed our firms.

But then you see that is not the case. If we are to believe Mr Patterson, all the evils which beset us — economic decline, the dismantling of whole sectors of industry, increasing unemployment, falling investments, flight of capital — could be cured by a single remedy: the liberalization and derestriction of the movement of capital for multinational concerns; and that is what we are dealing with in the guise of the internal market. Mr Patterson states that he will cure the evil with an even greater evil. Mr de Ferranti's remarks moreover have just confirmed this: that this is above all a question of the competitiveness of firms.

To demand the free movement of capital and the removal of exchange protection when the flight of capital towards American financial institutions is depriving the Community of vast sums amounts to economic perversity. To remove our internal frontiers when our external frontiers — as was pointed out by one of our Members — are the most open in the world, leaving us unprotected in the face of the aggression shown by Japanese and American exporters is a sign of dubious logic and of thoroughly questionable economic efficacy. We should become a free-trade area, including the new Member States. There are no safeguards provided for preventing the frauds or malpractices which would inevitably arise from such derestriction; quite the reverse, the law of the jungle will prevail. Clearly the national parliaments will have to be ignored and supplanted if such a project is to be introduced and of course the States will even have to be stripped of their prerogatives. Did not Mr von Wogau just now confuse the elimination of bureaucracy and the right of veto — essential features for guaranteeing the independence of the States?

When the transitional stage for extending the Community to Spain and Portugal begins, the Community will be in a state of disintegration. At the very least the creation of an internal industrial market should have as its corollary the setting up of a genuine Community preference in industrial products, a plan of attack for employment, for our regions and our States. It is therefore equally essential to develop investment and production in Europe by means of mutually advantageous cooperation agreements and of investment for

## De March

worker training, research and new technological advances all based on a genuine Community commercial policy and a resolute stand in international negotiations.

Such investments would in our view reduce the disparities between deprived regions, thus avoiding the creation of a two-speed or multi-speed Europe. The real challenge lies not in freeing the movement of capital solely for the sake of profits but in mobilizing it to meet today's real needs — that is, investment in people, citizens, economic revival, productive investment such as jobs, training people to cope with the requirements of this modern age.

**Mrs Tove Nielsen (L).** — *(DA)* Madam President, the Liberal Group looks forward with great interest to the initiative on the internal market expected from the Commission in the next few days. In our view this is by far the greatest challenge facing the Community, because the time is approaching when we shall know for sure who wants to be actively involved in the task of making the Community function for the good of its citizens. In short the sheep will be separated from the goats. There are some who want to talk, who want to continue talking about how we can make Europe better for the citizens, and there are the others who want to translate proposals into action. It should be clearly understood that the Liberal Group wants action. We want action to be taken now on the many proposals designed to ensure that the internal market can function. We therefore look forward with great eagerness and interest to the initiative from the Commission promised before the Milan summit.

But we may as well abandon all thought of getting the internal market to function if we fail to grasp one very important point. Remember what has happened in the Community since the onset of the first oil crisis at the start of the 1970s. What has happened unfortunately is that state subsidies to industries in Europe have surged ahead, and we cannot and must not tolerate that. We must do all in our power to get state subsidies phased out. I need only point out that they are currently running at 40-50 billion ECU per year. This represents a sixfold increase in only 10 years. This must be stopped. If it is not, we shall never get the internal market to function.

I should also like to say that, if we are to build a better future, if we are to re-establish the conditions we want, it will be very instructive to cast our minds back and learn from our experience. It is always good to build on experience, and we have some experiences which trace their origins back to the 1960s. That was when customs duties were phased out, and the effect was that Europe experienced a return to sound economic conditions. That stimulated interest in investing in European firms and readiness to do so, it helped the Europe of the day to become competitive. We were able to hold our own in international competition. It

meant that many new jobs were created and that in the 1960s unemployment was virtually abolished. Well, isn't that precisely what we should do again? We must repeat what we did in the 1960s. We must create an economic revival in Europe. We must create new jobs. We must make new products. We must be able to compete on the world market. In short we must learn from our experience.

I shall conclude by saying that, if we do not make something of the proposals before us, we shall continue down a very bad road, which will mean for one thing that we have two categories of business in Europe. The big firms are much better equipped to deal with the many problems, while the small and medium-sized firms — and they form the majority in Europe — will get into even worse difficulties, since they do not even have the capacity needed to despatch a consignment in the space of one or two days. We cannot allow two categories of business to exist in the Community. Think of what is happening in our small and medium-sized firms. The spirit of enterprise, the drive to create something new, the get-up-and-go mentality, the absence of all talk of 40-hour weeks or cuts in working hours. They are happy if they can only escape some of the problems, only happy to be allowed to work, to produce, to create some new jobs. Let us help them, let us make our goods cheaper by simply removing all the obstacles at frontier crossings, all the formalities and documents to be filled in. Think that 5-10% of the price of an article is attributable to the many delays at frontiers and the many documents which have to be completed, not forgetting the many outlandish statistics which have to be returned. Madam President, let us show in the face of this, the greatest of all the challenges, that, instead of continuing to talk, we are now going to take action, that we now really intend to create a common Europe for the good of us all. That is what constitutes for us Liberals the greatest challenge of all. Let us act!

**Mr Carignon (RDE).** — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the report presented to us by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the internal market deals with an essential matter for the European Community and for its development. We all know that amongst the reasons for the industrial weakness of Europe the decisive factor is the absence of a large-scale market with harmonized rules, particularly as regards taxation, standardization and, as has just been said, freedom to cross frontiers.

Without going into the detailed figures we must nevertheless mention the matter. The failure to create Europe is costing the Community and its citizens dearly — somewhere between 1 and 2% of the Community GNP is the cost of non-Europe. All member countries could gain 1 or 2 additional growth points if intra-Community trade could develop without hindrance. In this age of low growth and of unemployment this is, I believe, a direct way for the Community to recover.

### Carignon

How then can this great internal market be created? I think the vast majority of Members of this House will agree that the means proposed in the report are amongst the most suitable. Nevertheless the creation of a large internal market certainly presupposes the preparation of a framework for action free from all kinds of constraints, but to judge from the Community's position in the field of research we still, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, have a long way to go. In fact, although Europe needs a continental dimension in order to develop and flourish, it also urgently needs a real European policy on research and development to enable firms to move successfully into what is known as the third industrial revolution.

Thus a coordinated Community policy for research plus the existence of a vast hinterland favouring the creation of large competitive production units would appear to be essential factors for the rapid creation of a large-scale European economic area.

Finally I should like to remind the House that, as was just mentioned a moment ago, this absence of an internal market constitutes a major handicap for small- and medium-sized businesses. If the obstacles and constraints are inconvenient and involve additional costs for big companies with branches in various Member States, they are often almost insurmountable for small- — and medium-sized businesses — even though, we know, they are dynamic and inventive and provide proportionately more jobs than large-scale concerns.

Creation of the internal market, which would be a boost to Community efficiency, the creation of jobs, competitive production costs, the free movement of persons, goods and capital, the strengthening of the EMS and the ECU, the elimination of the partitioning of public markets are all so many aspects of the same stake — a stake which is crucial for the Europe of today and for generations to come — that of regenerating strong growth and a Europe which is sure of itself.

Overtaken by America, threatened by new competitors, handicapped by its many markets separated by frontiers, under attack on world markets where it is gradually losing ground, Europe really does not present a clean bill of health. Thus an effective and quick-acting remedy must be administered unless we want to see Europe miss this third industrial revolution. Hence the urgent need to create a large-scale internal market freed from all kinds of constraints and obstacles.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the new Commission has, unequivocally and courageously, set Europe the target of a fully unified internal market by 1992. This target does indeed seem a difficult one to achieve, but our group will, also unequivocally, support Mr Patterson's report on the internal market. We all think that the creation of this large area of economic activity will allow the Community full scope to

redeploy its talents. It is clearly in a market of continental dimensions in which this boost to Community efficiency can reach its full potential, that Europe will have a chance to reach a situation of full employment once more and if possible to get its second wind.

Let us grasp the opportunity! Ladies and gentlemen, our Community lacks neither the imagination nor the means to take up the challenges of its day. European *savoir-faire*, its commercial and inventive talents, the dynamism of its traders and its citizens require only a suitable framework — that is, the existence of a true European market.

**Ms Quin (S).** — Madam President, the idea of completing the internal market is one which is very much in vogue at the present time and perhaps is in danger of becoming an article of faith, something which is claimed to be the solution of all our problems. However, speaking as a Socialist Group speaker, I would like to highlight some of the social and regional aspects in this matter which many of us feel are in danger of being overlooked.

Let me say from the outset that I do believe that some barriers are certainly unnecessary and cumbersome and do prevent firms from exporting. I am also aware of the many irritating measures which hamper the movement of people between our countries. However, some barriers can be and are necessary, particularly those of a short-term nature, when they are designed to avoid regional and social disruption on a damaging scale or are necessary for health and safety reasons. The Patterson report does not make adequate mention of this.

More fundamentally, I feel that there is very little actual proof that opening up the market is of itself going to have dramatic beneficial effects. I know, for example, that when Britain joined the common market one argument was that automatically in a larger market, trade would prosper. Of course, that was only one factor. At the same time the price of oil had risen astronomically and there were many other economic factors which meant that the world was moving into a recession and that that one factor, therefore, could not counteract the others.

I am also very worried that some of the effects of opening up the internal market so freely will actually be centralizing effects and, as has been pointed out many times in this House, we know that the gaps are actually widening between the rich and poor regions of this Community, and that adopting an entirely free market approach and talking about flexibility of labour, which might actually mean a flight of labour from the least prosperous regions, is not really going to solve our problems. While it is important that people can travel freely between countries, there is not much use having a theoretical freedom if many people in the poorest regions are simply not able to afford to make use of that freedom.

## Quin

The economic philosophy underlying the Patterson report again raises problems for me. I believe that without specific regional, social and employment policies it may simply result in the survival of the fittest and a climate in which big companies can win through but many others go to the wall. For that reason I still believe that the strong version of the Vredeling directive which the Socialist Group wanted is something that still ought to be agreed for the future.

As a Labour Member, there is much in the Patterson report which is contrary to our economic strategy, particularly on the total lack of controls on capital movements without any reference to the severe economic and social effects such uncontrolled flights of capital can provoke.

The economic philosophy of the report also seems to be that, if Europe's industry is more competitive, then automatically it will be in a better position in the world economy. Again, I believe that this is an over-simplified view when one looks at the United States and Japanese protectionism in industries as varied as ship-building and modern electronic consumer goods.

In conclusion, I would like to say that I believe in many respects the Patterson report is an example of putting the cart before the horse and my amendments seek to point this out. For even the most committed Europeans, I believe that regional and social policies should actually precede many of the measures that Mr Patterson is talking about, as well as industrial policies for coordinated, economic expansion.

The report seems to favour free internal market for its own sake but I believe that Europe can only make sense economically speaking if it serves the needs of people and creates a fair distribution of the wealth created. Our industries have been forced to undergo the most painful upheaval of restructuring and yet if the ideas of the Patterson report are taken to their logical conclusion, and without social, regional and industrial measures then the pain may simply be even greater in those of our regions which have already been hardest hit.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Patterson (ED), rapporteur.** — Madam President, under the Rules of Procedure, with your permission, I was asking the lady to give way and asking her whether or not all the points she has made are not to be found in paragraph 6 at the beginning of my resolution?

**Ms Quin (S).** — Madam President, that is not the case. Although we did manage to get included reference to the regional and social implications of the Patterson report, the point that I have been making is that such action should precede the action envisaged in the

Patterson report which, I know, is something that Mr Patterson himself does not accept.

**Mr Anastasopoulos (PPE).** — *(GR)*, Chairman of the Committee on Transport Madam President, unless a common European policy is developed in the sector of transport, and traffic and communications in general, as required by the Treaty of Rome, no substantial integration of the Community's internal market will ever be possible.

This may not perhaps be a very original thing to say, but on the other hand there can be no doubt about it. The report by our colleague Ben Patterson, which presents an almost integrated study of the various aspects of the all-important subject of consolidating the internal market, could be considered from this standpoint to be open to the following criticism: That while it refers to communications, it does not lay upon that subject the stress which it deserves; all the more so after today's signing of the agreement for Portugal's and Spain's accession, which enlarges the geographical limits of a Community comprising 340 million people. Within that area, the interdependence of development in the transport sector and in the internal market is still more apparent.

It is important to recall the consequences for trade, industry and employment of the introduction of new means of transport and major infrastructure projects at the time when those things happened. The railways, air transport, and the Panama and Suez canals — to name but a few.

Europe will not be able to build a unitary and dynamic internal market until goods and passengers can move around more freely, more rapidly, more safely, more conveniently, but also more cheaply. When the flow from the centre towards the periphery, but also from the Community's most outlying regions inwards towards the centre is established, the economic benefits to both sides will be substantial, and will not of course be limited to a much greater capacity for the distribution of products. An essential prerequisite, however, is a balanced development on a Community-wide scale, of the type that only common policies can secure. Otherwise, there is a risk that in the long term the market will again become fragmented, owing to the built-in mechanics of a united market which favours the most prosperous sectors and regions.

Within this framework it would be the task of a common transport policy to contribute to the consolidation of the Community's internal market, by promoting economic activity and the creation of new jobs, by investing in major infrastructure projects that would in turn facilitate new productive investment, and by increasing the Community's competitiveness by applying new and advanced technologies.

**Anastasopoulos**

In his opinion on behalf of the Committee on Transport, of which I have the honour to be chairman, Mr Rossetti has already developed the first recommendation for a common transport policy, namely the need for harmonization, but also liberalization of the relevant legislation, of taxation, etc. I do not think it necessary to repeat assertions with which I agree, nor to take up time today by referring to air and sea transport, concerning which the Commission has only recently begun to formulate the Community's policy with two communications, which are currently being studied by the Committee on Transport and which will in due course be presented to Parliament as a whole.

I need only point out that we are unfortunately still at the very beginning. However, I should like to dwell a little on infrastructure policy in the transport sector. I do not think it can any longer be doubted that appropriations from the common budget for infrastructure projects in the transport sector need to be trebled, at the very least. However, even in that event the appropriations would not suffice for the major works. European industry has estimated that at least 60 billion dollars are required if, in the next 20 years, we are to have a Channel tunnel, the link between Scandinavia and Germany known as Skanlink, and a network of European high-speed railways with a new pass across the Alps. It is therefore essential to combine common appropriations with private capital, to secure the finance for such works.

Need I point out that a road and rail link between England and France could alone according to estimates, create 100 000 jobs for 5 years? Yet, if we want to fight unemployment and promote a high level of economic recovery, we must proceed with caution. The advanced technologies adopted must be labour-intensive so that the rate of development of employment per unit of investment will be high. Time does not permit me to go more fully into the matter, but given the interdependence between transport development and the integration of the internal market, and the absence of any real common transport policy, which the European Court also recognised last May in its historic decision condemning the Council of Ministers for negligence, I cannot but conclude by expressing some concern. The Commission and Mr Delors' aim to consolidate the internal market by 1992 seems very ambitious, but we ought all help make it a reality.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Oppenheim (ED).** — *(DA)* Madam President, this report on the internal market leaves no doubt that the Commission and the European Parliament are now drawing on all their resources in the effort to create a common home market.

But the common home market can only yield maximum benefit if confidence in European cooperation is restored among the population and if the citizens are

once again convinced that European integration is necessary. Finally it is also necessary for the European business community to be convinced in all seriousness of the great potential inherent in the common home market.

Unfortunately it has taken many years to map out the details and, even though the ideas have been given concrete form despite everything, we could certainly have made even more progress if the will had been there. I have the feeling that in the past efforts to move forward were made conditional on harmonization, whereas in more recent times attention has been concentrated on exploiting practical possibilities instead of waiting for actual harmonization to become effective, which is perhaps just not possible or at least not at the present time.

The will is there in the Commission and the European Parliament, and it is now really necessary to concentrate all our efforts on a joint initiative and to make a realistic leap forward, just as was done when the customs union was created. Business and industry in Europe need firm guidelines in order to make better use of the advantages offered by a European home market. It is necessary to map out a strategy which can serve as a basis for action in the years to come. Thus not enough can be done to strengthen the Community's competition policy and, in that connection, the Commission must be even more active. We cannot accept many of the so-called technical barriers to trade which have been paraded in this forum by the score. I still cannot see why the conduct of the Italian authorities in doing everything to obstruct the passage of trucks across their frontiers should not be treated as a technical barrier to trade. I asked the Council a few months ago whether steps were not to be taken to intervene in connection with this competition-distorting reality and was told that it was for the Member States themselves to police the maintenance of law and order.

Once again — and I shall continue saying so — it is a barrier to trade when others are deliberately prevented from entering a country. There are many other examples, and we must continue to draw attention to them. We hope that the Commission will now be helpful to Parliament and its Members in giving practical effect to the necessary measures.

**Mr Bonaccini (COM).** — *(IT)* Madam President, we know that today's debate has enormous importance for the development of our Community and its unity. The agenda gives the subject of the debate as consolidating the internal market. I hope in the end this will not mean consolidating the many defects some of my colleagues have described here, but consolidating the progress — however little — and making of this a point of departure for the further development of our initiative.

**Bonaccini**

I agree with Mr Seal's objections to the organization of the work, even if that is not Mr Patterson's fault. Such important matters cannot be dealt with in this way, without documents, and so forth. I would frankly request President Delors, whom I esteem for his great political expertise and as a person, to pay attention to these facts and to realize that better relations between Parliament and the Commission also mean reciprocal documentation and information on a wider scale. I do not think all the political groups were able to 'metabolize' the problems and questions raised by this report properly. This situation will also result in different evaluations by the various political groups, perhaps also mine; but may I say at once that at any rate the Italian members of my group, who make up the majority within it, will vote in favour of this resolution, because we cannot vote against the principles set out in it and the first attempts to tackle this field.

As for the amendments, we will vote in favour of those which aim in that direction, even if the emphasis is not always the same. We cannot do the same for those amendments which do not seem to accept the principles to which I referred earlier.

Since I have little time left, I shall confine myself to a few remarks of a general nature. The political intention was to offer a new approach to market questions. It is a question not only of removing obstacles, as many Members have rightly pointed out, but of ensuring that these obstacles do not re-emerge, which is always possible, and thus making it possible to work towards further expansion and the achievement of the common market.

To this end we certainly need, for some matters at least, the competent technical staff of which Mr Von Wogau spoke. I must tell him, however, that some of his arguments about the red tape and procedural costs are not convincing and cannot apply, given the political importance of the subject.

We agree about the need to delegate to special bodies the decision-making powers to which he referred, but we must remember that these are decision-making powers of which Parliament is jealous and we therefore need the guarantee that when we work for the fair standardization to which he referred, we will also see the necessary links established with environmental and consumer protection questions, additives, animal feedstuffs, and so on.

What must be done, therefore, is to try to prevent the formation of new obstacles. In any case, we believe we have before us an important declaration of intent, designed to put pressure on the next European Council to look at it in a positive manner.

We want to create an instrument that is not an end in itself but valid for the future. In this context, may I cordially observe to Mr De Gucht that although his observation regarding recourse to the Court of Justice

is very acute, I shall take good care not to make that into the fundamental instrument. We are a political Assembly which cannot be content with a purely jurisdictional act.

We need a comprehensive framework. This has been referred to in the case of transport and fiscal policy. Mr Abelin said some very true words about industrial, commercial and monetary policy. We must prevent the same happening here as happened at the time of the Unity of Italy or even the German Zollverein. The Unity of Italy, and the bayonets of the Piedmontese troops moving south, also brought the unification of the internal market and today, in 1985, we still have the great problem of the Mezzogiorno to resolve. We do not want all this to happen to the Community; we want it strengthened, we want it successful in its progress towards economic and political union.

*(Applause from the Communist Group benches)*

**Mr Wolff (L).** — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Patterson is to be congratulated on his report. It is a comprehensive and accurate piece of work. I should also like to thank the Commission for having taken account of the amendments concerning the mutual recognition of qualifications and the number of customs officials and also for managing to treat agricultural products on the same basis as other goods.

In my opinion several paragraphs warrant further consideration.

The report places the emphasis on the need for greater use of majority voting. We all need of course to look beyond ourselves, we all need to understand that Europe represents the survival of all and that it will depend on our being able to look beyond ourselves and, where Europe's need is greater, to move beyond national contingencies. The Member States will have to give a reasonable and serious explanation of any veto. Majority voting should become the basis for our decisions.

During the course of the examination in the parliamentary committee I tabled amendments on the item dealing with the crossing of internal frontiers. I consider this to be one of the most important points since it will determine what follows this report.

When intra-Community frontier controls are scrapped completely commerce and trade will improve and irritations will be cut out. But should we not scrap intra-Community customs, since there is no point in doing away with customs checks unless the customs themselves are scrapped?

The officials will have to be retrained and put to other jobs, which they are quite capable of doing. A Community customs organization must be set up.

**Wolff**

We must not cease to stress that the real Europe involves the free movement of persons and goods. We must have mutual recognition of qualifications. The creation of the ECU will be of fundamental importance for Europe.

The recognition of European passports and even of those of Members of Parliament should not be the object of ridicule or rejected out of hand by meddling officials.

Tax barriers will be eliminated by harmonization. We must deal not only with VAT but with other taxes as well. We must envisage a parity of taxation which may perhaps affect rates either upwards or downwards for certain States and that must be borne in mind.

As regards inspections and the follow-up, we must specify them without going into detail. We must act to the best of our ability and as quickly as possible.

As regards standardization procedures and the laying down of norms, we welcome the fact that the Council at its last meeting adopted the Commission's fresh approach on standardization which will make it possible to decentralize the process for the creation of Community standards. Let us bear in mind that standardization must make it possible to eliminate clashes between national standards and avoid any obstacles to penetration of markets, but also, beyond the Community context, the standards must facilitate the flow of trade at international level.

All the objectives I have mentioned will make it possible to create the large-scale market planned for 1992 at the latest.

In the past we have seen that good intentions were not enough. The Commission had the right approach in proposing in its work plan for 1985 to present a timetable for the creation of the internal market which should be fully approved by the Council and which would be a consistent and binding instrument paving the way for the implementation of the Commission's plans for the great market. We await with interest the Commission's white paper and in particular the reactions of the governments at the Milan Summit at the end of this month. But there is one thing we can tell them and that is that we expect them to get off to a firm start with a real political will on the creation of the internal market by supporting the guidelines proposed by the Commission and we hope that the Commission itself, before putting the final touches to its white paper, will take account of and assess the scope of the measures requested in the Patterson report through which the European Parliament — and the popular will which it represents — intended to express once again its desire for a great market and a great Europe.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Lalor (RDE).** — Madam President, I am extremely pleased to see that in the same debate this Parliament is discussing both the necessity for a vast internal market and also the general orientation of specific public markets, even if at this point in time they are only limited to the supply aspect.

It does no harm to remind ourselves that the opening up of public markets is subjected to traditional practices which are mainly attributable to a series of political restrictions. Unfortunately for the Community and its people, this sad reality weakens the strength and potential of the European economy.

If, in the initial stages, we all deplore the shortcomings and in some instances the specific privileges attributable to public markets, we must also gradually abolish all existing barriers to the public market sector. The importance of public markets for all Member States — at an average of 20% of GNP — is evident. However, the fact that these public markets are restricted represents additional costs at Community level of tens of billions of ECU. Such figures give some idea of the economic benefit which would result from an integration of the internal Community market.

Furthermore, a substantial part of public supplies are destined for new sectors of economic activity whose future is more and more linked to accessible markets, for example, telecommunications, the new technologies, etc.

We must realize that the cost of a non-Community approach represents a serious threat for vital sectors of the industrial future of our Community. The means to achieve free circulation of goods is set out in the Treaties. These same Treaties also set out what should not be done in this sector.

The opening up of public markets should not only benefit the suppliers — industry and commerce — but also, and even more so, the consumer, thereby allowing national budgets to make substantial savings. Furthermore, all valid supply should be afforded equal opportunity. By adopting this attitude, numerous small and medium-sized companies would be able to tender for the supply of public markets.

In conclusion, I believe that it is important for all to bear in mind the situation that exists in the United States. In the case of our American competitors, from 10-20% of public orders are allocated to small and medium-sized industries, which results in vast improvement for these companies, a noticeable increase in employment and a more competitive price for state purchases. Maybe we can learn a lesson or two from the example of the US.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — *(DE)* Madam President. Colleagues. Dozens of ministers and heads of government in our Community — and previously, members of the

## Rogalla

Commission as well — are scornful of their fellow men and their legal rights: since 1958, contrary to Community law, they have resisted the obligation of allowing all citizens to move freely between the Member States without any kind of control. Workers, housewives, pensioners, everyone has to suffer — Helmut Kohl, François Mitterrand, Bettino Craxi or Margaret Thatcher admittedly do not. What, for obscure reasons, the bureaucratic chain of command — from the experts responsible, through the official advisers to the higher advisers and heads of division — concedes only centimeter by centimeter in the corridors of power — identity cards, searches, checks on bags and cases — the weekend speakers of Europe secure for themselves by virtue of their office. They never have to wait and have border officials say to them, 'I ask the questions here, open the boot'.

To judge by the variety of declarations — i.e. measured by their weekend speeches — the heads of State and of government themselves are now in danger of pontificating about peace and good relations. As far as the documentary freedom of movement for our citizens is concerned they make the same impression as the people who instal more and more rockets with the ostensible aim of making the peace more secure. Apparently they do not even notice it themselves.

How else is one to interpret what I myself experienced yesterday: a television team from ZDF waited a full 40 minutes at the Europe Bridge between Kehl and Strasbourg while its cameras were checked. It was only paperwork, the rubber stamp fetishists and the form maniacs went to absurd lengths — no-one checked whether the cameras were actually being carried! There could have been a small space shuttle among them. Only paper and stamps count. Is it any wonder that this Parliament has been fighting for freedom of movement for our citizens and yet has achieved very little? Any observer with any experience at all can confirm that controls are increasing not falling! Officials who are no longer employed on so-called spot checks have to be used somewhere else. If they are no longer needed at road frontiers, they carry out checks in trains and travel on them — first class of course.

The Socialist group therefore reaffirms its unreserved approval of this further attempt by the Patterson report to bring the people together without checks and so to give concrete form to the work of peace. What is possible among larger populations of varying degrees of size — from Brazil, through Canada to the USA — cannot be denied to a French grandmother and her German grandchildren. 30 billion DM of unnecessary annual expenditure and the associated attack on the dignity of the people subjected to controls without sense or purpose, cry out for changes to be made at last. Checks on people at internal frontiers must be stopped overnight, preferably by 1 July 1985. The only barriers which we really need within the Member States are the ones at level crossings!

Kohl and Mitterrand were on the right road when they bowed before the pressure from the European Parliament last year. This top road is the only one which leads to more cooperation between the police authorities of the Member States, to simplified legal and administrative assistance, to increased exchange of information in the fight against drugs and terrorism, to more pursuit of Customs duties and taxes, to uniform Customs administration for the European Communities. It leads to greater freedom for every young German visiting his Dutch girl friend, and for every French businessman looking for orders abroad or sending his goods there. The fathers of the EC Treaties knew that — almost 30 years later our great politicians of the 'Bottle counters' cartel' are allowing the civil servants at the frontiers to steal their thunder.

It cannot be right for the steel worker from Bochum to have his cigarettes and bottles of spirits counted when he comes back from his summer holidays, while banks, corporations and other wealthy members of society are able to transfer 100 million DM to the USA or Canada today in order to profit from higher interest rates. The small man is deluded into believing that the budgetary balance of the State or the EC depends on taxation being levied correctly — the big man takes his millions away from European investment. The one is an offence, the other is legal. The daily occurrences at our frontiers, the control dramas, the arguments and counter-arguments, system versus man, so-called order against freedom of movement, are more than a scandal. Let us therefore strengthen the forces which move these stumbling blocks to Europe out of the way, and let us help those people who have a sense of responsibility and who want to further cooperation!

**Mr I. Friedrich (PPE).** — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen. One of the problems of the internal market is that unfortunately people are not yet sufficiently aware of the immense advantages which an enlarged market offers them. Otherwise the pressure from the people would be much greater. Perhaps we have not explained it to them enough — in spite of repeated speeches from Mr Rogalla, to which I continue to listen with pleasure. The ordinary man only reads that goods have been coming in from outside again, and fails to take into account the fact that he therefore has a greater choice of supplier, and that this has the effect of lowering prices. One can only reply to the undertakings which complain about foreign competition that the word *foreign* is obsolete in Europe. We should get out of the habit of talking about foreign within Europe. We are citizens *within Europe*. Competition between undertakings is indeed increased, but the opportunities for supply are immensely enlarged and strengthened. Every serious analyst knows that the enlarged market is one of the most important measures there is.

It is erroneous that, as many politicians believe, the large undertakings gain more from a large market. It is

**Friedrich**

not so, it is only that the large ones exploit the opportunity of producing better where there are fewer 'Greens' running around, and make their profits where the taxes are lower. Let me give you two examples as evidence of this. There is a company in Germany which produces 'Wonder bags' for children with red, green and yellow sweets in them. They have to use colourings for them. Some of these colourings are permitted as unharmed in country A, whereas in country B they are noxious. Therefore these 'Wonder bags' have to be sorted: one kind of 'Wonder bag' for Britain, another for France and one for Germany. If the company could fill the 'Wonder bag' with one kind of sweet, things would be much simpler.

Another manufacturer in the area produces pallets for France. Suddenly he is unable to produce these pallets for the French market any more, the French are no longer able to buy them, because suddenly, for safety reasons, only certain nails are allowed to be used there. So, if the company continues to use German nails it can no longer export its pallets to France!

These are just two minor examples of how small and medium sized firms could benefit if we had a large market. There is so much discussion of economic programmes, job creation schemes, structural programmes, while here with the internal market a programme worth billions is already under way, and costs nothing. It could provide our governments with the opportunity to give impetus to the intensification of economic activity, the creation of new jobs, without gigantic costs. All it costs is adjustment, the breaking of old habits — and for many people that is manifestly the hardest thing there is. We have to rethink — each in his own field — to adapt to new conditions. Non-adaptation is the only thing which argues against it or makes it so difficult to translate the greater market into practical reality.

I hope that we are at last exploiting the opportunities which Europe offers. Unfortunately we have not hitherto exploited our opportunities in the way that we ought to exploit them in order to make it possible for our peoples to develop their potential. I hope that the Patterson and von Wogau reports will provide the impetus for us to take a step forward along the necessary road to a united Europe, for the sake of our peoples.

**Mr Cassidy (ED).** — Madam President, I rise to speak in support of Mr von Wogau's report on public supply contracts. British companies as a whole have little awareness of the important public sector market in the European Community. The public sector share investments and current purchases of gross domestic product in Community countries average 20%, including public undertakings and military purchases. In 1982, the last year for which full figures are available, 2 301 official contract notices were published in the Official Journal of the European Community, sup-

plement S. The value of those contracts was ECU 12 billion. In spite of the size of this important market very few companies seem to be aware of it if the number of subscriptions to supplement S is any criterion. Only 3 500 subscriptions for the whole of the Community! Yet supplement S carries details not only of Community contracts but Japanese public procurement and of contracts for countries associated with the EEC through the Lomé Convention.

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy feels that big though the market is it should be even bigger. They point out that the contracts advertised in 1982 accounted for only 6.77% of public sector purchasing. It is evident therefore that many authorities are not complying with the 1976 directive on the procedure for the amount of public supply contracts. Telecommunications undertakings in particular are among the worst culprits. But the biggest irony of all is that the military in all Member States buy principally from the United States of America and not from Community suppliers.

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (GR) Madam President, I am sorry but I cannot agree with most of the representatives of the menagerie we have seen established here today, and in the short time available to me I would like, in particular, to stress how very dangerous it would be for the Greek economy to conform to a common public procurement market. Especially as the Greek Government has announced it is to implement a programme for the Hellenization of public procurement, and bearing in mind that already a large proportion of public supplies come from imports, of which 50% from the EEC's Member States. We must sound a warning to the Greek Government, first on the basis of Directive 77/62/EEC of 1976, which requires Greece as well to conform with the practice of publishing in the Official Journal of the EEC, to align her national procedures with those of the Community, etc. Secondly, on the basis of Directive 80/767/EEC of 1980, which extends its validity to the GATT countries as well. Thirdly, in connection with the proposals by Mr Delors for the derestriction of public supply contracts until 1992, as part of the aim of consolidating the Community's internal market. Fourthly, because the transitional provisions applying to Greece lapse at the end of 1985, and Greece will then have to forgo any advantage Greek producers may enjoy when tendering at home. And finally, because of the procedures the European Commission has set in motion for instituting proceedings in the European Courts, under Article 169, in relation to Greece's present policy on public procurement.

In our opinion, especially in our own country, and subject to appropriate control and planning, public procurement could become a motor for supporting and restructuring domestic production, now facing huge problems. On the other hand, if it is made to fit in with the situation in the EEC, the inevitable result

**Alavanos**

will be a further undermining of our industry, a deepening of its dependence, and even greater penetration of EEC monopolistic capital into our country. We fear that in place of Hellenization, unless the Greek Government takes immediate action, we shall see public procurement in Greece becoming totally subject to the EEC.

**Mr Visser (S).** — *(NL)* Madam President, we all agree that the internal market must be established by 1992. But will we succeed in the transport sector if we continue at the present snail's pace? It has got to be done. An internal market without a liberalized and harmonized transport sector is only half an internal market and so not really an internal market at all.

Madam President, it can be assumed that everyone is aware of the economic significance of the transport sector, which is even greater than that of the agricultural sector. About six million people work in the transport sector. Despite this, it appears to have been rather pushed aside in the debate on the internal market, even in Mr Delors's mind. How definite is 1992 then? Fortunately, we now have the judgment of the Court of Justice, which went Parliament's way. The Council's negligence has now been established. The Council will have to keep at it from now on if it does not want to lose another action in two years's time.

In the last six months nothing has been done again in the transport sector. This is not the fault of the Italian Transport Minister but of the Council of Ministers of the European Communities. The judgment of the Court of Justice also seems to have settled the old question of what should come first, harmonization or liberalization. The Court decided that liberalization is needed, with harmonization as a back-up policy. So the Council must now put its shoulder to the wheel at last. There is enough to do to bring the internal market closer. I will mention just a few things: a substantial increase in the share of road transport under the Community quota, harmonization of weights and measures, customs formalities, more flexible tax settlement, improvement of social conditions, a larger share of transport handled by the railways (which is also environmentally more acceptable), the infrastructure programme (good for employment) and so on and so forth.

Let there be no misunderstanding, Madam President: as Socialists we do not want freedom if it means the right of the strongest. Regulation is still desirable, even necessary. There will have to be common European legislation, and the Patterson report, which I rate very highly, has many suggestions to make, for the umpteenth time. A tight schedule is essential in the transport as in other sectors.

Relations with the transit countries, Austria, Switzerland and Yugoslavia, are also very important for the internal market. Quite simply, we cannot get round

these countries, and here again a more decisive Community policy is needed, with rather more understanding for Austria's difficult position in particular.

To conclude, a few words about the free movement of capital. The Socialists are in favour of restricting extensive, speculative movements of capital — a threat to the world economy — and also extensive exports of capital to the United States. The free movement of capital should not mean simply letting everyone do as he likes. On the other hand, it is very important that there should be enough capital available, for example, for productive investment, Community facilities and regional policy, and the Community's internal frontiers must not form an obstruction. From various talks I have had with authorities I gather there is no satisfactory or complete list of existing bottlenecks. The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy agreed years ago that there should be a list of this kind, because without it an effective policy is hardly likely to be established. I therefore urge the Commission to submit this list to us as soon as possible.

**Mrs Van Rooy (PPE).** — *(NL)* Madam President, it is a disgrace that thirty years after the establishment of the EEC there should still be so many obstacles between Member States that the additional cost to just one country like the Netherlands is about 5 000 m guilders a year. I call this a disgrace because it is the European citizen who suffers, either by paying excessively high prices or because too few new jobs are created. I therefore congratulate the authors of the reports we are discussing today, Mr Patterson and Mr von Wogau, on the various practical, realistic proposals they have made. This realism is also apparent from the large majority by which these proposals, these reports were approved in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy. As chairman of this committee, Mr Seal should therefore never have said that the objectives outlined in the reports were unrealistic. I find that very regrettable.

Madam President, it is crucial to the satisfactory functioning of the internal market that the obstacles at frontiers caused by the collection of differences in VAT in the various Member States are removed. This is one of the worst, one of the most time-consuming obstacles at the frontiers. I therefore call once again for the adoption of the fourteenth VAT directive, because it is a very specific and practical proposal, which is so important because the existence of different VAT rates in the Member States, as there are now, is no obstacle to the adoption of this system. I know certain Member States have difficulty with this system, but I feel that is due more to prejudice, to a lack of familiarity with the arrangement, than to any real reason.

I therefore suggest to the Commission that it should organize a working visit to the Benelux countries for

**Van Rooy**

the tax authorities of these Member States so that they can see for themselves how the system works and that they have no real reason to object. Otherwise, Madam President, if we do not adopt this fourteenth VAT directive in the next few years, I am afraid we shall go on having all these problems with VAT at the frontiers and the goal of a single internal market without frontier barriers will not be achieved for a very long time to come. This presupposes majority decision-making in the Council.

*(Sustained applause from the right)*

**Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the Commission.** — Madam President, may I say, first of all, that I am sorry that I was not here to listen to the opening passages of Mr Patterson's most interesting speech. I have spent the last two days in Luxembourg battling on behalf of the internal market, an experience which has left me with much sympathy for many of the views which have been expressed in this Chamber this morning.

This has been a most interesting debate, notable not only for the large number of people who have participated, but for the quality of the speeches and the very interesting points which have been raised. I am most grateful to Mr Patterson and to the members of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy for having produced such a thorough and comprehensive report on the internal market. It comes, in fact, at a very opportune time because tomorrow the Commission will be putting the final touches to its own White Paper on the internal market.

This White Paper, which President Delors spoke about in Parliament here when he was speaking in March, will be presented very shortly to the European Council which meets in Milan on 28 and 29 June. The White Paper sets out in detail the steps that have to be taken to complete the internal market by 1992. When you read the White Paper you will find that it is no collection of vague and general hopes and phrases. It sets out precisely the measures needed and the timetable to be followed. In fact, I may say that the White Paper leaves no stone unturned. It is not only a detailed document but it sets out the timespan within which every single proposal needs to be implemented. The Commission will be asking the European Council to give us a mandate to undertake and complete this programme. We shall be reminding the Heads of State and Government of their repeated commitment to complete the market. At Milan they will need to pledge their support to turning this rhetoric into reality.

I will not attempt to restate the case for the completion of the internal market. As many speakers have said this morning, completion of the internal market is crucial to Europe's future. Without a single barrier-free market we will be unable to meet the challenge

posed by the United States and Japan. I can assure Mr Seal, as well as Mr Patterson, that we have taken Parliament's report very fully into account in preparing our own White Paper. In general we agree with the principles in the Patterson report and this will strengthen our hand in Milan.

Perhaps I might highlight one or two specific areas which merit particular attention. Parliament's resolution expresses fears about possible negative consequences for certain sectors in the short term following the creation of a true internal market. We, too, recognize these fears and have highlighted them in the White Paper. But I would stress that the overall benefit to the Community will greatly outweigh any limited negative effect.

Paragraph 10 of the report asks that the Commission confirm its commitment to the consolidation programme. This point was repeated by Mr Patterson in his speech. The Commission stands by this programme and in the White Paper we will present those items that should be a priority. Similarly, in the mandate we are seeking from the European Council, we have asked for endorsement of the specific timetable included in the White Paper in the way that your report asks. The way to get a job done is not simply to specify the job but to attach a time schedule to it. This is the approach we have followed and this is what appears in the White Paper.

We share with Parliament the view that we need to have legislative instruments that can be easily adopted by the Council. The new approach to standards adopted in May is an important first step in this direction which we propose should be applied in other fields. But a great deal of thought must be given also to the question of decision-making in the Council — a point emphasized, quite rightly, by Mr De Gucht and others.

Mr Patterson referred to the adoption on Monday of the architects' directive. That directive has been on the Council table for 17 years, and the speed with which they dealt with it makes the tortoise compare favourably with the speed of light.

*(Laughter)*

That is a situation which clearly is not acceptable if we are to make progress in the time-span which not only the Commission has set itself but which was specifically endorsed by the Heads of Government at Brussels in March. The Heads of Government asked not just for proposals, they asked for specific proposals with a timetable for completion by 1992. If that remit by the Heads of Government themselves is to be fulfilled, it is essential that something should be done about the decision-making process.

We are also conscious — and this is a point which has been raised — of the need to ensure that the Spanish

## Cockfield

and Portuguese are integrated into the internal market so that all 12 countries can work together from 1 January next, and our programme for completion of the market will take account of this.

Mr Patterson referred to the question of CADDIA. I understand the point he is making, and we will most certainly bear it in mind, but our objective, of course, is to remove the frontiers altogether, in which event, of course, there will be no computers at the frontiers.

We broadly accept all the proposals for easing controls and facilitating the free movement of goods and persons. Mr Patterson asked specifically about progress on the frontier directive. I can only tell him this: that progress has been disappointingly slow. I demanded, therefore, at Luxembourg that the matter should be tabled again next week at the Foreign Affairs Council, and that if insufficient progress had been made it was the duty of the Council to report their lack of progress to the Heads of Government at Milan.

Parliament makes a number of interesting points on fiscal measures. Without commenting on each proposal, I would say that certain steps will have to be taken in the fiscal field to ensure that liberalization of technical and physical barriers does not cause incompatibility with fiscal arrangements in Member States.

Parliament has also addressed a number of other specific points to the Commission, and many such points have also been raised in the course of this debate. Most of these points are, in fact, dealt with in the White Paper, and when this is published in a few days's time I am sure that honourable Members will find the answers to many of the points that will be worrying them. But in any event, Madam President, I would suggest that when I appear before the committee — which has been arranged for the end of June — we can pursue any of these points that Members wish to pursue in more detail.

The debate on the internal market was coupled quite rightly with two other debates, both of which, of course, have implications for the internal market. May I start with the von Wogau report on public purchasing contracts — a matter which was also referred to by Mr Cassidy.

The results of seven years of operation of the supplies directives are disappointing. Granting of contracts across Community frontiers continues to be an increasingly rare event. We continue also to find that non-competitive tendering is the preferred method of procurement by governments. It is regrettable that instead of a gradual improvement in the situation over time, the contrary is largely true. Mr von Wogau put forward a number of ideas to improve the functioning of public procurement. Broadly speaking, we agree with Parliament's views, and as we said in the Commission programme for 1985, we shall continue to press for the opening of public procurement in all sec-

tors. This is another matter which is dealt with in detail in the White Paper, and Mr von Wogau and honourable Members will find our proposals set out there in very specific form.

I would like then to come to the report, also by Mr von Wogau, on roll-over protective structures for tractors. I am in sympathy with the basic motivation behind Parliament's resolution on the draft directive. The draft directive is indeed a formidable document into which, I may say, an immense amount of work has gone. One might even regard it as the last of the dinosaurs.

*(Laughter)*

Looking at the matter from the point of view of the approach we are now adopting, I would agree that it would be more sensible if all the provisions relating to the safety of narrow-track agricultural forestry tractors were laid down in a single directive. However, there are difficulties in swapping horses in mid-stream. As the House will know, this is one of the directives implementing the framework directive No 74/150 (EEC) on the type approval of agricultural tractors. Under this directive, 20 directives have already been issued which regulate 50 separate characteristics of agricultural tractors. It would be difficult to change the procedure followed at this stage. No less than 90% of the type approval work in respect of passenger cars and 60% of the work in respect of agricultural tractors has already been completed. By changing our approach at this stage, we should be jeopardizing the substantial progress which has been achieved after much painstaking work. Moreover, the standards institutes have not yet done any preparatory work in the tractor sector on which we could base a new-style framework directive and it would therefore take some time before they could put forward appropriate standards. I am aware of the strength of feeling in the House on this issue, and I am sympathetic to the House's views. I hope, however, that in this particular case Parliament will accept that the change now would create uncertainty and confusion. I would urge, therefore, that you do accept the present directive, and what I propose in this. Instead of preparing further separate directives, the Commission will prepare a single proposal for a directive on the nine principal outstanding aspects of agricultural tractors and a further directive on one particularly complex matter. This will provide a more coherent approach and will meet Parliament's objection that the present system is very complicated. As a general principle, we shall, of course, follow the new approach in all sectors where we are starting from scratch.

I shall now return very briefly to the main question of the internal market. I do assure Mr Seal that we are not simply dealing with dreams. Without a vision, the people perish. We must, therefore, have principles. We must, therefore, have a philosophy underlying what we are doing. That is fully reflected in the White

**Cockfield**

Paper. In addition, the White Paper does deal with hard reality and it does deal with it in a very practical way. We are also — and I assure honourable Members in all parts of the Assembly — fully aware of the repercussions of the internal market on other areas of policy. We are fully aware of this and the White Paper does refer to it. However, the essential point is that unless we weld together the separate economies of the ten or twelve Member States into a single internal market comprising 320 million people, there is no real future, either for Europe or for the individual Member States.

(Cries of 'Hear, hear')

The strength of the Community is much greater than the strength of the ten or twelve Member States taken separately. That is the vision we must have in front of us. That is the vision we must set out to achieve. And that is the vision that the White Paper contains, the hard, practical proposals to achieve.

(Applause)

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The vote will take place at the next voting time.

4. *Right to petition Parliament — European driving licence — European passport — Obstacles at intra-Community borders*

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

- report (Doc. A 2-41/85) by Mr Chanterie, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, on strengthening the right of citizens to submit petitions to the European Parliament
- oral question with debate (Doc. B 2-324/85) by Mr Rogalla and others, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, to the Commission, on the European driving licence
- oral question with debate (Doc. B 2-387/85) by Mr Amadei and Mr Chanterie, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, to the Commission, on the European passport
- oral question with debate (Doc. B 2-325/85) by Mr Rothley and others, drawn up on behalf of the Socialist Group, to the Commission, on the introduction of the European passport in the Member States
- oral question with debate (Doc. B 2-323/85) by Mr Seefeld and others, to the Council, on the

removal of obstacles at the Community's internal borders<sup>1</sup>

**Mr Chanterie (PPE), rapporteur.** — (NL) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, today sees the ceremonial signing of the Treaties of Accession of Spain and Portugal to the European Community in Madrid and Lisbon. The European Community thus becomes a democratic area with 320 m inhabitants, 320 m European citizens who can invoke a number of rights.

The main subject today is, in a nutshell, the citizen's Europe. Every Member of Parliament and every parliamentary committee is directly or indirectly concerned with the citizen's problems. But no one will take it amiss if I say that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions has a special antenna for detecting what moves the public and what specific problems arise for the man in the street when Community decisions are implemented.

The 600 petitions that have been received by the European Parliament since 1979 bear witness to this. I would point out, Madam President, that these petitions come from both individual citizens and groups. Some have been submitted by tens or even thousands of European citizens. The most recent example is a petition sent to the European Parliament by 34 000 Scots.

We all know that the Community's decisions have an increasing effect on the day-to-day lives of the public. The Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions believes that it is one of the essential rights of the European citizen to lodge his or her objection to the implementation of the European Community's administrative and legal decisions, at both Community and national level. The Community system must therefore be made more transparent, and a flexible and effective complaints procedure must be introduced.

The interim report I am presenting today on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions concerns the strengthening of the European citizen's right to petition the European Parliament. Even before direct elections, in May 1979, the European Parliament adopted a resolution calling in principle for the appointment of a Parliamentary Commissioner to

<sup>1</sup> Also included in the debate:

- Oral question (Doc. B 2-441/85) by Mr von Wogau and others, to the Commission, on the easing of travel arrangements for European citizens through abolition of frontier formalities
- Oral question (Doc. B 2-442/85) by Mr Herman and others, to the Commission, on easing tourist traffic at the internal frontiers of the Community by simplifying travellers' duty-free allowances
- Oral question (Doc. B 2-440/85) by Mr Coste-Floret, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, to the Commission, on including the teaching of the history of the European Communities in school syllabuses in the Community.

## Chanterie

examine complaints received from citizens of the Community and to advise them on the means of redress available.

As a result, the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions of the first directly elected Parliament considered a number of working documents and the problems to be solved if the objective that had been set was to be achieved. In a provisional conclusion drawn in February 1984 the committee opted for the expansion of its own examination of petitions rather than the appointment of a single person. The final decision was, however, left to the second directly elected Parliament.

The new Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions constituted after the 1984 elections resumed the examination of the whole problem and first considered ways of strengthening its own powers and responsibilities with respect to the treatment of petitions. We said from the outset, Madam President, that this would depend on an interinstitutional agreement strengthening the procedure applied by the European Parliament for the examination of petitions. The committee has instructed its chairman to draw up a report on the subject.

At roughly the same time, the European Heads of State and Government set up the *Ad Hoc* Committee for a People's Europe at their meeting in Fontainebleau. We were informed of this committee's intention to include in its report a proposal concerning the creation of a Community ombudsman. Our committee therefore decided to draw up an interim report on a people's Europe and to submit it to Parliament so that it might deliver its opinion before the Community summit in Milan. I consider it important that the European Parliament should be expressing its views for the first time today on the course to be adopted for the examination of petitions received from the public.

I would point out, Madam President, that our committee has meanwhile decided to continue its activities after this part-session and, in preparation for the final report, to have a meeting with the ombudsmen of the various Member States and to take a closer look with them at the legal framework for Community legislation.

It is important that we should find a Community solution that meets needs at Community level. During my investigations I found that, although the Member States all have an ombudsman or a similar system, responsibilities, powers and procedures differ from one country to another. It would not therefore be easy to transfer a given system in a given country to the European Community. We must devise our own system that is suited to the possibilities and needs at Community level. Our debate today should not therefore concentrate solely on the question of form but on the main issue, strengthening the citizen's right to submit

petitions and guaranteeing that such petitions are examined.

In the motion for a resolution we propose, firstly, that Parliament affirm its will to strengthen this right of the citizen. Secondly, we welcome the initiative taken by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on a People's Europe in including this aspect in its report. We also urge the European Council meeting in Milan to acknowledge in its conclusions the right of the citizen to petition the European Parliament, the obligation on the Community institutions to provide the European Parliament with the information required for the examination of petitions and the need to lay down detailed provisions as rapidly as possible on a proposal from the European Parliament.

It is also essential, of course, that the Commission should undertake to provide the European Parliament with the information it requests in connection with the examination of petitions that have been declared admissible and in certain cases to give Parliament access to its files in accordance with appropriate procedures, which can be discussed with the Commission.

It is also important, Madam President, that the European Parliament should decide today to increase and expand its own resources and structures devoted to the consideration of petitions, in terms of both administrative structures and the publicity campaign to advise the citizens of Europe of their right to petition the European Parliament and of our intention to prepare Community legislation.

We have always borne in mind that the solution we propose must be of direct benefit to the citizens of Europe in their daily lives. What is needed, therefore, is legislation that gives them a real chance. This is in the European Community's interests because it increases its credibility in the eyes of the citizen.

As regards the amendment tabled by Mr Ciccionesere, Mr Pannella and Mr Tortora, I would like to point out that it could not be discussed in committee because it was not submitted to the committee. I therefore request the authors of this amendment to withdraw it and submit it in time for the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to discuss it when it resumes its consideration of this report.

On behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions I must also say something about the introduction of a European passport. The committee has received quite a number of petitions from citizens complaining that the introduction of the European passport is proceeding in a far from perfect manner, if at all, in some Member States at least. I would remind the House, Madam President, that the first reference to the European passport was made in the final communiqué of the European summit held in Paris in December 1974, when two objectives were set. The first was the introduction of a uniform passport to be

**Chanterie**

issued by every Member State to its nationals in place of existing passports. The second objective was linked to the first and concerned the abolition of checks on persons at the European Community's internal frontiers.

It must be said, Madam President, that, while the introduction of the passport was originally planned for 1978, the decision was not finally taken until 1981, when the Member States agreed that this passport should be issued from 1 January 1985 onwards as a first step towards the introduction of a European passport union. Despite this, a number of Member States have not yet started issuing the passport, others are not planning to introduce it until later in the year, and two will not be introducing it until 1987. The Commission has already complained about this through Commissioner Ripa di Meana. He has accused the national authorities of being lazy and lackadaisical in this matter. I must point out, however, that the introduction of a uniform passport raises not only internal problems but external ones as well and that nothing has been done — and this is surely important — to ensure the recognition of the European passport by third countries. Nothing has been done to encourage the introduction of a passport union, although the Commission undertook in June 1981 to draw up proposals on this subject.

I quite appreciate, Mr Commissioner, that it was your predecessors who were responsible for the absence of proposals and that you are not to blame for this. But Parliament has no alternative but to say that the Commission is in default in this respect. We feel the European passport is a document that should be recognized at European and international level. We believe it must enable the Community citizen to require the application of the Treaties, in the European Community itself, and the application of the laws and decrees in his country of residence. We also take the view that the European passport is a means for the Community citizen to prove his rights to national and local authorities.

These, Madam President, are the causes of the concern felt by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions about the introduction of the European passport and other matters. I hope that in this debate on a people's Europe we can today give effective answers that satisfy the citizen, and I also hope that the citizen will continue to express his views on these subjects, because there can be no people's Europe without the people.

**President.** — The debate will resume at 4.30 p.m. after Question Time.

*(The sitting was suspended at 1.05 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)*

## IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*President*

5. *Accession of Spain and Portugal*

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, on this very day, in Madrid and in Lisbon, the representatives of the ten Member States of the Community and those of Spain and Portugal sign the Treaties of Accession of those two countries to the European Community.

As President of the European Parliament I was invited by the Spanish and Portuguese Governments to attend the signing of the Acts of Accession. Not being able to take part in those ceremonies, because of the exigencies of the present part-session, I should like to express here the joy we feel on this momentous day in the history of the process of European unification. At the end of nearly seven years of difficult negotiations, two countries eminently European by virtue of their history and culture join us in sharing, after their return to democracy, in the destiny of the free nations gathered together within the European Community. Next year we shall have sitting with us Spanish and Portuguese Members, but it is today that I should like, on your behalf, to send to those two nations a warm message of welcome from the 270 million Europeans represented in this Assembly.

*(Loud applause)*

6. *Calendar 1986*

**President.** — The enlarged Bureau has approved a proposal for Parliament's calendar of part-sessions for 1986. This proposal will be published in the Minutes of today's sitting.

If no objections are raised on the adoption of this sitting's Minutes, the calendar of part-sessions will be deemed to be adopted.<sup>1</sup>

7. *Action taken on the opinions of Parliament*

**President.** — The next item is the communication from the Commission on action taken on the opinions and proposals of the European Parliament.<sup>2</sup>

**Mr Normanton (ED).** — Under the heading of 'Statement by the Commission', I wonder whether you

<sup>1</sup> *Topical and urgent debate (objections):* see Minutes.

<sup>2</sup> See Annex.

**Normanton**

would agree that it is in order to draw to the attention of the House a notice which appeared in the press yesterday to the effect that one of the recommendations of this Parliament, promoted or promulgated in 1978 under the heading of the Klepsch report, has been put into effect in the form of the European Independent Programme Group, the first meeting of which takes place in London on Monday of next week. Is not this a matter for satisfaction in this House that we have projected recommendations and that although they are activated and acted upon late, at least action follows from our deliberations?

## IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

*Vice-President*

**President.** — Mr Normanton, I am sure the House will take note of your remarks.

**Mr Metten (S).** — (NL) I have a question to ask the Commission in connection with resolutions which were adopted on 18 April 1985 and called for economic sanctions against South Africa. The Commission took a positive view of such sanctions during the debate. Can the Commission say what it has done in the last two months to bring the imposition of these sanctions closer?

**Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission.** — (GR) I think the question submitted by the Honourable Member lies outside the scope of today's agenda, which concerns the action taken by the Commission on Parliament's opinion on various proposals.

Here we have a resolution on an initiative by Parliament. Let me then answer the question in a general way, because in essence the subject is not relevant to the matter we are examining. I can, however, say that the matter is under consideration by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, who as you know, have prime responsibility in discussions on the situation in South Africa, as Mr De Clercq has said. The Commission can take no initiative before the matter has been clarified by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation.

**Mrs Ewing (RDE).** — Having regard to the fact that the Council of Europe Convention on animal experimentation has been signed and will be open for ratification in September, what action has the Commission taken on Resolution A2-26/85 of 10 May of this year, in particular paragraph 8 of that resolution which again calls on the Commission to forward to the Parliament and the Council of Ministers as soon as possi-

ble a draft directive on animal experimentation, and in any case by the July part-session?

**Mr Varfis.** — (GR) The Commission is looking into the matter, and I hope that in our next document relating to action to be taken on the European Parliament's opinions and resolutions, in other words the July document, an answer to the question will be given. At any rate, I can assure Mrs Ewing that the Commission will abide by such undertakings as it has made. As for the Convention, it has indeed been approved, but the procedure for signing it has not yet been completed.

**Mr Cryer (S).** — Referring to page 6 of the Commission report and the list of food aid which is printed there, I wish to say that while the amount of cereals shows a welcome increase over the previous month, emergency aid for the Sudan amounts to only 8 000 tonnes and there are many reports of impending starvation in the Sudan on a scale possibly even greater than in Ethiopia. Can I ask what the Commission intends to do about that, because the total in stock of wheat, for example, is in excess of 5 million tonnes and at the present rate of transfer of these stocks to the starving of the world, the Common Market will still have huge supplies in store when people are starving, and this really is a disgrace!

**Mr Varfis.** — (GR) As for cereals, there has been a substantial increase mainly in the regular aid that continues to be sent to a number of countries, without any special analysis at this end. I would, however, like to add the following comment: During recent part-sessions, whenever this matter is debated the subject of food aid is always raised, and I do not think we can examine it in depth at this time. I think the proper time to raise the issue is during Question Time or under matters for urgent debate. Here, we must restrict ourselves to the action taken on Parliament's opinions, as I said earlier. The tables of facts and figures concerning the development of food aid are issued in order to inform Parliament, precisely as a basis for written or oral questions, or an urgent debate. Consequently I cannot go deeply into the matter now. Besides, I must admit that I myself am not fully up to date on the matter, because another colleague is responsible for it.

**President.** — Mr Varfis, I am sure that Mr Cryer has taken note of your reply but I am sure too that both Mr Cryer and the House would hope that you will take up his question with the Commissioner responsible and do everything you can to make sure that this cereal aid to the Sudan is increased.

**Mrs Boot (PPE).** — (NL) Referring to the Rogalla report on a proposal from the Commission for a directive simplifying the checks and formalities applicable

**Boot**

to citizens of the Member States when they cross internal frontiers, I should like to ask whether the Commission, when discussing this matter in the Council, abides by the position it adopted in Parliament (through the person of Lord Cockfield.) It rejected Parliament's proposal that an advisory committee should be set up to ensure the directive is enforced. I therefore want to ask Lord Cockfield if he cannot make a comparison, for example, with the Equal Opportunities Commission in Britain, a similar committee at national level, which ensures the observance of certain legal provisions. Parliament thinks it particularly important for the amendment in question to be considered during the discussions, and we would also ask if the Commission, having given the matter more thought, would not like to change its mind.

**Mr Varfis.** — (GR) As mentioned in the document circulated to all the Members of the House, the Commission adopted all the amendments proposed by Parliament and to which the Commission had committed itself through its representative, Lord Cockfield, who is here today. The basic issue is the explanation that this is the first phase in the derestriction of currency exchange. It can be said that the first step is now being taken with the new and important effort being made to enlarge and deepen the internal market, and we hope that at the Council of Europe in Milan the Commissioner's very wide-ranging proposal will indeed be approved.

As for certain details raised in Mrs Boot's question, I would like to point out that in the Commission's document, already circulated to Parliament, all the amendments accepted are referred to in detail.

8. *Question Time*

**President.** — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. B 2-407/85).

Today we consider the questions to the Commission.

As the author is not present, Question No 61 will be answered in writing.<sup>1</sup>

Question No 62, by Mr Pasty (H-619/84):

Subject: Community gas desulphurizing project

Is it true that the Commission intends to set up and operate a pilot industrial project for desulphurizing combustion gases in order to test the process developed at the Ispra Joint Research Centre? If so, what timetable is scheduled for the project?

**Mr Narjes, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (DE) Before I reply to the question, may I point out that in some languages the translation of the question was misleading. It relates to a Community project for desulphurization of combustion gases and not desulphurization of gas.

Having dealt with that, may I say that the Commission intends to set up and operate a pilot plant in order to test the MARK 13A combustion gas desulphurization process, which was developed at the Ispra Joint Research Centre during an earlier hydrogen programme. The process was tested in the laboratory and on an engineering scale. The forecasts which were made in the course of this now have to be tried out on a substantially larger scale. The forecasts tend to indicate that this process is at least technically and economically equal to the rival process.

The process which we have put out to tender is not yet for a plant to desulphurize the entire throughput of combustion gases in a large furnace, it is initially for application on a pilot scale, that is, of a size which is larger than the laboratory and engineering scale but which has not yet reached industrial level.

The call for tenders was activated on 28 November 1984. The Commission expects to subsidize the projects submitted up to 50%, subject to a maximum of 5 million ECU, and to grant the contractor a royalty-free licence for later utilization in two industrial-scale plants.

The tender procedures ended a few days ago on 31 March 85, and the Commission is at the moment examining the proposals which have been submitted. If suitable proposals are put forward, it expects to conclude the contract this year and to ensure that the pilot plant is completed by the end of 1989.

**Mr Pasty (RDE).** — (FR) If I understand the position, we may have from 1986 a pilot industrial project. For my supplementary question I shall ask: given the present state of research done in the laboratory, is the Commission in a position to let us have information about the economic application of the project? To put it another way, given the present state of research, does the Commission think that industry can use this process without becoming involved in unreasonable expense? Will it be possible to extend this process generally to all industries faced with a pollution problem arising from the discharge into the atmosphere of sulphurous gases; and even though the advantages for the environment are clear, will it not involve the industrial firms concerned in excessive operating costs?

**Mr Narjes.** — (DE) This process differs from the rival process in that virtually no other substances have to be added, and furthermore there are no other substances which have to be disposed of later or which pose other

<sup>1</sup> See Annex 'Question Time'.

**Narjes**

problems. The main product would be sulphurous acid in marketable concentrations which can be used easily, and could be sold, so producing revenue. Theoretically it would also be possible at a later stage to introduce a process to strip off the nitric oxide and similarly at a later stage to produce hydrogen during the process.

The question of economic viability remains open, because it is not possible to investigate the energy consumption of the process more closely without pilot plants. Should it prove to be acceptable, this process would be superior to others.

**Mr Seligman (ED).** — Does the Commissioner agree that a desulphurization of coal-fired power stations may well be irrelevant because sulphur dioxide may well not be the main cause of acid rain? Does he agree that it is a blow to coal-fired power stations and to the coal industry as a whole and a gift to nuclear power for that matter, and does he really think that we should persevere at this time until the scientific facts are known?

**Mr Narjes.** — (*DE*) In addition to nuclear energy in the working load range there will always be power stations using fossil fuels in the medium and peak load ranges. Since the Commission in the draft directive on large-scale fired power stations is energetically pressing for all components of air pollution to be reduced and is of the opinion that this process may have particular advantages compared with existing processes, it considered it right to push this process through to the current pilot stage, to see whether it produces a breakthrough or not.

**President.** — Question No 63, by Mr Vandemeulebroucke (H-676/84):

Subject: Dutch-language edition of the periodical 'Europe Information, External Relations'

A number of Dutch-language readers greatly regret the fact that the periodical 'Europe Information, External Relations' no longer appears in Dutch.

In view of the fact that the law enshrined in the Treaties specifically provides for the use of the seven official languages on an equal footing. I find this measure somewhat odd.

Can the Commission give an explanation for this measure, particularly at a time when the Community has every interest in publicizing its activities as widely as possible, not least through information brochures in what are the seven official languages of the Community?

**Mr Ripa di Meana, Member of the Commission.** — (*IT*) The Commission appreciates the constant

interest Mr Vandemeulebroucke devotes to this subject. For the rest, we have already replied to one of his written questions.

The Dutch-language edition of the periodical 'Europe Information, External Relations', published for the past fifteen years by the Directorate-General for Information and addressed in particular to ministers and to the representatives of the chambers of commerce, professional organizations and educational and press circles, is much appreciated and has acquired a position of its own among the Commission's publications, as is clear from what has been said to me by many of those who have the pleasure of reading it regularly.

Unfortunately, it had to be decided to suspend publication, temporarily I believe, because of the budgetary restrictions familiar to Parliament. In the course of 1985, the Council decided to cut the information budget by more than half, in total contradiction to the many appeals for amore intensive and structured information policy made to the Commission by the Member States and by the Council itself on several occasions.

That is the sad reason for this decision — which I attribute to the 'schizophrenia' that at times characterizes the Council's activities: good words and bad deeds, as in this case. That is why the publication we are discussing, which is of high quality but unfortunately of limited circulation — some 700 copies — and has a production cost of about BFr 192 per copy, has been suspended for the time being.

As soon as the budgetary situation and the work load of the translation services — which also had some bearing on this decision — change as a result of improved funds, I shall be happy to be able to give Parliament the good news which at present I can only hope for.

**Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC).** — (*NL*) I note first and foremost that the publication of the Dutch-language version has been temporarily suspended on budgetary grounds. But may I point out to the Commissioner that, although this periodical has a fairly small circulation, it is much appreciated in my country, for example, and that, as we recognize every language as being equal, the Commission should make it a rule to take account of the identity of every region and every country in its information policy.

**Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED).** — Would the Commissioner agree that the time has come for the Commission to put forward a serious proposal to reduce the number of languages used in the Community to three or four?

**Mr Ripa di Meana.** — (IT) As regards the quality and popularity of the Dutch edition of the periodical we are discussing, I can only repeat what I said before.

The decision which, I repeat, I regard as temporary, is connected only with the budgetary difficulties I described, although I must also point out that at the moment the entire question of Commission publications is under review with a view to future decisions.

As regards the need to review the entire system of publications in the official languages — here I am replying to Mr Scott-Hopkins — I too believe that the accession of new Member States to the Community will entail a problem which the Commission will have to look at very soon.

I would prefer, Mr Scott-Hopkins, not to give a final opinion today on such a delicate and complex matter.

**President.** — Question No 64, by Mr Wijzenbeek (H-681/84):

Subject: Inland navigation

Can the Commission state whether it intends to ensure that measures are taken, either directly or by the Member States, in connection with inland navigation, particularly as regards north-south routes, to guarantee free competition as set out in the Treaty?

**Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission.** — In the inland navigation market, just as in other transport sectors, the Commission's policy is to seek to ensure that the objectives of the Treaty are met. Since 1967 the Commission has proposed free access by all Community inland navigation carriers to the national transport markets of each Member State. This proposal remains on the Council's table and, indeed, it is one of the proposals on which the European Court of Justice, in its judgment of 22 May 1985, expressly based its decision that the Council had failed to act. Moreover, in the Commission's communication to the Council of 9 February 1983 entitled 'Progress towards a common transport policy — Inland navigation', the Commission questioned whether there was any reason to regulate the access to the market of inland waterway transport. In its proposal of 7 October 1983 for common action to be taken by Member States in the framework of the Central Commission on the Rhine navigation, concerning the structural over-capacity of the Rhine fleet, the Commission clearly opposed the introduction of restrictive measures for new capacities.

With specific regard to north-south transport, that is to say, waterway transport between the Netherlands, Belgium and France, the Commission stated in its communication of 9 February 1983 to the Council that it is currently studying problems in connection with the *tour de rôle* system with a view to proposing appro-

priate solutions. Discussions with interested parties continue but have been especially contracted because of the conflicting interests involved. However, it remains the intention of the Commission to establish conditions under which non-resident carriers may operate inland navigation services in another Member State and for the international transport of goods by inland waterways. Freedom to provide services where this does not exist will be pursued. Given the difficulties involved, such measures will take time to be introduced, but it is hoped that by 1989 they will be in place.

**Mr Wijzenbeek (L).** — (NL) May I ask the Commissioner if, in the light of the Court's judgment on the question of negligence, he considers 1989, when the Commission says measures will be taken, to be a reasonable deadline?

**Mr Clinton Davis.** — The court judgment has certainly given an impulse to decision-making as far as this is concerned, and it is to be welcomed both as far as the Commission and the Parliament are concerned. 1989 is a date within which I think it is reasonably possible to bring a system into viable operation but I think that it must be preceded clearly by important decisions which it will take time to bring into effect but I am not prepared to allow negotiations to drag on indefinitely particularly in the light of that judgment.

**President.** — Question No 65, by Mr de Vries (H-723/84):

Subject: Accession of the Community to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

Is the Commission in a position to state why it has not yet taken action in line with the Gonella resolution (Doc. 1-547/82)<sup>1</sup> calling on the Commission to submit to the Council as soon as possible a formal proposal providing for the accession of the Community to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and does it intend to make such a proposal soon?

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (FR) The Commission's memorandum on the accession of the Community to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights was presented in May 1979. The Parliament adopted its opinion on 29 October 1982. In its resolution it put forward two demands: first, that the Commission should take part in the work of the Council of Europe on the extension of the rights protected by the Convention. That has

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 304, 22. 11. 1982.

**Cheysson**

been achieved. In May 1983 the Commission was granted observer status; it takes part in the work of the groups and committees in question.

Secondly the Parliament asked the Commission to submit to the Council a formal proposal for accession in the light of the situation as it developed. On several occasions the Commission declared to Parliament that it felt it should make sure of the agreement of the governments before submitting its formal proposal. Nothing would be worse, in fact, than the Council's rejection of a proposal to that effect. Imagine what the psychological effect would be, the political discredit into which the Community would fall, when, let me remind you, its essential purpose, in the European structure, is the protection of human rights throughout the world, starting with Europe. The Community ought therefore to be able as such to put its views forward on the matter.

The debates in COREPER and the direct contacts with the governments have brought to light a good many reservations, often couched in legal terms. As regards the Community's powers under the Treaties, three delegations have declared themselves in favour of accession and five others have formally requested postponement. After four meetings on this subject, COREPER decided on 20 December 1983 to come back to the matter at a later date. Since then nothing has been done.

Now the question must be taken up again in an attempt to convince those Member States which have reservations. The Commission looks to Parliament and its Members. It welcomes the question put today by Mr De Vries. For itself, it is determined to examine the position again in the near future and, on the basis of the attitude of the European Parliament, to take a fresh initiative which, we hope, will result in the accession of the Community to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights.

**Mr De Vries (L).** — (NL) I should like to thank the Commissioner for his extremely positive answer. This is a matter that has concerned Parliament since 1979: the first resolution in which Parliament called on the Commission to take the step it has now announced is dated 22 April 1979. My next question to the Commissioner is whether it is right that four Member States in particular still have major objections: firstly, Greece, because it does not recognize the right of the individual to take legal action, and secondly, Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom, because the provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights would apply in the territory of these Member States after the accession of the Community, where the Convention does not yet have the same legal force as national legislation. I should like the Commissioner to identify the Member States that are holding things up at the moment so that we parliamentarians can make contact with our national colleagues, bring maximum pressure

to bear and support the initiative the Commission promises us it will be taking.

**Mr Cheysson.** — (FR) The Honourable Member is very well informed. But he has not mentioned the reluctance shown in 1981 or 1982 by other States.

I happen to know about the position of one of the States which had reservations at that time, namely France. As France has, since then, accepted all the clauses of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights, I think Mr De Vries was right not to mention its opposition. As regards the four countries he mentioned, it is true that it would be a good thing to take action *vis-à-vis* the Parliaments and governments to bring home to them the striking contradiction between the attitude they have adopted as States: on the one hand they have all acceded to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights, and on the other hand they refuse to grant the Community the right to accede.

There is thus a striking contradiction between accepting, as we do, individual actions before the European Court of Justice on certain aspects of the protection of human rights and refusing to allow any such action before the European Court of Human Rights.

**Mr Nordmann (L).** — (FR) My question partly overlaps with Mr De Vries's supplementary question. The Commissioner said in his reply just now that it was for mainly legal reasons that the accession of the Community as such to the Convention had so far been refused.

Are there any reasons other than legal ones, and can he tell us what they are?

**Mr Cheysson.** — (FR) Although I do not like to resort to quoting my own words, I should point out to the Honourable Member that I said that the reservations were couched in legal terms, which implied that the reasons put forward in some cases fell, in my view, outside the legal sphere and tended to call in question the European Community's fitness and capacity to make pronouncements on human rights. In fact there is disquiet in certain quarters about the natural tendency of the Community institutions, in which the European Parliament has always taken the lead, to make pronouncements about human rights outside Europe. To disclaim that right, some people think that the proper course is to challenge the legal powers of the Community within Europe. It seems to me that that is one reason why we ourselves should try to advance them.

**Mr Wijsenbeek (L).** — (NL) Can the Commissioner tell us what prevents the Commission from applying

**Wijsenbeek**

for accession as far as its own legal acts are concerned?

**Mr Cheyssou.** — (FR) Timidity . . .

(Laughter)

**President.** — Question No 66, by Mr Lalor (H-760/84):

Subject: Motor tax

Will the Commission state whether or not it has examined the different levels of motor tax operating in each of the Member States, and if not, will it agree to do so, and will it also clarify how monies levied on European motorists are used by the respective governments in the Member States, particularly whether or not such taxes are spent on maintaining or developing new roads or other infrastructures provided for transport users?

**Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission.** — With regard to vehicle taxes on the possession or use of cars, the Commission is aware of the different levels and tax bases prevailing in the Member States. A study on its behalf to ascertain the influence of such taxes on fuel consumption, completed in 1983, concluded that these taxes were not an important factor in decisions by motorists to purchase specific cars.

For commercial vehicles, the Commission has proposed a directive on the adjustment of national taxation systems. This was agreed in principle by the Council in 1978 but not adopted, owing to a reservation by one Member State. It provides a flexible system of combining fuel and vehicle taxes to ensure that the heavier goods vehicles pay at least their marginal cost of using roads. Provision is also made for vehicles being charged the full cost of such use and the tax system introduced in the United Kingdom, in the past few years, implements the draft directive in this way. The Commission does not have detailed data on overall revenues from fuel and vehicle taxes and any other taxes which may be considered specific to motoring or road transport. It is therefore unable to inform the Honourable Member whether or not such revenues correspond in total, or by category of vehicle, to the cost of maintaining and constructing roads.

National budgets are unified in nature and apart from a few cases, the vehicle taxes form part of general tax revenue so that there is no specific allocation of such taxes to road construction and maintenance. The Commission is, however, requesting Member States to provide more data on such tax revenues, and our present studies would indicate that a majority of Member States obtain more fuel and tax revenue than they spend on roads, whereas the reverse is the case in Belgium and the Netherlands.

**Mr Lalor (RDE).** — First of all I want to say that the Commissioner dodged the issue until the last sentence but I have a brief supplementary. In view of the sizeable amounts necessary to provide for national road transport facilities, does the Commissioner not agree that the monies collected from motorists by way of motor taxation should be used by national governments for the purpose for which they were originally intended, which was transport facilities provision, rather than having such monies diverted to other political and economic needs?

Is the Commission further aware that because of national governmental neglect in Ireland over the past three years, it would take all of the motor tax at present collected in the Community to fill Irish potholes?

**Mr Clinton Davis.** — I am not an expert on Irish potholes or pot-holes anywhere else! But as far as the hypothecation of taxes for specific uses is concerned, the principle is at variance with that practised in most Member States. What I think we can seek to insist upon is the provision of greater data on such tax revenues, as I indicated before. I do not think the honourable Member can expect me to go any further.

**Mr Cryer (S).** — Would the Commissioner accept that there are a large number of areas for individual governments to make a judgment of their own and that this is one of them and that, as he has pointed out, the motor revenue in the United Kingdom is accepted as part of general revenue for a wide number of functions, including, for example, sustaining the National Health Service and other valuable services? Would he agree with me that Member States have different requirements for transport — some, for example, have overcrowded roads and therefore might use taxation as a means of trying to reduce that overcrowding and shifting transport from road to rail? Would he not agree that that sort of decision is for each Member State to make and not for the Commission to try to harmonize and interfere where it is entirely unnecessary?

**Mr Clinton Davis.** — In answer to the honourable gentleman's three questions: yes, yes and yes!

**Mr Wijsenbeek (L).** — As national road taxes are often used for other purposes, does not the Commission think that a proportion of national road taxes has to be spent on international, and especially European, motorways and therefore infrastructure?

**Mr Clinton Davis.** — The answer is contained in what I said before. I have nothing to add.

**President.** — As the authors are not present, Questions Nos 67 and 68 will be answered in writing.<sup>1</sup>

Question No 69, by Mr Zahorka (H-796/84):

Subject: International agreement on flags of convenience

A conference in Geneva on flags of convenience in shipping attended by some 100 states came to an end in the middle of February 1985. The final text of an agreement is to be decided on at a further meeting in July 1985. Has the Community adopted a common position at this conference to date? If not, will it do so in July and on which key questions was there no common position?

**Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission.** — The Plenipotentiary Conference to which the honourable Member refers will be in its third session in July 1985. In fact, the House will recollect that the conference in question in conformity with Resolution No 39/209 met for the first time in Geneva from 16 July to 3 August 1984.

The aim of this conference is to consider the adoption of an international agreement concerning the conditions under which ships should be entered into national shipping registers. In consideration of the importance of the questions dealt with and the interplay that these questions are likely to have with the Treaty, the Commission has very closely followed the work carried out in this forum with the greatest interest and in close contact with the Member States.

The Member States have proceeded throughout the work of the conference with a common position elaborated in meetings with the other OECD States and with the participation of the Commission as well as in specific Community coordination meetings held on the initiative of the Commission as circumstances required. The Commission intends to follow a similar course during the next session of the conference in view of which it is at present carrying out a thorough examination of the most appropriate way to best ensure Community interest during the final negotiations which will probably come to a conclusion during this third session.

**Mr Zahorka (PPE).** — (DE) Might I ask the Commissioner whether there was dissent on any particular question at the Conference? Were the preparations for this Conference carried out within the framework of European political cooperation, or did the Commission get a whisper of a mandate here, is it to be expected that the Conference will produce no results, and is there then a possibility that the Commission will receive a mandate?

I am concerned that the European Community should present a united front at multilateral conferences. In this connection I should like to suggest, — or ask whether consideration is being given to this — that the European Community should join the relevant national flags in international shipping. Is attention being paid to this, and if not, is the Commission prepared to initiate it?

**Mr Clinton Davis.** — Addressing myself to the questions in order, the answer is that our role is a very limited one. Our role is to ensure that the Treaty of Rome is observed. We are there effectively as a watchdog rather than anything else and in so doing we do seek, of course, to help to coordinate the views of Member States. But Member States are somewhat reticent about our role in this regard. I think that it would be wrong for us to take too high a profile.

Insofar as the more general issues are concerned as to our role in relation to shipping generally, I think the honourable Member should have regard to the shipping memorandum which was introduced recently by this Commission which had been, of course, the subject of debate by the previous Commission, and I think he will see from that we do seek to influence the way in which policy decisions, including the subject matter of this particular conference, should be directed. But it is only an influential role. The way in which we express that is stated very clearly, I think, in the Shipping Memorandum.

**Mr McMahon (S).** — I am glad that the Commissioner has decided to take action on this very serious problem. Will the Commission take into consideration talks with the International Transport Federation when they come to have their discussion on it and, in particular, will they take on board the question of discussing what happens to shipwrecked mariners who are unfortunate enough to be on one of these ships that sail under flags of convenience? At present I have a tremendous problem getting a body returned from Denmark and getting a death certificate because of this.

**Mr Clinton Davis.** — That does not really arise out of this specific and very limited question which was raised by the other honourable gentleman. In fact, as I have indicated previously in this House, it is my intention as the Commissioner with responsibility for shipping to be accessible to all points of view in the shipping industry. We certainly do not have a monopoly of wisdom in this regard and we must listen very carefully to those who *are* experienced.

As to the question generally of flags of convenience, this was a matter raised by Mr Pitt at the last part-session. I did, in fact, indicate the general philosophy of the Commission as expressed in our shipping memorandum where we raise important question

<sup>1</sup> See Annex 'Question Time'.

**Clinton Davis**

marks about the whole concept and philosophy of flags of convenience in relation to the viability of European merchant shipping.

**Mr Wijsenbeek (L).** — I would like to ask the Commissioner if he could possibly state what percentage of shipping in the Community of European Community origin sails under a flag of convenience?

**Mr Clinton Davis.** — Too many!

**President.** — As the authors are not present, Questions Nos 70, 71 and 72 will be answered in writing.<sup>1</sup>

Question No 73, by Mrs Lizin (H-816/84)

Subject: Steel pipe exports to the USA

Can the Commission state what stage has been reached as regards the implementation of the current agreement with the United States, the size of the quantities exchanged and the situation with respect to short supply?

**Mr Narjes, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (DE) The agreement between the United States and the Community on trade in steel pipes entered into force on 1. 1. 1985 and lays down a maximum share for the Community of 7.6% of the American market for steel pipes for a period of two years.

Since then the Commission has authorized the issue of export licences by the Member States to the order of 23 000 tonnes. Of these 66 800 tonnes are so-called oil pipes, for which a separate partial quota of 10% of the American oil pipe market has been laid down within the overall quota.

The Community and the United States also reached an agreement that the consignments from the Community involving a quantity of 260 000 tonnes, which were seized by the American Customs between 29 November and 31 December 1984, are to be released. These consignments, less a partial credit, will be added to the quotas for 1985 (65%) and 1986 (35%).

Finally, as a result of the most recent talks with the United States, it has gone on record that the problem of additional consignments of pipes for the All American Pipeline Project, which has been under discussion for weeks and months, has finally been resolved. The United States have declared their readiness to release the consignment of 100 000 short tons.

These results, which have been achieved after protracted negotiations, can perhaps be seen as a limited advance, as the order was of vital economic import-

ance to various European pipe producers. I cannot however overlook the fact that in relation to the total consignment of 320 000 short tons which had already been agreed these results appear somewhat modest.

**Mrs Lizin (S).** — (FR) I think the Commissioner knows that in the case of a number of firms, particularly those with which we are concerned, that is, in my case, the Belgian firms, a number of orders were lost because of delays in the Short Supply talks and the firm could not wait any longer. On the other hand one of the problems for the moment is how what I might call traditional pipes and specific OCTG pipes are to be shared out amongst the European countries.

Is there an agreement at the level of the working parties of the Council and, of course, of the Commission, on the way in which these quotas are to be divided and, within the quotas, the OCTG sub-quotas?

**Mr Narjes.** — (DE) The final allocation of the sub-quota for the oil pipes is still outstanding. At the moment it is being allocated periodically on the basis of a Commission proposal, with a precautionary deduction. The allocation of the 100 000 short tons for All American Pipelines is still outstanding, but is expected in the foreseeable future.

**Mr Hindley (S).** — As I understand it, the difficulties with the quotas and the over-supply of steel arise not from the quantity of steel pipes and tubes but from the way the quota is affected by the rising dollar or the fall in the dollar. So, if it is the fluctuation in currency rather than the oversupply or under-supply of steel products that causes the problem what negotiations have taken place or are planned to work out some compensatory factor which would take into account changes in the value of the dollar?

**Mr Narjes.** — (DE) It is correct that the American internal steel price is on average 20% higher than the European price, because of the present currency distortion, and that for that reason there has been very strong pressure from Europe on the United States, which is continuing.

From the point of view of the United States, the negotiations being held with the United States go far beyond the question of whether or not compensation should be made for the present currency imbalance. The United States is conducting the negotiations with an eye to the so-called President's multiannual steel programme, which aims to give the American steel industry a certain degree of protection from imports up to the end of the present decade, so that it can carry out its — hitherto protracted — restructuring.

**President.** — Question No 74, by Sir James Scott-Hopkins (H-1/85):

<sup>1</sup> See Annex 'Question Time'.

**President**

Subject: The UK in the information technology field

To ask the European Commission what particular support it has given to training and re-training schemes in the UK in the information technology field over the last five years? Bearing in mind the relatively high wage costs of many Member States, as compared with many of those countries outside the Ten with whom the Community countries compete, does the Commission not agree that the often capital-intensive information technology area of industry offers the prospect of many job opportunities in the future?

**Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission.** — In the five-year period from 1980 to 1984 a total of 14.8 million ECU has been allocated to specific training and retraining programmes in the United Kingdom in the information technology field by the European Social Fund. In addition, the Commission has given support to the general development of education and training in information technology by means of promoting seminars, conferences and discussions. Furthermore, the Commission's purpose has been to facilitate increased access to information technology through-out education and training systems, recognizing, as the question inherently does, the importance of this field for the future.

Many information technology markets are growing rapidly and thus offer potential for increases in employment. However, these benefits may well be partly offset by productivity improvements caused by technical changes in relation to both product and process.

The Commission has produced a number of communications on these questions, which Sir James will be aware of and which have been submitted to the Council, Parliament and the social partners for discussion. It continues to monitor the impact of new technologies on employment the impact of new technologies on employment and reports on these issues in *Social Europe*.

Let me say in conclusion that the economic and strategic importance of information technology lies, of course, in its contribution to the general economic performance of Europe. It is crucially important — and the Commission recognizes this crucial importance. Latest estimates indicate that more than half of all economic activities in the Community already depend heavily on the application of information technology and Telecom, and this is expected to increase even further in the coming years. In contrast, the information technology sector itself represents only a few percent of the GNP.

Finally, the new guidelines for the Social Fund, recently adopted by the Commission and applicable for the period from 1986 to 1988, give special prominence to this area of activity in new technology and, in particular, in the area of information technology.

**Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED).** — Would the Commissioner agree that this is a very rapidly changing field and that there is an enormous leeway to make up compared to other countries, particularly in the United Kingdom's West Midlands region? Will he do all he can — his goodwill was obvious from the answer he has given — to give as much encouragement as possible to these capital-intensive developments which are taking place in the high technology field?

**Mr Sutherland.** — It is absolutely clear that there is a deficiency in Europe generally in this particular area. I think it is something which is now rapidly being addressed by the Community. It is recognized as such, it features in the work programme of the Commission, it is something which is evidenced, as I say, by the inclusion in the Social Fund guidelines for this year of a special requirement in relation to new technologies which will be operative from now on.

Preliminary research being conducted at the present time indicates that in the area of higher education also a new impetus is required in Europe to bring about a greater degree of awareness of the importance of this type of training and of perhaps moving away a little bit from the stereotyped third-level education system prevalent in most Member States.

**Mr McMahon (S).** — As rapporteur on these matters for the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, I welcome the Commissioner's replies. However, in January of this year 10 million was given to Nat Semi-Conductors who made various forecasts about jobs and so on. Two weeks later the workers were told to take a holiday — unpaid — because work was falling off. Two weeks later the same thing happened again. Last week they declared 450 of their workforce redundant. Is there any way the Commission could carry out a more rigorous scrutiny when giving grants to many of the sunrise industries? Otherwise the sun is going to set in terms of job creation before it ever rises in the new technology industry?

**Mr Sutherland.** — I cannot deal with the specific case raised by Mr McMahon without notice, but I can say that the problem of scrutiny in regard to Community funds is a recurring theme in all areas of Community activity. It is a problem which will continue to cause difficulty to the Commission and the Community generally until sufficient manpower is made available to deal with the problem of scrutiny. So, I accept in general that there will always be a problem in regard to scrutinizing applications of one kind or another. That is not to pass comment on the particular case, about which I have no direct knowledge.

**Mrs Caroline Jackson (ED).** — Would the Commissioner not agree that unless the European Social Fund

**Caroline Jackson**

is greatly expanded, it cannot possibly make an adequate response to the pockets of training needs in the non-priority areas? I am now talking about my own constituency of Wiltshire, for example, not West Midlands, as my colleague has done. I think particularly of Swindon, in my constituency, where 2 300 redundancies were recently announced in the British Rail engineering workshops, but where local high-technology firms find it very, very difficult to fill the jobs that are available. Can the Commissioner give Swindon, and the people who are about to lose their jobs there, any hope that the European Community may be able to help them?

*(Cries from the left)*

**Mr Sutherland.** — Let me say at the outset that I absolutely agree with the suggestion made by the questioner that the Social Fund should be increased in quantum. This is something that is badly needed, for the Social Fund at the moment represents only something approximating to 4% of the total expenditure on training within the Community and therefore cannot possibly effect a radical change on its own in training policies throughout the Community. In general, I agree with the suggestion that there needs to be a greater input from the Social Fund, and that can only be brought about by a greater amount of money being made available for disbursement. Until it is made available, the difficulty is that in order to make any effect it must be concentrated on the areas and activities of greatest need. That necessarily means that some will suffer, and this, I think, is entirely regrettable. I would much prefer — and I am sure I speak for the Commission as a whole — that there were adequate resources available to deal with all of the problems that exist throughout the Community in the field of training and the introduction of technology generally. I think it is a Community-wide problem. Regrettably, we are forced into a situation of concentration.

**President.** — Question No 75, by Mrs Tongue (H-16/85):

Subject: Inspection policy of nuclear installations in EEC Member States under the Euratom Treaty

In the light of Chapter 7 of the Euratom Treaty and of EEC Commission Regulation 3227/76, which provide safeguards against the diversion of nuclear materials for purposes other than those for which they are intended, would the Commission state what steps it has taken to ensure full and non-discriminatory inspection of all civil nuclear facilities in each Member State and how many inspection hours on site per kilo of fissile material members of the Euratom inspectorate (DG XVII) have carried out in the specified installations or parts thereof, to include details of all commercial, fast and material-testing reactors, and to cover

fuel fabrication, fuel consumption and reprocessing in the Member States; and would the Commission state the fundamental principles and philosophy on which inspection time is allocated to the different processes in these installations, with particular reference to the special agreements or arrangements made with Member States over and above the exemptions in Regulation 3227/76, and provide full budgetary details concerning monies allocated to DG XVII?

**Mr Mosar, Member of the Commission.** — (FR) For any civil nuclear facility existing in a Member State the Commission requires the operator to provide a declaration of the basic technical characteristics. When these characteristics have been checked the Commission decides how often and how thorough the routine inspections should be; in doing so it takes account of the following factors:

First, the international commitments of the Community arising from its three agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency;

Secondly, the special monitoring commitments entered into by the Community in its agreements with various non-member countries, in particular affecting the supply of nuclear materials;

Thirdly, the Community's internal commitments arising from the Euratom Treaty.

The Commission is continuing to ask for the allocation of sufficient funds for the fulfilment of the Community's obligations towards Member States and non-member countries. That covers the budgetary aspect of the question. In this connexion I am glad to say that the Parliament has always supported the Commission's requests in this field.

To go into greater detail, let me now say that in 1984 the Euratom inspectors spent 6 050 days inspecting plant in Member States. That total is broken down as follows:

11% in enrichment plants;

33% in conversion plants;

15% in power reactors;

15% in reprocessing plants;

25% in research establishments and miscellaneous installations.

The Community's stocks of fissile material, for example plutonium and uranium, went up from some 420 tonnes at the end of 1982 to nearly 500 tonnes at the end of 1984.

**Mosar**

First of all, the inspections carried out as part of security checks vary in terms of the ease or difficulty with which anyone tempted to misuse nuclear materials might divert them to unlawful purposes or any other undeclared use.

Next, the purpose of inspections is to discover whether nuclear materials are being used or stocked in bulk or in the form of complete identifiable articles.

Finally, other inspections are intended to check whether the nuclear material changes its chemical or isotopic composition whilst it is in the plant, whether or not it has an easily measurable form and whether the through-put of nuclear material at the plant is high or reduced as compared with the stock.

These principles are applied, as far as the workforce available allows, to all nuclear plants in the Community containing civil nuclear materials, with the exception of those plants to which the Commission is gradually applying the procedures laid down in Article 35(2) of Regulation No 3227/76 on nuclear materials, plant or parts of plant capable of being used for purposes of defence in nuclear weapon States.

As regards the actual budgetary question, my answer is that the budget of the Euratom Safeguards Directorate, that is, Directorate F of Directorate General XVII, is as follows: for the 1982 financial year, 1.8 million ECU; for the 1984 financial year: 3.3 million ECU. As to staff: for 1982, 175 officials; for 1984, 178 officials.

**Mrs Tongue (S).** — The problem I would like to focus on is that spent fuel for both civil and military purposes is reprocessed simultaneously. Unfortunately, the Euratom Treaty deals only with civil material, and we must ensure that the Euratom inspectors have full access to *all* reprocessing facilities in the Community. I was very pleased to see that you gave me a breakdown of inspection days, but you did not say at which plants those inspections were carried out. As you are no doubt aware, I am trying to focus on the Sellafield plant where Euratom inspectors are not allowed into the reprocessing facility. Would the Commission agree to and push for the separation of reprocessing of civil and military materials to allow Euratom inspectors to assess exactly what is going on in all civil nuclear facilities in the Member States?

**Mr Mosar.** — (*FR*) As regards the distinction drawn between civil and military establishments, I think I should remind you what the situation was before the Non-proliferation Treaty and the Verification Agreement concluded with the International Atomic Energy Agency. At that time the Euratom safeguards inspections in the Community were carried out in a non-discriminatory manner. In view of the situation created following those agreements, we recognize that it is

hard to carry out inspections in the same way in both sorts of undertaking and in a way which is genuinely non-discriminatory. But it is the intention of the Commission and the relevant Directorate General to do their best to make it possible.

In reply to the supplementary question which asks for further figures and details of the breakdown of the various inspections, I would say that it is hard to give a satisfactory reply to the Honourable Member during Question Time and that reference to tables will no doubt be required. I should add that as things are at present the figures do not seem very informative because the inspection hours put in per unit of nuclear material depend of course first on the type of plant and then on the type of material treated and whether there is in fact a substantial through-put of material or whether on the other hand the material is simply stocked. But naturally I am ready to supplement this answer by giving in writing tables showing all the details asked for.

**Mrs Lizin (S).** — (*FR*) No doubt the Commissioner knows that the third nuclear reactor, Tihange III, in my constituency has just been commissioned.

I should like to know if he can tell me, since he seems well-informed, what types of inspection have been effected by the Euratom inspectors or the Common Market officials at Tihange III. In addition, since there has been an earthquake in that area over a radius of 15 km, can he tell me whether, as a result of many questions and enquiries, the Commission has given special consideration to this specific aspect of the ability of Tihange III to withstand earthquakes and whether as a result the calculations on this point have been altered as compared with the two previous reactors?

**Mr Mosar.** — (*FR*) In view of the fact that some 200 officials employed by the Safeguards Directorate in Luxembourg have to inspect between 400 and 500 plants, if not more, you will understand that I am not in a position to give you a detailed answer on this very special case. But I can tell you now, subject to supplementing my reply later, that in this case the information supplied to us has been checked in the light of the provisions and regulations provided for by the Treaty.

**President.** — As the author is not present, Question No 76 will be answered in writing.<sup>1</sup>

Question No 77, by Mrs Lemass (H-96/85):

Subject: Dublin Bay pollution

Is the Commission now satisfied with the checking of pollution levels in Dublin Bay and its bathing

<sup>1</sup> See Annex 'Question Time'.

**President**

areas in view of the findings of two reports, one of which shows that water samples taken near Blackrock, Co. Dublin, were 63% above the EEC guideline limits and 6% higher than the mandatory limits, whilst the second report shows that wild tomatoes discovered near Sandymount, Seapoint, Scotsman's Bay and Shankill owe their origin to tomato pips undigested in the human digestive system which end up on the shores in Dublin Bay?

**Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission.** — The Commission has no knowledge of the two reports mentioned by the honourable Member. However, in compliance with Article 13 of Directive 76/160/EEC concerning the quality of bathing water, the Member States submit a comprehensive report to the Commission on bathing water and its most significant characteristics. In general, the Irish authorities send to the Commission the value of the parameters set out in the said directive, the average value of the results and the number of results exceeding the values specified in columns I and G of the annex to the directive and the national limit values.

For Dublin County they have submitted the results for the locality of Portmarnock and not Blackrock, which is some 15 miles away. Going by the reports in this instance, it can be seen that in 1981 the I values in the directive were respected for Portmarnock on all occasions, that the national limit values for faecal coliforms and faecal streptococci were exceeded on one occasion and that for 1982 the national limit values for streptococci were exceeded on one occasion. According to the Irish authorities, however, this situation was exceptional.

Finally, the Commission would remind the honourable Member that, in accordance with Article 4(1) of Directive 76/160/EEC, ten years after notification of the directive, i. e. by 8 December 1985 at the latest, the quality of bathing water must comply with the limit values set down in the annex to the directive.

**Mrs Lemass (RDE).** — I would just like to ask the Commissioner what penalties a Member State will incur if the directives are not complied with before December 1985 and if it is found that the pollution of water is above what it should be, because, as far as I am aware, pollution in Dublin Bay is at a very high level and is a very serious matter.

**Mr Clinton Davis.** — If there is no compliance, then the Commission initiates infringement proceedings against Member States. It is not really a question of compliance: we have always had infringement proceedings, once initiated, respected by Member States. I think that is really the important criterion.

**Mrs Tongue (S).** — The Commissioner mentioned the Water Bathing Directive of 1976. We are now in 1985. Many of us here in this Chamber have good reason to believe that there is more than one Member State contravening this directive, particularly the United Kingdom. What is the Commission doing to monitor fully and, indeed, pursue Member States who are failing to comply with it?

**Mr Clinton Davis.** — A number of honourable Members have written to me. I am personally looking into the matter to ensure that there is compliance, and any breach will be dealt with in the way that I have indicated.

**President.** — Question No 78, by Mrs Rabbethge (H-117/85):

Subject: Commission statistics on the European Social Fund

Can the Commission say why its publication for the Federal Republic of Germany, 'Berichte und Information' (e. g., No 14 of 9 April 1985), does not contain a detailed regional breakdown of European Social Fund statistics, which, as a result, are never complete? Can the Commission ensure that this is rectified?

**Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission.** — Many Social Fund applications are national in scope, and for some of these Member States have difficulties in furnishing a breakdown of aid requested by region. For this reason, there are no valid statistics to indicate the amount of Social Fund aid destined for individual regions. The Commission, however, is continuing to examine ways of solving the remaining problems in this area. One object of the management decision adopted by the Commission in connection with the new system introduced in 1984 was to have a complete breakdown by region of Fund aid. Several Member States have apparently been unable to go all the way in providing this information in the case of some large national programmes, and they have pleaded that where approval is sought under guidelines which contain no regional limitations, we should not be justified in refusing for the lack of a regional breakdown. The difficulty that one has in this regard is that there appears to be some degree of logic in that position, however desirable it would be for us to have the information in regard to regional breakdowns.

**Mrs Rabbethge (PPE).** — (DE) I thank the Commissioner for this comprehensive information, but I should like to make it clear that we are all aware that the people back home in the regions are very interested in knowing how the individual governments allocate the money from the Social Fund — and the agricultural and other funds, of course — in the individual regions. This is a point which makes it easier for

### Rabbethge

us Members — and the Commission must also be concerned about this — to bring to the forefront of people's minds Community Europe, Community responsibilities and also the dependence on European money.

I therefore ask the Commission once again: is it not possible to make the individual governments more aware of their responsibility to provide a better breakdown for people in individual Länder and regions than has been the case hitherto? The last electoral campaign for the European Parliament demonstrated the urgent need for this in all the countries of the European Community! I am not just speaking for my own country, the Federal Republic of Germany.

**Mr Sutherland.** — The simple answer to the question is yes, it would be of great assistance to the Commission if the Member States were able to provide the information.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that the Social Fund has the peculiar advantage of being a scheme-by-scheme fund rather than a quota fund. I personally believe that that is the most appropriate type of fund for Community action. In other words, it is not based on national quotas, it is based on scheme-by-scheme application. This being the case it is doubly important that the Community participation in the scheme be clearly evidenced to the local population and it should be possible to identify for the populations in question exactly what is happening.

So I entirely commend the question and the impulse behind it.

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — While welcoming the Commissioner's answer about the need for the detailed regional breakdown, would he agree with me that in the event of that regional breakdown's lacking the adequacy he is demanding, priority for the limited resources in the fight against unemployment should be given to the constituencies of Members who supported the Commission's agricultural price policies rather than those who voted for higher levels of agricultural profligacy?

**Mr Sutherland.** — The funds of the Community should be directed to those in need.

**President.** — Question No 79, by Mr Wolff (119/85):

Subject: Commission decision on exchange controls

Does the Commission not take the view that the restrictions on the liberalization of capital movements, as reflected in the decision adopted at the end of December 1984<sup>1</sup> to maintain exchange

controls on capital movements (to France's benefit), is an example of the very type of measure that retards convergence in the field of economic, monetary and financial policy? Accordingly, would the Commission not agree that it has been somewhat lenient in taking this decision, the grounds for which would hardly appear to be congruent with the general interests of the Community or with the interests of the Community's businessmen and citizens?

**Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission.** — The decision of 19 December 1984 to which the honourable Member refers put an end to the derogation in favour of one Member State and put stricter limits, both in time and substance, on the derogations applied to the other three Member States concerned.

This represents, we think, real progress, albeit not complete progress, towards the liberalization of capital movements which the Commission and the honourable Member are united in seeking. However, the Commission does not consider that it would be in the general interests of the Community or its citizens to press for measures of liberalization which would at this stage risk compromising the stabilization programmes of Member States and economic convergence.

Finally, I would remind the honourable Member that the measures to which he refers were taken in the context of the provisions of the Treaty which provide notably for such measures to be authorized when balance of payments problems threaten to undermine the working of the common market or of the common commercial policy. But in general we are in favour of the liberalization — the whole Community is — and I share the concerns of the honourable Member.

**Mr Wolff (L).** — (FR) I should like to thank the Commissioner for the details he has given.

I should like to put a supplementary question: is there a time-limit for the application of these measures? Will they be extended and if so what will the consequences and advantages be?

**Mr Sutherland.** — For three Member States concerned, namely France, Italy and Ireland, the field of application was reduced and a time limit fixed — two years for France, three years for Italy and Ireland. For the other one Member State, Denmark, the existing derogation was ended on 19 December 1984.

This is the progress and that is the timescale with which the Commission is now concerned to implement the liberalization which it seems as being desirable in the movement of capital.

**Mr Cryer (S).** — I wonder if the Commissioner could tell me what his view would be of a proposal by the

<sup>1</sup> Commission decision of 19 December 1984, OJ L 8, 10. 1. 1985, p. 29.

**Cryer**

deputy leader of the Labour Party that a tax should be placed on the export of capital from the United Kingdom? Is he aware that since Mrs Thatcher's government removed the derogation in 1979, some £ 50 billion has flowed out of the United Kingdom? Does he not believe that some sort of derogation is necessary and that it would not be illegal for the United Kingdom Government to reimpose that derogation and that, as the appropriate directorate-general has indicated, a tax on capital such as has been proposed should not be regarded as illegal?

**Mr Sutherland.** — I would not wish to enter into the particular topic that has been raised by the Honourable Member other than to say this. The current situation as far as the Community is concerned is that the only derogations which have been permitted are the remaining three of France, Italy and Ireland. Those are the only ones that have been considered that the context of the liberalization programme which has been put into force. I have indicated that the overall position of the Community is that it is concerned with the general interest of the Community and its citizens and in that regard believes that measures of liberalization are generally desirable. Particular cases have to be dealt with in the particular circumstances of those cases and I would not like to deal with it without considering the full implications of the question.

**President.** — As the author is not present, Question No 80 will be answered in writing.<sup>1</sup>

Question No 81, by Mrs Giannakou-Koutsikou (H-139/5):

Subject: Stepping up research into solar and wind energy

As the Community's energy requirements — and dependence on energy imports — grow, it is increasingly urgent to exploit new sources of energy; furthermore, a definite policy in favour of renewable sources of energy could form the basis for a new industry in the Community and in Third World countries, creating secure jobs and export potential and contributing to a genuine European industrial policy.

In view of this, what measures has the Commission taken to coordinate the efforts of European scientists in their research into the profitable exploitation of solar and wind energy, and does not the Commission consider that for this purpose at least two European research centres should be set up forthwith to step up and coordinate research into wind and solar energy respectively?

**Mr Narjes, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (DE) Research, development and pilot projects in the

field of solar and wind energy are widely supported by the Community.

The Joint Research Centre carries out its own research in the field of renewable energy sources. Testing procedures for solar systems are being developed at Ispra and extensive installations for testing structural components and complete systems in the field of photovoltaics and passive and active solar heating are being operated.

By concluding cost-sharing contracts the Commission encourages all over Europe research in the field of renewable sources of energy, in universities, as well as in State and private research institutes and in industry.

At the same time the Commission contributes to the coordination of national research programmes and improves the transnational exchange of knowhow.

Last, but by no means least, it provides financial help in the construction of technically innovative installations at the pre-industrial stage. In view of the multiplicity of successful promotional measures which already exist at Community level, the Commission does not consider it necessary to set up additional Community research centres.

Parliament was expressly informed of this view in the discussion of Mr Linkohr's report on problems and prospects for Community research policy. The Commission is convinced that within the budgetary resources available the present distribution of support measures offers the relatively best cost-benefit ratio.

As regards the assertion about Community dependence on imported energy made in the question, it has to be said that in recent years it has not risen, and that in the period 1973 to 1983 it dropped from 64% to around 41% of the total energy requirement.

**Mrs Giannakou-Koutsikou (PPE).** — (GR) I am particularly grateful to the Commissioner for his very clear answer. In my question I raise the matter of founding European centres of research, as a sort of proposal for wider coordination in this sector. I was aware of the support granted to research centres in the public and private sectors by the Commission. Of course, the Commissioner has expressed the clearly realistic position that within the scope of the Community's financial capabilities, that is as much as can be done at present.

**Mr Narjes.** — (DE) If I might just add a few words: it was not just for budgetary reasons that I considered the setting up of a further centre unnecessary, I wished to convey that what should be handled centrally is handled centrally in Ispra and that we are also able to influence and guide virtually the entire Community-wide research into solar energy through our research

<sup>1</sup> See Annex 'Question Time'.

**Narjes**

contract network, the shared cause contracts. Under these circumstances we consider this to be the relatively best solution.

**Mr Cryer (S).** — Would the Commissioner accept that although research into solar and wind energy is very important, in the interim period i. e. until this research produces positive results, he should encourage the use in the Community of United Kingdom coal? At the moment the Community is dependent on imported, dumped coal whilst Mrs Thatcher's government is trying to close down a number of coalmines in the United Kingdom which could provide a valuable source of low cost energy and which is not being used by this supposedly buoyant market which everybody in the Common Market keeps talking about but which does not seem to cover the coal industry in the United Kingdom?

**Mr Narjes.** — (DE) With regard to coal, I would point out that it is not the Commission's intention to comment on the measures taken by the UK Government. Second, utilization of coal is also subject to the laws of profitability and for any deviation therefrom there need to be very good reasons.

**President.** — Question No 82, by Mr van der Waal (H-145/85):

Subject: Use of the official languages in the Community

In its prepared answer to my Question No H-70/85<sup>1</sup> on the use of the official languages in the Community, the Commission stated that it would continue to implement practical arrangements in the light of actual requirements (and the resources available) and that no language whatsoever would have to be dispensed with. Must this be taken to mean that the Commission will see to it that every official Community language receives equal treatment with regard to active and passive usage, thus retaining the principle of equality of status for these languages?

**Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (DA) I have already answered the question put to me in essence on a previous occasion, but I will try to clarify my answer a little more. Mr van der Waal has of course raised an important question, namely whether the Commission will continue in the future to uphold the principle of equal status for the official languages of the Community. I should like to take this opportunity to confirm that that is indeed a correct interpretation of the answer I originally gave. I think it is particularly important that the question has been asked in an assembly such as this, quite simply because

it is a prerequisite for elections to a body such as the European Parliament that they should have a democratic quality, since it must be possible for every individual — irrespective of his or her linguistic affiliations — to represent political opinion in the Member States. We also consider it important of course that people in the Commission and the Community's other institutions should be able to use the languages they wish to speak. Some are prepared to speak a number of languages in a single situation; others prefer to use their own language, but all options must be possible. Thus I can only confirm Mr van der Waal's interpretation of the answer I gave earlier.

**Mr Van der Waal (NI).** — (NL) I should like to thank the Commissioner sincerely for his positive answer regarding the equal treatment of languages. Would he also confirm that, when Spain and Portugal have acceded and the number of languages rises from seven to nine, the costs and translation services will be increased accordingly and that, despite this, he will abide by this statement regarding the equal treatment of languages in every way.

**Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (DA) I am happy to confirm that there will be nine languages in place of seven after enlargement. We all know that. I cannot imagine that there is anyone in the Community who thinks that the two new languages should be inferior in status to the seven existing languages, so we do not disagree there. It is also correct that the costs do not have any significance in that respect. But, as Commissioner responsible for the budget, I would point out that it does have significance in all other respects, for the cost will be quite high. It is also one reason, as the Honourable Members know, for the increase in Parliament's expenditure. I can also inform the House that in the Commission too we are having to increase the number of our officials quite considerably in the translation service alone, but of course we take that on board because it is a precondition for the Community's ability to function.

**Mr Fich (S).** — (DA) I should like to thank the Commissioner for his confirmation that all the languages have equal status. I should like to ask whether this means that the practice which has grown up recently in the Commission's working groups, according to which representatives of Member States are pressured into renouncing the use of their own languages, is to cease, so that in future there will be interpreters both into and out of all the languages.

**Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (DA) I have not heard of anybody being pressured into agreeing not to speak his or her own languages. All speakers have the right to use their own languages and, if they wish to avail themselves of that right, the necessary interpreting facilities are provided. But peo-

<sup>1</sup> Verbatim report of proceedings of 17. 4. 1985.

**Christophersen**

ple attending meetings do not always insist on that right. The Commission, purely as a matter of principle, of course does not interfere in these arrangements. It also happens, for example, that Commissioners do not always wish to use their own language, but each one decides for himself. To the extent that a member of a working group wishes to use his own language and insists on doing so, we naturally make interpreting facilities available. If the member or members concerned wish to use another language they can do that too.

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — While thanking the Commission for its answer, with which I heartily concur, would the Commissioner comment on the fact that some Members are dissatisfied with the length of time it is taking to get replies to questions from the Commission? Does he attribute this to the difficulty of interpretation? If that is not the alibi, why is it that after four months we are getting replies of such appalling quality to some of our questions to the collegiate body of which he is a part? It has taken me four months to get a reply that could have been written in five minutes. Is it interpretation difficulties that have led to the four months delay? If not, what is the alibi for it?

**Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (DA) I am not aware of the specific example Mr Tomlinson is referring to. It may be that it was a very complex question but, more to the point, a great many questions are being asked. For example, I have just had to answer four. The number of questions being put is also on the increase. I can only say that, with the resources the Commission has at its disposal, we give answers as quickly as we can. If you are dissatisfied and can single out concrete examples, we shall be pleased to explain the reasons for any delay. But I must stress that at a time when we have to be extremely careful about how we use our resources — and there are some Members of Parliament who think that too, Mr Tomlinson among them, which as Commissioner responsible for the budget I greatly appreciate — we must expect you to bear with us if, in a situation where a great many questions are asked, things take a little longer. But, if it is a good question, it should not matter so much if one has to wait for a good answer.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) Does the Commissioner agree with me that a great deal still has to be done to explain to the public that multilingualism is necessary and that the costs of it do, of course, have to be borne. In this connection I should like to ask him to clear up a misunderstanding. In his first reply he said that everyone must have the opportunity of representing his own country in his own language. I should therefore like to ask him whether he agrees with me that as a result of the EEC Treaties no member of the Com-

mission represents his own country in the discussions of the Commission, and whether he abides by that.

**Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (DA) Yes, I subscribe to that, but I was not talking about the Commission; I was referring to the working groups on which the Member States are represented. The Members of the Commission do not indeed represent any Member State, and for that reason we also speak other languages. What I am referring to are the cases in which the Member States want to be represented in the manner which I permitted myself to mention in regard to Parliament. It is for the Commission alone to decide how it is to organize its work; there is no-one else who may or must be involved in the matter.

**President.** — As the author is not present, Question No 83 will be answered in writing.<sup>1</sup>

Question No 84, by Mr Mac Sharry (H-431/84):

Subject: Grant aid for Connaught Regional Airport

Will the Commission state if an application was made by the Irish authorities for grant assistance from the ERDF towards the cost of Connaught Regional Airport and if so, the date of the application and if it was pursued by the Irish Government and furthermore would the Commission give favourable consideration to such a request?

**Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission.** — (GR) Mr President, in August 1982 the Commission did indeed receive an application from the Irish authorities for a grant of aid from the ERDF for Connaught Airport. After examining the application, the Commission requested clarification on certain points from the Irish authorities. There has in fact been a dialogue. We consider that the answers are not sufficiently clear, and that is why the matter is still outstanding.

**Mr Mac Sharry (RDE).** — I would like to thank the Commissioner for the information. However, did I understand him to say that the Commission has had some response from the Irish Government but that the response was not sufficient to enable a final decision to be taken? I did specifically ask in my question if the application had been pursued by the Irish Government. I would further like to ask the Commissioner if the queries raised by the Commission were of a nature that might suggest that the project would not get support and, secondly, if money is available for such projects.

<sup>1</sup> See Annex 'Question Time'.

**Mr Varfis.** — (*GR*) Since, as I said earlier, the application is still on the table, the Commission will be able to supply the finance in question when it receives the supplementary answers concerning parts of the economic and technical feasibility study, and the absolute coordination of the project in question with the programme of regional development in Ireland. There will be no difficulty about the money since the programme is included among the works submitted by the Irish Government, which will assign to it a certain priority. I repeat that the matter is still under consideration, and I cannot say that it is something which will be solved very promptly. Prospects at this time are such as to preclude my telling you that in a week, or in a month, the problem will be solved.

**President.** — Question Time is closed.<sup>1</sup>

9. *Right to petition Parliament — European driving licence — European passport — Obstacles at intra-Community borders (continuation)*

**President.** — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate (Doc. A2-41/85 - B2-324/85 - B2-387/85 - B2-325/85 and B2-323/85).

**Mrs Vayssade (S),** *draftman of the opinion for the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights.* — (*FR*) Mr President, the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, in whose name I am now speaking, which deals with citizens' rights in the Community, is especially sensitive to the problems raised in this afternoon's debates.

It was asked for its opinion on Mr Chanterie's interim report and broadly approved the contents. The question of the right of European citizens to submit petitions is important: the point is to give specifically to each of the inhabitants of this Community the idea that it is gradually becoming a Community based on the rule of law and that there actually are Community institutions to which they can turn for the enforcement of these rights. The right to petition is one of the ways of having the law enforced.

It therefore seems important to us that the right to petition, established by the Parliament and operating within the Parliament, should be formally recognized by all the Community institutions and that in particular the Milan Summit should issue a declaration to that effect.

It seemed to us that this was not the right moment to speak of an Ombudsman. The differences between the national legal systems and the Community legal system do not make it possible simply to transpose that

institution into the Community system and it seemed to us much more effective for the Community that Parliament should retain its competence in this sphere, but that it should then appoint a committee on petitions, whose only task should be to deal with petitions, and which thus would be recognized as a collective body by all Community citizens and would have to be given the resources with which to operate.

I should also like to say a word about the subjects to be dealt with in the oral questions and in particular the problems of the passport and the driving licence. I think the Milan Summit must take decisions, and decisions which must speedily be followed by specific action. The passport is a good example of promises made some time ago, which people do not see coming rapidly into effect: so they end up no longer believing them.

Mr President, I am afraid that if the decisions taken are not put into practice or worse still, if no decisions at all are taken at Milan, all the citizens of the Community will feel like quoting to all the Community institutions — because I think they are confused in the public mind — the line by one of Raymond Queneau's characters in 'Zazie dans le metro': 'You talk, you talk, all you can do is talk'.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PLASKOVITIS

*Vice-President*

**Mr Visser (S).** — (*NL*) Mr President, I would rather not be standing here because that would mean our good friend Horst Seefeld would be explaining his questions himself. He was, after all, the one to take the initiative. Unfortunately Horst Seefeld is not yet completely fit, but I know for sure we all wish him a speedy and complete recovery and hope to see him back soon.

In the Community some things are difficult and others are relatively easy. Difficult things take up a great deal of time, but so, unfortunately, do relatively easy things — even when they are unnecessary. We all agree that the Community must mean more to its citizens. That is very important if the Community is to be accepted and to go on developing. This is difficult to achieve with abstract things, but it should be done with things that directly concern the citizen. And what concerns the citizen more than being able to cross frontiers quickly, especially during the holiday period? This is an urgent matter. In some countries part of the holiday period comes earlier in the year. Unnecessary delays have an undesirable effect, reflect badly on the Community, because the citizen then rightly complains: 'You can't even sort that out.'

<sup>1</sup> See Annex 'Question Time'.

## Visser

Mr President, one thing is certain. We are generally agreed that obstacles at the frontiers, especially to the movement of persons, should, and indeed must, be removed. The European Council said as much at its meeting in Fontainebleau almost a year ago. The Commission came forward with practical proposals in January, and then there are the Adonino report and the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee for a People's Europe, which contains practical recommendations, on the green E disc, for example. Parliament delivered its opinion in the Rogalla report in April of this year, and yet decision-making in the Council of Ministers leaves a great deal to be desired. There are, of course, problems, and it is rather convenient to pick on various things during frontier checks — like the policy on aliens and the collection of fines. But the 270 million inhabitants of the Community should not be the victims of this. Nor are simple obstructions at frontiers figments of the imagination. France and Germany have provided practical proof with the E disc that it is easy if only the political will is there. On 15 July the same procedure will apply at the frontiers between the Benelux countries, France and Germany, which I consider to be an unnecessary and unfortunate delay, because it means that traffic will not move smoothly throughout the coming holiday period. But the decision will be taken. But what about the other Member States? The Community has more than five Member States. And there is more than just road transport. People also travel by rail and arrive at seaports and airports, and hardly any progress has been made here.

Consequently, Mr President, with an eye to the Community's credibility but also to demonstrate that we are still very much capable of action, Horst Seefeld and many others have put these very specific questions: what practical preparations has the Council made, what practical prospects can the Council offer the citizens of the Community for the coming holiday period? The E disc is particularly interesting in this respect. There is absolutely no point, of course, in allowing people to cross frontiers freely if they can still be stopped for importing goods. I am thinking here only of the personal exemptions for taxable goods carried by travellers, which should be increased in the very near future. If this is not done, we shall even see the opposite happening, as witness the checks by Belgian customs officials at the Dutch-Belgian frontier. In addition, some frontier posts will, of course, have to be changed so that different types of traffic can be dealt with separately. Otherwise, holders of the E disc will still have to stand in line.

To conclude, Mr President, I stress the need for good information and publicity. I have the strong impression that the European citizen has not been adequately informed of the importance of the E disc and what can be done with it. Publicity and information must also be improved, and I should like to see something done about that too.

**Mr Fracanzani, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (IT) Mr President, honourable Members, at its meet-

ing of 29 and 30 March 1985, the European Council examined the report of the Committee for a People's Europe, evaluated it and declared itself in agreement with the proposals which can be implemented immediately, and with those relating to long-term objectives.

Among these proposals is the free movement of citizens in the Community, and here the *Ad Hoc* Committee for a People's Europe recommended immediate measures: without waiting for the Council to adopt a directive, the European Council should decide at once that the Member States must take all possible practical steps to secure the most global solution.

The European Council also gave its agreement in principle to the suggestions put forward by the Adonino Committee on internal border controls and controls at sea ports and airports.

For its part the Council, like the honourable Members, attaches great importance to the free movement of citizens. The Council and the representatives of the Member States' governments, meeting in the Council, therefore adopted a resolution in June 1984 on easing the crossing of frontiers by citizens of the Member States. The Council believes that the implementation of measures aimed in the long term at the free passage of frontiers by citizens of the Member States could give the people a stronger sense of belonging to the Community.

In this context, the Commission submitted to the Council a proposal for a directive on easing the controls and formalities applicable to citizens of the Member States crossing intra-Community frontiers. The European Parliament delivered its opinion on this proposal on 18 April 1985 and the Commission amended its proposal on the basis of that opinion.

The matter was submitted to the Council at its meetings (internal market) of 8 May and 10 June 1985 and the Council, basing itself in particular on Parliament's opinion, proceeded to examine this proposal.

The main questions raised by the proposal concern:

- the principle of free passage of frontiers as an immediate or long-term objective;
- the differences between controls at internal frontiers and at ports and airports;
- the limits of the stricter controls;
- controls of international trains and long-distance coaches;
- cooperation between the control authorities;
- the form of the legal instrument and Community competence.

**Fracanzani**

The Council's activities, although leading to progress in some of these areas, have not yet made it possible, for the moment, to specify the terms of an agreement.

The presidency, which attaches great importance to this matter, is doing all it can to ensure that a decision is adopted rapidly and has decided to enter this item on the agenda of the Social Affairs Council on 18-19 June 1985.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, I am to speak on the subject of driving licences, but before I do that, I should like to make some comment on what the President-in-Office of the Council said here just now. Perhaps the President-in-Office would be so kind as to hear me. The point is that he said here, without blushing, that the Council, like the members of the European Parliament, attaches particular importance to freedom of movement. I question that, before the assembled House, before the European public!

*(Applause)*

I should like once again to express my disappointment over the fact that nothing happens in the Council committees at all, precisely because — as I said this morning in another connection — the politicians who make endless promises in their weekend speeches are unable to prevail against the pea-tellers cartel which exists in various corridors of power.

*(Applause)*

I have no doubt that the Italian Presidency is making particular efforts towards progress in this sphere, but the history of the document about which the President-in-Office spoke, is enough in itself to expose the Community to ridicule, in the light of events in this sphere among large populations like Brazil, the USA and Canada. Quite simply, it is no longer acceptable for Parliament and the citizens of the Community to be led around by our rulers, the politicians, the heads of State, the foreign ministers and the President of the Council.

I come now to the classic examples, driving licences, postage stamps and the Customs sign, which I have already described this morning. Perhaps the President-in-Office of the Council would be so kind as to look at this sign which is in contravention of the law, according to the rules of this Community. President-in-Office, this sign is in contravention of the law: there are no Customs duties in the Community any more, therefore there cannot be any signs which say Customs. If the Member States wish to draw a line between themselves and the other States, if they perhaps levy different taxes, then they should state the truth: taxes — but not Customs! That is lying to the European public, which is what the citizens of this Community are supposed to be.

*(Applause)*

The President-in-Office, too, is personally affected and I have to speak sharply so that he will use the opportunity, as Mr Kohl and Mr Mitterrand did, to take action from above, to simply issue instructions to his civil servants, from the top — and this is the only way to draw attention to these problems — to act in the way which he, as a politician, wants. Those who do not want to follow these instructions can be provisionally retired, and we can look among the individual Member States for officials who are willing to implement the legal principles of the European Treaties.

Because the Council is not in a position to act as an organ of the Community, some Member States will endeavour on 14 June in a town not far from Luxembourg to take at least a small step forward. I think that we should nevertheless warn against excessive hopes, because this is an attempt to defend the control points at the frontiers. In the view of the experts this is not the way to freedom of movement, it is an attempt once again to justify controls, and we must get away from that.

I have hundreds of letters from people in Europe about these problems and I hope that you will take note that every check at the internal frontiers of the Community is a stumbling block for Europe and increases unemployment, because it clouds the awareness that in worldwide competition with Japan and the USA we have to tighten up our internal structures, our economic and industrial policies, to make them more economic. That is why it is so important for us — and the President-in-Office particularly — to wake up the people concerned and to induce greater understanding in them.

In conclusion I should like to revert once more to the question of driving licences: a verdict of the Bonn district court of 13 May 1985 found two young Europeans guilty of a traffic offence because they had driving licences from Belgium, the country in which they live, and not from Germany. This is a scandal which must be stopped. I appeal to the President-in-Office to lend his support.

**Mr Rothley (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President. What my colleague Mr Rogalla said about driving licences is basically equally true of the European passport. For many sceptics the European passport is merely a symbol without any functional significance. That is inadmissible! Our colleague, Mr Chanterie, referred this morning to the Paris communiqué of December 1974. I think it appropriate to quote from it:

'A working group is to be set up to examine the possibility of creating a passport union and introducing a uniform passport as the first step forwards it. As far as possible the appropriate draft should be laid before the governments of the Member States before 31 December 1976. In particular the draft will provide for the gradual harmonisation of legislation on aliens and the abolition of passport controls within the Community.'

**Rothley**

That was in 1974. What we are talking about here is a passport union. That means that there are no longer any passport controls within this European Community, that controls at frontiers, and ultimately the frontiers themselves, are abolished.

The decisive point about the European passport is that it only attains functional significance when it is recognised by third countries. It is therefore all the more regrettable that the Commission has done nothing in precisely this field, namely the recognition of the European passport by third countries.

In view of the functional significance of the European passport there is no contradiction between the call for abolition of frontiers, and thereby frontier controls, and the introduction of the European passport.

The European passport is intended to be a first step towards a European citizenship. At the end of this road we shall all be able to say that we are citizens of Europe.

The European passport is intended, as the quotation says, to be the first step towards a passport union. Already, at this first step, we are stumbling because narrow-minded bureaucrats are putting stones in our way. There is the demand for electronic readability, as though we can only abolish frontiers if we construct thousands more new electronic frontiers within Europe. Or traditional passports are issued, because there is a larger stock of them. The citizens of the European Community have really had enough of the way in which no action ever follows these, usually solemn, resolutions.

The heads of government either have not the will or have not the power, to put their resolutions into reality. The political damage it might cause is incalculable. Hopes are aroused, and then bitterly disappointed. Our credibility is lost and there is increasing annoyance over Europe.

I do not believe that it is any longer a question of evolving new ideas. Rather we must find the strength to implement the resolutions which already exist. It is no longer a question of setting something in motion, but of the perseverance and obstinacy to bring it to a satisfaction conclusion!

But that is what is now lacking. It is the bureaucrats, who confuse the narrow field in which they work with the whole world, who have the say-so. We expect the Commission to urge on the governments to exploit every legal possibility of introducing the European passport and in addition to report regularly to this Parliament on the results of its efforts.

**Mr Ripa di Meana, Member of the Commission.** — (IT) Mr President, first of all the Commission would like to express its appreciation of the work done by

Parliament and, in particular, the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, in the recent report by Mr Chanterie, and for all the activities so ably chaired by Mr Amadei. All these matters relate to protecting the citizen's rights as an individual and help to make Europeans more aware of the benefits of the Community.

As the Commissioner responsible, may I stress my direct interest not only in all the Community activities which affect the life of the citizens but also in the needs and expectations which these citizens are expressing here in a most eloquent 'crescendo'.

On the question raised and discussed in Mr Chanterie's report, the Commission is in favour of strengthening the right of the citizen to petition the European Parliament, as it is of strengthening Parliament's power to obtain the information which will enable it to examine whether a petition is justified and to deal with the problems raised in it.

It must be the duty of the Community institutions to provide a valid response if a citizen believes that the application of Community law violates his rights as an individual.

For its part the Commission is doing all in its power to cooperate with the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions of Parliament in examining these matters. And you know, Mr Chanterie, that it is doing so.

When I took part very recently, as commissioner responsible for a People's Europe, in a meeting of your committee, I was able to confirm the spirit of agreement that prevails in our joint task.

I believe, however, that it would now be useful and timely to distinguish the tasks incumbent on Parliament and on the Commission more precisely. Some of the cases presented to Parliament are in fact denunciations of infringements of Community law which fall within the competence of the Commission. I am referring to Article 169.

I must of course point out that the Commission intends to exercise its basic function as guardian of the Treaties in absolute independence. So I think Parliament should not deal with petitions relating to infringements of Community law in the strict sense. That would allow Parliament to develop its own approach to petitions.

The necessary improvement in the procedure for examining petitions must come from the Council or, even better, from the Member States. The main improvements can come from direct cooperation between the Member States and the European Parliament. After all the talk, we must really establish this cooperation now.

### Ripa di Meana

So the Commission fully endorses the Council's appeal to the Member States for close cooperation with Parliament in the search for procedures to ensure an effective and prompt reply to petitions. I do not think, however, that these improvements will prove sufficient in the long term and I think it will also be necessary to amend the Treaties in order to assign Parliament real powers of investigation and inquiry.

Mr President, if you permit me I would now like to devote a few words, a few remarks, to the questions by Mr Rogalla, Mr Amadei, Mr Chanterie, Mrs Dury and Mr Schwalba-Hoth on the Community driving licence and then to move on to the questions by Mr Amadei, Mr Chanterie, Mr Rothley, Mrs Vayssade and Mr Hänsch on the European passport.

Then, again if time permits, I will have the pleasure of commenting on some of the questions at the foot of the agenda.

I shall now speak to the question of the Community driving licence.

Like the questioners, the Commission too believes that the period of one year — you, Mr Rogalla, have just spoken vehemently and I share your disapproval of the scandalous incident you mentioned — referred to in Article 8 of Council Directive No 80/1263 of 8 December 1980 on exchanging a driving licence when the holder takes up residence in another Member State, should not constitute a rigid deadline for recognition of the validity of a licence.

The Adonnino Committee, the *Ad Hoc* Committee on a People's Europe, has of course already drafted proposals and is working on the matter now. I believe that at its final meeting, scheduled for 17 and 18 of this month, the proposals now under examination by the committee will be formally approved and forwarded to the European Council of Milan.

The Commission believes that a licence holder should be able to exchange the licence after the one-year deadline if good reasons exist for proceeding in this manner and it is in the interests of the applicant.

We therefore deplore the severity with which some Member States observe the deadline; but we are also aware that in some specific cases submitted by the applicants, the refusal was justified for other reasons, including reasons of road safety and the highway code, which must of course be taken into account.

In its programme of activities for 1985 the Commission referred to its commitment in this field and it will present a proposal to guarantee the validity of the Community driving licence throughout the Community. Despite the risk that such a proposal may be relegated to the sidelines of the activities of the European Council of Milan, we shall submit it.

It will deal mainly with the conditions for exchanging licences. I must also inform you that preliminary studies are now under way on harmonizing vehicle categories and standardizing driving tests. The Commission intends to submit a proposal on these matters to the Council at the end of the year, or at the latest early in 1986. Harmonizing the rules on physical and mental fitness is a far more complex matter; here we have thresholds, requirements and characteristics that differ from state to state, in particular the question of the permissible level of alcohol for drivers, which is not easy to harmonize. But here too we will formulate a proposal very soon after.

An effective Community driving licence system is therefore foreseeable, after the process of harmonization I mentioned, and presupposes the adjustment of the Community driving licence model.

I shall reply as a whole, where possible, to the questions by Mr Amadei and Mr Chanterie and to those by Mr Rothley, Mrs Vayssade and Mr Hänsch on the European passport. The Commission has already raised its voice loudly and emphatically in the General Affairs Council and in the Council on the Internal Market, to protest at and denounce the existing situation. We have protested at the delays and at the fact that five and a half months after the deadline of 1 January 1985, a date fixed by the Council in 1981, the European passport is still not available to every European citizen.

According to our latest information — going back to 25 May — the situation is as follows: only three states, Denmark, Ireland and Luxembourg, made a European passport generally available at the scheduled date.

In June last year Italy made available a first issue of 5 000 passports, but before the European passport can be distributed and made generally available, the supply of existing Italian passports must be exhausted, barring exceptions. We have drawn the Italian Government's attention to the need to deal with this situation and to proceed at once to the unconditional distribution of European passports and give up its stock of national passports.

In Belgium, a first issue of European passports was available last month. However, even in Belgium, their general distribution presents difficulties analogous to those in Italy.

In France, the European passport was not given to the police and consulates until after the second half of April. However, in France too the national authorities say they must first exhaust the stock of national passports.

In the Netherlands the European passport will not be introduced before the end of 1985, for undisclosed technical reasons.

### Ripa di Meana

In the Federal Republic of Germany, it was decided to introduce a passport that could be read electronically, but in view of the technical requirements and legislative discipline such a passport involves and the equipment needed for reading it, the European passport will not be introduced before 1987.

More or less the same applies in the United Kingdom. On 29 July last year the Home Secretary declared to the House of Commons that the European passport would not be introduced before 1987 and that this would coincide with the introduction of a passport that could be read electronically.

Finally, in Greece, even though the presidential decree on the matter was published in 1983, the European passport will not be available before 1987.

In view of this situation, the Commission wrote to the foreign ministers on 2 April stating its regret at the failure to adopt or inadequate adoption of the new passport by some states, while others had taken the necessary steps. The Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom wrote to me giving me the information I have just mentioned and assuring me that he had given very explicit instructions at frontiers to ensure recognition of the European passport if presented. After this letter, I had a similar correspondence with the ambassador and representative of France in Brussels, who has informed me of the most recent developments.

As for the cost of the European passport, over a same period of validity it varies from state to state, with differences of up to twenty times, as in the case of the passport issued by the Italian Republic and that by France, which costs 22 times more than in the Federal Republic of Germany.

In its same letter of 2 April, the Commission pointed out that this situation could have an adverse effect on the attitudes of the citizens concerned. However, at the present time, honourable Members, it is extremely difficult for the Commission to propose harmonization in this matter, since it is not a question of the costs of producing the passport but of the fees charged by each Member State.

As for the difficulties encountered by the first travellers carrying a European passport at internal Community frontiers, besides the external frontiers, difficulties which already became apparent in the early months of this year, they arose because the Member States had not given notice of the new passport to the frontier authorities and had not informed third countries of the introduction of the new passport. When the Commission learned of this, it drew the Member States' attention to their obligations, in that same letter of 2 April, emphasizing that this could damage the Community's image and make it look ridiculous. After these steps, there were fewer incidents, although unfortunately the book is not yet closed.

Lastly, may I formally subscribe to the recommendation by Mr Amadei that the Commission should launch an intensive information campaign to promote awareness among the people of the Community of the existence of the European passport and its gradual utilization. Should a resolution to this effect be adopted by Parliament, I am prepared to discuss with the Directorate-General for Information the procedures of such a measure, so that the Commission, which has already made arrangements for a series of publications, printed matter and video material, can with Parliament's agreement publish them and distribute them rapidly in all the Member States.

May I now say a few words on the questions by Mr von Wogau and others.

Only two Member States, the United Kingdom and Germany, have, as I said, the intention to use electronic readers for the passports. I have already explained that the equipment is not yet available and that computerized passport control requires complex equipment, especially at airport control points. So far, however, we have no further information either on when it will be installed or on the obligations this could entail for the Member States and the Commission.

As for the green EEC sticker on cars — and this is the second part of the question — which, as you know, can be affixed at Franco-German frontier posts to the cars of citizens of those countries, an agreement now seems imminent and, truth to tell, was signed last week between Germany, France, Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. Similar discussions are now under way between Germany and Denmark.

As far as we know, special channels — I am on the same question — for citizens of Community Member States have been set up for police controls at the airports of London Heathrow, Roissy-Charles de Gaulle and Orly, Frankfurt and Rome.

No doubt the creation of a combined control instead of one police control and a second, customs control — Mr Rogalla, I must alas use the current term — would greatly simplify and speed up frontier formalities. There exist bilateral agreements and there exist Community directives, dating back to December 1983, which in fact make provision for this combined control.

To conclude this item, and perhaps reserve myself the right to reply to the question by Mr Costé-Floret at a later stage of the debate, so as not to take up too much time, I can summarize the situation as follows: the green sticker, the special channels at airports, the single control point are all matters which the Commission regards as compatible with earlier directives and in respect of which it exerts pressure on the Council at their periodic meetings. These specific points were on the working agenda of the Council on the Internal

### Ripa di Meana

Market on 10 June, but no agreement was reached despite our urging and our pressure.

The next Council will also be faced with these problems and I hope a solution can be found before the end of July, as was in fact requested by the European Council at Fontainebleau.

I would like to warn the national administrations and Member States' representatives against further delaying the adoption of these measures: they are necessary on the eve of the long summer vacation, when millions of Community citizens will indeed, in the spirit of Raymond Queneau's character *Zazie*, measure whether the Community is made up of words or deeds.

**President.** — (GR) I have received five motions for resolutions (Doc. B 2-411/85), B 2-415/85, B 2-427/85, B 2-428/85 and B 2-472/85) with requests for an early vote, with a view to winding up the debate on oral questions.

The vote on the requests for an early vote will take place at the end of the debate.

**Mr Adam (S).** — Mr President, I wish to address a few remarks to the subject of the Chanterie report. I shall not have time, I suspect, to get on to the matters of the oral question with debate.

In Britain our national parliament is so well known that we actually have a bottle of sauce named after it. If there is ever going to be a bottle of sauce named after the European Parliament, then we certainly need to have much greater understanding between the electors and what happens in this Parliament and what happens in the rest of the Community.

I believe that since the advent of direct elections, the Parliament is the natural focus where a citizen, or a group of citizens, should take their comments or complaints about the operation of the Community and the things they consider to be important. Therefore, the Socialist Group will support the Chanterie report. We believe that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions is a better means of dealing with a citizen's complaint than would be the imposition of an ombudsman. That would require, in any case, a change in the Treaties, and I do not think we are likely to see that at a very early date.

There are, however, four points I think that need to be mentioned, because this is an enabling motion that is attached to the report. We are asking the Parliament for approval of our stand and therefore putting forward certain things that we believe should be followed up. Firstly, we need much more publicity as to what the Parliament does, what it is and how citizens can approach it. Secondly, we need to be clearer in our

minds as to admissibility. Commissioner Ripa di Meana mentioned this in his speech. I would say this: that while the Commission may be the 'Guardian of the Treaties', I do not think that they are solely responsible for their interpretation or operation and, therefore, I think the role of the Parliament is important in that connexion. Thirdly, we need to strengthen our rights of investigation *vis-à-vis* the Commission and the Council. Fourthly, for our part, we need to organize the business of our committees so that attendance at our committee is better than it is, because that has been a serious limitation on our work in the last six months.

**Mrs Braun-Moser (PPE).** — (DE) Mr President, colleagues. We heard this morning how the realization of the internal market is still in abeyance and that it will take a long time to achieve a citizens' Europe. We directly-elected 'Members' know how restless people are getting, that they are slowly losing confidence in integration, that they are talking about Eurosclerosis, that the authorities are not working faster, and that they actually need a Europe to hold on to.

It does not consist simply of a European driving licence and a European passport, as we heard today. The suggestions which we have heard today, and particularly the excellent Chanterie report, do in fact indicate that there is something more. The main thing is to realize the four basic freedoms which were incorporated in the EEC Treaty in 1958. The first is free movement of persons, then freedom of trade, the free movement of money and capital and the freedom of establishment. Many more steps have to be climbed however to reach freedom of establishment, particularly where the mutual recognition of school leaving certificates is concerned, so that students can go to study in another country and still complete their studies.

If, then, we ask ourselves what else citizens' Europe involves, it is largely problems of trans-frontier traffic. These problems do not consist in simply moving customs and tax offices away from the frontiers and into the interior, there are also problems of foreign visitors, tourist traffic, people who want to cross the border.

We have heard that the first measures are to be taken in time for the summer holidays. That ought to include the harmonization of holiday periods, it ought to include the increase of the taxfree allowances to the real level of 1969, namely to 350 ECU per adult and 90 ECU per child.

But there are other things which we ought to mention briefly, since we are discussing these things at the moment. That is, more competition in air transport, i.e. greater transparency of tariffs and services. The principles of double taxation should of course also be given a firm foundation. Protection of and legal assistance for tourists still have to be secured. Their security

**Braun-Moser**

must be guaranteed, otherwise they cannot travel across the frontiers. We should also introduce a European television channel and European radio broadcasts for all people in all countries as soon as possible.

It was tragic to hear what Mr Ripa di Meana said just now, when he said that the European passport had got nowhere. It is also regrettable that there is no general recognition for the European driving licence, in the form, as Mr Rothley said just now, of recognition of national driving licences, which would be much simpler.

On behalf of my group I should like to thank the Commission for taking up so many points after the completion of the report on citizens' Europe. We were unable to notice any similar understanding on the part of the Council however. There is still no EEC-wide renunciation of frontier controls, except in individual countries. We, who represent precisely the same citizens as the ministers do, place our hopes in the Milan summit. Our joint credibility is at stake!

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) Mr President, I should just like to add something which the member of the Commission clearly does not know, namely the date of signature of this five-party agreement. It is to be on 14 June, next Friday. Above all though I want to ask him whether he can give an assurance that no data processing facilities, which could in any way provide control functions, will be installed at the internal frontiers of the Community.

**Mr C. Beazley (ED).** — Mr President, I wish to speak about the European passport. I think we have had a very valuable discussion in this House today on this subject.

It is well known that the Chinese name their years after animals — the year of the dragon, the year of the horse, etc. I wonder if a little oriental wisdom has seeped into this House because quite clearly today is the day of the kangaroo. The kangaroo has a pouch, and I should like to affirm here that that pouch is not for sticking passports in. In other words, we do need a European passport but we do not need a European passport for travelling within the internal market, within Europe itself.

Very briefly, I wish to relate two anecdotes which I think might illuminate the difficulties which we have had in the past. As a young schoolboy I once returned home — I lived in Frankfurt at the time — forgetting to take my British passport with me. I can proudly boast that I was able to cross a frontier without a passport, although Britain was not, sadly, at that time a member of the Community; but it did take the combined efforts of the entire British Consulate to get me through.

Secondly, shortly after I was married to a French citizen, on returning to France the customs officer said to my wife: Do you intend to return to Britain for long? She said: Yes, I am married to an Englishman. The customs officer said: *Comment ca s'est fait, c'est pas possible.* We have a great deal to do in terms of relating to the ordinary citizens of Europe the importance of European identity. I think the European Passport has a great value in this respect.

Finally, returning to Britain, there are now three passport lanes — one for UK passports, one for EEC passports and one for the rest. I should like to take this occasion to publicize the fact to any British citizens who may not be aware of the fact that they may actually walk through the EEC lane because we do acknowledge the fact that Britain is a member of the European Community. So progress is being made slowly. In conclusion, I think the European Passport will only be acceptable to members of the European public when the national governments themselves not only agree to adopt it but also to explain to the public why this is to their advantage.

In reference to the footnote tabled by Mr Coste Floret I should like to ask the Commission what their view is about the necessity of including the teaching of history of the European Communities in schools in Europe.

**Mr Coste-Floret (RDE).** — (FR) Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, first I should like to explain why the Group of the European Democratic Alliance will vote for Mr Chanterie's report on strengthening the right to petition.

It is a definite step towards the establishment of a Citizens' Europe. A Citizens' Europe has so far been the subject of fine speeches, but few specific steps have been taken to bring it about.

The organization of a right to petition will allow citizens to play a part in the working of the Community bodies and to submit their claims. They cannot do that before the Court of Justice because the procedure for doing so is complicated and the procedure is lengthy and expensive.

On the other hand the right to petition is a simple and easy procedure. But it needs to be organized. Mr Chanterie speaks of drawing up Community legislation on this point and he is right. Soundly-based petitions must be sorted out from those which are not so sound.

For that reason my group suggests that, to be admissible in future, citizens' petitions should be signed by a Member of the national parliament and a Member of the European Parliament. What is more, this would allow of cooperation with the national parliaments and would establish a Community right which, I say again, will be a desirable step forward for a Citizens' Europe.

**Coste-Floret**

For it to make such an advance — and this was the point of my question for oral answer with debate — the history of the European Communities would have to be taught in educational establishments in the Community. At present it is not taught. If we want European citizenship to become a reality one day, Europe must be taught as a subject at school and university levels and it must be made clear why it is indispensable.

Finally, on the European passport, I should like to say that what has been drawn up so far is not a European passport but a national passport of a uniform pattern. What we should like is a second stage: a passport issued by the European authorities, recognized by non-member countries (which it is not today) and which will operate as evidence of a European identity.

Teaching in the schools, the European passport, organization of the right to petition — all these things help to advance Community Europe; that is why my group will vote for these three proposals.

*(Applause)*

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES

*Vice-President*

**President.** — The debate will be continued tomorrow.

10. *Votes*

**Proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. C 2-23/85) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 3599/82 on temporary importation arrangements, as regards the date of its implementation: adopted**

\*  
\* \*

**Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-416/85) by Mr Didó and others, on the social situation**

*Explanations of vote*

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE).** — *(NL)* My group will vote for the Didó resolution and also for my own resolution, which we will be dealing with in a moment. The main purpose of the Didó resolution is to pressurize the Council of Social Ministers into taking a decision at their meeting in Luxembourg tomorrow on the ten or so directives that have been awaiting the Council's approval since 1978. As things now stand, it looks as if not a single decision will be taken tomorrow, and

I therefore consider it extremely important for this resolution to be adopted.

I should just like to comment on one point. Paragraph 1(b) concerned the redistribution of work and the reduction of working hours. My group wanted to emphasize once again that we can endorse the redistribution of work and the reduction of working hours only if the competitiveness of industry is not affected as a result. We are particularly pleased that this amendment was approved orally, which means that this resolution now has our entire support.

**Mr Welsh (ED), in writing.** — I shall vote against this resolution because although I fully endorse the demand that the Social Affairs Council should take decisions, I cannot agree that the enactment of some of the Directives listed would promote the creation of new jobs for the Community's unemployed citizens.

Indeed while the Vredeling and fifth Directives would at best have a neutral effect on job creation, those on temporary and part-time work would actively inhibit the propensity to employ more people.

Europe needs de-regulation and flexibility of working practices. Listening to the debate I was astonished to hear so many speakers call for new initiatives to create jobs in one breath and demand the enactment of legislation which would inhibit job creation in the next.

As a result both resolutions to close this debate are fatally flawed.

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)*

\*  
\* \*

**Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-429/85/rev.) by Mrs Maij-Weggen and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the Council's failure to take decisions on directives on social affairs, the labour market and equal treatment for men and women: adopted**

\*  
\* \*

**Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-462/85) by Mrs Veil, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the achievements of the Italian presidency: adopted**

\*  
\* \*

**Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-478/85) by Mr Arndt and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Klepsch and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party; Sir Jack Stewart-Clark, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Cerv-**

## Welsh

**etti and others; Mrs Veil and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr Pannella, on the achievements of the Italian presidency**

*Explanations of vote*

**Mrs Faith (ED).** — I support the amendment tabled by Mr Cassidy and others, but I cannot vote in favour of this motion.

An intergovernmental conference would be time-wasting, might well be counter-productive and should not be necessary. It is true that decision-making in the past has been a slow process and that this *has* impeded the creation of a genuine internal market and the free movement of goods as well as the liberalization of transport. However, proposals have been put forward by the British Foreign Secretary which, if accepted, would hasten and facilitate the making of important decisions. Furthermore, no major changes to the Treaty would be necessary. These realistic and sensible proposals should have the support of this Parliament. We all wish the Council of Ministers success in Milan, where they must make the important decisions which we hope will secure the prosperity of this newly enlarged Community.

**Mr Marshall (ED).** — I voted in favour of the two amendments tabled by Mr de Ferranti. Because they failed, I will vote against this resolution. I believe that it is time that people in this House recognized the fact that the Spinelli report is dead and that the call for an intergovernmental conference may sound very good but is, in fact, quite meaningless.

We have seen the realities of life in the actions of the German Government. It is all very well for members of the European People's Party to vote for this resolution, but they should examine the way the German Minister for Agriculture has behaved over agricultural price-fixing. I am not willing to be lectured at by members of the European People's Party when they do not practise in government what they preach in this House.

What we have to recognize is this: if the European Community is to progress, it has to do so on the basis of common consent. If you get rid of the veto, you get rid of progress by common consent. One has to remember that when certain countries joined this Community, one of the reasons that there was such support for that membership was the fact of the national veto. I think it would be counterproductive for that to be taken away in its entirety.

I ask all Members of the House to go and read the editorial in today's *Financial Times*. It is pink enough

for Mrs Castle. I hope it is pink enough for others in this House as well.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Herman (PPE).** — *(FR)* At six o'clock this evening in Luxembourg the Council of Ministers for Agriculture had still not managed to fix agricultural prices. The Italian Presidency promised yesterday that the vote would be taken at noon today. At noon the United Kingdom opposed a vote, followed by Denmark and Greece.

*(Mixed reactions)*

And the German Minister, for the first time in the history of the Community, formally invoked the defence of national interests. So once again we have the proof that the rhetorical proclamations, the fine intentions recited at Stresa, come up against the harsh realities of national interests. We have proof that the declarations made here in this Chamber by the representatives of the Foreign Affairs Ministers of the United Kingdom and others lead to nothing. The process of decision-making must be changed without delay. That is the only way to create Europe!

*(Loud and sustained applause)*

**Mr Pannella (NI).** — *(FR)* I feel that the quest for a consensus, that is, for unanimity, is part of a technique which does not really go well with the historical success of democracy.

The most glorious republic on our continent, the French republic, came into being as a result of a single parliamentary vote. There are times when a single vote may change destiny. Now, faced with the news reaching us from Luxembourg, and with your mutual recriminations, we must demand that this Parliament be true to itself, that is, demand that the political forces represented here fulfil what they promised their electors in the European and national elections.

Mr Herman has just told us clearly about the present situation in Luxembourg. Tomorrow Parliament must have a great debate before Milan so that the inter-governmental conference may take place — whatever the attitude of Greece, Denmark and others — as we have demanded.

Madam President, a vote will have to be taken at Milan too and the way must be reopened for democracy.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti (PPE), in writing.** — *(IT)* The process of Western European unification got under way, after the tragedy of the second world war,

### Cassanmagnago Cerretti

at the initiative of three great Catholic statesmen, Schumann in France, Adenauer in Germany and De Gasperi in Italy.

From way back in 1948, the date of the foundation of the OEEC, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, until today, that ambitious programme has been consolidated by events and in the minds of the people of the EEC, who have already been called upon twice (in 1979 and last year) to elect their own representatives to the European Parliament.

We have now reached a moment which may be decisive, for we are faced with the alternative of implementing or consigning to oblivion the 'Treaty establishing European Union'.

This proposal was drawn up by the European Parliament to give the EEC the uniform political platform that is vital to it if it is to tackle in an adequate manner the enormous current internal and international issues, such as peace, unemployment, technical progress, etc.

No EEC country can hope to find a solution on its own, even temporarily.

Only a united Europe can deal on a par with the other great political and economic blocs which are fighting for world dominion.

Only European Union can effectively implement the new plans for cooperation with the 'Third World', put an end to the international monetary disorder with its own currency, the ECU, relaunch the economy by creating new job opportunities for young people. We all recognize this now.

The governments and national parliaments have made grand speeches about the plans for European Union drawn up by the European Parliament. In Italy in fact all the political forces have done so.

And yet, in face of the improvement in quality proposed by the new Treaty, there were and are a variety of more or less hidden or open reactions and attempts to shelve the question or render it meaningless.

We must react to these manoeuvres; the European Council which will meet in Castello Sforzesco in Milan on 28 and 29 June this year must take a decision in favour of the 'Treaty'.

To this end the Christian Democrats will demonstrate together with the EPP members and members of other political forces and groups. The demonstration will be a major event by the variety and scale of its membership.

On 29 June we may see the beginning of a new phase in the building of Europe with the direct and vast participation of the people in the federalist battle.

This participation is becoming ever more vital. The European Parliament, although its position is clear and it is firmly resolved to defend its plan for European Union, has little contractual power *vis-à-vis* the governments.

Only the mobilization of the people can give it this power.

I thank Mr Andreotti, President of the Council, on behalf of the EPP for the work accomplished by the Italian Presidency, which in six months achieved the followings:

1. The accession of Spain and Portugal;
2. The solution of the 1985 budget question;
3. Fulfilled its mandate with courage, following the lines indicated by the European Parliament, which led to the Treaty establishing European Union.

**Mr Croux (PPE), in writing.** — (NL) As the European Parliament's rapporteur on the European Council's policy on the European Union, I note with satisfaction that the European Parliament has reaffirmed by a large majority the position it adopted on 17 April 1985.

I should like to underline the following points in particular:

— Although the European Community has been in existence for almost thirty years, it is clear that further progress cannot be made towards European integration unless a new institutional framework is created.

— In this process wider powers and responsibilities, principally in the form of a genuine and democratic right to a say in decisions on European legislation, must be conferred on Parliament.

— The Council of Ministers must at last abandon the pernicious veto and apply the rules on majority decisions. The judgment of the Court of Justice of 22 May 1985 is of the utmost importance in this context.

The Court reminded the Council that the national governments must also respect Community legislation.

— Finally, Parliament affirms that another intergovernmental conference must be held to consider a new Treaty on the European Union, even if some governments are not in favour. We must consider European integration in the long term, for the future. When the Treaty establishing the Community was signed thirty years ago, some countries failed to see the benefits that would accrue, but they acceded later. We now face the same situation. The majority of the Member States, the ones that want to make progress with a new Treaty, must show the way. The others will undoubtedly follow in the future.

**Croux**

It is, after all, becoming clearer by the day that without European integration there will be no future for our nations and certainly not for our young people.

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)*

\*  
\* \*

**Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-492/85) by Mr d'Ormesson and Mr Romualdi, on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on the achievements of the Italian presidency and on the forthcoming Summit in Milan:** rejected

\*  
\* \*

**Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-493/85) by Mr Didò and others on the drought and famine in Africa and the forthcoming European Council meeting in Milan**

*Explanations of vote*

**Mr Pannella (NI).** — *(FR)* I should like to say briefly that this resolution tabled by Mr Didò, Mrs Cassanmagnano Cerretti, Sir James Scott-Hopkins, Mr Trivelli, Mr Habsburg and others is one of extreme importance for European politics in so far as it asks for confirmation at Milan of the North-West/South axis as an essential feature of our policy.

For that reason I am happy to state that I support this resolution both in my own name and on behalf of my party.

**Mr Christopher Jackson (ED).** — This resolution proposes a Milan plan for a new emergency campaign to combat famine and drought, and I think all of us would agree that this is a very worthy aim. Is, however, a worthy aim being carried through in the wrong way? This is not something which arises from the Italian Presidency, and something like this should be the subject of Rule 47 to be considered by committee, to be the subject of a report and followed by a proper debate in this House. It is a worthy aim but dangerous. Off-the-cuff big ideas like this, not thought through, will not be acted on and may in fact be totally wrong. I shall abstain.

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)*

\*  
\* \*

**Report (Doc. A 2-64/85) by Mr De Vries, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the estimates of revenue**

**and expenditure of the European Parliament for the 1986 financial Year**

Estimates for 1986 — Item 3708 — Amendment No 11

**Mr De Vries (L), rapporteur.** — Madam President, I am against this amendment, but if it were adopted, could I read it in such a way that the appropriation of 4.3 million ECU which is at present intended for inclusion Chapter 100 should be deleted? In other words, that this amendment replaces the 4.3 million ECU in Chapter in 100? Is that the intention of the European Democratic Group? I am against this amendment, but should it be adopted, then it is important to have this point cleared up.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr De Vries. I think your comments are perfectly clear.

*Motion for a resolution — Paragraph 32 — Amendment No 3/rev.*

**Mr Cornelissen (PPE).** — *(NL)* I feel, Madam President, that you should put the De Backer amendment to the vote first. This is Amendment No 12 to paragraph 32, and it would perhaps be a good thing if the rapporteur repeated his opinion, because I believe there is considerable confusion in Parliament.

**President.** — I will explain what the confusion is. My instructions indicate that Amendment No 12 was to paragraph 28. In fact, I think it is also to paragraph 32. On my sheet, Amendment No 12, tabled by Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken and Mr Beumer, seeks to change the wording of paragraph 32. Perhaps one of the two people who tabled this amendment could confirm to which paragraph this amendment is meant to be tabled. Could Mr Beumer perhaps help us? Is Amendment No 12 to paragraph 28 or 32?

**Mr Beumer (PPE).** — *(NL)* Madam President, Amendment No 12 concerns paragraph 32. A vote should not therefore have been taken on this amendment as if it concerned paragraph 28. I feel we should do what Mr Cornelissen has proposed and vote on this amendment when we come to paragraph 32.

**Mr De Vries (L), rapporteur.** — *(NL)* For the sake of clarity, I will repeat what I have just said. The amendment tabled by Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken and Mr Beumer reasserts a position previously adopted by this Parliament. And Parliament would be acting consistently if it adopted this amendment. The Committee on Budgets, I should add, rejected this amendment by 9 votes to 8. Speaking on the committee's behalf, I am therefore opposed to the amendment, but speaking

**De Vries**

personally, I am in favour and believe Parliament would be acting consistently if it adopted it.

**Mr Arndt (S).** — (DE) May I point out to the rapporteur that the Committee on Budgets voted for para 32. The vote was however linked to the vote on para 30, part 2 and para 31, which were both adopted. Had the Committee on Budgets known that para 30 subsection 2 and para 31 are being rejected by the Plenary, would it also have rejected the De Backer-Van Ocken motion? What does the rapporteur say to that?

**Mr De Vries (L), rapporteur.** — (NL) In reply to Mr Arndt's question, I should like to say — but this is my personal opinion, I am speaking personally — that the De Backer amendment is justified and should therefore be adopted, despite what has happened to paragraphs 30 and 31.

**Mrs Scrivener (L).** — (FR) I feel that in a matter as complicated as this it would be a good thing to recall just what the attitude of the Committee on Budgets was. I should like the rapporteur to tell us. Clearly we ought to know that.

(Applause)

**President.** — Mrs Scrivener, I see that your request has been accepted with acclaim, but I must point out that the rapporteur has already given his opinion. In order to clarify the position, however, since there clearly has been some confusion, I would request him to be kind enough to repeat his comment on Amendment No 12.

**Mr De Vries (L), rapporteur.** — (NL) The answer to Mrs Scrivener's question is, as I have told the House twice, that the Committee on Budgets rejected Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken's amendment by 9 votes to 8. I have thus explained the position of the Committee on Budgets twice.

The House will be acting consistently if it adopts this amendment, since its adoption will comply with an earlier vote.

#### *Explanations of vote*

**Mr Langes (PPE).** — (DE) In our opinion the new instrument of conciliation between the Bureau and the Committee on Budgets is a good thing. It is also our opinion however that the interval between conciliation and implementation must be longer, both in the Committee on Budgets and in the groups.

That is the reason why some of my colleagues have voted against the budget, although the majority of my group was in favour. We shall therefore certainly have to think very carefully about the amendments to the Parliamentary budget after the first reading.

We amended paras 30 and 31 because in our opinion the college of quaestors has raised a very sensible and fundamental point regarding the elimination of currency disequilibrium. We request the Bureau to pass this motion quickly so that the House is clear about it.

**Mr Van Miert (S).** — (NL) I shall vote against this report because Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken's Amendment No 12 was not adopted. This means that Parliament is being totally inconsistent. We have already adopted a resolution in which it was decided to stop increasing allowances. Parliament has not in fact abided by its own decision, and I shall therefore vote against. I have also taken the view for many years that any expenses actually incurred should be reimbursed.

**Mr CiccioMessere (NI).** — (IT) I would like to draw the attention of the honourable Members to the way in which this draft budget authorizes stealing from the purses of the people of the Community. Apart from the proposals to limit expenditure, this budget authorizes expenditure of 4.3 million ECU, i.e. 7 000 million lire or 35 million French francs, for the parties' 1989 electoral campaign — I repeat 1989. I think this decision, which goes beyond the ridiculous, which is surely not a serious one and which is being taken a good four years before the money will be refunded for the 1989 campaign, cancels out all the proposals for budgetary morality and savings put forward here by the rapporteur, Mr De Vries. It demonstrates, Madam President, the lack of seriousness of this motion for a resolution, which does not tackle the central issues of the European Parliament's budget, the status of its Members, the organization of the work of its members.

Therefore, Madam President, we will vote against this motion for a resolution, which is demagogic, does not resolve the problems at all and would lead to the money stealing to which I referred.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)<sup>1</sup>

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — I must put a proposal to the House. We have the Patterson report before us with a considerable number of amendments. We have to consider now whether the House wishes to stop at 7 o'clock, as is on the agenda, in order for political groups to meet, or to

<sup>1</sup> The rapporteur was:  
— Against Amendments Nos 1 to 3/rev., 11 and 12.

**President**

carry on until 8 o'clock with the Patterson report and amendments.

For your information, the staff, including the interpreters, have very kindly agreed that should the House decide to carry on they would be prepared to carry on until 8 o'clock.

Please bear in mind that tomorrow you have the vote on the budget and many important matters.

*(Parliament rejected the proposal)*

I, nevertheless, would like, on your behalf, to thank the interpreters and staff for having agreed to stay on until 8 o'clock.<sup>1</sup>

*(Applause)*

*(The sitting was closed at 7 p.m.)*

---

<sup>1</sup> *Agenda for the next sitting*: see Minutes.

## ANNEX

**COMMISSION ACTION ON EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT OPINIONS ON  
COMMISSION PROPOSALS DELIVERED AT THE APRIL AND MAY 1985  
PART-SESSIONS**

This is an account, as arranged with the Bureau of Parliament, of the action taken by the Commission in respect of amendments proposed at the April and May 1985 part-sessions in the framework of parliamentary consultation, and of disaster aid granted. The texts of the amended proposals are being sent to the European Parliament for information purposes.

Reports adopted by Parliament in April which were included in the May 'Commission Action' paper do not appear here unless there have been subsequent developments. This paper also covers two reports that were adopted at the March part-session in respect of which the Commission adopted amendments to its original proposals after the May part-session.

*I. Commission proposals to which Parliament proposed amendments that have been accepted by the Commission in part*

A. In connection with the following reports the Commission has adopted amended versions of its original proposals which incorporate the proposed amendments it accepted at the plenary sitting:

1. Report by Mr Rogalla, adopted on 18 April (EP 2-18/85), on the EC Commission proposal to the Council for a directive on the easing of controls and formalities applicable to nationals of Member States when crossing intra-Community borders (COM(84)749 final)

The Commission's amendments, intended to bring out the fact that its proposal constitutes an initial phase in the abolition of all controls and formalities, relate to the following matters in particular:

- (a) determination of the prerequisites for the removal of controls: policy on control stamps, tax harmonization with regard to VAT and exise duties in particular,
- (b) promotion of a firm policy of easing of controls and formalities,
- (c) the same amount of control (including health control) whatever the means of transport,
- (d) reference to the target date 1992,
- (e) inclusion of currency in the scope of the directive,
- (f) desire to prevent the increase in the number of mobile teams leading to a shifting of the place of control,
- (g) obligation to inform the Commission of the manner in which controls are carried out,
- (h) establishment of green and red corridors at road checking stations and rules concerning their use.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 18 April 1985, pp 254-256

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 18 April 1985, Part II, pp 5-14

Commission's amended proposal: COM(85)224 final

2. Report by Mr Van der Lek, adopted on 15 March (EP 2-1778/84), on the EC Commission proposal to the Council for a directive amending Directive 78/

1015/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States on the permissible sound level and exhaust system of motorcycles (COM(84)438 final)

The Commission amendments relate to:

- (a) the second recital, which now stipulates that the noise limit should be reduced to about 80 dB (A) by 1985 in the case of more powerful motorcycles;
- (b) the wording of Articles 2(1) and 3(1).

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report on proceedings, 14 March 1984, pp 242-243

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 15 March 1985, Part II, pp 16-19

Commission's amended proposal: COM(85)228 final

3. Report by Mr Visser, adopted on 12 March (EP 2-1763/84), on the EC Commission proposal to the Council for:
  - (i) a decision amending Decision 75/327/EEC on the improvement of the situation of railway undertakings and the harmonization of rules governing financial relations between such undertakings and States (COM(83)764 final)
  - (ii) a regulation amending Council Regulation (EEC) No 1107/70 on the granting of aids for transport by rail, road and inland waterway (COM(83)764 final)

The amendments involve:

- (a) introducing a 3-year trial period during which the client authorities would be authorized to offset public-service obligations either on the basis of Regulation 1191/69 or contractually;
- (b) requiring Member States to implement the decision within two years of its coming into force and not by 1 January 1985 as was originally the case.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 11 March 1985, pp 30-31

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 12 March 1985, Part II, pp 6-11

Commission's amended proposal: COM(85)252 final

- B. In connection with the following reports the Commission is preparing amended versions of its original proposals in which account will be taken of the proposed amendments it accepted at the debates:

1. Report by Mr Nordmann, adopted on 19 April (EP 2-6/85), on the EC Commission proposals to the Council for:
  - (i) a directive on consumer protection in respect of the indication of prices for non-food products (COM(83)754 final),
  - (ii) a directive amending Directive 79/581/EEC on consumer protection in the indication of the prices of foodstuffs (COM(84)23 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 18 April 1985, pp 280-281

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 19 April 1985, Part II, pp 6-14

2. Report by Mr Bonaccini, adopted on 19 April (EP 2-11/85), on the EC Commission proposal to the Council for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States on the sound emissions of rail vehicles (COM(83)706 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 18 April 1985, pp 274-276

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 19 April 1985, Part II, pp 1-5

3. Report by Mr Marshall, adopted on 19 April (EP 2-9/85), on the Commission proposal for a regulation amending Regulation 543/69 on the harmonization of certain social legislation relating to road transport and Regulation 1463/70 on the introduction of recording equipment in road transport (COM(84) 147 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 18 April 1985, pp 309-311

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 19 May 1985, Part II, pp 29-42

4. Report by Mrs Schleicher, adopted on 10 May (EP A-2-26/95), on the Commission proposal to the Council for a draft resolution concerning a European Community action programme on toxicology for health protection purposes (COM(84)284 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 10 May 1985, p 314

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 10 May 1985, Part II, pp 28-33

5. Report by Mr Schmid, adopted on 7 May (EP A-2-1777/84), on the Commission proposal to the Council for a directive on limiting the placing on the market and the use of certain dangerous substances and preparations (2nd PCB-PCT directive) (COM(84)513 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 14 March 1985, pp 246-248

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 15 March 1985, Part II, pp 22-23; Minutes of 7 May 1985, Part II, pp 2-3

## II. *Commission proposals in respect of which Parliament did not request formal amendment*

Report by Mrs Pery, adopted on 10 May (EP A-2-31/85), on a proposal for a regulation for the conclusion of the agreement between the Community and Madagascar concerning fishing off the coasts of Madagascar

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 10 May 1985, pp 21-22

## III. *Emergency aid granted in May*

### *Emergency aid within the Community*

Nil

### *Emergency aid for third countries*

#### *Financial aid*

<i>Country</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Reason</i>	<i>Distributed by</i>	<i>Date of decision</i>
Chad	5 m ECU	famine (Dublin plan)	LICROSS	15. 5. 85
Bangladesh	500 000 ECU	cyclone/floods	LICROSS Médecins sans frontières (F)	28. 5. 85
Cambodian refugees on Thailand frontier	300 000 ECU	—	UNDRO	6. 5. 85

*Food aid*

On 6 May 1985, after the Food Aid Committee had delivered an opinion on 18 April 1985, the Commission decided to make the following allocations of *food aid*:

	Zambia	Mozam- bique	UNRWA <sup>1</sup>	NGO	ICRC <sup>2</sup>	LICROSS <sup>3</sup>	WFP <sup>4</sup>	UNHCR <sup>5</sup>
Cereals	15 000	40 000	500	50 000	20 000	10 000	110 000	55 900
Powdered milk		300	1 850	21 000	600	500	26 000	2 000
Butteroil		100	1 000	850	500	500	6 000	100
Vegetable oils		300	50	1 100	1 000		2 000	1 500
Beans		2 000	200	1 950	1 500	1 000	4 500	2 500
Sugar			1 000	1 350	800	100	500	2 500
Corned beef			1 000					
Tomato paste			550					
Tea			2					
Dried fish				650		500		1 000
Raisins								300

<sup>1</sup> United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

<sup>2</sup> International Committee of the Red Cross

<sup>3</sup> World Food Programme

<sup>4</sup> Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

The budget value of the aid is estimated at around *181 million ECU*.

The Commission also decided to make the following allocations of *emergency food aid*:

6 May 1985: 8 000 t cereals for Sudan

15 May 1985: 2 000 t cereals allocated to Caritas Germanica for victims of the recent earthquake in Chile.

Lastly, effect was given on 2 May 1985 to the decision taken by the Commission on 21 December 1984 to allocate 200 t of powdered milk as food aid to Malta.

## ANNEX

I. *Questions to the Council**Question No 8, by Mr Fitzgerald (H-763/84)*

Subject: Unemployment in Cork — 11% of the national total

In view of the appalling unemployment crisis in Cork which has been particularly aggravated by the closure of Ford's, Dunlop's and the Verolme Dockyard and since unemployment in Cork now represents 11% of the national total, will the Council state what action it is taking and intends to take to ease the situation?

*Answer*

The Council regrets that it does not have any information to enable it to reply to this question. The initiative as regards the granting of Community aid in the field referred to by the Honourable Member lies with the Commission.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 9, by Mrs Chouraqui (H-805/84)*

Subject: Meeting of the Council of Ministers of Consumer Affairs during the Italian Presidency

Does the Italian Presidency plan to hold a meeting of the Council of Ministers of Consumer Affairs, and if so, what items will be included on the agenda?

*Answer*

Realizing the importance of consumer-policy questions, the Italian Presidency has speeded up work within the Council to the point where it has proved useful to hold a ministerial meeting during its term of office.

A Council meeting on questions connected with consumer protection and information was, in fact, held on 21 May 1985 under the presidency of Mr Sanese, State Secretary at the Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Italian Republic.

During that meeting, the Council discussed a series of proposals concerning:

- liability for defective products;
- doorstep selling;
- the Community system of information on accidents in which consumer products are involved;
- consumer credit.

The Council's conclusions on these points were made public in a press release issued after its meeting.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 13, by Mr Pearce (H-87/85)*

Subject: Council meetings in public

What reasons are there for excluding the public from Council meetings while A points are passed?

*Answer*

Article 3(1) of the rules of procedure of the Council applies to all Council meetings, irrespective of the items being discussed.

The Council would also remind the honourable Member that, in accordance with Article 2(6) of the rules of procedure, 'items for which the approval of the Council is possible without discussion shall be included in part A [of the provisional agenda for the Council] . . . '.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 14, by Mr Toksvig (H-103/85)*

Subject: Implications of European space policy

What are the implications for the Community, in the judgement of the Council, of the decision of the Council of Ministers of the European Space Agency, 30/31 January 1985?

*Answer*

As the Council has already had the honour to indicate in reply to Oral Question No H-692/84 put by the honourable Member, it is not within its sphere of competence to adopt a position on the deliberations of the European Space Agency.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 16, by Mr Filinis (H-121/85)*

Subject: Statements by the Bavarian Minister for Internal Affairs

According to German press reports on 7 March 1985, the Bavarian Minister for Internal Affairs, Mr Hillemeier, stated in the Landtag (the regional assembly) that all foreign nationals applying for residence permits, including nationals of Member States of the European Community, would be vetted by the Office for the protection of the Constitution (Amt für Verfassungsschutz). On the same occasion, he pointed out that anyone wishing to obtain permanent residence in Germany would have to demonstrate that they held social views consistent with social life in Germany.

Does the Council intend to respond to these statements by the Bavarian Minister for Internal Affairs, which are prompted by a desire to control intellectual activity, this being contrary to the spirit of the Treaty of Rome and a flagrant violation of European citizens' human rights and democratic freedoms?

*Answer*

It is not the Council's practice to respond to information published in the press concerning statements made outside the Council.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 17, by Mr Alber (H-153/85)*

Subject: Car emissions

Can the Council state why, despite the growing strain on the environment highlighted in most countries by the increase in the death of trees, it is not prepared to incorporate in its directive the timescale proposed by the European Parliament, and has it used its influence with the Commission to ensure that research is taking place into the most appropriate forms of technology (catalytic converters, lean-burn engines or others)?

If so, is such research receiving financial support?

*Answer*

In reply to the honourable Member's question I would point out that the Council discussed this topic on the *basis of a Commission proposal*; the Commission had proposed a two-stage plan to reduce exhaust pollution from motor cars: the first stage would apply as from 1 July 1989 with a substantial reduction in such emissions; and the second as from 1 July 1995 with definitive limit values to be imposed on vehicles.

Throughout its discussions on 20 and 21 March 1985 the Council had at heart the same concerns as the European Parliament. Nonetheless, it had to take account of all the interests concerned, and particularly those of the automobile industry, which provides vast numbers of jobs and will have to put in a substantial effort, over and above coping with the problems of the current crisis period, to meet the exhaust levels which are in any case, and this I would stress, very stringent.

As for the second question, all I can say is that various technical methods, other than 3-way catalytic converters, are being investigated and that some of these methods have now reached the finalization stage, although they are solely a matter for the professional circles concerned.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 18, by Mr Schmid (H-154/85)*

Subject: Tax reductions on the purchase of low-emission cars

Certain European countries (such as the Federal Republic of Germany and Austria) allow tax reductions on the purchase of low-emission cars.

Does not the Council agree that such assistance is an effective means of promoting the sale of low-emission cars, and therefore — from the point of view of equal treatment for European citizens — should not provision be made for tax concessions in the directive which has still to be adopted? If so, exactly what form should such measures take?

*Answer*

The Directive on emissions of pollutants by motor vehicles has entered the final stage of discussions within the Council. It forms part of the process of harmonizing the technical characteristics of such vehicles laid down by compulsory provisions in the various Member States. Generally speaking, this harmonization fits into the pattern of the programme for the elimination of technical barriers to trade in industrial products.

The problem raised by the honourable Member, which concerns tax regulations, cannot be examined in the context of this Directive. Furthermore, a Commission proposal would

in any case be required for such an examination and so far the Council has not received such a proposal.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 19, by Mr Collins (H-155/85)*

Subject: Decisions of the Council of Environment Ministers of 20/21 March

Does the Council agree that the decisions of the Council of Environment Ministers on 20/21 March had more to do with economic than with environmental issues? Would it not be more sensible and more correct if the Council of Ministers of Economic Affairs were asked to take decisions on such matters instead of the Council of Environment Ministers?

*Answer*

1. The Council held its 990th meeting in two parts, on 7 and 8 and 20 and 21 March 1985. The agenda for that meeting consisted of over seven proposals concerning, in the main, environmental protection.
2. During the discussions on the problem of noxious emissions from motor vehicles all the aspects of the dossier were taken into account, including the environmental, industrial and energy aspects.
3. In view of the nature of the items on the agenda for the March meeting most of the Member States were, for obvious reasons, represented by the Ministers or State Secretaries responsible for environmental questions.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 20, by Mr Adamou (H-158/85)*

Subject: Statements by the President of the Commission on Star Wars

What is the Council's attitude to the repeated statements by the President of the Commission, Mr Delors, on EEC participation in the plans for the militarization of space known as 'Star Wars', statements which have given rise to extremely grave anxiety among public opinion in the Community's Member States, and does it consider such initiatives by the new President of the Commission to be in keeping with the Treaties governing the European Communities? Furthermore, does the Council share Mr Delors' view that the afore-said programme must 'go ahead, even if only with the states wishing to be associated'?

*Answer*

The Council is aware of the statement made by President Delors before the European Parliament on 8 May when he announced that the Commission was in the process of preparing an overall proposal to enable the Community to make a qualitative leap forward in the technological sphere.

The Council has not yet received this proposal from the Commission.

It will be for the Council to examine this proposal upon receipt.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 21, by Mr Alavanos (H-160/85)*

Subject: Action to be taken on the Greek Memorandum

How does the Council, following the European Council's decision on the Mediterranean Programmes, now view the question of the action it is proposed to take on the Greek Government's Memorandum, particularly with regard to financing the large projects contained in Greece's five-year economic development programme, for which the Council established a special heading in its 1985 draft budget?

*Answer*

1. In reply to the memorandum from the Greek Government, the Commission has submitted six proposals to the Council covering the agricultural, social and transport infrastructure sectors.

Of these six proposals, five have meanwhile been adopted by the Council. Examination of the sixth, concerning aid for transport of the means of production to certain Greek islands, has not yet been completed.

2. As regards more particularly the large projects contained in Greece's five-year economic and social development programme, the Council has not received any specific proposals from the Commission.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 22, by Mrs Boot (H-174/85)*

Subject: Inclusion of the ECU value on stamps issued by the Member States of the Community

Inclusion of the ECU value on stamps issued by the Member States would do much to make people more aware of Europe.

Is the Council prepared to put forward such a proposal at the European Council in Milan?

*Answer*

The Council expects that proposals to help make people more aware of Europe will be examined in the context of the report which the Addonino Committee is to submit to the meeting of the European Council in Milan.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 23, by Mrs Beate Weber (H-177/85)*

Subject: Motor vehicle emissions

Can the Council indicate what percentage of vehicles is affected by the measures aimed at reducing motor vehicle emissions in the various categories of cubic capacity, decided by the Environment Ministers Council and what reduction in NO<sub>x</sub> pollution in tonnes per year will be attained at the various stages?

*Answer*

1. The solution discussed by the Council of course covers *all motor vehicles* weighing less than 3.5 tonnes.

2. It is estimated that some 56% of the Community car market (excluding diesel engines) consists of vehicles of less than 1 400 cc. Between 1 400 and 2 000 cc the figure is around 37% and it is 7% for vehicles of over 2 000 cc. However, these figures do not tell us very much since there are considerable variations in the structure of the Community car market from one Member State to another.

Indeed, a number of the difficulties the Council has experienced in its recent search for a compromise on this important dossier are attributable to these considerable variations in market structure.

3. The amendments the Commission recently made to its original proposal would, according to the Commission's own estimates, result inter alia in a reduction of approximately 50% in the pollutant gas emissions (known as NO<sub>x</sub>) which are particularly harmful to forests. Nitrogen oxide emissions would fall from 3 million tonnes to 1.5 million.

4. I would also point out that, at the Council's request, the Commission has undertaken to submit suitable proposals before the end of the year to combat pollution caused by motor vehicles weighing more than 3.5 tonnes and by particulate emissions, from diesel vehicles.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 24, by Mrs Boserup (H-182/85)*

Subject: Community participation in the Stars Wars project

On 25 April 1985 the Agence Europe news agency reported apropos of EUREKA that 'France, together with Germany, is proposing a European initiative which is open to all interested European countries, the aim of which could be to set up a technological Europe'. On page 8 of the same bulletin, Agence Europe states that the planned EUREKA research will cover many different sectors in civilian areas but also in the military field.

An informal meeting of the Council of Ministers on 22-23 April 1985 discussed arms development and the Stars Wars project. Does the Council believe that military applications can be disregarded in EUREKA research or most of it, and can it confirm that non-member countries will not be invited to participate in EUREKA?

*Answer*

The Ministers for Research of the ten Member States of the European Communities met on 22 and 23 April in Rome. This meeting was purely informal and it would not have been possible for it to reach conclusions at Community level.

However, the Council took note of the words of the President of the Commission before the European Parliament on 8 May 1985 when he stated that the Commission would draft a comprehensive proposal enabling the Community to make a qualitative jump in the field of technology.

The Council considers that it is in the framework of the discussions on the proposals to be made by the Commission that policy guidelines which the Community might follow in this field will be worked out.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 25, by Mr Iversen (H-183/85)*

Subject: Lead-free petrol

In a letter dated 22 April 1985, the European Parliament's Directorate-General for Research and Documentation informed me of the Swedish, Austrian and Swiss plans concerning exhaust gases from motor vehicles and the introduction of lead-free petrol.

All three countries are planning to follow American legislation closely and so introduce measures that are far more stringent than the proposal that 9 of the 10 Member States have now agreed to.

Have any calculations been made as to how much less pollution there would be in the 10 countries if they were to implement the rules to be introduced in Sweden, Austria and Switzerland rather than the proposal now being discussed?

*Answer*

1. *The Council* has not been officially informed of the measures contemplated by Sweden, Switzerland and Austria concerning exhaust gases from motor vehicles and the introduction of lead-free petrol. However, it has been informed that a meeting was held at experts level on 22 and 23 April 1985 in Stockholm, at the invitation of the Swedish government, to discuss problems relating to automobile pollution. That meeting was attended in particular, in addition to the three countries mentioned by the honourable Member, by three Community Member States and the Commission representatives.

2. To the Council's knowledge there are not at present any data or means of calculating, at Community level, the impact which the measures envisaged in Sweden, Austria and Switzerland, based on American standards, might have on pollution levels.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 26, by Mr Megahy (H-188/85)*

Subject: Vredeling Directive

What progress is being made within the Council on the basis of the 'new approach' to the Vredeling Directive that was suggested by an *Ad Hoc* Working Group established by the Irish Presidency of the Council in 1984?

*Answer*

1. The Presidency has continued work in the Council on examining the Vredeling Directive on informing and consulting workers. These proceedings have enabled some progress to be made or confirmed as regards the technical examination of the question, and the Council confirms that it would like to reach a consensus on the matter as soon as possible.

2. With this aim in view, the Presidency is making active attempts to put together a compromise that could ease the way for an agreement, and the issue will be put to the Council again at its meeting on 13 June next. At this stage it is not possible to predict the outcome of its debate.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 27, by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-189/85)*

Subject: Directive on the limitation of emissions from large combustion plants

What action does the Council intend to take with regard to the proposal to amend the directive on the limitation of emissions of pollutants into the air from large combustion plants? The Council is undoubtedly well aware of the urgent need for this directive in certain countries, such as Italy, where plans are underway for the building or extension of many coal-fired power stations which, if approval of the Community directive is further

delayed, would not be in a position to comply with the reduced pollution rates, even by the latest deadlines.

*Answer*

The Council is aware of the importance of the question of emissions of pollutants into the air from large combustion plants.

It has examined this dossier on more than one occasion, most recently last March, after having received an amended proposal from the Commission at the end of February following the Opinion delivered by the European Parliament on the initial 1983 proposal.

This amended proposal is under examination by the Council bodies. However, the proposal as a whole raises a great number of complex technical and economic problems. The amended proposal, which provides, in some cases, for limit values even stricter than those contained in the initial proposal, necessitates a detailed study of its implications, especially where the abovementioned problems are concerned.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 28, by Mr von Wogau (H-190/85)*

Subject: Problems concerning mail sent from Member States to France

Germans with relatives in France frequently complain that Christmas or birthday parcels only reach their destinations several weeks after being posted, long after the event. For instance, it takes three to five weeks for parcels sent by a couple in Simmern/Hunsrück to reach their married daughter in St. Quentin although no valuables are enclosed and the official customs forms are filled in carefully and even in French.

Does the Council agree that the post-office and customs officials concerned should make every possible effort to ensure that letters and parcels are delivered between Member States as quickly as mail sent over similar distances within Member States?

*Answer*

The Council has already shown in the past the importance it attaches to this subject by tackling the fiscal and para-fiscal obstacles which impeded the dispatch of small non-commercial consignments from one Member State to another.

For some ten years, such consignments have been exempt from tax. In 1978, moreover, the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting in Council, decided to abolish charges for customs presentation for these small consignments.

However, the Council cannot ignore the fact that consignments from one Member State to another cannot still be treated in the same way as consignments which do not cross a frontier within the Community, if only due to the need for a minimum of controls to be carried out to ensure that the consignments in question meet the conditions for tax exemption.

In any event, even taking account of the fact that these controls still exist and the specific problems with which the postal authorities are undoubtedly confronted, especially during the end-of-year festivities, the Council has no reason to believe that small consignments from one Member State to another could not reach their destination within a reasonable period of time.

*Question No 29, by Mrs Fontaine (H-200/85)*

Subject: The situation in Malta

Could the Council indicate its position with regard to the current situation in Malta. Has it requested its respective governments and the Commission to make the conclusion or renewal of agreements with Malta conditional upon observance by that country of civil rights and the rules of international law? If not, does it intend to do so?

*Answer*

The Council's recent discussions concerning the EEC-Malta Association were directed at the specific question of the negotiation of a second Financial Protocol with that country to take over from the first Protocol which expired on 31 October 1983. On that occasion the Council bore in mind the points made by the European Parliament in its Resolution of 22 May 1984 on economic and trade relations between the Community and Malta.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 31, by Mr Romeos (H-203/85)*

Subject: Financial aid for peat and lignite

The Member States wish to increase the effectiveness of the Community energy policy by establishing a just and comprehensive Community strategy in respect of solid fuels. This can be achieved by affording a more important place to solid fuels in the Community's energy balance sheet.

In view of this state of affairs why is the Council unable to agree with the Commission's proposal for a regulation concerning financial aid for solid fuels and why has it rejected in particular aid for peat and lignite?

*Answer*

1. In the course of its discussions on the Community's energy strategy the Council has on many occasions confirmed that solid fuels are a vital element in such a strategy.
2. In August 1983 the Commission forwarded to it a proposal for a Regulation on Community financial support to Community industries producing such fuels. The Commission proposal contained three sections, relating to aid for coal production, aid to encourage release from stocks and, lastly aid for the production of peat and lignite. However, initial discussions on the basis of this text revealed serious differences of opinion within the Council.
3. In view of this situation, the Commission submitted a revised proposal to the Council in September 1984. It became clear at the Council meeting on energy matters in November 1984 that there were still different attitudes even on this new text. However, all delegations, anxious to improve the effectiveness of the Community's energy policy, expressed their will to obtain the objective, which they had set themselves, of making progress towards an equitable and comprehensive Community strategy on solid fuels. In particular, they decided to continue their efforts to increase the share of solid fuels in the Community's energy balance. In order to achieve that aim, without prejudice to definitive choices on the basis of the various suggestions before them, they want to examine how the penetration of solid fuels can be increased to the benefit of the Community economy under conditions which are acceptable from the point of view of the environment.
4. The Council will certainly resume examination of this issue once the Commission has informed it of the action it intends to take. The forthcoming examination of a Commission communication on national aids to the coal industry, submission of which has been

promised for late May 1985, may well provide the occasion for a more general debate on the problems involved in the development of a balanced solid fuels policy, including, for example, questions relating to investment in the producer industries in this sector.

5. The situation which has just been described must not, however, be regarded as constituting a total absence of financial assistance from Community sources for the lignite and peat sectors. Such assistance is already being provided through various existing Community instruments, such as the ERDF and NCI and EIB loans.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 32, by Mrs Dury (H-211/85)*

Subject: International trade negotiations

During the Bonn Summit, President Mitterrand quite rightly refused to accept a set date for the future international trade negotiations. In his opinion, the first topic to be dealt with during these negotiations, namely agriculture, is the only one that has been adequately prepared.

Can the Council state what progress has been made in preparing the various dossiers (agriculture, new technologies, services) to be discussed during these GATT negotiations and on what date it considers they can be held?

*Answer*

In its declaration of 19 March 1985, the Council made clear that the Community was ready to participate in the launching of a New Round of Multilateral trade negotiations provided that an adequate prior international consensus was established on the objectives, participation and timing of such a New Round.

To this end the Community repeated its proposal for an ad hoc GATT meeting, in the coming months, preferably at the level of senior officials from capitals, to intensify consultations about a New Round, and with the objective of securing a broad consensus on subject matter and participation as soon as possible.

The Community's proposal is currently under discussion in the GATT. The subject of fixing the date for the launching of a New Round could be usefully discussed when adequate progress has been made in response to the fundamental questions raised by the Community.

I can assure the honorable Member that the Community will do its utmost to ensure that all subjects for negotiation will be carefully prepared.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 33, by Mr Zaborka (H-214/85)*

Subject: Bilateral transport negotiations between Italy and Switzerland

Early in May 1985, the Swiss Ministry of Transport (the Federal Department of Transport) in Berne announced that Italy wished to enter into negotiations for a general bilateral transport agreement with Switzerland. According to the Swiss authorities' communiqué, the Italian Ministry of Transport — which is headed by the President of the EEC Council of Transport Ministers — wishes to consider all matters of relevance in the course of these negotiations, including problems associated with road tolls in Switzerland. According to statements issued by the Ministry in Berne, Italy does not intend for the time

being to introduce the 'diritto fisso' in response to the introduction of the toll on heavy goods vehicles.

Does the procedure adopted by the Italian Minister of Transport undermine a coordinated Community approach to Swiss road tolls, and to what extent has the Commission been consulted on the negotiations which Italy and Switzerland wish to conduct with a view to securing a bilateral transport agreement?

*Answer*

The Council has not yet been informed of the course taken by the negotiations between Italy and Switzerland referred to by the honourable Member. It expects the Commission to report to it in due course on the situation in this matter, in the light of the negotiations undertaken by various adjacent Member States with Switzerland.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 34, by Mrs Jepsen (H-219/85)*

Subject: Agricultural trade war between the USA and the Community

The American Government has decided to export one billion dollars worth of agricultural products 'free' to the Community market.

What does the Council of Ministers intend to do to prevent the impending agricultural trade war between the Community and the USA?

*Answer*

Measures taken or planned by third countries which may affect Community interests are normally examined by the Commission to see whether they are compatible with GATT rules. In the specific instance of the American measures referred to by the honourable Member it will be for the Commission to decide, after examining the matter, whether any proposal should be submitted to the Council.

Furthermore, this problem falls within the general context of the agricultural dispute with the United States which already involves various points of disagreement. In order to defend its legitimate interests, the Community takes part in discussions constantly being held on these problems both multilaterally within GATT and bilaterally, in particular at high-level meetings which regularly take place between the Commission and American representatives.

More generally, I would add that it is in the interests neither of the United States nor of the Community to embark upon a trade war. It is in our mutual interest to strengthen the open system of international trade and to develop trade in compliance with GATT rules and disciplines.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 35, by Mr Debatisse (H-222/85)*

Subject: Decision taken by the Council on the 85/86 agricultural prices

Does the President of the Council have the impression that the Commission's price proposals really took account of Parliament's call for a 3.5% graduated increase in agricultural prices together with a co-responsibility policy?

*Answer*

Before taking a decision on the Commission proposals the Council took account of all the factors relevant to the fixing of agricultural prices and paid particular attention to the Opinion delivered by the European Parliament.

From an examination of the Commission proposals, the honourable Member will have been able to note the various factors on which the Commission based its proposals and to make his own assessment in this respect.

May I just briefly draw attention to three aspects which it was essential to bear in mind:

- the real situation on the agricultural products market, with a fall-off in demand for a very large number of products contrasting with ever-increasing production, and even considerable expansion, in certain sectors;
- inescapable budgetary constraints;
- finally, the desire to develop a common policy consistent with the guidelines and decisions adopted by the Council in March 1984 specifically to take account of existing economic and financial realities;
- the European Parliament's many Resolutions insisting on the need to control budgetary expenditure on agriculture.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 36, by Mr Ducarme (H-223/85)*

Subject: Council decision on 'Overall policy' 1002nd meeting of the Agricultural Council

Press Release 6687/85 (Presse 63) from the General Secretariat of the Council of the European Communities announcing the decision on 'Overall policy' states that the Commission will take the necessary steps in the management of the agricultural markets to obviate the need for a supplementary or amending budget for 1985.

What exactly does the Council mean by 'necessary steps in the management of the markets', especially as the question of cereals prices has not been settled?

*Answer*

The honourable Member is referring to an undertaking entered into by the Commission during the Council discussions on the agricultural prices for the 1985/1986 marketing year.

It is consequently for the Commission itself to specify what practical steps it proposes taking to honour its undertaking.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 37, by Mr Clinton (H-226/85)*

Subject: Delays in farm price fixing

Having regard to the exceptional delay in the fixing of prices for agricultural products in 1985 and the heavy losses suffered in areas heavily dependent on milk production, has the Council any plans for ensuring that this situation is not repeated in future years and if it is can the Council give an undertaking to make provision for compensation?

*Answer*

The Council would point out that this year the prices of a number of agricultural and processed products were fixed, and the related measures adopted, in good time before the beginning of the marketing year.

Admittedly for a number of products prices were not fixed until some time after the usual beginning of the marketing year. The honourable Member is aware of the particular problems which caused the delay this year. It was not the first time that such a delay had occurred, but efforts must certainly be made to prevent it happening again. However, the Council does not believe that this caused problems for producers. The honourable Member will have noticed that in the milk sector the Council was careful to ensure that the arrangements reducing the level of the co-responsibility levy from 3 to 2% applied as from 1 April 1985.

\*  
\* \*

## II. Questions to the Foreign Ministers

### Question No 43, by Mme Lizin (H-66/85)

Subject: Uruguay

Could the President of the Conference of Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation indicate the Conference's views on the developments currently affecting the Uruguayan regime?

*Answer*

The Ten are following with considerable satisfaction the developments in Uruguayan political life following last November's elections, which marked that country's return to democracy.

<sup>1</sup> The ceremony to install the President elect, Julio Sanguinetti, in office, which took place on 1 March last in an atmosphere of enthusiastic approval both in Uruguay and internationally, was attended by high-level delegations.

At the very beginning of his term of office the new President expressed his desire to govern in harmony with the country's other political forces and restored the civil liberties which the previous military regime had curtailed, granting among other things a broad amnesty to political prisoners. He also stated that he wished to play a part in stimulating the spread and consolidation of democracy throughout Latin America.

In addition to the national messages expressing satisfaction at and support for the restoration of democracy in Uruguay, it should be pointed out that the President-in-Office of the Ten, Mr Craxi, when addressing the press at the end of the European Council in Brussels on 29-30 March 1985, warmly welcomed Uruguay's return to democracy and expressed the wish that such a development would spread throughout Latin America.

\*  
\* \*

### Question No 46, by Mr Mattina (H-150/85)<sup>1</sup>

Subject: Protection of ethnic minorities in Bulgaria

According to recent press reports, the army in Bulgaria has massacred a number of Turks who were demonstrating peacefully against Bulgarian Government measures to integrate the Turkish community into the national population.

<sup>1</sup> Former oral question without debate (O-12/85), converted into a question for Question Time.

Foreign journalists have been forbidden access to the entire area where the Turks have been active. This is not the first time that measures of this type have been adopted in Bulgaria with regard to the ethnic minorities, which constitute about a quarter of the entire population.

1. What action do the Foreign Ministers intend to take in order to express the disapproval of such brutal integration measures felt by the peoples of Europe?
2. How do the Ministers propose to guarantee protection for ethnic minorities in countries which do not give them proper civil equality with the national population and in which their culture, language and traditions are not respected?

*Answer*

As stated in the reply to Oral Question No H-77/85, the Ten are closely following the situation of the Turkish Muslim minority in Bulgaria, and the Ministers meeting in European political cooperation are continuing to examine this matter. The problem has been dealt with at the meeting on human rights and fundamental freedoms being held in Ottawa.

In accordance with the commitments entered into with the signing of the Helsinki Final Act and confirmed in the document issued at the end of the Madrid follow-up conference, the Ten intend to continue, in the appropriate international forums, to take any action seeking to ensure that all countries respect the rights of people belonging to a national minority.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 48, by Mr Taylor (H-149/85)*

Subject: Votes by Greece at the United Nations

How often did Greece vote at the United Nations during the year 1984, with the other nine countries of the European Community, and in a manner different from the other nine countries of the European Community?

*Answer*

It would not seem appropriate for the President-in-Office, speaking on behalf of the Ten, to comment on the individual stance adopted by any one Member State when voting in the UN General Assembly. However, I can inform the honourable Member that at the 39th Session of the General Assembly, the Ten voted unanimously on 68.5% of the resolutions (including those passed on the nod), that percentage being higher than the one recorded at the previous Session.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 49, by Mr Alavanos (H-161/85)*

Subject: Démarches relating to human rights in Turkey

In recent months the European Parliament has made a number of moves by way of resolutions or questions on the violation of human rights by the military junta in Turkey. In fact, at its last plenary part-session in April 1985, it unanimously adopted, by the urgent procedure, the Ephremidis resolution on that subject.

What specific démarches have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation made, to what specific cases do they refer, to which specific authorities in Turkey were they made, and on what actual dates?

*Answer*

As stated on many occasions, the Ten closely follow the human rights situation in all countries, including Turkey. They have repeatedly expressed their concern over this matter in their contacts both with the Turkish military government and with the present government.

Although they have noted the declarations of intent by the Turkish government, as well as certain positive developments, the Ten will continue to follow the situation closely.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 50, by Mr Ephremidis (H-163/85)*

Subject: EEC and Atlantic Alliance

What are the Council's views on the text by the Spaak II Committee referring to 'the need for the Atlantic Alliance to maintain adequate military strength in Europe for effective deterrence and defence' and stating that account will have to be taken of 'the frameworks which already exist . . . such as the Atlantic Alliance, the framework for and basis of our security, and Western European Union, the strengthening of which, now under way, would enrich the Alliance with its own contribution'?

*Answer*

As stated on many occasions, the military aspects of security are outside the scope of European political cooperation, and therefore the Ministers concerned do not discuss developments connected with the Atlantic Alliance and the WEU.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 53, by Mr Adamou (H-167/85)*

Subject: US policy in Central America

What approaches could the Foreign Ministers make towards the American Government to persuade it to curb its aggressive policy in Central America, a policy which is much disputed in the USA itself, and, in particular, to persuade the American Government to accept the conciliatory proposals put forward by President D. Ortega of Nicaragua for an immediate ceasefire with simultaneous cessation of US support for the mercenary partisans of the dictator Somoza?

*Answer*

The ten Member States of the European Community have constantly expressed their conviction that the problems of Central America, including Nicaragua, cannot be solved by force but only through a political solution emanating from the region itself. With this in mind, the Ten have on many occasions expressed their support for the Contadora Group's initiative seeking a peaceful and global solution to the problems of the region. Further-

more, the position of the Ten has been repeatedly expressed publicly and is thus well known to all the parties concerned.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 54, by Mr Selva (H-179/85)*

Subject: Massacre of Christians in Lebanon

What measures have been or will be taken to prevent the current massacre of Christians in Lebanon?

*Answer*

The Ten have repeatedly expressed their concern at the deterioration of the situation in Lebanon and at the repeated acts of violence against the civilian population. This was most recently expressed in the declarations by the Foreign Ministers of the Ten in Luxembourg on 29 April and in Brussels on 20 May. On the latter occasion the Ten drew up a practical proposal for a conference of genuine national reconciliation, at which dialogue between the various Lebanese communities can be resumed and an agreement can be arrived at to ensure peaceful co-existence and internal stability. Indeed, the Ten retain their conviction that it is only by overcoming the differences of the opposing parties that the people of Lebanon, whatever community they belong to, will be able to enjoy a peaceful and prosperous future.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 55, by Mrs Boserup (H-181/85)*

Subject: Community participation in the Star Wars project

Two meetings were held simultaneously on Monday 22 and Tuesday 23 April: in Rome an informal meeting of the Council of Research Ministers and in Bonn a meeting of the Defence and Foreign Ministers of the seven member countries of the Western European Union.

Both meetings discussed the USA's invitation to the countries of western Europe to participate in the Star Wars project and President Mitterand's plans to use the Eureka project to enable the Community to compete in technology with the USA and Japan.

What are the Foreign Ministers' views on Eureka and do they regard it as an appropriate way in which the Community can participate in the development of the Star Wars project?

*Answer*

The Eureka project, which seeks to promote research programmes for civil purposes, is a joint effort by the Member States of the Community and, more broadly, by the countries of Europe to establish for Europe a place, alongside the United States and Japan, in the development of advanced technologies. The Strategic Defence Initiative is a research programme for military purposes and as such is outside the field of competence of European political cooperation.

The Ten have discussed the Eureka project in these terms and have expressed their interest in an initiative which could give a considerable boost to the economic and technological progress of the Community as a whole.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 58, by Mrs Dury (H-212/85)*

Subject: Expulsion of persons not in possession of papers from Nigeria

Tens of thousands of foreigners, 'without papers', officially expelled from Nigeria, have rioted in the Ikeja transit camp near Lagos.

As a result of the closure of Nigeria's frontiers, thousands of people await repatriation in makeshift camps. According to witnesses, several foreigners have been killed by the police at the frontier between Benin and Nigeria.

Can the Foreign Ministers approach the Nigerian authorities to request that the repatriation process be carried out in more human conditions and what proposals will they make to the Nigerian authorities to achieve this purpose?

*Answer*

The Ten are following developments in Nigeria and in the neighbouring countries following the recent measures introduced by the Lagos Government against foreigners illegally resident in the country.

They hope that while these measures are being enforced there will be no further incidents and that the human rights of the expelled immigrants will be fully respected.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 59a, by Mr Iversen (H-195/85)*

Subject: US trade embargo against Nicaragua

Do the Foreign Ministers meeting in European political cooperation agree that the trade embargo imposed by the USA against Nicaragua is a totally inappropriate way of solving problems in Central America, and can the ten Foreign Ministers state in this connection what initiatives they propose to take to counteract the American trade embargo?

*Answer*

The Ten Member States of the European Community have constantly expressed their conviction that the problems of Central America, including Nicaragua, cannot be solved by force but only through a political solution emanating from the region itself. With this in mind, the Ten have on many occasions expressed their support for the Contadora Group's initiative seeking a peaceful and global solution to the problems of the region. Furthermore, the position of the Ten has been repeatedly expressed publicly and is thus well known to all the parties concerned.

\*  
\* \*

III. *Questions to the Commission**Question No 61, by Mr Roux (H-572/84)*

Subject: Freedom of movement for masseurs-kinesitherapists

Does the Commission not take the view that a specific directive should be drawn up laying down freedom of establishment for masseurs-kinesitherapists and other paramedical pro-

fessions, without waiting for a general directive to cover freedom of establishment for the professions through mutual recognition of diplomas, as this is long overdue?

*Answer*

The approach followed hitherto in the case of the professions has been to provide for mutual recognition of qualifications, profession by profession. Agreement had been reached in the case of five professions — doctors, dentists, nurses, midwives and veterinary surgeons — and on Monday the directive on architects was approved. A further directive for pharmacists is still with the Council but we hope for early agreement.

While progress has been made, it has been slow. Accordingly, the heads of State and Government at Fontainebleau decided that a generalized system of equivalence of higher education diplomas would be more appropriate. The Commission is therefore giving priority to work on a generalized system of recognition of higher education diplomas. This would facilitate free movement of professional people, including masseurs, physiotherapists and other paramedical professions. The matter is dealt with in detail in the forthcoming white paper on the internal market.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 67, by Mr Flanagan (H-769/84)*

Subject: Irish design for a swivel car seat for the disabled

Thanks to the work of an Irish designer, a new swivel car seat has been invented which enables a disabled person to transfer easily from a wheelchair to a car.

Would the Commission be prepared to provide financial support for the expansion of the manufacturer's business to enable his design to be of benefit to disabled people throughout the Community?

*Answer*

It is not possible for the Commission to give financial support to a single selected manufacturer of a product for disabled people.

The Commission is promoting improvements in the market of technical aids for disabled people by means of the 'Handynet' project, which is a long-term action to establish in the Community a network of computerized data bases concerned with disability questions. The first module of Handynet to be developed will concern technical aids, and a pilot project for the exchange of information between centres in different Member States is planned to become operational in 1986. The rapid exchange of accurate and comprehensive information offered by Handynet will greatly improve the opportunities for good new products to establish themselves on the market.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 68, by Mr Elliott (H-784/84)*

Subject: Definition of minority groups in the Community

In view of the growing numbers of second and third generation immigrants making up the increasingly multi-racial society of many Member States, the current definition of migrants, designed to cover those groups whose special needs are assisted by certain specific provisions made by Community Institutions, is now inadequate.

Having regard also to the reply given by the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers in February 1984 to Oral Question No H-631/84<sup>1</sup> in which he stressed the importance of this problem.

Would the Commission be prepared to make new proposals aimed at widening the definition of minority groups, eligible for specific help and consideration, to include all those of different ethnic origins to the indigenous Communities in which they live, even if they have legal citizenship of the countries concerned?

*Answer*

The Commission would agree that the pattern of foreign population in the Member States is gradually changing. The second and third generation immigrants are acquiring more and more the nationality of the host country, either by naturalization, or by the fact that they are subject to the *jus soli*, applied in some countries. Hence, while disappearing from the statistics of foreign population, these young people of foreign origin retain in sociological and educational terms, the characteristics of foreign nationals in a 'migratory situation', subject to xenophobic attitudes, and sometimes encountering a *de facto* situation of discrimination. However, I would not attempt to define these people by the simple expression of 'minority groups', having regard to the different national situations within the Member States. (Would this include also regional and linguistic national groups?)

I will just say that the Commission views with great interest the question raised by the honourable MP, concerning people, let us say for instance, born and educated in the United Kingdom, having British nationality, but whose parents are of another ethnic and national origin.

The Commission has always borne in mind the situation for granting specific aids, particularly in the framework of social and educational activities, carried out by public and voluntary associations, and they have not been asked to specify their own citizenship. Therefore, there is no need for more proposals of eligibility for financial aids.

Nevertheless, specific consideration is needed as regards the European Social Fund.

The European Social Fund, reviewed by the Council Decision of 17 October 1983 (83/516/EEC) which was implemented by Regulation No 2950/83, offers assistance for a very wide range of operations.

The Fund, whose task is 'to participate in particular in the financing of vocational training, the promotion of employment and geographic mobility' (Decision, second recital), does not preclude account being taken of workers of foreign origin in the overall framework of national applications for assistance; moreover, it takes account specifically of actions designed to facilitate the transfer and integration of migrant workers and members of their families, including workers who have become legal residents in the Community in order to take up employment (Regulation, Article 1(d)).

With regard to the Fund's innovatory schemes, the categories described as disadvantaged on the labour market also include the immigrant population.

In conclusion I would say that, whatever the definition of minority groups, and the citizenship of their members, every individual of different ethnic origin to that of the host country is eligible for consideration and financial aids from the Community, either through national schemes or through specific actions.

\*  
\* \*

<sup>1</sup> Annex of the verbatim report of proceedings of 13. 2. 1985, p. 205.

*Question No 70, by Mr Musso (H-811/84)*

Subject: Solar energy

Can the Commission provide information on the development of photovoltaic solar energy in the Community?

*Answer*

Intensive development work on photovoltaic technology is being conducted in the Community by a dozen industrial firms, university institutes and other research establishments. There are several European firms among those represented on the world market and active in research and development, mainly in the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, France and the Benelux countries.

The European market in photovoltaic elements currently accounts for a volume of 3 MW annually with a turnover of approximately 100 million ECU. An important use to which they are put is the electricity supply to telecommunications installations in remote locations.

With regard to the technological aspects, it should be noted that Europe has so far concentrated its efforts on silicon crystals. In this sector, for example, a single European firm supplies approximately a third of the entire world market.

As regards amorphous silicon, which is used in large quantities by Japanese industry, particularly in the manufacture of miniature calculators, Europe is in an even weaker position. It should be noted, however, that on 17 April 1985 a new factory for the manufacture of amorphous photovoltaic cells is due to come into operation and will make use of technology taken over from the United States.

In the field of research and development considerable financial resources are being devoted to photovoltaic technology, particularly in the Federal Republic of Germany, France and Italy, and since 1975 by the Commission also, which has to some extent become a leader in this field.

In the recently adopted third programme in the field of non-nuclear energy (Official Journal L 83 of 25 March 1985) particular importance continues to be attached, as in the previous programmes, to solar energy and particularly photovoltaic electricity production.

Since 1979 the Commission has also supported demonstration programmes in the field of alternative energy sources, whereby photovoltaic projects represents an increasing proportion of the total number of solar energy projects as a result of improved quality.

The Commission's programmes and above all the subsidized construction of 15 photovoltaic pilot plants for a wide range of uses with capacities ranging from 30 to 300 kW, together with a number of national programmes, have considerably stimulated industry. On the basis of the experience acquired with innovative technology, a number of European firms have managed to establish themselves on the world market. In this branch of technology they are already achieving an annual turnover of more the 30 million ECU.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 71, by Mr Malaud (H-812/84)*

Subject: Oil and gas fields in the North Sea

Can the Commission provide information on the recent discovery by an oil company of major oil and gas fields in the North Sea, off Scotland?

*Answer*

1. Offshore exploration for hydrocarbons in the Community is an activity coming exclusively under the sovereignty of the Member States. The Commission does, however, follow progress in oil and gas discoveries in the Community through information published by the oil companies or the specialized press.
2. According to these sources, the only discoveries in 1984 and in early 1985 involved a certain number of small deposits.

These discoveries, together with a revision of the methods used to assess existing resources, have led to an increase in the proved recoverable reserves in United Kingdom offshore waters of approximately 16% for oil and 15% for natural gas as against the 1983 estimate.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 72, by Mr Mouchel (H-813/84)*

Subject: Growing energy dependence of the Community in 1984

Is the Commission concerned at the overall increase in energy consumption in the Community in 1984, namely a rise of 4.5% compared to 1983, which has led to an increase in imports and as a result greater dependence by the Community in the energy sector?

*Answer*

The Commission does not consider that the increase in energy consumption and in energy imports in 1984 is cause for concern since, on analysis, these short-term effects are due to the economic recovery and the impact of the British miners' strike.

The most recent statistics available suggest that overall energy consumption in 1984 increased by approximately 3.5%, slightly less than previously expected. Nevertheless the Commission considers that effective energy policies will be necessary if an unacceptable increase in energy dependence is to be avoided in the longer term.

For this reason the Commission adopted on 22 May new Community energy objectives for 1995 (Doc. COM(86) 245 final of 28 May 1985). It has forwarded its proposals, which must be seen as an integral part of the Commission's overall strategy, to Parliament for its opinion and to the Council for adoption. Two kinds of objective are proposed: the horizontal objectives stress the basic considerations to be borne in mind in all sectors of energy policy, and the sectoral objectives point the way to improving the energy situation of the Community. Furthermore, the communication takes account of the interaction of these objectives with those of other policies, e.g. environment policy, research policy and regional policy.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 76, by Mr Marck (H-29/85)*

Subject: Use of languages by the Commission

I have noticed that the answers to oral questions published in annex to the report of parliamentary proceedings appear only in French and English, regardless of the language of the Member putting the question. Does this mean that the Commission intends to confine itself to these two languages in future, thereby contradicting the principles laid down by Parliament in the past (Nyborg report)?

*Answer*

If the honourable Member refers to the report of proceedings of the last two part-sessions, he will note that the written answers to questions which could not be answered orally during Question Time were in English, French, Dutch, Italian and German.

In fact, the answers to questions for Question Time are normally drawn up in or translated into the mother tongue of the Member of the Commission responsible for answering the question.

As regards the obvious predominance of French and English noted by the honourable Member, the Commission would like to point out that six of its members speak these two languages.

Furthermore, on the procedural level, the texts of answers which are drawn up by the Commission in one language and which are not given orally are forwarded to the Secretariat of Parliament, which is responsible for publishing and translating them.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 80, by Mr Raftery (H-134/85)*

Subject: Rabies

Would the Commission agree that the time is right to resubmit proposals to the Council for the control of rabies? If so, what action will they take?

*Answer*

As has been indicated in the reply to the honourable Member's Written Question on this matter (No 2089/84) the subject of rabies and its control has not received a priority rating when discussion had taken place in the Council on the creation of priorities in the veterinary field. However, I am aware of the seriousness of this disease and it is my intention when time and availability of staff allow, to investigate the possibilities of taking some initiatives in this field.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 83, by Mrs Ewing (H-313/84)*

Subject: The Assisted Development Programme in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland

What steps will the new Commission take to encourage the United Kingdom Government to support the proposed Assisted Development Programme in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland?

*Answer*

In its answer to Oral Question No 102/84 tabled by the honourable Member,<sup>1</sup> the Commission stated that it was prepared to consider the possibility of launching an integrated development programme for the Scottish Highlands and Islands. However, it was not possible for a final decision to be taken until the Council had adopted its proposals on improving the efficiency of agricultural structures.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> European Parliament — Verbatim report of proceedings — Sitting of 11 September 1984.

<sup>2</sup> COM(83) 559 final of 30 November 1983.

That requirement has now been met: the Council of Agricultural Ministers adopted the proposals referred to above at its meeting of 12 and 13 March.

On that basis, the Commission can now consider in greater detail requests such as those concerning the Scottish Highlands and Islands.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 85, by Mr Barrett (H-549/84)*

Subject: Nuclear dumping off South West Irish coast

Will the Commission confirm that nuclear dumping is taking place off the South West coast of Ireland and to ascertain to what extent the European Community can play a full and positive role in having such activities banned forthwith?

*Answer*

A dumping campaign has been organized each summer from 1977 to 1982 at a site some 700 km from the coasts of Ireland and Spain. In 1983 and 1984 no dumping operations took place subsequent to a resolution of February 1983 adopted at a London dumping convention consultative meeting which called for the suspension of sea dumping of radioactive wastes pending a review to be prepared for the consultative meeting in September 1985.

The Commission has already stated in answers to previous parliamentary questions that it will have to consider the results of the above review before formulating its position.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 86, by Mr Marshall (H-576/84)*

Subject: Sugar and Portugal's accession to the Community

Can the Commission state how much sugar Portugal currently imports from the Third World and how much it will be allowed to import if the current proposals are accepted and has the Commission made any studies of the impact of these proposals on the world sugar price?

*Answer*

1. In 1982 and 1983 (latest statistics available), Portugal imported a total of 320 000 and 350 000 tonnes respectively (expressed as white sugar equivalent). When imports from the Community and amounts re-exported onto the world market under the active processing traffic system are deducted from those totals, it may be assumed that some 220 000 to 230 000 tonnes imported each year from third countries were actually sold on the Portuguese market during the two years referred to.
2. Under the accession treaty as negotiated, during a transitional seven-year period, Portugal will be able to import at a reduced levy an annual quantity of 75 000 tonnes (expressed as white sugar equivalent) from the four ACP States (Malawi, Swaziland, Zimbabwe and Ivory Coast) with which it has concluded supply contracts. Should there be a shortage of unrefined sugar, Portugal may be authorized to import additional quantities from third countries, similarly at a reduced levy.
3. The Commission takes the view that the supplies for the Portuguese market based on the terms of the accession treaty will have no impact on the world sugar price since the

amounts traded on that market will remain constant overall, the only changes affecting the geographical destination of the exports.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 89, by Mr Van Miert (H-650/84)*

Subject: Severe smog in Western Europe

In January 1985 Belgium and the Ruhr, amongst other areas, were for several days affected by one of the most persistent forms of air pollution ever recorded. On 16 November 1984 the European Parliament passed resolutions in favour of European directives on air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide and the limitation of emissions of pollutants from large combustion plants. These resolutions call on the Commission to put forward new proposals for Community rules on emissions of pollutants from fuel, specifically sulphur dioxide and nitrogen dioxide, and to lay down standards for these areas and submit proposals for a Directive. What action has been taken on this call?

*Answer*

The question asks for information on actions taken by the Commission as a response to the European Parliament's resolution adopted on 16 November 1984. The best way to answer the lengthy list might be to take them up in the same order as in this resolution.

Points 1 to 4: The Commission has taken into account as far as possible the Parliament's wishes for changes and amendments to its proposal on large combustion installations. It has submitted to the Council on 18 February 1985 a proposal for revisions to be made on the basis of the Parliament's resolution (COM(85)4/Final). The leading principle followed by the Commission upon amending its proposal was to take up all suggestions which are likely to improve the environment without hampering an early agreement on the proposal.

Point 5, first indent: The Commission has put forward in June 1983 a proposal to the Council concerning a Community scheme on protection of forests against fire and acid rain which provides *inter alia*, for the setting up of a measurement network for acid depositions. This proposal is still under discussion.

Point 5, second and third indent: The Commission will study the possibility of direct financial support in particular cases where the reduction of emissions is of common interest.

Point 5, fourth indent: The proposal on large combustion installations contains articles destined to assure the continuous survey of the operation of the directive. No further actions seems to be necessary at present.

Point 5, fifth indent: A proposal concerning emission limit values for waste incineration plants will be elaborated as soon as possible and be submitted to the Council.

Point 5, sixth indent: The work on further proposals to reduce emissions from industrial plants has started. However, given the need for a thorough analysis of the sectors concerned before formulating proposals this task has to be considered as a long term undertaking.

Point 5, seventh indent: The Commission is going to submit very soon a proposal to the Council concerning the sulphur content of gasoil, so that the discussion with national experts can start under the Luxembourg presidency.

Point 5, eighth indent: It is common practice for the Commission that all proposals and amendments made by the Parliament are brought to the knowledge of the Council, even those which have not been taken over by the Commission.

Point 5, ninth indent: Work is under way in the Commission, to set up a detailed emission inventory for major industrial sources of air pollution, covering as well combustion installations above 50 MW<sub>th</sub>.

Point 5, tenth indent: The directorates XI and XVII cooperate tightly in all questions of common concerns.

Point 6: The Commission is always seeking to lay down in its proposals reference methods which help to obtain reliable and comparable measurement results.

Point 7: The Commission has put forward a study programme within which questions relevant for the reduction of emissions and of waste from energy production will be investigated.

Point 8: The Commission agrees that in the field of domestic heating there is a large potential for environmental improvement and energy saving by combined schemes of urban heating and refuse incineration.

Point 9: The directive on limit values for NO<sub>2</sub> has been adopted by the Council in March 1985.

Points 10 to 12: Do not directly concern the Commission but constitute by no doubt a precious political support for a rapid agreement in the Council of ministers.

Point 13: The Commission cannot agree with the opinion expressed by the European Parliament in this point, because a number of suggested amendments are clearly not feasible and would rather block the adoption of the directive.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 95, by Mrs Marinaro (H-827/84)*

Subject: Discrimination in the application of social measures

On 25 November 1984 Paris City Council decided to increase the monthly allowance paid to mothers who decided to stop working following the birth of their third child.

At the same time it also decided that this measure would not apply to 'foreign' families.

Since this provision takes no account of either the principle of freedom of movement for migrant workers, which implies the abolition of all discrimination on grounds of nationality, or of Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68 of the Council, does the Commission not intend to intervene so that this decision, which is particularly detrimental to workers at a time of economic crisis, and which is merely one example of increasingly widespread discrimination against migrant workers, is revised forthwith by Paris City Council in the same legal form in which it was taken?

*Answer*

The Commission is aware of the Decision of the Ville de Paris concerning 'l'allocation de congé parental d'éducation' (allocation of parental leave for education).

The 25th of February 1985, the Commission has already drawn the attention of French Authorities on the applicability of Article 7 § 2 of Regulation 1612/68, and invited the responsible authorities to amend the decision in conformity with Community Law, deleting the condition that limits the allocation solely to French citizens and to foreigners married to a French citizen.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 96, by Mr Moorhouse (H-831/84)*

Subject: State Aids for air transport

Has the Greek Government put an end to the granting of exemption from landing and air traffic control charges in Greece to Olympic Airways? If not, what action has the Commission taken since 1983 to ensure that an end is put to this aid and of what other state aids granted by the Greek Government to Olympic Airways is the Commission aware and what action is the Commission taking to put an end to them?

*Answer*

The Commission services are currently examining the system of aid to airlines in Greece in accordance with the guidelines published last year in Civil Aviation Memorandum No 2. This examination has included the issue of whether the exemption from landing and air traffic control charges granted by Greece to Olympic Airways are aids incompatible with the Treaty. We hope to conclude this examination shortly.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 98, by Mr Sherlock (H-151/85)<sup>1</sup>*

Subject: Use of the growth promoters carbadox and olaquinox

Commission Directive 85/157/EEC<sup>2</sup> amends Annex II to Council Directive 70/524/EEC concerning additives in feedingstuffs<sup>3</sup> by extending the period of authorization of use of the growth promoters carbadox and olaquinox until 31 May 1985, and by stipulating in relation to each of those additives the maximum amount of dust which may be emitted during handling.

1. In view of the possible hazard to farmers and feed mill operators involved in the handling of any premix containing carbadox or olaquinox which does not comply with the dust emission limit laid down in Directive 85/157/EEC, does the Commission agree that, if the period of authorization of use of carbadox and olaquinox is further extended, it will be essential to maintain in force during the extension period the stipulation imposing that dust emission limit?

2. Does the Commission agree that the rapid implementation by the Member States of Council Directive 84/587/EEC<sup>4</sup> — which introduced the principles that growth promoters listed in Annex I or Annex II to Directive 70/524/EEC, and that such additives shall be subject of monographs — will facilitate the enforcement of restrictions such as the dust emission limit referred to above?

*Answer*

1. In the Commission's opinion, Directive 85/187/EEC<sup>5</sup> and, to an even greater extent, the Directive it adopted on 31 May 1985<sup>6</sup>, leave no doubt as to its determination to regulate the conditions governing the use of carbadox and olaquinox.

The Commission believes it vital that authorization of the use of carbadox and olaquinox should be subject to conditions which guarantee not only the safety of workers but also the protection of animals and of consumers of foodstuffs of animal origin.

<sup>1</sup> Former oral question without debate (0-7/85), converted into a question for Question Time.

<sup>2</sup> OJ L 59 of 27 February 1985, p. 27.

<sup>3</sup> OJ L 270 of 14. December 1970, p. 1.

<sup>4</sup> OJ L 319 of 8. December 1984, p. 13.

<sup>5</sup> OJ L 59, 27 February 1985.

<sup>6</sup> OJ not yet published.

The Commission is seeking above all to avert the risks which could arise from the use of carbadox and olaquinox-based preparations other than those which have been examined and which may be authorized at national level.

It should be pointed out that the harmlessness of any active substance, and therefore of the growth promoters concerned, is closely linked to the composition of the preparation of which it is a part. In the case of carbadox, for example, the use of soya oil as a base for the active substance makes it possible to prevent the formation of dust almost entirely. That is why the Commission has seen fit to limit the maximum quantity of dust emitted to a very low level so as to exclude certain carbadox and olaquinox preparations with bases such as cereal or soya flours.

By taking these measures, the Commission has abided strictly by the recommendations of the Scientific Committee on Animal Nutrition and the opinion of the Standing Committee for Feedingstuffs.

As its most recent directive of 31 May 1985 confirms in very explicit terms, the Commission considers it vital to maintain the conditions laid down in Directive 85/187/EEC referred to by the honourable Member. It should be stressed that these conditions are intended not only to limit the maximum amount of dust which may be emitted during handling but also to introduce certain stipulations regarding composition which will make it possible to distinguish the products authorized and therefore to control their identity more effectively.

2. Since it was the instigator of the measures adopted by the Council, the Commission naturally believes that Directive 84/587/EEC, which is due to enter into force by 3 December 1986 at the latest, will considerably improve safety with regard to the use of authorized additives in the Community.

The introduction of monographs laying down the composition and the properties of authorized preparations using a given active substance should make it possible to exercise stricter control over imitation products, which until now have been circulating freely.

In addition, the introduction of control rules at production and distribution level, and in particular the obligation to restrict the use of these additives to manufacturers of officially authorized premixes or feedingstuffs, should make it possible not only to control the quality of the additives placed on the market but also to prevent the sale of those additives and premixes to breeders.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 99, by Mr Romeos (H-84/85)*

Subject: The economic consequences of enlargement on the Mediterranean region

It is generally acknowledged that the new enlargement of the EEC will affect not only those Mediterranean countries which are already Members of the Community but also those non-Member States in the region which have a similar export trade with the EEC.

In view of this problem, will the Commission: consider the possibility of a more rational internal policy towards the Mediterranean regions of the Community, and in particular towards those regions which will be directly affected by the new enlargement; pursue a policy of piecemeal solutions in respect of the most important and sensitive sectors of Mediterranean external trade and step up financial cooperation, and finally formulate a new policy aimed at bringing about a gradual redistribution of labour among countries on both sides of the Mediterranean?

*Answer*

The forthcoming enlargement of the Community is likely to have economic consequences for the Mediterranean regions of the present Community. However, the relatively long

transitional period that has been agreed upon should provide the necessary breathing space for economic operators to adapt to a new economic and commercial situation in the Mediterranean region. This adjustment should also be facilitated by the Community's Integrated Mediterranean Programmes one of the objectives of which is to help the Mediterranean regions to meet the problems that could arise following enlargement.

As regard sectoral solutions, it is evident that consideration needs to be given to sectors that could find themselves in difficulty. However this must be done in the wider context of an overall approach to the Mediterranean.

For the Mediterranean non-member countries the Commission has set out its position on numerous occasions, more recently in March of this year, when it recalled to the Council that the final phase of the enlargement process was imminent, the importance of the Mediterranean and the need for the Community to establish its position. In particular this communication considered that an important objective should be the maintenance of traditional trade flows so as to neutralize any harmful effects arising from the enlargement. The Council subsequently adopted a resolution on 30 March 1986, on the Mediterranean Policy of the enlarged Community in which it reaffirmed the global approach of the Community's Mediterranean Policy and announced its intention to find solutions to the concerns raised by its Mediterranean partners. The Commission for its part is actively working on proposals called for in the Council Declaration.

The Commission takes the view that co-operation between the Community and the non-member Mediterranean countries should be strengthened but this should not be considered as a form of compensation. The enlargement of the Community towards the south will widen the scope for co-operation. M. Cheysson in his speech to the Parliament on the 8 May has already given some indications of the areas that could be developed and expanded.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 101, by Mr Pitt (H-94/85)*

Subject: Consumer protection regulations on the motor vehicle retail trade

Is the Commission considering action to stop the practice of motor vehicle retailers zeroing odometers on second-hand cars prior to sale, ensure that all second-hand car dealers public a checklist to show that the basic functions of a car have been checked over before it is put on sale, and end the practice of car retailers charging for number plates and delivery over and above the advertised price of a new car?

*Answer*

The Commission has been considering action to protect purchasers of used cars; among other things to stop the practice of traders zeroing odometers. We are aware of reports on this subject expressing concern, notably that of the British Office of Fair Trading in 1979.

Various approaches are possible. One is to forbid the practice. The introduction of a specific rule on zeroing odometers would probably add little to the existing law of the Members States, buyers already have a contractual remedy against a deliberate misrepresentation of this type. However, the remedy will apply only in individual cases, and then only if the consumer has or can acquire the means to bring a claim for damages — assuming he has discovered the misrepresentation, which will not happen in every case. Whether, if successful, the consumer can enforce judgment against the type of trader who indulges in this type of practice is also highly problematical.

A more practical approach would be to require all cars to be fitted with tamper-proof odometers. Assuming that a technical solution exists for the production of such a device,

the installation would almost certainly increase the price of the new car to the first purchaser, who might reasonably object to paying for the protection of subsequent purchasers. Moreover, this type of action would only begin to have an effect several years after the new equipment was introduced.

A third solution is one which the Commission will be studying in the near future, namely the licensing of car dealers. This exists in at least one Member State. It could be the best means of disciplining traders who are guilty of malpractice such as tampering with odometers, or charging for extras of which the consumer has not been informed before purchasing a used car.

I also recognize that the consumer may not only have inadequate, perhaps inaccurate, information about a car's history and mileage, but also inadequate information about the car's actual condition. The Commission is aware of this problem and will take it into account when it will make its proposal for a roadworthiness test of private cars in the course of the year.

I would conclude by emphasizing that the Commission is not solely concerned with the consumer interest. The sale of used cars which are unroadworthy, or which may rapidly become so, is a question of general public interest. The appalling toll of deaths and injuries on the road make it essential to improve road safety standards.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 103, by Mrs Hammerich (H-125/85)*

Subject: Community cooperation in the armaments sector

Is it the Commission's view that instigating Community cooperation in the armaments sector lies within its terms of reference, as this would seem to be implied in the Commission's programme of work for 1985, part I, pt 1.3, third paragraph?

*Answer*

Defence policy is outside the Commission's field of competence, and the Commission does not seek to alter this state of affairs.

Neither does it have anything to do with arms policy.

With regard to industrial and research policy, the Commission cannot, however, fail to recognize that the defence industry is very important owing to the purchasing power of the procurement programmes and to its high-technology components.

Therefore the above components must also be dealt with in the context of the efforts to liberalize the system of public contracts in the internal market.

Since the components are increasingly tending to become dual-purpose, and in view of the associated spin-off, they will become even more important to the Community for technological development as a whole and for the full exploitation of innovation potential.

Lastly, in this sector in particular the need to make rational use of the scarce resources calls for a high degree of division of labour at the development stage, which also helps to bring about the division of labour at the production stage.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 104, by Mrs Caroline Jackson (H-148/85)*

Subject: Polluter pays principle

Will the Commission indicate whether and, if so, how the polluter pays principle is applied in the Member States to the removal of nitrates from drinking water pursuant to Council Directive 80/778/EEC on the quality of drinking water for human consumption?<sup>1</sup>

*Answer*

The directive relating to the quality of water intended for human consumption 80/778/EEC lays down a guide level of 25 mg NO<sub>3</sub>/l and a maximum admission concentration of 50 mg NO<sub>3</sub>/l. The method of achievement of this quality with respect to nitrate is within the competence of the Member State.

There is no obligation on the part of Member States to furnish the Commission with information on the extent to which treatment may be necessary in order to achieve the required quality. The Commission has therefore not been informed of the cost of treatment which may be involved nor the degree to which the cost of any such treatment is shared by the polluter in each Member State.

The sources of nitrate pollution of aquifers are diffuse in nature and subsequently there are difficulties in applying the 'polluter pays' principle fully.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 105, by Mr Adamou (H-157/85)*

Subject: Reduction in Greek farmers' incomes

According to official Greek Government figures, Greek farmers' incomes fell 3.5% in the four years after Greece joined the Community (1981-1984) compared with their incomes in 1980. Again according to Greek Government figures, Greece's farming population fell by 3% in 1984 alone, chiefly because of the inadequacy of farming incomes.

What steps does the Commission propose to take to ensure that Greek farmers have adequate incomes and continue to farm their land, particularly at the present time when the steep rise in unemployment has made it impossible for them to find jobs in other sectors of production?

*Answer*

Firstly, it should be pointed out that according to the official data forwarded to the Commission by the Greek government authorities, the income of Greek farmers, measured by the net value added to the cost of inputs by man-work unit, rose by 15.6% in real terms between 1980 and 1984. This increase is considerably greater not only than the Community average for the same period (+ 10%) but also than that recorded in Greece during the four years preceding its accession to the Community (+ 12.3% between 1976 and 1980). In the light of this, it may be stated that Greek agriculture has unquestionably benefited from the Common Agricultural Policy.

It is true that the farming population gets smaller every year, particularly as a result of the rationalization of farming: but this is a trend which can be observed both in Greece and in the rest of the Community. This is proved by the fact that between 1980 and 1984 the total farming population decreased by 7.4% in Greece and by 8.2% in the Community as a whole.

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 229 of 30 August 1980.

In addition to the general measures and provisions applied to Greece under the Common Agricultural Policy, many specific measures have been adopted in recent years to help Greece to integrate into the Community. Greece will also be the main beneficiary when the integrated Mediterranean programmes come into operation. All these measures have had or are intended to have positive effects both on farm incomes and on jobs in farming.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 106, by Mr Alavanos (H-159/85)*

Subject: Market unity and the Greek economy

Can the Commission say whether its programme for the unification of the market makes any provision for maintaining special measures exempting Greece from the rules governing the single market beyond 1992, or whether the special measures for Greece will lapse with the expiry of the time-limits for the regulatory tax on industry and value added tax, taking account of the serious negative effects which the development of the single market will have on the economy of Greece, which is at a much lower level than the average for the Community?

*Answer*

The Commission recognizes that integration into the Community has caused certain difficulties for Greece. However, we do not feel that the problems faced will be aggravated by completion of the internal market. The completion of the Internal Market will create new and better opportunities and these will outweigh any short-term difficulties that may arise.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 107, by Mr Ephremidis (H-162/85)*

Subject: Greece's dependence on imported oil

Greece's dependence on imported oil, expressed as a percentage, remains almost double that for the EEC. According to figures given to the UN's International Symposium on financing oil research and extraction in the developing countries by the Greek Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, the figure for Greece is 56%, whereas for the EEC it is 32%.

What special steps has the Commission specifically taken or does it propose to take to promote the development of local energy sources in Greece as part of the Common Energy Policy?

*Answer*

As the honourable Member rightly points out, Greece's dependence on oil imports for almost 60% of its gross energy consumption is far higher than the Community average (currently about one-third of that figure), even if the figure for Italy is actually higher.

The economically satisfactory exploitation of national energy resources is a permanent feature of each Member State's energy policy. It is also one of the keystones of Community energy policy. The Commission restated this in its latest communication of 28 May entitled *New Community Energy Objectives* (COM(85) 245, see paragraph 36 and the section on sectoral objectives), particularly in its resolve to keep the Community's net oil imports below one-third of overall energy consumption in 1995.

Greece, for its part, has made considerable progress in this field, since in 1973 its dependence on imported oil amounted to 89% of its gross energy consumption. According to the Greek authorities, the present level of dependence should continue to fall and could be around 56% by 1990 (see 'Review of the Member States' Energy Policies, COM(84) 88 of 29 February 1984, p. 103).

The credit for what has been achieved rests with the Greek authorities, and what has yet to be achieved is also their responsibility, but the Community is not standing idly by in this process, as the following facts demonstrate.

In 1983 Greece received for the development of energy projects 143 million ECU in loans (mostly EIB) and approximately 245 million ECU in subsidies (of which 235 million from the ERDF and 6 million for projects submitted under the Community support scheme for demonstration projects and technological developments in the hydrocarbons field.

It should also be pointed out that Greece is currently in receipt of funds under an ERDF non-quota programme for energy (20 million ECU for the period 1984/88) and of special Community aid for a regional energy study in the Cyclades islands.

Lastly, Greece might in future receive Community support for the development of its energy resources either under the IMPs (integrated Mediterranean programmes) or under the Community programmes carried out as part of the reform of the Regional Fund. Greece could also receive specific aid for its lignite resources if the Council adopts the Commission's proposal to assist industries producing solid fuels (COM(84) 469 of September 1984).

*Question No 108, by Mrs Crawley (H-168/85)*

Subject: Positive action for women

Following the recommendation by the employment and Social Affairs Ministers of 13 December 1984 requesting the Commission to 'promote and organize; in liaison with the Member States, the systematic exchange and assessment of information and experience on positive action for women within the Community', what exchange and assessment of information and experience on positive action within each Member State has been collated by the Commission?

*Answer*

1. The Commission considers it expedient to organize the exchange of information and experience envisaged in the Council's recommendation of 13 December 1984 on positive action for women in the context of its cooperation with the Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunities. As the representative body of the national organizations responsible for equal opportunities, this committee is particularly well equipped to deal with this matter.

The Commission has drawn up a questionnaire covering all the points set out in the recommendation which will be forwarded to the Committee in the near future. The Committee will keep the Commission informed of results through regular briefings starting in June 1986.

2. In addition, the Commission has available a considerable amount of data, some of which has been gathered from studies and research projects of relevance carried out at the Commission's request, which it will circulate to the Member States; the Commission will endeavour to keep this data as up-to-date as possible.

3. The Commission will evaluate the experience acquired through its programme to promote positive action in industry and will circulate it to the interested parties in an appropriate manner.

4. Finally, in drawing up its report on the progress made in implementing the recommendation (end of point 2), the Commission will ask the Member States directly what positive action they have taken in line with the recommendation.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 109, by Mrs Van Hemeldonck (H-169/85)*

Subject: Attitude of the Commissioner for External Relations and Trade to the Belgian VAT case

The Commission has instituted proceedings against Belgium for evading Article 33 of the Sixth VAT Directive by introducing a registration tax on cars. According to the *Financieel-Economische Tijd* of 27 April 1985, Mr De Clercq who, as the former Belgian Finance Minister was responsible for the measure in question, has informed the Commission's legal experts that he does not agree with the proceedings and will try to convince the other Members of the Commission of the validity of Belgium's position.

Does the President of the Commission consider that this attitude is consistent with the complete independence from national governments required of the Members of the Commission pursuant to Article 157(2) of the EEC Treaty, and is the Commission considering bringing the case of Mr De Clercq before the Court of Justice pursuant to Article 160 of the Treaty?

*Answer*

While having due regard for the obligations placed upon them by their duties, the Members of the Commission remain free to express their personal opinion completely independently and under their sole responsibility.

However, Commission decisions are taken collectively, and it goes without saying that all the Members of the Commission are bound by them.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 112, by Mr Iversen (H-184/85)*

Subject: The Community, Sweden and lead-free petrol

Bulletin No 1/1985 states that on 29 January 1985 the Commission and Sweden met in Brussels to discuss various important subjects such as exhaust gases from motor vehicles — in the light of the work being done at Community level — and lead-free petrol.

Can the Commission elaborate on those discussions and state what impact the Swedish Government's plan to introduce American rules on the subject as from 1989 will have on the environment compared with the agreement reached by 9 of the Community's Member States in the Council of Ministers?

*Answer*

1. The meeting of the 29 January 1985, between Commission services and a Swedish delegation was the annual meeting held in the framework of the exchange of letters between the Commission and Sweden in the field of the environment protection.
2. The Swedish government's plan to introduce American rules on exhaust gases from motor vehicles, aims at reducing air pollution in Sweden. The Commission is not in a position to comment on the state of air quality in Sweden and the effect on it of any particular measures.
3. The agreement reached in the Council of Ministers in March 1985 does not provide a complete basis for any forecasts on the environment impact. Decisions on the new limit

values for emissions are needed before the measures envisaged for the Community can become operational. These European standards will be adapted by categories of vehicles so that the effect on the European environment will be equivalent to that produced by USA standards, taking into account differing patterns of use for each category. At the present stage, preparatory work with regard to these decisions is in hand. The matter is scheduled for the Environment Council of 25th June. However, the impact on the environment will remain very difficult to estimate in a precise way due to the number of variables involved and their regionally differing impact.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 113, by Mr Turner (H-185/85)*

Subject: EUREKA proposal by the Government of the French Republic

Will the Commission report to Parliament on the steps it is taking to follow-up the Eureka proposal by the Government of the French Republic?

*Answer*

The Commission has submitted a number of major proposals over the last three years in response to the challenge posed by advanced technology, a sector in which our industry is lagging behind its main competitors, the USA and Japan.

These proposals include Esprit, Brite and the biotechnology programme. The Council has recently granted authorization for the definition phase of RACE, an advanced programme in the telecommunications sector.

In preparation for the last European Council in Brussels, however, the Commission went even further and submitted a six-point programme of action to consolidate the Community's technology base. With these mutually complementary proposals, the Commission is working towards a comprehensive long-term industrial strategy for the Community in the advanced technology sector.

The Franco-German Eureka proposal, which provides for a number of major civilian projects, may be appraised in the light of the above.

The Commission discussed the matter in an exchange of views with the ministers responsible for research at their last meeting in Council on 5 June. All the Member States are agreed on the need for action to achieve significant qualitative consolidation of European R&D policy commensurate in scope and strategic significance with the projects envisaged by Eureka and by the Commission's rather more comprehensive plans.

The Commission is convinced of the need for a specific Community initiative. It will be putting its views to the European Council in Milan at the end of the month. It is the Commission's opinion that it is entirely possible, provided full use is made of the possibilities available under the EEC and Euratom Treaties, to set up in the Community the requisite institutional framework, sufficiently flexible and dynamic for projects of this magnitude and type. If fully exploited, Community law affords scope for varying degrees of participation depending on the project, for the mobilization of private, national and Community funds to finance these projects and for competent and expert project management. In addition, it would be possible for third countries to take part in certain projects.

If we succeed in managing the Community budget in compliance with the Commission's own guidelines on budgetary policy — which were endorsed by both the European Parliament and the European Council — a significant contribution towards financing these projects could be made by making funds available from the Community budget.

I need hardly repeat that advanced technology is a matter of the highest priority for the Commission. It will need the full support of the European Parliament to overcome the red

tape which has from time to time obstructed the progress of Community policy in the field of advanced technology.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 114, by Mrs Lehideux (H-186/85)*

Subject: French higher education policy

Is the Commission aware of the French Government's higher education policy and that that policy has just been sharply criticized by the Conseil d'Etat (French Council of State)? Does it consider that the two decrees which have been issued on the method of appointment of the Conseil Supérieur des Universités (universities' governing board), which is responsible for the recruitment and career of university teaching staff, are in accordance with the democratic rights laid down in the Treaty of Rome?

- The first decree established, on 24 August 1982, an interim governing board responsible for the career of university lecturers but composed of members drawn by lot and not of members elected by the profession;
- The second decree, of 13 April 1983, set up a new board appointed in a very dubious manner; junior lecturers, though not affected by the new body, nevertheless took part in the election of its members.

*Answer*

The problems raised by the Honourable Member of Parliament are entirely a matter for the competent French authorities.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 115, by Mr Christensen (H-191/85)*

Subject: Increase in Danish steel production quota

When does the Commission intend to submit a proposal to increase the Danish steel production quota by 100 000 tonnes as Denmark was given to understand at the Council of Ministers' meeting on 26 and 27 March 1985?

*Answer*

Following the Council meeting of 26 and 27 March 1985, the Commission examined the possibilities for granting the Danish steel concern additional quotas under Decision 234/84/ECSC. It is expected that a proposal for a decision will be put before the Commission soon.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 116 by Mr Le Chevallier (H-193/85)*

Subject: Repatriation grant fraud

How does the Commission propose to combat repatriation grant fraud and does it intend to encourage bilateral agreements between countries to resolve the problems involved?

*Answer*

I have nothing to add to the reply to Mr. Le Chevallier's written question No 1894/84 which was identical with the oral question now put. The reply was as follows:

'Since the question as posed relates to the policies pursued by individual Member States, the Commission has no competence to intervene in the manner suggested by the honourable Member. The Commission would, however, hope to examine the question of return migration, following the conclusions of the Council of Ministers of 22 June 1984 on a Community medium-term social action programme<sup>1</sup>. This examination would take place in the framework of consultation on migrant policies between Member States and the Commission outlined in the Commission's Communication to the Council of 1 March 1985 on Migration Policy<sup>2</sup>.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 117, by Mr Croux (H-198/85)*

Subject: Implementation of the European Parliament resolution on southern Africa

In its resolution on southern Africa of 9 February 1983<sup>3</sup> Parliament calls upon the Commission to make a detailed study of the methods by which the European Community could exert peaceful pressure upon the Government of South Africa by political or economic means and to report to Parliament on the results of the study.

It also requests that the study include an investigation of the effects of specific and limited sanctions against South Africa upon (a) South Africa, (b) neighbouring states in southern Africa and (c) the Member States of the European Community (paragraphs 16 and 17 of the resolution).

Could the Commission state whether it has complied with this request by Parliament and what the results of the study are.

*Answer*

The Commission took note of the resolution on southern Africa (PE 82.723) of 9 February 1983 calling on the Commission to study the methods by which the European Community could exert peaceful pressure on the government of South Africa and to study the probable effects of sanctions against South Africa.

Since then the Commission has on several occasions emphasized that it condemns the apartheid system in all its forms. It has called upon the South African government to end its policy of apartheid. To this end, the Commission has not excluded any measure which might make South Africa see reason.

The thorough examination of the problems involved in such measures has led the Commission to the conclusion that such measures would only be fully effective as part of a concerted international effort. The Commission notes that so far there is no sign of a consensus, either at Community or at international level.

Lastly, the Commission wishes to stress that any policy decision which might be taken in this connection comes under political cooperation between the Member States.

\*  
\* \*

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 175 of 4 July 1984.

<sup>2</sup> COM(85) 48 of 1 March 1985.

<sup>3</sup> OJ C 68 of 14 March 1983, p. 42.

*Question No 118, by Mrs Castle (H-207/85)*

Subject: Dairy quotas

Since many UK workers in agriculture process industries, such as the animal feeds industry and the milk processing and distribution sector, have found themselves redundant as a consequence of the quotas, will the Commission agree to set aside some funding to be used as a compensation for workers made redundant in this way, possibly by setting aside some of the funds used for compensating small dairy producers hit by the quotas?

*Answer*

The Commission is aware that the contraction in the dairy sector brought about by quotas has affected a large number of firms and their workforces who are dependent upon the dairy farmer. I cannot, however, accept the principle that Community financing should be made available for workers made redundant in the milk processing industry and other industries allied to the milk sector.

The reductions in milk deliveries and processing capacity required by the quota system are relatively small in relation to historic levels of output — milk deliveries are restricted to the levels attained two or three years previously, following a long period of continuous and rapid increase. For all Member States, the quotas are at least equivalent to milk delivery in 1981 + 1%, corresponding at Community level to 1983 - 5%. In this respect, the situation is quite different from other industries subject to production quotas such as steel where a whole manufacturing industry has been reduced to a fraction of its previous and traditional level of output with all the consequent problems of massive restructuring, including large-scale redundancies.

I have also to point out that the distribution of the 120 MECU to assist the incomes of small milk producers is subject to strict criteria and can only be used for this purpose which has been decided by the Council.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 119, by Mrs Dury (H-210/85)*

Subject: Improper prescription of antibiotics

According to a report by the Caisse nationale française de l'assurance maladie des travailleurs salariés (CNAMTS), one in four prescriptions issued by a pharmacy is for antibiotics. The report goes on to say, however, that most of them are 'preventive' prescriptions and, particularly when used in the treatment of viral and non-bacterial illnesses, are therefore issued improperly. Furthermore, local antibiotics, which are considered less effective in the treatment of certain infections and are liable to induce resistance in the body, are prescribed in 36% of cases.

Is the Commission aware of these improper prescribing practices, particularly with regard to antibiotics, and what measures does it intend to take to remedy the situation?

*Answer*

It is the responsibility of the individual doctor, subject to guidance and control by the national professional and regulatory authorities, whether to prescribe an antibiotic or not. The Commission has no power to intervene in this matter.

Under the terms of Council Directive 83/570/EEC which will enter into force on 1 November 1985, the drug regulatory agencies of the Member States will be required to establish an approved summary of the characteristics of each new medicinal product, including details of therapeutic indications, counter-indications and undesirable effects. This will

provide the national authorities with an objective basis for assessing the accuracy of drug advertising and information disseminated to the medical profession.

In addition, the Commission has proposed a Council recommendation<sup>1</sup> to standardize the presentation of technical information concerning antibiotics and other antimicrobial drugs.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 120, by Mr Hughes (H-215/85)*

Subject: Transportation of live animals

What steps has the Commission taken to ensure stricter adherence to Directives 77/489 EEC and 81/389/EEC?

*Answer*

By virtue of the frequent letters that I receive and the questions tabled by honourable members I am certainly aware of the lively public interest concerning the protection of animals during international transport.

I understand that a recent BBC television programme in particular questioned whether the Community directives are being strictly adhered to. You may be also aware that the Commission has received a formal complaint from the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) in relation to the application of our rules.

I can assure you that the Commission is taking steps to investigate these complaints, and has requested observations from the United Kingdom and French Governments. We shall insist that the Member States fulfil their obligations to respect Community rules.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 121, by Mr Debatisse (H-220/85)*

Subject: Decision taken by the Council on the 85/86 agricultural prices

Does the Commission Member responsible for agricultural matters have the impression that the outcome of the Agricultural Council meeting held in Brussels on 13, 14 and 15 May might have been different if the Commission had thought fit to endorse Parliament's request for a 3.5% graduated increase in agricultural prices and a co-responsibility policy for cereals?

*Answer*

The Commission does not feel that accepting the European Parliament's proposal for a 3.5% graduated increase in agricultural prices and a co-responsibility policy would have made it any easier for the Council to adopt the price proposals. This is proved by the fact that, leaving aside the cereals and grape sectors, for which price fixing was temporarily postponed owing to the opposition of one Member State, most of the other Commission proposals were largely accepted by the Council.

\*  
\* \*

<sup>1</sup> 84/C 293/04, OJ C 293 of 5 November 1984, p. 23.

*Question No 123, by Mr O'Donnell (H-225/85)*

Subject: Integrated Development Programme for the Gaeltacht (Irish language speaking areas)

In view of the linguistic and cultural significance of the Gaeltacht and taking into account the economic and social disadvantages of its remote and peripheral location as well as its physical and other features, would the Commission be prepared to cooperate with Udaras na Gaeltachta — (the Development Authority for the Gaeltacht) in formulating and implementing an integrated development programme for the Gaeltacht?

*Answer*

The Commission is happy to discuss any development proposals for the Gaeltacht area with the Irish authorities, including the Development Authority for the Gaeltacht (Udaras na Gaeltachta) and to co-operate with these authorities in the formulation and implementation of such proposals. Clearly, in examining the possibility of integrated approach to development of the Gaeltacht regions, special consideration would have to be given to their disparate geographical nature.

Recent informal discussion between Commission officials and Udaras na Gaeltachta have pointed to the possibilities of formulating a development initiative based on the indigenous potential of the areas concerned which would be grant aided by the European Regional Development Fund.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 124, by Mr Clinton (H-227/85)*

Subject: Delay in fixing farm prices

In view of the further experience of failure to reach agreement on the fixing of prices for certain agricultural products before the start of the marketing year, what action does the Commission now propose to take to ensure that this will not happen in future?

*Answer*

The only truly effective action that the Commission can take vis-à-vis the Council to prevent decisions from being blocked in the future, not only in connection with the annual fixing of farm prices, is in every case to pursue with determination its efforts to re-establish the decision-making procedures laid down in the Treaties.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 125, by Mr Cot (H-228/85)*

Subject: Free movement of livestock

The Italian Government is currently subjecting French livestock to veterinary tests for tuberculosis and brucellosis, which means that it may not be possible to send them to Italian mountain pastures early enough. Moreover, Italian farmers have also been left in uncertainty and cannot sign leases for French mountain pastures. These difficulties are jeopardizing a custom that is highly valued by the French and Italian border communities and also contravene the Franco-Italian convention on mountain pastures of 29 January 1951.

Can the Commission explain why the Italian Government is disregarding the Convention of 19 January 1951 and state what urgent measures it intends to take to ensure the free movement of Italian and French livestock?

*Answer*

The Commission was not aware of problems affecting the grazing of French livestock on Italian mountain pastures. It has therefore investigated the matter by approaching the Member States concerned.

As the Commission sees it, the epizootic situation in the region in question is as follows: for some months there has been an epidemic of foot-and-mouth disease in Italy; the Commission has adopted several preventive measures, in particular regarding the movement of livestock (cattle and pigs). The French authorities have also introduced protective measures, more particularly with regard to sheep.

The Commission will make its final assessment of the practical situation when it is in possession of all the facts. The Commission must confine itself for the moment to stating that, from the legal point of view, the requirements currently being enforced by the Italian authorities with regard to French cattle and pigs may not be more stringent than those provided for by Directive 64/432 of 26 June 1964 on animal health measures in intra-Community trade in cattle and pigs. As regards the Franco-Italian Convention of 29 January 1951, the Commission would point out that this is not a Community standard and that the Commission therefore has no power either to judge whether the Italian authorities are abiding by it or to demand its application; furthermore, it is currently examining whether Community law allows the application of agreements between Member States to settle specific border problems in areas such as animal health checks in intra-Community trade in cattle and pigs, which are governed by a Community directive.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 126, by Mr Prag (H-229/85)*

Subject: Cost of Community driving licence

A British citizen resident in France who recently applied for a Community driving licence found that, in addition to the charge of FF 185 he had to pay FF 240 for translation into French of the text of his British driving licence, and FF 39.60 for photos and stamps, making a total cost of FF 464.60.

Does the Commission not consider such a charge exorbitant, and contrary to the need to build a 'people's Europe' and what action does the Commission intend to take to keep the cost of Community driving licences within the same order of magnitude as that of national driving licences?

*Answer*

The fact that one Member State requires a translation of the original driving licence into the language of that State as part of the procedure for exchanging driving licences is not contrary to the provisions of Council Directive 80/1260/EEC of 4 December 1980 on the introduction of a Community driving licence. Article 6 of that Directive lays down that the Member States may apply the provisions of national law relating to the issue of a licence to this issue of a Community licence.

The requirements for exchanging driving licences currently in force in France lay down that the licence to be exchanged must be written in French or accompanied by a certified translation into French. They also lay down that among the documents accompanying the request must be two photographs of the applicant. In addition, the tax payable on the issue of a French driving licence must be paid at the time of issue.

The Commission does not intend to harmonize the national provisions in the aforementioned fields concerning the exchange of driving licences. A solution to the problem raised by the Honourable Member might be found if the mutual recognition by the Member States of driving licences issued by them were unrestricted. In that case, there would be no need for the holder of a driving licence to exchange it for another on transferring his place of residence from one Member State to another. That is the way in which the Commission would like to proceed. It will submit a proposal along those lines before the end of this year. Furthermore, in conjunction with a group of government experts, it is drawing up proposals for the harmonization of vehicle categories and standards for the driving test to be taken by those applying for a driving licence. A second proposal relating to part of that programme should be submitted early in 1986.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 128, by Mr Romeo (H-243/85)*

Subject: Events in the Heysel stadium in Brussels

In view of the dreadful events caused at the Heysel stadium in Brussels on Wednesday, 29 May 1985 by Liverpool supporters, in which 39 spectators were killed and 200 injured, and bearing in mind that this was merely the latest in a long series of similar outbreaks of violence by British football supporters at international matches in other towns on the continent, does the Commission not think that the time has come for joint measures at European level to make a repetition of such tragic events impossible?

*Answer*

In common with the rest of Europe the Commission was shocked by the events of last month at Heysel Stadium. It has already expressed its sympathy to the bereaved families and the injured, and has announced its intention to make available the sum of 200 000 ECU for their assistance.

The issue raised by Mr Romeo is, in the first instance, one of public order and safety which is not strictly a matter of Community competence. Since, however, the problem of soccer violence and its causes is not confined to any one part of the Community the Commission could see considerable advantages to discussing this on a European level. The initiative for such a discussion would remain a matter for the Member States, though the Commission would be willing to contribute in any way it could. Due account would also have to be taken of the activities of the Council of Europe which has, as recently as 21 May 1985, raised the problem of safety in sports grounds.

## SITTING OF THURSDAY, 13 JUNE 1985

### Contents

- |    |   |     |     |  |     |
|----|---|-----|-----|--|-----|
| 1. | <i>Approval of the minutes:</i><br><i>Mr Patterson; Mr Marshall; Mr Ephremidis;</i><br><i>Mr McGowan . . . . .</i>  | 205 |     | <i>Courcy Ling; Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul; Mr van</i><br><i>Aerssen . . . . .</i>   | 235 |
| 2. | <i>EEC and Central and Latin America —</i><br><i>Reports (Doc. A 2-42/85) by Mrs Wieczo-</i><br><i>rek-Zeul, (Doc. A 2-45/85) by Mr van</i><br><i>Aerssen and (Doc. A 2-44/85) by Mr</i><br><i>McGowan:</i><br><i>Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul; Mr van Aerssen; Mr</i><br><i>McGowan; Mr Cheysson (Commission); Mr</i><br><i>Glinne; Mr Arndt; Mrs Veil; Mr Klepsch;</i><br><i>Mr Romeo; Mr Pannella; Mr Provan; Mr</i><br><i>Huchfield; Mr Tomlinson; Mrs Castle; Mr</i><br><i>Fich; Mr Tomlinson . . . . .</i>  | 206 | 8.  | <i>Integrated Mediterranean Programmes —</i><br><i>Report (Doc. A 2-49/85) by Mr De Pasquale:</i><br><i>Mr De Pasquale; Mr Thareau; Mr Sakellar-</i><br><i>iou; Mr Lambrias; Mr Hutton; Mr Alava-</i><br><i>nos; Mr Romeo; Mr Musso; Mrs Piermont;</i><br><i>Mr Almirante; Mr Avgerinos; Mr Ciancag-</i><br><i>lini; Mr Filinis; Mr Mattina; Mr Geronto-</i><br><i>poulos; Mr Saby; Mrs Boot; Mr Delors</i><br><i>(Commission) . . . . .</i>   | 239 |
| 3. | <i>Budget 1985 — Votes:</i><br><i>Mr Fich; Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr Saby;</i><br><i>Mr Fich; Mr von der Vring; Mr Fich; Mr</i><br><i>Curry; Mr Fich; Mr Pitt; Mr Fich; Mr Tom-</i><br><i>linson; Mr Arndt; Mr Tomlinson; Mr</i><br><i>Curry; Mr Pasty; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr</i><br><i>Ulburghs; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Pannella; Mr</i><br><i>Bonde; Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr Stevenson;</i><br><i>Mrs Lizin; Mrs Castle; Mr Lomas; Mrs</i><br><i>Dury; Mrs Ewing; Mr Hutton; Mr Roelants</i><br><i>du Vivier; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr Fich;</i><br><i>Mr Fracanzani (Council); Mr Christopher-</i><br><i>son (Commission); Mr Cot; Mr Arndt . . . . .</i> | 215 | 9.  | <i>Topical and urgent debate:</i><br><i>Tragic events at Heysel Stadium — Motions</i><br><i>for resolutions (Doc. B 2-408/85) by Mrs</i><br><i>Cassanmagnago Cerretti and others, (Doc.</i><br><i>B 2-409/85) by Mr Vandemeulebroucke and</i><br><i>Mr Kuijpers, (Doc. B 2-419/85) by Mr Moli-</i><br><i>nari and others, (Doc. B 2-455/85) by Mr</i><br><i>Brok and others, (Doc. B 2-461/85) by Mrs</i><br><i>Larive-Groenendaal and others, (Doc. B 2-</i><br><i>467/85) by Mr Newens and others, (Doc.</i><br><i>B 2-469/85) by Mr Tripodi and others, (Doc.</i><br><i>B 2-486/85) by Mr Arndt, (Doc. B 2-494/85)</i><br><i>by Sir Henry Plumb and Mr Prag, (Doc.</i><br><i>B 2-498/85) by Mr de la Malène and others,</i><br><i>and (Doc. B 2-514/85) by Mr Papapietro and</i><br><i>others:</i><br><i>Mr Mattina; Mr Costanzo; Sir Henry</i><br><i>Plumb; Mr Papapietro; Mrs Larive-Gro-</i><br><i>enendaal; Mr Andrews; Mr Vandemeule-</i><br><i>broucke; Mr Almirante; Mr Van der Waal;</i><br><i>Mr Van Miert; Mr Howell; Mr Ducarme;</i><br><i>Mr Coste-Floret; Mr Staes; Mr Ulburghs;</i><br><i>Mr Stewart; Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken; Mr</i><br><i>McMillan-Scott; Mrs Dury; Mr Cheysson</i><br><i>(Commission); Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr</i><br><i>Tomlinson; Mrs Viehoff . . . . .</i> | 251 |
| 4. | <i>EEC and Central and Latin America</i><br><i>(contd):</i><br><i>Mrs Rabbethge; Mr Tuckman; Mr Iverson;</i><br><i>Mr Wolff . . . . .</i>   | 223 | 10. | <i>Votes:</i><br><i>Mr Adamou; Mr Seal; Mr Patterson; Mrs</i><br><i>Van Hemeldonck; Mr Bonaccini; Mr Seal;</i><br><i>Mr Cryer; Mr Huchfield; Mr Christiansen;</i><br><i>Mr Filinis; Mr Marshall; Mr Patterson; Mr</i><br><i>Bonde; Mr Herman; Mr Cheysson (Commis-</i><br><i>sion); Mr Herman; Mr Ducarme; Mrs Wiec-</i><br><i>zorek-Zeul; Mr Zarges; Mr Chanterie; Mr</i>   |     |
| 5. | <i>Agenda:</i><br><i>Mr Maher; Mr De Pasquale . . . . .</i>   | 226 |     |  |     |
| 6. | <i>Farm prices (Commission statement):</i><br><i>Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Arndt; Mr</i><br><i>Bocklet; Mr Provan; Mr Cervetti; Mr</i><br><i>Ducarme; Mr Musso; Mr Graefe zu Baring-</i><br><i>dorf; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Pannella; Mr</i><br><i>Woltjer; Mrs Castle; Mr Andriessen; Mr</i><br><i>Delors (Commission) . . . . .</i>   | 227 |     |  |     |
| 7. | <i>EEC and Central and Latin America</i><br><i>(contd):</i><br><i>Mr Guermeur; Mr Staes; Mr Antony; Mr</i><br><i>Ulburghs; Mrs Simons; Mr Mühlen; Mr de</i>   |     |     |  |     |

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Arndt; Mr Cornelissen; Mr Arndt; Mr De Pasquale; Mr von der Vring; Mr Herman; Mr De Pasquale; Mr Cheysson; Mrs Boot; Mr Pranchère; Mr Herman . . . . .</i> 259</p> <p>11. <i>Right to petition Parliament — European driving licence — European passport — Obstacles at intra-Community borders (Docs A 2-41/85, B 2-324/85, B 2-387/85, B 2-325/85 and B 2-323/85) (contd):</i></p> <p><i>Mr Schwalba-Hoth; Mr Stavrou; Mr Christensen; Mr Van der Waal; Mr Estgen; Mr Chanterie . . . . .</i> 264</p> | <p>12. <i>Hydrocarbons — Report (Doc. A 2-36/85) by Mr Seligman:</i><br/><i>Mr Seligman; Mr Adam; Mr Kilby; Mr Mosar (Commission); Mr Seligman . . . .</i> 267</p> <p>13. <i>RACE programme — Report (Doc. A 2-58/85) by Mr Turner:</i><br/><i>Mr Turner; Mrs Lizin; Mr Herman; Mr Seligman; Mr Cheysson (Commission) . .</i> 270</p> <p>14. <i>EDF — Fisheries — Reports (Doc. A 2-39/85) by Mr Price and (Doc. A 2-34/85) by Mr Battersby:</i><br/><i>Mr Price; Mr Battersby; Mr Natali (Commission); Mrs Boserup; Mr Ryan; Mr Price .</i> 274</p> |
|---|--|

IN THE CHAIR: MR ALBER

*Vice-President*

*(The sitting was opened at 9.30 a.m.)*

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — It is not so much an objection. It is on Item 16 in the Minutes which is the agenda for today. Yesterday evening the House, I think rather unwisely, voted not to continue voting on the reports by myself and Mr von Wogau. May I suggest, if there is any time left today after voting on the budget before our lunch break, that we then proceed to vote on the reports by myself and Mr von Wogau. Otherwise it will be only late this evening when we shall have many other votes. If there is time available may I suggest we do that?

**President.** — I am afraid I must disappoint you, Mr Patterson, because it has been decided to finish the Latin America debate and the debate on the De Pasquale report after the votes so that they can be voted on this evening. If we were to take other votes in the meantime — and in any case we cannot decide to do so — it might not be possible to vote on the reports I mentioned, and we might have to wait until Friday. I am sorry, but I am sure you understand my position.

**Mr Marshall (ED).** — Mr President, may I refer you to the Minutes of yesterday's sitting. On page 5 it says that the first October part-session of 1986 will start on 5 October and end on 10 October. 5 October is a Sunday and those of us who have lived for parts of our lives in Presbyterian Scotland would resent most strongly having to come to a parliamentary session on a Sunday even in Strasbourg, even in October.

**President.** — You are absolutely right. I assume that it is a misprint, since we have never begun on a Sunday. The matter will be checked, and I assume that it should be *sixth*.

**Mr Ephremidis (COM).** — (GR) Mr President, in the annex for roll-call votes my name is not included under the vote on the motion seeking to include the motion for a resolution on Cyprus in the list of subjects for the topical and urgent debate. Of course I voted for this motion since I was one of the co-signatories. The electronic voting system was probably not working properly, so I would ask for the list to be corrected to show that I voted for the motion

**President.** — The results of the vote will be checked and your justified objection will be followed up.

**Mr McGowan (S).** — Mr President, I wonder if you could clarify a point for me. Concerning the debate yesterday on Ethiopia and with respect to the request for an early vote, it is my recollection that the President announced that there was going to be a vote at 9.30 this morning. Is this the case or is it to be at 7.30 this evening?

**President.** — No, the vote on that item will be taken this evening after the topical and urgent debate. This morning we shall only be voting on the budget.

(Parliament approved the Minutes)<sup>1</sup>

## 2. EEC and Central and Latin America

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

- the report (Doc. A 2-42/85), drawn up by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the proposed cooperation agreement between the European Community and Central America;
- the report (Doc. A 2-45/85), drawn up by Mr van Aerssen on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on trade relations between the European Economic Community and Latin America;
- the report (Doc. A 2-44/85), drawn up by Mr McGowan on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on relations between the European Community and Latin America — development aspects.

**Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul (S), rapporteur.** — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report by the Committee on External Economic Relations on the planned cooperation agreement with Central America reflects the Committee's unanimous approval of the Commission's proposal.

This concerns cooperation with Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Honduras, Panama, Guatemala, El Salvador and perhaps also with the Central American Common Market as such. In our eyes, the Commission's proposal honours the commitment made at the San José Conference as well as satisfying our demands, voiced in 1982 on behalf of the European Parliament, for the establishment of this kind of cooperation agreement.

The aim of the agreement is the use of economic and political cooperation and development aid to reduce confrontation in the region, assist the development of peaceful solutions to the region's problems and to curtail external military and economic interference — i.e. by the United States. A further goal is the use of the European Community's limited resources to alleviate the economic and political dependency of the region. This is a new and very welcome type of agreement since it links economic cooperation with institutionalized political cooperation between, on the one hand, the EEC and its Member States and, on the other, the

Central-American governments — by means of annual conferences. This is a very welcome step towards the more coherent development of a concordant foreign policy for the European Communities.

Our report supports the Commission's proposal to the Council of Ministers for a negotiating brief. We urge the Council to approve this proposal — rapidly and as it stands and together with our additional demands — without delay. This would then open the way for negotiations with the Central American countries and allow the agreement to be concluded before the end of this year. We therefore ask the Council not to delay approval of the negotiating brief and request that the governments organize the format for this political dialogue.

Since the boycott of Nicaragua by the United States, the situation in Central America has been tenser than ever; if we are to block confrontation, we will very soon have to make our presence felt in the region with our cooperation initiative.

What are the individual demands of the Committee on External Economic Relations? We explicitly call for a doubling of the funding already given to Central America — i.e. from 40 to 80 million ECU annually over a five year period, in other words an additional 200 million ECU. We are rather surprised that the precise figure does not appear in the Commission's proposal and have made a point of stating it quite clearly in our report to remind the Council of the commitments it made in San José. We also want to see existing bilateral aid to countries of Central America maintained without reduction. I would remind members that Nicaragua received approximately a third of the 40 million ECU with the rest going to Costa Rica and Honduras. Guatemala, Haiti and El Salvador received no financial aid.

As we say in our motion for a resolution, where governments systematically violate human rights and democratic principles, we demand that aid should only be given to projects where the needy population benefits directly via non-governmental organizations. After all, the planned agreement concerns all governments in the region and must be allowed to bolster up what we regard as dictatorships.

We want to see further strengthening of financial resources as part of the cooperation agreement and the introduction of a system to stabilize export income that will also include the countries of Central America in order to allow long-term alleviation of their dependency on producing and exporting a small range of raw materials.

In our view, the primary causes of political conflict in Central America are to be found in the social structure. Their colonial past has left almost all of these countries with glaring social inequality and a traditional but unfair system of land ownership that cry

<sup>1</sup> Authorization to draw up reports — Referral to committee — Documents received: see Minutes.

### Wieczorek-Zeul

out for change. In Guatemala, 65% of the land is owned by 2% of the population while the huge majority have to be satisfied with 10%. As a result, the country people are reduced to poverty and a marginal existence.

In Central America, the shared interests of major land owners, exporters of agricultural products, United States multinationals such as United Fruit and the American Government have for decades brought about a situation in which any real reform was suppressed, with bloodshed if necessary. It is high time that this 'cartel' was smashed.

Unfortunately, the USA incorrectly views any revolutionary social changes in nearby countries as a threat to its security and there are very few United States Presidents capable of responding as calmly as Carter did to the fall of Somoza in Nicaragua.

Social conflicts in Central America are aggravated by the current economic situation and the effects of high interest rates and fluctuations in the world market prices for agricultural goods. As a result, the GNP per head of population in the region has fallen by around 20% since 1980. 41.8% of the population lives in extreme poverty. Infant mortality is approximately 60%. We would therefore stress that the situation will not be improved by artificially fanning conflicts between the countries in the region — for example, by building up Honduras into the major military base in the region. What is needed is support for the Contadora peace process and aid for regional cooperation. It is not the suppression but the promotion of reforms which will help the region. There is a need for agricultural reform, better development of country areas and improvements in education, training and health services. We must stress that the region will benefit not from military aid and a disproportionate build up of the military and police forces in the Central American countries, nor from foreign military advisers and armaments being sent in, but from economic, financial and development aid. Imposing boycotts and economic sanctions on Nicaragua is no way to help the region: the individual countries must instead be given the opportunity to make real use of their right to self-determination and to choose the manner of their own development.

Those are the basic precepts and demands we feel should shape the European Community's work under the cooperation agreement. We would also like the Community to examine the scope for economic cooperation with Cuba, for example as part of cooperation with the Latin American Economic System, since we believe that the European Community should not be absent from any part of the region.

On behalf of my Group, may I add that we will support the report on Latin America presented by Mr van Aerssen. We hope that both reports — on Central America and Latin America — will demonstrate to the

conference in Brasilia between the Latin American and European Parliaments the goodwill of the European Parliament with regard to cooperation between the two regions.

(Applause)

**Mr van Aerssen (PPE), rapporteur.** — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I will be brief, because the report on Latin America that I now present on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, which approved it unanimously is virtually a continuation of the approach adopted at the sixth European Community/Latin America Conference. The Committee has decided, as an exceptional measure, to present an interim report since we want to await the results of the impending conference in Brasilia and then present a much more complete document in the autumn. Moreover, the Committee on Development and Cooperation has decided to investigate the topic of international indebtedness, which particularly affects Latin America, and this will also be covered in our discussions.

To sum up the situation, I would like again to outline the strategy we have agreed, which is based on our assessment that an overall approach to the Latin American continent is impracticable and that the major structural and institutional differences are such that only a combined strategy can help in the future. In our view, the most important thing is to find, at long last, a way of coming to an arrangement with Latin America. It is with great regret that we see that some of the decisions of the sixth conference have still not been implemented. We therefore strongly urge that the Commission and the Council finally get moving on this matter.

In order to do this, the first essential would be the conclusion of a framework agreement between Latin America and the European Community, in other words between the *Sistema económico latinoamericano* and the European Community, in order to create a healthy, general platform for further progress.

Secondly, we must put more life into the regional agreements. Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul has spoken on Central America and I can add nothing to her comments. From my own point of view, however, I would like to point out that the start we have made with the Andean Pact is still not quite what we had in mind and that carefully directed work will be needed to strengthen this regional agreement which we see as having great potential importance.

Thirdly, the bilateral agreements with Mexico and Brazil must be strengthened. Similarly — and this is a challenge to the Commission — there should be concrete negotiations with the new democracy in Argentina to allow an agreement to be concluded between Argentina and the European Community.

**van Aerssen**

The fourth plank of this strategy is the conclusion by the European Community, which is very dependent on the importation of raw materials and energy, of a bilateral agreement with OLADE, the South American energy authority.

That is the general framework for our strategy. One need hardly stress here that Latin America and the European Community are absolutely ideal complementary partners. It is equally obvious that 1 January 1986, when Spain and Portugal join the European Community, will provide us with the ideal intermediaries to strengthen relations with the Latin America on a cultural as well as an economic level. It would, we think, be a particularly good idea to set up a Euro-Latin American bank to stimulate investment in Latin America and hence promote diversification of trade in the region. I need hardly stress that it would be a particularly good thing if the European Investment Bank would play a more active role in Latin America in the interests of trade and economic development.

To sum up, I would again like to stress that this is an interim report or assessment — or more precisely, a summary of our strategy as it was confirmed at the sixth conference in Brussels. We expect this interim report to be thoroughly discussed at the seventh conference in Brazil and we would be pleased if after this conference-colleagues, would join our Committee in discussions so that we can present a final document in the autumn. Furthermore, on behalf of my group, I would like to say that we, broadly speaking, support Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul's proposals and that the most important thing now is that this House should take this opportunity to extend the hand of intellectual and cultural friendship in view of the prospects open to the European Community as a natural partner for Latin America.

*(Applause)*

**Mr McGowan (S), rapporteur.** — Mr President, I wish to be very brief this morning. This is also an interim report. We see it as an important interim report in that we hope that the arrival of Spain and Portugal in the Community next year will provide development opportunities for Latin America. The purpose of the interim report is to give some very basic guidance to the delegation that is about to leave for Brazil in a few days time.

I would like also to stress that although I think many colleagues feel that the problems of Latin America are perhaps mainly political problems, this report is concerned with development issues and should be seen in those terms.

The Community as a whole gives very low priority to development when compared with areas like the common agricultural policy. But as far as Latin America is concerned, I think it has to be said that in develop-

ment terms Latin America does not exist. The small contribution we make in development terms has to be described as chicken feed. I think that our responsibility for the so-called North-South dialogue has not in any way been applied to Latin America. In the Committee on Development and Cooperation we all want to take advantage of the arrival of Spain and Portugal to do something more positive in this area.

I would like to stress that while we are reasonably active in development terms, or concerning our Lomé responsibilities with the ACP countries, it is very much the view of the Committee on Development and Cooperation that we would want Parliament to see our interest in Latin America not as an alternative or a shifting of emphasis or resources but additional to any contribution that we are making as far as the ACP countries are concerned and to our links with other parts of the world. We do not want a shift to Latin America; that must be additional.

The report makes reference to human rights, touches on environmental issues and stresses in particular the enormous problem of indebtedness. The strategy of the committee is that because we are dealing with the 17 mainland countries of Latin America, many different kinds of countries with different problems, we think it is correct to have a multi-strategy, to be flexible and creative in looking at development opportunities across that continent.

It is always important to stress the link between peace initiatives and development initiatives. We should remember that there are parts of Latin America, including Mexico, where there has been a great deal of interest in nuclear-free zones and peace building and serious concern about armaments, particularly nuclear armaments. I should like to remind Parliament as well that both Mexico and Argentina have joined up with other important countries in Africa, Asia and Europe in the Five Continents Initiative, an initiative that seeks to shift global resources away from building up nuclear arms and in the direction of development. I think we should bear this in mind.

As far as my own country is concerned, I myself — and I am sure many of my colleagues — regret that there is not at the moment a meaningful dialogue with Argentina about the future of the Falklands. With the exceptional opportunity that we have with the enlargement of the Community, we hope that that non-positive, non-constructive approach to Argentina, as well as the way that this Assembly has been used in the past to justify conflict with Argentina over the Falklands, will in no way inhibit the opportunities that we have in development terms.

I should like to thank members of the Committee on Development and Cooperation for their advice in preparing the report. It did have the full backing of the committee, and I hope, Mr President, that we are going to take full advantage of the opportunity

**McGowan**

afforded by enlargement to take development possibilities very seriously indeed in Latin America.

(Applause)

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (FR) Mr President, let me first thank the Committee on External Economic Relations and the Committee on Development and Cooperation for providing the Commission with its first opportunity since taking office to make a general statement on policy *vis-à-vis* Central and Latin America.

I would particularly like to thank the rapporteurs, whose work has been so thorough that it enables me — if you will permit, Mr President — to remind you of the principles on which our policy is based and show how they fit in with those governing our actions, throughout the world in defence of human rights, and which consequently illustrate our determination to support all work in the interests of peace, economic progress and growth.

Let us first look at Central America. Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul has provided an exceptionally good analysis and one to which I will constantly refer. Our determination to help the cause of peace must be made evident in Central America, where serious tension has arisen between neighbours, and where there is, unfortunately, presumed intervention by a superpower. As the rapporteur noted, this open and traditional intervention by their North American neighbour has resulted in a risk that disagreements between these countries may become part of the East-West conflict. As elsewhere, European policy in this region should try to prevent this happening. The explanatory note accompanying the motion for a resolution stresses the need to avoid the militarization of conflicts and any direct or indirect military interference. One need hardly say how much the Commission is in agreement with this view.

This will require, as in other places, the strengthening of regional cooperation. Let us encourage these countries to discuss their problems among themselves without any external intervention. This is the Contadora concept, i.e. the proposals for achieving stability in Central America that have been put forward by the four neighbouring countries. It is therefore quite understandable that the political approach of the Ten has been to demonstrate their interest and support — this being further highlighted by the imminent entry of Spain and Portugal. The unprecedented phenomenon of the San José de Costa Rica Conference on 29 September clearly showed our desire to help.

If you will allow me, I will cite one of its conclusions. All the countries involved, represented by their Ministers of Foreign Affairs, stated that the conference should mark the creation of a new structure that would allow a political and economic dialogue

between Europe and Central America. Together with the increasingly effective cooperation that would result from it, this dialogue should make it possible to buttress the work of the Central American countries themselves, with the support of the Contadora group, to halt violence and instability and promote justice, economic development and respect for both human rights and democratic liberties in this part of the world. The aim is precisely defined and the method clearly described. We are quite happy to be guided by this resolution.

As far as the countries themselves are concerned, I note that the work of the Contadora group is progressing by fits and starts — the Panama meeting in April was a success but external pressures too frequently make themselves felt. Moreover, the rapporteur expressed concern, which we share, about decisions to impose an economic boycott. These decisions are surprising in view of the general desire around the world for economic liberalization but *they are certain* to throw the country, which has been described as a threat, right into the clutches of the one state *able* to help it or to enable that state to tighten any hold it already has.

The Commission's recommendation made on 22 May concerns a political dialogue to be carried out within a cooperation agreement. While this is indeed not within the direct competence of the Community, the political aspect would be negotiated under the usual conditions in the context of political cooperation. I see that a further meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs is planned for November in Luxembourg.

In Central America, our desire to aid economic progress is particularly important because — as the rapporteur has so rightly pointed out — tensions between different groups within one state or between neighbouring states in that area very often stem from sociological and political conditions created by decades of arrangements that are often unjust for a proportion of the people. These include large land holdings and an agricultural sector employing 50% of the population to produce just a few export products. One should bear in mind that 60% of Central America's exports to the Community are taken up by coffee and bananas. In the case of Nicaragua, coffee and raw cotton represent 84% of its exports. The rapporteur says this is a legacy from colonial days and I agree entirely.

Certain countries especially Honduras are very badly affected by poverty and the effects of civil war have been shattering. It is therefore essential that we contribute to systematic and structural action in this part of the world — in addition, of course, to humanitarian aid in emergencies. The current situation is that the EEC, over the years 1979 to 1984, placed 300 million ECU at the disposal of the Central American countries. In response to one of the rapporteurs who brought up the subject just now, I would point out that in certain countries — Nicaragua and Honduras

### Cheysson

— aid per head of population is equal to or higher than the level in the countries of the Lomé Convention.

Moreover, the Community accounts for 20% of the exports of these countries and 10% of their imports, which gives them a annual balance of trade surplus of 200 to 300 million ECU. This is an important factor in building up their economies.

Nevertheless, we are convinced that we can do better, and it is for this reason that our recommendation of 22 May lists our expectations from economic, commercial, financial and technical cooperation within the overall agreement that we have proposed. This aspect will be discussed, negotiated and then implemented according to the usual procedures, whereby the Commission will play the role assigned to it by the Treaty.

As regards trade, we could perhaps make some improvements to the way the system of generalized preferences is applied. The main priority is to diversify the exports of these two countries. As I pointed out just now, far too much emphasis is placed on certain export products. We must be able to achieve progress in the field of industrial cooperation particularly for the benefit of SMEs as has been very properly emphasized in the draft resolution. We have stated our intention to try to double financial aid, but without stating precise figures — in order not to add to our difficulties in persuading our governments to adopt our proposal for a negotiating brief very soon.

Finally, cooperation with third countries from this region must be based on joint financing or joint action by ourselves and the Central American countries in international organizations.

I now turn, Mr President, to the rest of Latin America: South America and Mexico. Again, our course of action reflects our guiding principles: the defence of human rights. This is of particular significance in Latin America. The European Parliament has on very many occasions expressed its concern for the respect of human rights in Latin America, and with good reason: many of the peoples in the area are very closely linked to us by their past cultural religions and civilization. Human rights violations are unacceptable wherever they may occur in the world. They appear even more unacceptable to us when they occur in countries so similar to ours.

We should also express our extreme satisfaction — and there aren't all that many fields in which satisfaction has been appropriate over these last few months — at the marvellous return to democracy in a large number of the countries in Latin America. There, as happened earlier in Southern Europe, we can see countries returning to democracy and a respect for human rights: Bolivia, Argentina, Brazil and Peru join Mexico, Columbia and Venezuela in waiting for this

step to be taken, as it surely will some day, by Chile and Paraguay!

However, the peoples of Latin America expect more from this return to democracy than simply a respect for human rights and an affirmation of the right to dignity. They also expect development since, in Latin America, the current crisis has taken the form of a constantly deepening recession.

What is Europe doing for Latin America? Yes, I did say Europe. We should first note that it is the largest source of aid for Central and South America — way ahead of the United States. The Community and its Member States account for 57% of official development aid given to this part of the world, whereas the United States contributes only 17%. It is a very significant market for their products with 25% of Latin American exports coming to the Community. Between 1980 and 1984, exports to the Community virtually doubled while imports fell slightly — and very considerably in the case of Mexico and Venezuela. We have thus given Latin America a trade surplus valued at 9 000 million ECU in 1984, of which half was accounted for by Brazil. Progress is being made in diversifying exports and at the present time, in the majority of countries, processed products represent almost 50% of exports.

The Community as such, however, has a less impressive track record. Between 1979 and 1983 our aid was limited to 410 million ECU of which 250 million were allocated to Central America. However, in addition to this aid there have been major industrial operations such as the 600 million ECU the ECSC loan to Brazil.

Our agreements are more or less convincing. Brazil has definitely made remarkable use of them, as shown by its trade results, and similarly there has been recent progress in Mexico, particularly in cooperation in the fields of energy and science. However, the agreement with the Andean group has not been ratified by two of the Latin American countries concerned. The agreement with Uruguay was suspended for a long period and the one with Argentina has quite simply disappeared.

Trade relations, although generally satisfactory as I have indicated, are, and we have to face up to the fact, difficult to improve at the present time. In certain individual cases progress may be achieved particularly, by diversifying exports where this has not yet been done sufficiently — for example in Argentina; by making better use of the generalized preference system almost ignored by the Argentinians and Mexicans — three seminars were recently held with the latter country; or by encouraging industrial cooperation, i.e. joint action between European and Latin American operators — a meeting on this topic was recently held at Guadalajara — and by developing technical cooperation and opening more training facilities. This was referred to in point 12 of the resolution put forward

### Cheysson

by Mr McGowan. I am also, Mr President, hopeful of intervention by the European Investment Bank, which would be particularly useful in this part of the world — especially if there were parallel provision of venture capital to encourage the development of small and medium-sized enterprises.

Even if we can only hope for limited progress in this field, I would, Mr President, say that by contrast we have a very important role to play in other contacts with the people of Latin America — particularly through political dialogue. These countries, the people living in these new democracies, need consideration. They need to be listened to and to know that Europeans take an interest in their problems and their own interpretation of the situation. Their need is all the greater because they often suffer what seems to be incomprehension — some would go so far as to say arrogance — on the part of their huge northern neighbour. Your interparliamentary meeting in Brazilia on 16 June will provide an excellent opportunity for dialogue of this kind. In a similar vein, there are the contacts with ambassadors at Brussels, our visits to these countries and the visits to Europe by heads of state and other VIPs. The most important element is possibly our contacts and cooperation with all of the countries in the Cartagena group.

I mentioned the economic crisis a few minutes ago and it is important, Mr President, that Parliament should realize the extent to which this affects Latin America, which is heavily dependent on its exports of raw materials. Mexico, Venezuela and Ecuador derive 40% of their income from petroleum exports while Chile relies on exports of copper, for 45% of its revenue. They are now indebted to the tune of 400 000 million dollars — the figure quoted in the report is unfortunately a slight underestimate — and the interest rates are extremely high.

Allow me to quote a number of particularly shocking statistics. In 1984, Latin America's debt repayments amounted to an estimated 37 000 million dollars. This represents 50% of Brazil's export earnings. One should point out that capital is in fact being transferred in the wrong direction. We, the industrialized countries, are now in fact being financially supported by those countries. It has been estimated that the countries of Latin America paid 26 000 million dollars to the industrialized countries in 1984 in addition to what the latter countries received in the form of new loan finance: a net transfer of 26 000 million dollars. All the savings made in these countries, including the remarkable progress made in expanding exports and reducing imports, can do no more than pay the interest on the debt.

Is it likely that things can keep going like this for long? It is true that Latin American leaders have faced up to their responsibilities: as the Cartagena group, they declared at their first meeting in April 1984 — and on

many occasions since — that they would honour the agreements signed and fulfil their obligations.

They have requested joint examination of the problems facing them in what they call 'the political dialogue'. While this definitely includes the adjustment policies required to balance the rescheduling of their debt, it also involves — as they are quite right to point out — the possibility of providing more extensive financing to allow development to pick up again. Would postponing debt repayments make any sense if there were to be no improvement in the financial situation in the meantime? Thus the World Bank and regional banks must be mobilized by increasing their resources, by setting up this multilateral investment guarantee agency, by controlling interest rates and, where these are not under control, by measures to avoid the systematic discouragement of investment because of excessive interest rates. Monetary controls will be required: an increase of only one decimal point in the interest rates is the equivalent of an additional annual bill of 2 500 million dollars. The final element comprises GATT negotiations to make industrialized markets more freely accessible to their exports. What they are saying to us is that this must be a comprehensive package. It is impossible simply to make adjustments and leave the rest to merciless market forces.

The matter is urgent, Mr President, because it is a very delicate situation. Argentina's balance of payments is out of control, Are we going to allow the country to slip back into ways which could lead to a new period of totalitarianism? That would be too dangerous. May I point out that the ratio of debt to new loans is currently three to one in Argentina — its debts amount to three times as much as it could hope to receive in 1984. And it looks as though this ratio will be six to one in 1988: it will have to pay six times as much as it can hope to receive in financing. I could give figures that are just as frightening — and this is not too strong a word — for Brazil and Mexico.

The situation is delicate and dangerous. Again, I would like to cite a number of striking statistics. Debts owed by Latin America to nine major North American banks represent two and a half times their registered capital. Mexico alone owes these nine banks the equivalent of 50% of their registered capital. 50% is also owed by Brazil, 22% by Venezuela and 17% by Argentina. If any two of these countries default on their payments, these banks will be bankrupted and the international banking system, which affects all of us, is likely to be very seriously disrupted — to put it mildly. We are directly concerned by the problem of indebtedness in Latin America, not only because the political regime is at stake but because the current economic order — highly irregular and unstable as it is — depends on our ability to supply them with new potential for growth and development by taking measures identical to those we ourselves need, and which I mentioned just now, i. e. mobilizing international financial institutions, bringing interest rates under control,

**Cheysson**

attempting to establish some kind of monetary order and liberalization of trade.

Mr President, even though I have not attempted to cover the whole field, I have already been speaking for too long. Nevertheless I should have mentioned the IRELA, the Institute for Relations with Latin America, which is referred to in one of the paragraphs of Mr McGowan's motion and is a topic on which the Commission is delighted to see the considerable degree of interest shown by the European Parliament. I should also have mentioned the Latin American economic system, the SELA, with which we have very good links. We have, however, not been able to sign a formal agreement with this organization because the Community has not signed cooperation agreements with international organizations anywhere in the world. I should also have discussed the difficult problems associated with the absence of a cooperation agreement with the Dominican Republic and Haiti, and our relations with Cuba.

I have kept to fundamental issues affecting democracy, peace, development and growth as well as relations with the United States since I wanted, by examining these issues, to show that the interests of Latin America are closely associated with our own and that joint action between us is both possible and necessary. There should be joint action by the Ten or, even better, by the Twelve. This would give us an opportunity to show the value of a united Europe. If we look at the conference held in San José de Costa Rica, we have an example, in connection with one particular problem, of what is expected of us.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Glinne (S).** — *(FR)* Mr President, the Monroe Doctrine, which regards the slightest active involvement by Europe in Latin America with the greatest of suspicion, no longer applies and cannot be allowed to apply. The meeting of Foreign Ministers, held on 28 and 29 September 1984 in San José de Costa Rica and featuring the European Community, its Member States, Portugal and Spain together with the states of Central America and those of the Contadora group, clearly demonstrated this — in spite of the bad temper demonstrated by Mr Schulz, the American Secretary of State, in his famous letter to the participants.

It is now essential that the sequel to San José, in the Luxembourgish capital, be a success in terms of the same two objectives decided on at the end of last September — and in order to remind Members of these I will quote what Mr O'Keefe, the then President in Office of the Council, said when he addressed this House on 9 October 1984.

At a political level, and at a time that Central America is threatened by military escalation, we must continue the attempts to achieve détente launched in September

1983 as part of the Contadora process. In Mr O'Keefe's words:

the Ministers call on the States concerned to continue to make every effort to bring the Contadora process rapidly to final fruition through the signature of a comprehensive agreement which would bring peace to the region. They are agreed on the necessity for a practical commitment to the implementation of any such agreement by all the States in the region and all other countries which have interests there and on the necessity for the verification and control of that implementation.

Now that the draft document has been revised, Mr President, we must now tackle, and be determined to solve, the problem of verifying the demilitarization clauses concerning military advisors and the importation to the region of foreign arms. In this context, I would like to point out that at a recent meeting with a small delegation of European Parliamentarians, the Nicaraguan Deputy Foreign Minister noted that his government was prepared to accept the appointment of a monitoring authority made up of two Latin-Americans, two Europeans and a Secretary-General to be appointed unanimously by these four people.

This kind of authority would need a certain level of staffing, particularly customs officers and military observers, and it would be all the more fitting for Europe to make a contribution in this way since the constitution or basic law of a number of the countries involved in the Contadora group — Mexico, for example — forbids the stationing of military personnel on foreign soil.

In the sphere of economic cooperation, and I again quote Mr O'Keefe's comments on San José:

It was agreed to examine the promotion of business contacts between the two regional groupings, cooperation between public and private national financing instruments in the two regions as well as scientific, technical and basic training especially in research fields. Ministers also recognized the importance of promoting and protecting European investments and stressed the need for an improved climate for investments.

On the question of aid, I should like to report to you, that a great many speakers from Europe attached importance to the possibility of increasing Community and bilateral aid to the region so as to give practical effect to the desire expressed by all to develop and strengthen cooperation. Finally, we know that the Community formally announced its intention to start discussions as soon as possible with a view to negotiating an inter-regional framework agreement. The joint communiqué stated:

'Both sides considered that the conclusion of an agreement of this kind would confirm the political will of both regions to extend and develop their

**Glinne**

relations and that it would also help to reinforce relations between the Community and Latin America as a whole.'

That brings us, Mr President, to the heart of the matter. In spite of the information given us just now by Mr Cheysson, we do not know what is in the recommendation put before the Council by the Commission on opening negotiations with Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and El Salvador — i.e. the signatory countries to the general Central American treaty on economic integration— and Panama, with a view to concluding a cooperation agreement. Nevertheless the press — and I am particularly referring to *Le Soir* of 19 Mai — has published a number of particularly interesting details. The following is a quote from the newspaper:

A significant Commission recommendation is the doubling, over a period of five years, of the financial aid provided by the EEC.

We have just heard confirmation of this;

In 1983, this aid amounted to just under 40 million ECU (approximately 35 million dollars at the existing exchange rate) of which a quarter was in the form of food aid.

Between 1979 and 1982, government development aid from the Ten represented 16.7 % of the aid received by the six countries concerned as against 34.3 % supplied by the United States.

If I have understood this correctly, the aim is therefore to reach the quantitative level of American aid, without discriminating between the beneficiary countries and therefore not participating in any boycott of Nicaragua, which would inevitably be politically counter-productive. The aim is to help stabilize the region in the full knowledge that economic and social imbalances have been much more responsible for political instability in Central America than the confrontation between the two superpowers.

It is from this point of view, Mr President, that the Socialist Group will approve the excellent report by Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, together with the accompanying resolution — particularly paragraph 7 of the latter. I would like to emphasize that paragraph 7 states that this Parliament attaches particular importance to cooperation between Central America and its neighbours Mexico and Venezuela, and that it advocates three — way cooperation on energy supplies. The reference in Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul's resolution to three — way cooperation between Europe, Central America and the countries of Mexico and Venezuela seems to me to be very apposite at a time when certain Central American countries are having particular difficulty in meeting their needs for petroleum products.

Mr President, we hope that the Council will approve as it stands the Commission's recommendation for the

opening of negotiations on the draft cooperation agreement between the Community and Central America.

There is no time to lose. Nor should reservations on the part of one or two European Member States, dilatoriness in the negotiations between the two parties or shilly-shallying and other obstacles to ratification procedures in national Parliaments be allowed to turn benevolent Europe into a loquacious and dawdling fireman, when every week the conflagration could spread through Central America.

Our Group also expects that the Ten — and soon the Twelve — meeting in political cooperation will see to it that the revised Contadora document not only provides for the monitoring and verification I mentioned just now but also, and especially, contains a political guarantee by the Community, and by most if not all of the Member States, that they will adhere to the planned additional protocol accompanying the document itself.

I will close, Mr President, by adding that our Group also approves the extremely interesting report presented by Mr van Aerssen.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — We shall now suspend the debate on Latin America, which will be continued immediately following the vote on the budget.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PLIMLIN

*President*

**Mr Arndt (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, I should like to raise a point of order. According to press reports yesterday evening and this morning, the Federal German Government has prevented the definitive fixing of farm prices by announcing that it would use its veto. I should be grateful if you would ask the Commission to make a statement to Parliament in advance, either today or tomorrow morning, since I consider it an extremely important matter — not only because of agricultural policy but also in view of the Milan Summit — that a government which has so far always supported Parliament's position should threaten to use its veto and in so doing has moved away from Parliament's position. So I should be grateful if you would ask the Commission to make a statement to Parliament on this matter.

**Mrs Veil (L).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I think that the Commission can choose two moments to make a statement: this morning straight away, if it can manage to

**Veil**

do so, or this afternoon during the topical and urgent debate. But it is absolutely essential that the Commission should make a statement and that it should be either the President of the Commission himself or Mr Andriessen who does so.

I think it is up to Parliament to decide whether it wants to have this statement this morning even before the vote on the budget or this afternoon during the first part of the topical and urgent debate.

I would also stress that an urgent motion for a resolution on farm prices and the veto was tabled, but since the subject is not new, this urgent motion could not be included in the topical and urgent debate, but I think that it is now time to replace on the agenda an urgent motion already dealing with farm prices. The Liberal and Democratic Group foresaw perfectly well that this might happen, and its motion for a resolution was not included.

**Mr Klepsch (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, my group has already informed you that in view of Parliament's timetable we would suggest having this Commission statement today at the beginning of the topical and urgent debate.

**President.** — We have contacted Mr Andriessen, who is prepared to make a statement to the House at the beginning of this afternoon's sitting at 3 pm.

I therefore propose that we place a statement by the Commission on the agenda at the beginning of this afternoon's sitting at 3 pm. The statement will be followed by a half-hour debate in accordance with the Rules of Procedure.

*(Parliament agreed to the proposal)*

**Mr Romeo (L).** — *(IT)* Mr President, Rule 88 of the Rules for Procedure stipulates that the sitting may be suspended or closed during a debate or a vote if Parliament so decides on a proposal from at least ten Members. I would inform you that ten Members have requested the suspension of the sitting for half an hour. This is because, in view of the seriousness of the reports which have arrived on the disagreement between the governments on farm prices, and while we are waiting for the President of the Commission, who is about to arrive in the Chamber, I think it would be right for Parliament to have the chance to discuss and adopt an approach to the budget vote, since a very large part of this budget, namely that concerning farm prices, has not been finalized, which means that ultimately we would not be voting on something precise.

On behalf of the ten Members, I ask you to postpone the vote for thirty minutes. I would point out that the Liberal and Democratic Group also tabled an urgent

motion to the same effect, but — as Mrs Veil has pointed out — it was not accepted.

**President.** — It would considerably upset our proceedings if we were to suspend the sitting. Our agenda is extremely full.

**Mr Pannella (NI).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I think that since there are a number of Members — not only ten but 20 or 25 from all the groups — who have shown by their signatures that they wish to think before voting on a budget which, in view of the events of the last few hours, is a handicapped budget, we must agree to the request by Mr Romeo, Mr Papapietro and Mr Formigoni.

**Mr Provan (ED).** — Mr President, whilst I sympathize very much with the motion that has been put before us by Mr Romeo and Mr Pannella, I believe that we have a responsibility *vis-à-vis* the other sectors of the budget as well to actually discharge our duty. I would suggest that the motion that you yourself have just put to the House, in changing the agenda to accommodate the difficulties which we now face over the farm price review by debating it at 3 o'clock this afternoon, is a very adequate response to the situation.

I would therefore urge the House to continue with the vote on the budget as on the agenda and to take the farm price decision this afternoon at 3 o'clock.

*(Parliament rejected Mr Romeo's request)*

**Mr Huckfield (S).** — Mr President, I rise on a point of order to address you about a matter which I think has to be addressed to you, namely, the carrying out of Rule 95 of the Rules of Procedure of this House.

I think you will be aware that it was last year on 13 September that the Socialist Group submitted to you as a group and with other signatories as well a request for the setting up of a committee of inquiry into the policing of the miners' dispute in the United Kingdom. I do not seek to raise with you this morning the subject matter of that committee of inquiry. I simply seek to raise with you, Mr President, the carrying out of the rules of procedure which ought to govern our conduct in this House.

Since the setting up of that inquiry under Rule 95 is supposed to be an automatic process, since it was 13 September last year that that resolution, which was adjudged to be in order, was submitted to you and since with respect, Mr President, you have been telling me and others for the past four part-sessions that it was going to be considered at the next Bureau meeting, can you tell me what you now intend to do to see that the rules governing the conduct of this House are carried out?

**President.** — As you know, I considered that this request for setting up a committee of inquiry was admissible. Difficulties arose over the membership of this committee. The Bureau will be dealing with the matter again on 25 June.

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — Mr President, I raise a point of order under Rule 53 concerning the tabling of amendments. I and a number of my colleagues on behalf of British Labour Members tabled a single amendment to the budget resolution of Mr Fich. It has been rejected by the Table Office in the form in which it was tabled and has been replaced by something of the order of 30 amendments, which in total represents the single amendment that I produced.

In the interest of clarity and transparency in this House, something that we will hear a great deal about during the course of the budget debate, it would be much simpler if we could have a single motion which gives this House a simple opportunity to vote for rejection of the budget, a course which I argued during the debate on Tuesday.

Can you give me your advice, Mr President, why when it says in Rule 53:

Any Member may table amendments

and it goes on to say how they shall be tabled, and then in Rule 53(2):

An amendment may seek to change the whole or part of a text

my amendment sought to change the whole of the text. It was in accordance with Rule 53(2) — why should I have to advise my colleagues that they have to vote some 30 times when my text was tabled in a single form to replace all the articles in Mr Fich's motion, to replace all the paragraphs and have a simple, clear vote on rejection of the 1985 budget?

**President.** — Mr Tomlinson, this amendment is inadmissible under Rule 54(1):

No amendment shall be admissible if . . . it is tantamount to a motion for rejection of the text to which it relates.

Thus an amendment seeking to replace the entire text being voted on obviously amounts to a proposal to reject the text.

**Mrs Castle (S).** — Mr President, do you not recall the Plumb report of 1981, when I tabled an exactly similar motion on behalf of the Socialist Group to replace the whole text? That motion was not only admitted, it was debated and voted on in this House. Why has the interpretation of that Rule been changed?

**Mr Fich (S), rapporteur.** — (DA) Mr President, I had not intended to intervene in this procedural debate. I realize that it is somewhat unfortunate that we should actually vote 30 times on a single amendment. But if that is the procedure, that is the way it has to be.

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — Mr President, in rejecting what I was saying to you, you referred to Rule 54. Rule 54(1), as it reads in English, says quite clearly:

No amendment shall be admissible if it does not relate in any way to the text which it seeks to amend.

My amendment very clearly does relate to the text which it seeks to amend. Rule 54(1)(b) says:

if it is tantamount to a motion for rejection of the text to which it relates.

It is not *tantamount* to any such thing, it is quite clearly stating an alternative hypothesis. It is not a negation, it is an alternative hypothesis, it gives a number of alternative arguments, and although in its paragraph it reaches a different conclusion, I do not think your argument holds water if you are using Rule 54 as the basis for rejecting the text of my amendment and that of my colleagues. It would, as I say, when we have heard so much about transparency and simplicity, be much clearer if we could have a clear, direct vote for rejection of the budget. If we cannot do it in the form in which I have suggested, can you tell this House when and at which stage during the proceedings of our debate we will have the opportunity of voting against the budget as a whole?

**President.** — I have stated the reasons why we consider that this amendment is inadmissible. Having said this, and since there is disagreement, I shall immediately refer the matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure, but I would urge you, ladies and gentlemen, not to hold up our proceedings any longer.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

### 3. Budget 1985—votes

**President.** — The next item is the vote on:

— the amendments to sections II 'Annex', IV and V of the draft general budget of the European Communities for the 1985 financial year;

— the amendments to section III of the draft general budget of the European Communities for the 1985 financial year;

— the report (Doc. A 2-65/85), drawn up by Mr Fich on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the new draft general budget of the European Communities for

**President**

the 1985 financial year, as modified by the Council on 22 May 1985 (Doc. C 2-35/85).

Before opening the vote on the 1985 draft budget, I would draw attention to the content of Article 203 (10) of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, pursuant to which, and I quote:

Each institution shall exercise the powers conferred on it by this Article, with due regard for the provisions of the Treaty and for acts adopted in accordance therewith and in particular those relating to the Communities' own resources and to the balance between revenue and expenditure.

Parliament is therefore obliged to respect, at each stage in the budgetary procedure, the upper limit of available resources. Moreover, we must realize that voting on the amendments is Parliament's final opportunity to give expression to its wishes in the budgetary procedure. Consequently, the author of an amendment must be certain that expenditure can be kept within the limits of own resources if this amendment is adopted.

Unless Parliament is given an assurance, the vote cannot take place. Where necessary, such an assurance will have to be sought by the rapporteur.

I would therefore ask the rapporteur, Mr Fich, to take great pains to ensure that Parliament does not exceed its powers.

*Statement of revenue**Item 5201—Amendment No 113*

**Mr Fich (S), rapporteur.** — (DA) Mr President, I think I should say at this stage what the Committee on Budgets' position is on the proposed amendments, so that I do not need to speak several times on this point.

The first amendment we are to vote on, namely No 113, is the most important. Without this amendment we cannot put the other amendments to the vote, since it provides the 30 million increase in revenue. On behalf of the Committee on Budgets, I would therefore strongly recommend you to support it.

This 30 million plus the 3 million or so still remaining under the 1% ceiling comes to a total of around 33 million, which is the maximum amount at Parliament's disposal in this second reading. I have been asked to say how the Committee on Budgets thinks this 33 million should be used. In brief: the Committee on Budgets proposes that 26 million be used for long-term aid to developing countries, 2 million for aid to private agriculture in Poland, 1.9 million for information work at the Commission, 0.1 million for the youth

orchester, 2 million for administration and 0.35 million for the Latin America Institute. This more or less accounts for all the resources at our disposal.

In addition, it is recommended that the Regional Fund be increased by 20 million and the Social Fund by 30 million in commitment appropriations. I believe these remarks will suffice to explain the Committee on Budgets' position on the proposed amendments.

## SECTION III—COMMISSION

*Title IX**Article 951—Amendment No 15*

**Mr Christopher Jackson (ED).** — Mr President, this amendment on the cofinancing of grain purchases by NGOs was passed by Parliament and the Committee on Budgets at the first reading and rejected by the Council — it was approved by the Commission, however. We have now got to the stage in the budget procedure where no funds are in effect available to put this amendment as it stands into place. The only way of preserving the will of Parliament by later transferring funds to this is not to vote on 5 million ECU but to vote on a *pour mémoire*. This proposal has the support of the proposer of the amendment, and I would be grateful if Parliament could vote in that sense.

**Mr Saby (S).** — (FR) I am in favour of a *pour mémoire* entry since we have exceeded the amounts and cannot enter any new budget lines.

**Mr Fich (S), rapporteur.** — (DA) Mr President, the Committee on Budgets is quite clearly opposed to the 5 million amendment. However, it has not expressed an opinion on an amendment containing a *pour mémoire*. My personal view is that it would support a *pour mémoire* under this item.

**President.** — The proposal before us is therefore to replace the figures by *pour mémoire*. The rapporteur has told us that in his view the Committee on Budgets would be in favour of this.

I put the proposal to the House.

(Parliament agreed to the proposal)

*Article 991—Amendment No 20*

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — (DE) Mr President, Amendments Nos 20 and 60 are now inadmissible

**von der Vring**

since we are so close to the ceiling that it would be exceeded if we added these 5 million.

**Mr Fich (S), rapporteur.** — (DA) I should like to affirm what Mr von der Vring has just said. We cannot vote on the amendments proposed by Mr Battersby and Mr Alber since the funds are not available. The only alternative left is the proposal by the Committee on Budgets.

**Mr Curry (ED).** — Mr President, I was going to enquire of Mr Fich how much, according to his calculations, we actually have left in the kitty, and if this is the last amendment which involves money, perhaps we could have the possibility of an oral amendment to increase this amount to the amount we have left in the kitty.

**Mr Fich (S), rapporteur.**(DA) — Mr President, according to my calculations we now have 2.7 million at our disposal. However, I do not think we should exceed 2 million, since we ought to have a small margin in the event that our calculations are not quite accurate. I therefore oppose Mr Curry's proposal. I think we should keep to 2 million.

*After adoption of Amendment No 20*

**Mr Pitt (S).** — Mr President, could I ask you, on a point of order, to recognize the complication that this House — now that we have completed the monetary voting — gets itself into when we do not have a rule requiring the rapporteur to state each time how much money we have left.

In a single sentence, let me explain that we have just been told that there were 2.7 million ECU left and invited to vote on the only remaining expenditure amendment, which was to put 2 million for aid to private agriculture in Poland.

Whether we do it one way by taking each amendment on its merits and then deciding a figure at the end, or arrive at the position we just came to, there are those of us in this House who, knowing that there were 2.7 million left, would have preferred to go back to an earlier vote and increase the intergovernmental agreement by 2.7 million. You see the position we can get into by adopting a rapporteur's arithmetic which has no basis in your Rules of Procedure. I simply ask you to examine this point for future votes on the budget, because you have done it four times now and, in my view, your practice has no legal basis.

**President.** — We are looking into the matter, but I think that for the moment we cannot proceed otherwise.

*Motion for a resolution*

**Mr Fich (S), rapporteur.** — (DA) Mr President, to save time, I should like to say that I am opposed to all the amendments apart from three: firstly, Amendment No 31 tabled by Mr Curry, secondly, No 30 tabled by Mr Curry and lastly No 50 tabled by Mr von der Vring. These three amendments I would support, but not the rest.

*Preamble—12th indent—Amendment No 33*

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — On a point of order, Mr President, I am sorry to have to inflict a separate roll-call vote upon the House for each one of my amendments. It would have been much simpler if we could have had one amendment and one roll-call vote. However, the consequence of your ruling that we must split all these amendments is that my request for a roll-call vote has to be similarly split. Therefore we will have to have one on each separate amendment of mine in pursuit of your logic. I apologize for that and I am sorry for detaining the House, but that is the inevitable consequence of your ruling.

**President.** — It is a consequence of the provisions of the Rules of Procedure as they have always been applied.

**Mr Arndt (S).** — (DE) Mr President, you are right, but Mr Tomlinson is also right. Since there are bound to be no objections, I would propose that we deal with all 29 amendments by Mr Tomlinson — not the overall resolution — in a single roll-call vote. The result will be the same and it is practicable.

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — Mr President, that is exactly what I have been trying to persuade you to do. We could have saved the time taken on two points of order if you had accepted my view that I should have been allowed to table a single amendment to the Fich report. Now at long last we have come fully round to the persuasive logic of my original case, and I am happy to agree with you.

*Explanations of vote*

**Mr Curry (ED).** — I have spent today doing two sets of calculations. The first calculation is of how much money we have spent. The second is of the years rolling by, because today happens to be my birthday. Although I could not have wished to spend it in more charming company, I could have wished to spend it doing other things with the company.

**Curry**

My group regrets that the rapporteur's attempt to cut the intergovernmental agreement has succeeded. We feel that this is politically not very clever, however financially clever it might be. It will simply cause a lot of difficulty for what is petty cash.

On the issue of the 30 million, it was a difficult decision for my group. We have supported Parliament's position on this because we do believe in Parliament's revenue powers, we do believe that the Council must adopt this and we are in favour of the principle of interest being charged. At the same time, we attach great importance to an amendment tabled by Mr Price and myself which makes it clear that the use of this money is subordinate to the provision of a legal base. We do look to the Commission to confirm that it will abide by that interpretation.

I should like to thank my colleagues who have given me support and to express my appreciation of the great cooperation we have on my side of the House. We shall need it even more, because we are going through very difficult budgetary times and worse is still to come with new resources being rapidly exhausted already. I hope that the House will draw the conclusion not merely that my group fully supports the cause of this Parliament but that the British contingent on this side of the House is playing a full constructive and creative role towards that.

**Mr Pasty (RDE).** — (FR) The time has now come to take a vote and so end a long budgetary procedure. The 1985 budget, as shaped by both the Council's decisions and our votes this morning, has some positive points but also a large number of negative ones. On the positive side, our Group is pleased to note that the Council has taken notice of the Parliament's stand on the fundamental issue behind our rejection of the budget in late 1984 — the need for a budget covering the whole year.

Among the negative points, the first I would mention is the solution found at Fontainebleau, and unacceptable to this Parliament, to the irritating problem of the British budget rebate. Then there is the way that the powers of this House have been curbed by the Council's unilateral determination of the size of the inter-governmental advances and by the failure to completely cover the deficit brought forward from 1984. What our Group most strenuously deplores, however, is the political context within which the budget was drawn up. There is an ever widening gap between the Europe of words and the Europe of deeds.

On the one hand, heads of state and heads of government extoll the concept of the United Europe and talk of relaunching that move towards unity while, on the other, we can see a galloping resurgence of national egotism and a weakening in Community solidarity. On precisely the same day that the two new Member

States solemnly signed their Treaties of accession, the agriculture ministers presented us with the sad spectacle of the inability of governments to complete negotiations on agricultural prices that have been dragging on for a number of months.

It is therefore in this context, overshadowed by disenchantment, that we will now vote. Wishing to be realistic, but also without any enthusiasm, our Group will vote for the motion on the 1985 budget and so signal our approval of a budget which, in a different political context, could have been a good budget but which under present circumstances is unfortunately no more than the best available compromise between the many contradictions now tearing Europe apart.

**Mr d'Ormesson (DR).** — (FR) The Group of the European Right will vote for the 1985 budget. The Council has accepted the chapters which we regard as the most important such as the Common Agricultural Policy, food aid and new technologies.

Our group is, however, not happy about the level of aid provided to Polish farmers. The Commission on budgets has reduced the 5 million ECU that was initially allocated to 2 million ECU even though they were available elsewhere in the budget. We would like to see Parliament now reaffirm the initial figure of 5 million ECU.

Should we manage today to break the budgetary deadlock, the future of the Community demands that we show vigilance and political courage and that we do not yield, as this Parliament is too often wont to do, to demagogy.

The new tasks facing us are the need to find new resources and to choose appropriate policies.

At a time in which our attention, discussions and efforts are focused on financing our participation in the SDI and the Eureka project, we should remember the following statistics: from 1970 to 1985, the United States of America created 26 million new jobs. We abolished 9 million. Over the same period, the United States of America increased its production by 88% with our 85% increase being due to reducing employment. Any picking up of progress towards European unity will therefore require a reduction in the tax burden and the redistribution of wealth and the encouragement of both private enterprise and hard work.

**Mr Ulburghs (NI).** — (NL) I find it difficult to have to abstain on this budget. I find it particularly disappointing that, despite the lack of respect for human rights in Turkey, the Council is standing by the Financial Protocol with Turkey. I also regret the lack of a genuine food and development strategy for the Third World. Furthermore, I regret that the call for support we received from the non-governmental youth organi-

## Ulburghs

zations has largely fallen on deaf ears. Many thousands of young people devote themselves selflessly to social objectives and campaign for greater awareness of the weak in our society and of the Third World. The principle has been accepted, but with no resources to back it up.

Finally, I regret that, at a time of sacrifice and unemployment, Parliament's high salaries remain unchanged. For these reasons, I shall abstain.

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — I find it amazing that so many Members of this House who state that at best this is the best of a bad job as far as budget options are concerned, Members who regret that there is no proper dealing with the Turkish question as outlined by Mr Ulburghs, will not take their courage in their hand and vote against this budget. It is time when we are considering the future of Europe, when we are discussing questions of European Union, the needs of the citizens of Europe, that we consider what we want a European Union for and what the needs of the citizens of Europe are about.

In this budget we are still spending 73% of our Community resources on the interests of 12 million farmers. We have a budget based on Commission price proposals for agriculture which even at this point in time are being flouted by the Council of Ministers and are being obstructed by the Council of Ministers. Because we have not got the cereal cuts that the Commission is proposing, we have a financial basis in this budget which is falsified. We have, for the citizens of Europe, the high and continuing level of unemployment, the tackling of which has been made a major priority. Yet this budget does nothing adequate for the Regional and Social Funds. We have got in the world as a whole a major problem of distribution of resources. Yet the care and consideration in this budget for the needs and interests of the Third World is totally inadequate!

There is only one political response that the political and directly elected Parliament can give and that is to say to the other institutions of this Community: take this budget back, go away and do better because the citizens of Europe deserve better from you!

**Mr Panella (NI).** — (FR) The budget we have just approved is the outcome of negotiations between partners adopting well-known attitudes as far as we are concerned. A basic feature of it is a refusal to set own resources at a sufficiently high level. The 1.4% planned for 1986 is, of course, a very worrying feature of today's budget.

As our colleague has just said, the Council has demonstrated that its approach to Third World matters and the North-West-South debate is a desire to see a clear percentage fall in that part of our budget. It should be

recognized that Parliament as a whole, and its rapporteur Mr Fich, have done everything possible within the established framework. It is as a protest against this framework, and to stress that we have no confidence in this budget, that we are going to vote against it. I do, however, want to make it clear that, unlike other occasions, my comments today are specifically and consciously directed at the Council.

**Mr Bonde (ARC).** — (DA) Mr President, during the vote today I felt like a player in a game of monopoly. One starts by inventing and sharing out 30 million ECU, so that the money is now allocated to the various objectives. The question is then: can this monopoly money be used to buy anything outside this Chamber? Can one for example buy PR adverts in the newspapers, or houses or hotels for private farmers in Poland? This question I would like to see answered by the Commission and the Council today. What will they do now that we have an illegal budget? How can the Commission, for example, say which appropriations are within the amounts legally available under the intergovernmental agreement and which are not? I would like to have Mr Christophersen's answer as to whether he is able to differentiate between these two kinds of appropriations.

The People's Movement against Membership of the European Community is opposed to making legislation via the budget and inventing funds that do not exist. Parliament cannot create own resources; this can only be done by changing the intergovernmental agreement, and I think it is quite amazing that Parliament and the rapporteur have attempted to usurp the powers of ten, soon twelve, Parliaments. The Peoples Movement is on the side of law and order and will vote against the Fich report.

**Mr de Courcy Ling (ED).** — As the author of the original amendment in the Development Committee which has given birth to the amendment to Article 951 for co-financing of grain purchases by non-governmental organizations for famine relief in the urgent situation which we now face, I am very happy that my colleagues in Parliament join with me in voting for a *pour mémoire* line and I give notice to the House that at the earliest opportunity I shall be inviting the House to transfer a suitable sum of money from Article 958 in order that organizations like Oxfam in the United Kingdom can use up some of the surplus grain which will be produced from the European harvest during August and September for shipping to countries such as Ethiopia, Chad, Sudan and so on.

**Mr Stevenson (S).** — The first draft budget was rejected by this Assembly in December last year, the major reason being lack of funds to cover the full 12 months. We now see this covered by intergovernmental agreement to provide a further 2 billion ECU. All that amount is devoted to increased agricultural

**Stevenson**

expenditure. We have heard a lot of talk about the need to control such expenditure. The position reflected in this report shows that agriculture accounted for a larger percentage — 73% of the total budget — than before. This is no control and represents a major victory for the Community farm lobby.

At the same time, non-compulsory expenditure, such as the Social Fund, is being cut in some Member States. There never has been nor is there now any moral, social or economic justification for this. I further reject the argument that insists that more own resources are required to allow such progress to be made. A massive redistribution of existing resources is a vital prerequisite.

We shall be discussing shortly the budget for 1986 and the increase in own resources to 1.4% of the VAT ceiling. The failure to hold the farm price Commission proposals means that we are going to stagger into further crises. Really we should be facing supplementary estimates this year, in my opinion, and that will only be accommodated by further intergovernmental agreement, supplemented budget or carry-over of shortfall, as indeed happened this year. The historic significance of the complete failure of the Community to radically change direction and make jobs and social progress its priority is yet to be realized.

Therefore, I shall vote emphatically against this report.

**Mrs Lizin (S).** — (FR) Although of course our judgement must persuade us to vote for the budget — as I will do — I want to make a point of publicly criticizing the regrettable, and certainly too rigid, attitude which has led us to reject all youth-related amendments and particularly the credits to be allocated to non-governmental youth organizations.

The explanation of my vote on this topic will be done in writing.

In writing. I will be voting for this budget because I think the highest priority must now be accorded to completing the long budget process which is very often poorly understood by European electors.

One is then left with the often difficult job of making choices and selecting options. Here I would like to express my regret at the fate of the amendments proposed by the Committee on Youth and particularly of the amendment proposing support for non-governmental youth organizations. Christian Socialist hypocrisy, whereby they voted for the motion but failed to provide the necessary budgetary resources, was again evident but I hope this will not discourage the youth organizations following our deliberations.

**Mrs Castle (S).** — If this Parliament had any pride at all it would throw out the budget this morning,

because last night the German Minister for Agriculture, Mr Kiechle, cocked a snook at this Parliament and proved dramatically that we really ought not to be having any budget at all at the present time. At the last reading British Labour members argued that we should not attempt to introduce a budget until the farm price sum had been fixed. Otherwise, we lost all our control over it. We are always prating in this Parliament about the need to give us more powers. We had a power there to say: no farm price settlement, no budget, and we threw it away because we are only playing at control.

Now I do not challenge Mr Kiechle's right to exercise his veto. I challenge the policies that he is pursuing. We have the Federal Government of Germany telling us it wants stricter budgetary control. Oh, but that is not to apply to agriculture! If you are to have a rejection of the Commission proposals on the cereal price cuts and stricter budgetary control, that can only be at the expense of the Regional and Social Funds. It is to make a mockery of the control and powers of this Parliament. If this Parliament had any dignity it would send the budget back and say: no farm price settlement of which we approve, no budget at all!

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Lomas (S).** — I shall, of course, vote against this budget as I have every Common Market budget since I was elected. Once again we have been through the annual ritualistic muscle-flexing by all the Members, and today they will collapse like a house of cards and pass a budget which you all know has had no radical changes in it since the one you rejected. It will still spend 75% on the obscene agricultural policy that leads to high food prices, destruction of food, food surpluses sold at knock-down prices to countries which are not in the common market, but won't sell that surplus food cheaply to the pensioners, to the unemployed, to the low-paid workers in our own community.

This budget does absolutely nothing for the unemployed of Europe, it does absolutely nothing to increase the living standards of the workers of Europe. It is a farcical, ridiculous, absurd, irrelevant budget, particularly in view of the nature and seriousness of the deep economic crises which are facing every country in the Common Market. As Barbara Castle said, if you had any guts, you would throw this budget out today!

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mrs Dury (S), in writing.** — (FR) In my capacity as droughtswoman to the opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs, I cannot but feel satisfied that it proved possible to approve the 1985 budget.

**Dury**

Nevertheless, this budget does not seem to be an adequate reflection of the general commitment within the European Parliament to the fight against unemployment. Indeed the increases in the social sector, and particularly the social front, are insignificant both in relation to the expansion of the Community budget and in relation to inflation.

While quite aware that the Community's social budget cannot, in itself, resolve all the problems of unemployment, it is undeniable that it does spur on national policies at a time in which the effort to create jobs is too often confused with 'austerity measures', deregulation and flexibility . . .

Moreover, the European Parliament should have been able to vote for amendment 50 which aimed to provide aid for non-governmental youth organizations.

Youth is the future of Europe and a 'gesture' can sometimes impart a positive aspect to this self-evident fact.

**Mrs Ewing (RDE), in writing.** — I cannot vote for a budget which neglects two of the fundamentals of the Community — our youth and the need to inform our citizens about the Community.

The slashing of the information and youth and culture budget is all the graver as we are at present in the middle of International Youth Year.

**Mr Hutton (ED), in writing.** — You will know that a new regulation governing the European Regional Development Fund came into operation at the beginning of the year. It represents a major step in a European policy for the regions, and in the Regional Committee in this Parliament we are very anxious to see that this regulation operates effectively.

To do that it needs certain highly specialized staff, and although this Parliament is making it difficult to provide all the specialists who are needed we can go part of the way to help. We are concerned in the Regional Committee, that the increase in staff which Parliament has voted for is not quite as transparent as we would have liked. Members of the Committee are keen to see a recognition that the increase in staff from the rapporteur's original proposal came about as a direct result of the introduction of the Commission's requirements for Directorate-General XVI and the specialist needs which have arisen from the new ERDF regulation. As long as it is quite clear that twenty one members of the extra staff, including the A2 post, are earmarked for DG XVI, I shall vote for this resolution.

**Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC), in writing.** — (FR) Having approved the various articles of the Community budget on the second, in reality the fourth, reading and having provided itself with the

luxury of 740 000 ECUs worth of room to manoeuvre, Parliament is going to have to render its verdict on the entire budget structure. While I wouldn't go as far as to say it is about to collapse, it does seem full of cracks. Indeed, as I pointed out earlier on during the budget debate, we are faced with the contradictory desires of ten governments following policies that are different or even antagonistic. How will it be next year when the Spanish and Portuguese governments enter the fray? A solution has been found up to now — we have it before our eyes — known as the smallest common denominator. Courage and foresight are lacking and without them there is little hope of building the Europe of tomorrow.

In this whole affair, Parliament has the demoralising task of putting patches on the tattered structure. Here a bit, there a bit, with their salvage efforts finally failing to please anyone — the most obvious example being agriculture.

The ecologists in this Parliament, the representatives of the Green-Alternative Alliance, will be voting against this budget which adopts an industrial approach and so maintains agricultural imbalances, rejects new social policies — environment and consumer protection particularly — continues the nonsensical promotion of nuclear technology and shows far too little daring in its cooperation with southern countries. Even if we had still been wavering in our opposition to this budget, the last amendments to be rejected would have reinforced our opinion. For example, there was the rejection of the amendment by the Committee on Development which proposed using 20 million ECU not for the planned food aid in the form of milk powder but for action designed to achieve self-sufficiency in food. Then there was the rejection of the amendment calling for the commitment of 10 million ECU in indentures, and six and a half million in payments, to Community action for the protection of forests against fires and acid rain — compared to the 5 million ECU allocated to this item in 1984, we now have a rather squalid 'passing reference': that's all we are doing to help the forests and fight acid rain!. These are, however, but two examples and our overriding condemnation is of the complete immobility of a Community bogged down in its own contradictions and we will continue to condemn this by conducting our own constructive opposition.

**Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S), in writing.** — (NL) I shall vote for this budget, but with little enthusiasm. On the one hand, the share of agricultural expenditure remains inordinately high, which rules out any funds for a large-scale job creation programme. On the other hand, however, the Council has come some way to meeting Parliament's demands by, for example, expanding the Social and Regional Funds. Furthermore, the appropriations for women requested by Parliament have been approved.

**Van Hemeldonck**

I do, however, regret that the new Article 991 in Chapter 99 provides for Community aid of 2 million units of account, thus a good 90 million Belgian francs, for private agriculture in Poland.

I expressly voted *against* this budget line, which was proposed by the Christian Democrats at the behest of their 'Vatican connection'. Poland is a rich agricultural country and it is absurd to support rich agricultural countries outside the EEC, while poor developing countries have so many needs. Furthermore, we know that this aid is exclusively intended for land owned by the Catholic Church in Poland — not for the Polish peasants nor for the Polish workers.

Earlier, I charged that the 'Vatican connection' was diverting EEC funds to other ends, for example, BFRs 13 million from the European Regional Fund to finance the Pope's visit to Sprimont (Beauraing, Belgium). These practices are incompatible with the evangelical philosophy of the church of the poor, and are illegal.

**Mr Fich (S), rapporteur.** — (DA) Mr President, let me take this opportunity to give the figures we voted on this morning: we increased commitment appropriations by 94 million and payment appropriations by 33 million, while raising revenue by 30 million, leaving us 745 000 under the absolute ceiling.

I will not comment on the way we voted, apart from to say that one area has been considerably strengthened as a result, which pleases me personally. This is food aid and long-term aid for developing countries. As one of Parliament's priorities, it has been successfully maintained through both the first and second readings, so that this sector — Chapter 9 in our terminology — has come out of the budget procedure this year better than ever before.

I should like to take the opportunity to thank the spokesmen for the political groups for their cooperation, which went relatively smoothly — and I say this without wishing to embarrass the political group coordinators, for it is clear that if I say that it went smoothly some members of the political groups could think that their coordinators hadn't fought sufficiently for their standpoints. However, cooperation was indeed smooth and fruitful.

I should like to conclude by saying that the European Parliament should also be extremely grateful to the secretariat of the Committee on Budgets. I can assure you that this secretariat functions extremely well and has performed an incredibly good job during the no less than four readings required for this budget.

(Applause)

**Mr Fracanzani, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (IT) Mr President, at this stage in our work, I think I

should, on behalf of the Italian Presidency, thank you, the Chairman of the Committee on Budgets, Mr Cot, the rapporteur for the Committee on Budgets and the entire Parliament for your constructive and above all productive cooperation over the last few months on all sorts of problems including, in particular, the budget. This has resulted in substantial threefold improvements over the original draft. First of all, there have been increases in individual items for particular areas of policy — especially the most important, from the Regional and Social Funds in connection with the priority issue of employment, to food aid, as already mentioned by the rapporteur, Mr Fich. Secondly, the budget as a whole has been strengthened under this procedure so that it can now be regarded not merely as an accounting instrument but as a basic tool in the construction of Europe. Thirdly, our work together has seen a strengthening of the role of this Parliament — which is not merely a matter of economics, but also concerns policy making and institutional questions. This is very important for the Italian Presidency.

Obviously, we realise that these developments have taken place within the existing legal and financial framework and that we will have to move forward in the future, which will be possible by virtue of the decisions adopted and due to take effect from 1 January 1986.

I should like in particular, Mr President, to thank this Parliament for the amendment which has been made today to paragraph 5 of the resolution concerning the reinstatement of 30 million from interest. This is undoubtedly an improvement over the previous situation and I should like to stress this point, even if it is my duty, as representative of the Council, to point out that there is still no legal basis for this line.

Now, however, we must look ahead. We are all aware of the general difficulties facing us and of the new problems which have arisen and have been mentioned here today. On the one hand this should make us realise what a difficult road lies ahead but at the same time it should act as a further incentive to make serious efforts — in spite of these difficulties — to bring about European union.

Various meaningful and authoritative opinions have been expressed along these lines here today and I should like to assure you that the Italian Presidency intends not only to give it verbal support but undertakes to do everything in its power, during these final weeks of office and with an eye to the important deadlines to be met, to ensure that these ideas are translated into real action, not just because they reflect what are quite rightly Parliament's wishes, but in the interests of everyone — in the interests of an unambiguous Europe without reservations.

(Applause)

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Fracanzani, for your statement and particularly for the way in which you have cooperated with the European Parliament.

*(Applause)*

We are grateful to you and pay tribute to the Italian Presidency.

*(Loud applause)*

**Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission.** — *(DA)* Mr President, I have three comments to make on behalf of the Commission at the conclusion of this debate. My first concerns what has been achieved in concrete terms; after nearly six months without a budget, the budget authority has now completed its work with satisfactory results from Commission's point of view. I should like to express the Commission's gratitude.

My second comment concerns the votes today. I naturally took note of the fact that amendment No 30 tabled by Mr Curry was adopted by a very large majority. I can well understand the motive for this amendment, and I would like to say on behalf of the Commission that we shall comply with it by freezing the 30 m ECU for the budget as a whole — I repeat, the budget as a whole — until the Council has adopted a legal basis for acquiring this revenue.

The third thing I want to say is to thank the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Fracanzani, the rapporteur, Mr Fich, and the chairman of the Committee on Budgets, Mr Cot, for their excellent cooperation. The new Commission has found it somewhat difficult to deal with such a task at the same time as having to prepare a draft budget for the coming year. However, I think that our cooperation and the restrictions we have each placed upon ourselves have led to a satisfactory result today.

**Mr Cot (S), Chairman of the Committee on Budgets.** — *(FR)* Mr President, in saying a few words to close this debate, I would also like to thank Mr Christophersen, to extend my personal thanks to Mr Fracanzani and to thank Italy as well as the Italian Presidency. These were three contributions which stood out for their hard work, finally crowned with success, to have the 1985 budget adopted and for the appreciation shown by the Presidency for Parliament's positive role in adopting a correct budget, the same budget that has today cleared the way for the Milan summit and allowed us to concentrate on the future, to echo the words of the President of the Council.

I am particularly happy that a formula could be found to include the 30 million ECU thanks to the amended version of the resolution which today seems to enjoy general approval and I am delighted with this general

agreement which we have recorded. The structure should, of course, be completed by the necessary regulation as has often been demanded by the European Parliament and the Commission. I believe that we all agree on this point and I therefore say 'good luck' to the Italian Presidency in its efforts to finish off the work so far done during the few weeks still left to it.

*(Applause)*

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)*

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — Before continuing the proceedings, I should like to make a proposal on the organization of business for this afternoon and evening, following Parliament's decision to hear a statement by Mr Andriessen at 3 p.m. and to follow the statement by a half-hour debate.

Business could be organized as follows:

3 p.m.: Statement by the Commission on farm prices, followed by a 30-minute debate; then conclusion of the debate on Latin America — approximately 30 minutes;

4.30 p.m.: Debate on the intergrated Mediterranean programmes; then beginning of the topical and urgent debate;

7.30 to 9.30 p.m.: Votes on Latin America, IMPs and the other reports on which the debate is closed,

10.30 p.m. to 12 midnight: Continuation of the topical and urgent debate and continuation of the agenda.

Are there any objections?

**Mr Arndt (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, I must check that with my group. So I should be grateful if you would put the proposal to the vote at 3 p.m., since a few of us feel that we should get through the urgent items without an interruption. But please no final decision until 3 p.m.

*(Parliament agreed to the proposal)*

#### 4. EEC and Central and Latin America (contd)

**President.** — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on relations between the Community and Latin America.

**Mrs Rabethge (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are now discussing Latin America for the first time.

### Rabbethge

In 1982 and 1983 Parliament discussed the political and economic aspects of cooperation in sufficient detail, but unfortunately these questions always overshadowed matters relating to development policy.

Ladies and gentlemen, I always try to remain silent when you are speaking. It would be nice if those who are not interested in this subject left the chamber. I appreciate your cooperation.

*(Applause)*

My Christian-Democratic colleagues and I welcome the report by Mr McGowan and will of course be voting in favour of it. We shall be examining the motions for resolutions very carefully, especially those relating to the environment, after which we shall deliver our opinion. I would now like to express a few frank criticisms concerning the reports tabled by Mr Van Aerssen and Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul — not the McGowan report.

Forgive my saying so, Mr Van Aerssen and Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul, but I do not think that either of these reports has much new to offer. It is all very well to organize political dialogue, but what we need is new, practical ideas. However, what is new compared with 1982 and 1983 is our much broader understanding of Latin America's debt. So why are we holding this debate today? Would it not have made more sense to wait until after the big meeting of the Committee on Development and Cooperation in November, which will be discussing the debts mainly of Latin America, and until after the return of our delegations?

Our delegation to Latin America is setting off with old documents presented in a new way. Of course, it can convey the message that the two most important results which we hope will be achieved at San José are peaceful developments in internal and external affairs and help from the Contadora Group. The delegation can also say that most of us are of course against economic sanctions, but words must be backed up by deeds. Financing is also to be discussed, as well as human rights and democratic pluralism. Perhaps the delegation can also help Nicaragua's journalists' association which yesterday and the day before called upon the Managua Government to halt press censorship, which has existed since 1982.

How are things now on the distaff side? I also raise this question for the benefit of our ACP friends.

We must see to it that we retain our credibility with our opinions and our reports, even in that distant continent. As Mr McGowan has written, Latin America's agricultural structures, large industrial centres and overcrowded cities make it quite unique. Paragraph 10 makes particular reference to this point. We should take a flexible view of the matter and make allowances for these differences.

But the continent is young, highly intelligent and critical and will take us at our word. They are familiar with our old texts and speeches of 1982 and 1983. But what has the Community actually done since then? 108 million ECU are neither here nor there. Where are the new ideas and proposals and where, I repeat, are the practical measures? Should we appoint the Irela the new Latin American/European Institution in Madrid? What would our Latin American partners say in a debate in which the Mayor of Hamburg, Mr Dohnany is quoted as saying 'those who fail to recognize the limits of financial feasibility are unsuitable for politics'. Such a statement is justifiable in our part of the world, but is hardly a useful basis for discussions for our Latin American delegation and for our discussions with our Latin American partners.

How will our representatives and delegates reply to those who quote Francois Mauriac: 'It costs nothing to build castles in the air, but it is very expensive to destroy them'? Let us analyse our joint reports critically.

Despite these misgivings, which I raised intentionally from a deep conviction, I am preaped — I hope with the support of everyone here — for a rebirth of the Community's activities in Latin America, and would like in this connection to quote Jean Monnet: 'Those who do not want to take action because they are unsure that things will turn out as originally planned condemn themselves to immobility. We must remain steadfast in our work day by day. Our goals will then appear clearly before us'. The McGowan report was clearly written with such a goal in mind. The Committee on Development and Cooperation, my group and Parliament must constantly strive towards this.

Let me conclude with a saying, which our delegation could possibly take on its journey. Engraved in the conference building in Mexico are the words of Mexico's first democratically elected President, Benito Juarez, which we can take as a message for our partners and for ourselves: *El respeto al derecho del ajeno es la paz para todos* — Respect for the rights of others means peace for everyone.

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES

*Vice-President*

**Mr Tuckman (ED).** — Madam President, my group is very pleased to support the three resolutions; and can I also say that a great deal in what the Commissioner has said was highly acceptable. There is a great deal of knowledge, information and supportive opinion there and we are pleased about that. We are particularly pleased on a day when it looks, according to the news, as though the situation between the big

**Tuckman**

American USA and Nicaragua is getting worse. As I understand it, there are certain bits of information — right or wrong, I would not know — which do not seem to have reached us here in Europe and certainly not in the sort of papers I read. If I understand it rightly, it is that which has caused the American Congress to change its opinion just yesterday.

I am one of those who is on his way with the delegation to Latin America. It is, I think, my sixth trip out there since I joined this Parliament. I did not know that Continent before. I have begun to know it and to respect it, particularly that it is moving so strongly in the direction of democracy which, after all, is what we want. What I am worried about is whether this wave will then, like the ups and downs in the economic cycle, reverse itself later, and what can we do to prevent that? We are going to the Latin American countries at a time when their parents, Spain and Portugal, are already mentally part of our Community and will be legally so in a few months. So, yes, we extend that hand of friendship, but it has got to be real.

I, myself, am very interested in the new institute — the Irela Institute — and I am hoping that one can give it some real content to help to build the sort of bridges which they wish to have out there. In particular, I note that whenever I meet Latin Americans, they have that feeling that they are solely dependent on the USA and they want another partner. They look to Europe as that partner. In making that statement I am in no sense being anti-USA. I think that what they have done has been of enormous benefit to all the under-developed world. All the aid that flows is very largely American capital with us others also assisting. I think that should never be lost sight of. The power that exists in the USA, in my opinion, is being handled both tactfully and gently, certainly when compared with the other major world power and its relation to its subordinates.

I am far less — and here I make a personal statement, not a group statement — impressed with the idea of a new bank. What that Continent needs is money. I do think there are enough banks. I am surprised that it is still in these resolutions that we should have a new bank and I wonder how far the Commission goes along with that idea. I would have thought the time had come to say fairly openly and honestly that another bank is nonsense and that the EIB will do all that needs to be done where European banks are concerned.

I am very pleased to be able to single out one particular paragraph, namely, paragraph 14 in the Wiczorek-Zeul resolution, which stresses the role of small businesses. I do believe that it is helpful to be able to say to these that even across the ocean there are certain partnership arrangements which can be made and which can be helpful.

In talking about that Continent the key thing is to always remember the poverty, the lack of money, the

debts and, above all, the need to bring that very fast-rising population under control. I hope that they will be able to have a happy population without making it as enormous as it now looks to be.

**Mr Iversen (COM).** — (DA) Madam President, Parliament is holding a very important debate today on Europe's role *vis-à-vis* development in Central America in particular. At the moment, we find ourselves in a situation where the American threat to the entire region of Central America represents a danger to the current, necessary expansion of democracy in the area. In particular, the American military and economic sanctions against Nicaragua currently pose a threat to the democratization process started in this country after the fall of the US-supported Somoza regime. The only thing that the Americans can achieve with such an aggressive policy is to force Nicaragua into even closer links with the Soviet Union. In this connection, I am glad that in their answer to me during question time on 12 June 1985 the Community Foreign Ministers stated that the problems in Central America, including Nicaragua, cannot be resolved by force but only by political solutions emerging from the region itself. The latter point is especially important, and should be followed up by concrete political steps, since I interpret the statement by the Foreign Ministers as a total rejection of President Reagan's and the CIA's illicit military and trade intervention. Europe must therefore join other countries in all the international fora such as the UN to intensify its pressure against the American administration's conduct.

In view the present report on Central America by Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul as a commendable attempt to set out practical steps to ensure that the future development process in Central America is peaceful.

Furthermore, it is an extremely sensible idea to examine the possibilities for economic cooperation between the Community and Cuba. The considerable economic and monetary problems facing Central and Latin America require us to break with American imperialism's approach to trade and development.

I would like to conclude by expressing my extremely deep concern at the continuing American aggression against Nicaragua in particular, and by again stressing that the Community's rejection of the American trade blockade must be followed up by political action not just words.

**Mr Wolff (L).** — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, Parliament is now discussing economic relations between the Community and Latin America.

This debate is particularly important, coming as it does immediately after the signing of the Accession Treaty by Spain and Portugal and on the eve of the meeting between a delegation from this House and the Latin

**Wolff**

American parliament to be held next Saturday in Brasilia.

I shall confine myself, Madam President, to two broad observations.

Firstly, I feel we should understand and take seriously the practical, economic and political importance of the Community's enlargement to include Spain and Portugal and the effect which this will have on relations between the Community and Latin America. Although purely from the point of view of economics and trade, relations between Latin America and western Europe are of secondary importance compared with existing relations between Latin America and the United States, and although it would be unrealistic not to expect this situation to change substantially following enlargement, it is equally dangerous to underestimate the possibility that political relations between the Community and Latin America will develop in an interesting and even important way.

Spain and Portugal have maintained strong political and cultural links with their former colonies and can now more than ever provide a valuable channel of communication between Europe and Latin America. Spanish and Portuguese are important means of communication in that part of the world. Communication is essential since the Latin American countries are now trying to diversify their international trade relations. They are seeking thereby to avoid the danger of an East-West conflict, which is threatening to erupt violently in several parts of southern Latin America.

My second observation concerns the way in which the Community can effectively contribute towards stabilizing Latin America's democratic processes. We are aware of the foreign debts of several countries and of how difficult it is for the governments concerned to repay the loans and interest. The talks to reorganize the debt are therefore highly important politically. I think it is a mistake to assume, as certain Members here apparently do, that we can usefully help to strengthen the young Latin American democracies by postponing repayment. What Latin America basically needs is a plan for economic recovery whereby countries can keep their foreign debts within the limits imposed by the development of their own economies, as the same time abandoning their inflationary policies.

The Commission could play an important part in such a plan aimed at stabilization and economic recovery. The possibility of converting Latin America's debt to ECU has been mooted several times. This practical proposal could have a positive influence on the usefulness of the debt. We should aim to open up markets for our industries and promote trade between the Community and the Latin American countries, and not allow one powerful group to replace another. Such matters are not always settled democratically. Europe will grow in strength by acting to ensure that all ten-

sions of whatever kind are removed. This is an important task, but we must persevere. Reassuring statements from the Commission will not be enough.

For these reasons, Madam President, the Liberal and Democratic Group will be voting in favour of the three motions for resolutions before us.

**President.** — The debate will be continued after the statement by the Commission at 3 p.m. and the questions by the political groups.

*(The sitting was suspended at 1 p.m. and resumed at 3.05 p.m.)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*President*

### 5. Agenda

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, I already spoke to you this morning about the organization of business in view of your decision to hear Mr Andriessen, whom I welcome, at the beginning of this afternoon's sitting. After having looked into the question again, I propose the following definitive timetable:

3 p.m.: Statement by the Commission on farm prices, followed by a 30-minute debate;

conclusion of the debate on Latin America;

about 4.15 p.m.: debate on the integrated Mediterranean programmes;

topical and urgent debate;

until 9.30 p.m.: vote on Latin America, the integrated Mediterranean programmes and the reports on which the debate is closed;

10.30 p.m. to 12 midnight: continuation of the agenda.

Are there any objections?

**Mr Maher (L).** — On a point of order, Mr President. You have just announced that after Mr Andriessen's statement it will be possible to have a debate for half an hour. Mr President, we are discussing a very important question: the question of the German veto on the fixing of agricultural prices just in advance of the Milan Summit. Later this evening we shall be discussing problems arising far outside the European Community and affecting other countries — problems over which we have little control and little influence. I believe that only half an hour to discuss an important matter of this kind is not nearly enough, and I would

**Maher**

suggest that we look at a way of extending the time for this important debate. After all, we are talking really about the future of this Community and the possibility of greater union! If one country is going to hold up that union, I think it is something about which we must be very seriously concerned. I would suggest you look at the question of extending the time for the debate.

(*Applause*)

**Mr De Pasquale (COM).** — (*IT*) Mr President, I did not understand very well whether, on the basis of what you proposed, we shall definitely be able to vote on the integrated Mediterranean programmes this evening. I wish to point out that for the adoption of this provision a timetable has already been arranged: tomorrow the COREPER is due to meet to examine our decisions, and so these must be taken this evening, since on 18 and 19 June there will be a concertation meeting between Parliament and the Council and a meeting of the Council alone, which will have to make a final decision on the integrated Mediterranean programmes. If we do not keep to this timetable, it will disrupt everything. I should therefore like to draw your attention to the absolute necessity — irrespective of the debatable decisions taken by Parliament — for us to have a debate and a vote on the integrated Mediterranean programmes by this evening.

**President.** — That is exactly what I proposed, ladies and gentlemen. I would ask you to bear in mind that this afternoon's agenda is already extremely full, with the important debates and equally important votes. Owing to a new development, Parliament decided this morning to hear a statement by Mr Andriessen, who has been kind enough to join us, at the beginning of this afternoon's sitting. In my view, all we can do under the Rules of Procedure is to apply Rule 40, according to which a Commission statement should not, in principle, be followed by a debate; however, Members may ask questions for a total of 30 minutes. That is the rule which applies to our present situation. I would ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to accept this so that we can carry on our business as planned.

(*Applause*)

I therefore put my proposal on the organization of business to the vote.

(*Parliament agreed to the proposal*)

#### 6. Farm prices (Commission statement)

**President.** — The next item is the statement by the Commission on farm prices for the 1985/1986 marketing year.

**Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (*NL*) Mr President, I would like to begin by saying that the Commission very much regrets that the Council of Ministers was unable to fix the farm prices for the 1985-1986 marketing year yesterday. Following a vote, the President-in-Office of the Council had to announce formally the failure of the Council to reach agreement. The Commission finds this all the more regrettable since it had been established earlier — as noted by the President-in-Office — that a qualified majority of Council members could have approved the Commission's latest compromise proposal. It is finally extremely disappointing to note that in the final vote a majority on the Council abstained from voting when one country opposed a majority decision as provided for under the Treaty of Rome by invoking the so-called Luxembourg compromise. A majority on the Council has thus formally recognized a right of veto and moreover declared that it is up to the Member State concerned to judge whether a vital national interest is at stake or not. This is in stark contrast with the majority opinion in the Dooge report, which was submitted not long ago. . .

(*Applause*)

. . . not just by any European citizens, prominent or otherwise, but, *nota bene*, by personal representatives of the Heads of State and Government. Moreover, what has happened is in my view totally at odds with all the recent statements concerning the need to improve decision making. Such a setback on the day when the accession agreements with Spain and Portugal were signed does indeed give food for thought as regards the functioning of our institutions. . . .

(*Applause*)

. . . now that we have reached this stage of enlargement. I will not go any further into the institutional and political aspects of decision-making on farm prices. Perhaps there will be an opportunity in the debate to return to this topic in further detail.

I would like to confine myself now to the matter at hand and the immediate consequences of the fact that no decision has been taken to ensure operation of the common agricultural policy. I must say here that both the Commission and the majority of the Council demonstrated a considerable willingness to compromise and made substantial concessions to the German delegation.

The Commission had, after all, reduced its original proposal for price cuts of 3.6% for cereals and rape by half and — I should add — announced measures for payment instalments which reduced the effective cut in prices to less than 1%. What with one thing and another, our proposal was now reduced to merely a weak signal putting into practice only a fraction of the arrangements agreed earlier by Council and confirmed by the European Council in Stuttgart for cases where

**Andriessen**

guarantee thresholds were exceeded.

The *non possumus* of one delegation proved to be insurmountable in the final stage of negotiations. Even after I had stated in the Council that there was still some small leeway for a compromise, following a call on behalf of the German Delegation for a final attempt to reach a compromise. The President-in-Office therefore had no alternative but to invoke both the Treaty and the agriculture provisions and duly proceed to a vote.

I am firmly convinced that, as there was no way of finding a truly acceptable compromise, postponing a decision would have led to even greater uncertainty with no prospect of a final decision in time.

I believe it is better that the Council has been formally declared to have failed, which means that the Commission should now assume its responsibility to ensure the continued operation of the Common Agricultural Policy. . . . .

(Applause)

. . . . and to safeguard the financial interests of the Community. The Commission has the responsibility and duty to apply, for example, safeguards to prevent speculative sales to intervention agencies and disturbances in trade.

(Applause)

This means that the Commission will manage the markets prudently in the hope that the Council will in the end be able to settle farm prices. Accordingly, the Commission will inform interested parties soon of the conditions governing intervention operations, imports and exports and related matters.

The Commission will announce these conditions in good time, taking into account that the marketing season for rape, durum wheat and soft wheat already starts on 1 July in some regions of the Community. It will also take steps in time to prepare for the new marketing season for cereals from 1 August if the Council has not fixed prices by then. This means — this I would emphasize — that the continuity of agricultural policy is not at risk. However, it has become clear that the forthcoming marketing year faces a problem more fundamental than that of cereal prices, namely the link between prices policy and incomes policy, particularly in surplus sectors such as cereals at a time when our market and prices policy is subject to severe financial and commercial policy restraints. These aspects were indeed also discussed in depth by a great many Members of the House during its last debate on farm prices. I think that political clarity is served by bringing such differences of opinion into the open. A serious row is often better than disguising differences and allowing conflicts to continue which may prove to be disastrous for policy as a whole.

As far as cereals are concerned, the debate on the new perspectives for the Common Agricultural Policy has in fact already started even before publication of our 'option papers', which we have announced for the turn of the month. The subsequent debate on agricultural policy will take up a lot of time. I hope, however, that it too will provide some pointers to enable the Council at least to unblock the prices dossier for 85/86. In any event, after what has happened, the coming marketing year will be a year of transition. There is namely no doubt in my mind — and I stress this — that the European cereal arrangements require a further radical overhaul. This applies to the internal market, imports/exports and income support. As far as cereals are concerned, the Commission is prepared to accelerate the debate on perspectives. As soon as our green book is published, Mr President, I shall be travelling around with it or, as we say in Dutch, 'canvassing the farmers', in this instance both literally and figuratively. The first leg in my journey is already settled: I am off to Bavaria.

(Applause)

Yesterday, the Council experienced a setback, which I do not gloss over, certainly as far as the institutions are concerned. I do not dramatize it either from the standpoint of agricultural policy. The Commission will 'mind the shop'. However, I do not doubt that, after minor redecorations, the shop will reopen for business as usual, though with a view to future, more thorough renovation.

(Applause)

**Mr Arndt (S).** — (DE) I would like to ask the Commission three questions. Firstly, has it, together with Parliament, always supported the objective of Italy and the Federal Republic to establish sensible institutional rules? Does not the use of the veto by one of these governments mean a setback for the joint efforts which have so far been made by both governments, the Commission and Parliament to draw up acceptable rules and achieve progress in Europe?

Secondly, the only result of the present veto is inaction on the part of the Council. I therefore ask the Commission, is not the Council's inactivity as a result of the veto an infringement against the EEC Treaty, which requires action from the Community? Does it not conflict with the vital interests of Europe and of each Member State?

Unlike the Council, the Commission is obliged to reach a decision on farm prices. Is the Commission prepared, in the interests of agricultural reform, to stand firmly and steadfastly by its position in order to prevent at least the worst effects of the veto introduced by one of the governments?

(Applause)

**Mr Bocklet (PPE).** — (*DE*) I feel that what matters now in this debate is not so much the dispute on the farm policy as how we can overcome the institutional crisis into which the Community has been brought by mistakes on all sides.

*(Interruptions from the Socialist Group)*

There is no point in making accusations! What we need to discuss is how we can get the Community out of this crisis.

Mr Arndt suggested in his question that the Federal German Government had acted in conflict with its own demand for an improvement in the decision-making process.

I don't want to absolve anyone, but was the situation for one of the Member States so difficult that the decision had to be taken in that way?

*(Interruptions from the Socialist Group)*

I would like an answer from the Commission. I know Mr Arndt's answer already. Unfortunately, it is tainted by party-political interests.

*(Interruptions from the Socialist Group)*

I repeat that there is no point in laying the blame at each other's doors. I think we have all tried to reach a positive result. Perhaps the Commission should ask itself, however, whether it was perhaps too inflexible to achieve a result. Lest anyone think that I am motivated by party-political considerations, I should add that I am well aware that this was a difficult situation for the Commission, since it was dealing with a government whose Finance Minister was in favour of savings and whose Agriculture Minister wanted price increases.

*(Interruptions from the Socialist Group)*

I am not interested in cheap rhetoric but in discussing real problems. As far as the Commissioner, Mr Andriessen, has said, what has gone on here provides enough food for thought on the functioning of the institutions.

President Delors, when you began your term of office you promised Parliament solemnly that you would consider its wishes more than in the past. This clearly did not happen with the farm price proposals. That is surely an institutional problem for the Commission and Parliament!

We should discuss that too! Parliament and Commission must — and I think this is vital — combine their efforts and do all they can to improve the decision-making process at the Milan summit in the way that

Parliament and the Commission had suggested. This is an opportunity which we should grasp together.

*(Mixed reactions)*

**Mr Provan (ED).** — Mr President, it is unfortunate, when a Member State has decided that a vital national issue is at stake, that it has failed to observe that there is also a vital European issue at stake.

*(Applause)*

However, it is a very sad occasion. I think back with a certain amount of approval to the Genscher-Colombo plan for greater European unity and I fail to see how this decision by one Member State government, namely, the government of the Federal Republic, has anything to do with European Union at the present time.

May I ask the Commissioner what will happen when Regulation 2727 runs out? Will he accept that this is the most vital sector as far as agriculture is concerned? It is not just a matter of cereals only; the livestock sector is wholly dependent on the cereals sector. Will he therefore, as Mr Arndt requested, stick to his original proposals? Furthermore, is he empowered under the Treaties to set a new market price himself if he is going to manage that market? We must remember that the United States is currently showing a great deal of anger at the European common agricultural policy. Can he give us an assurance that he will try to mitigate that possible trade war in the decisions that he comes to? Also, does the Commission intend to take the Council of Ministers to the European Court? I think we have a brave Commissioner. That was evident from the statement he made today. I hope he is able to carry out his responsibilities to the European Community.

**Mr Cervetti (COM).** — (*IT*) Mr President, I should like to ask the Commissioner two questions, but first of all I must point out that I wholeheartedly approve of what he has said here today.

For the rest, whatever one thinks about agricultural prices, the German government's attitude is unacceptable.

Mr Bocklet maintained that it was a question of defending party interests. I should like to ask Mr Bocklet whether or not in this case the German government was defending not so much the interests of a particular political party but rather those of a certain other interested party, small in number . . .

*(Applause from various quarters)*

. . . Against the interests of hundreds of thousands of other agricultural producers in other countries and—as I understood from what the Commissioner

**Cervetti**

had to say—against the political interests of the Community and the prospects of European Union.

Mr Andriessen said that this raises certain questions regarding the way in which our institutions operate, and I think we must agree with him. I might add, furthermore, for the benefit of Mr Bocklet, that I do not see how the German government could have taken advantage of the right of veto if such institutional changes had been made. There is something of an inconsistency, therefore, between your professed wish to make progress towards European Union and the attitude of the German Government, which you have just defended.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

This brings me to my two questions. Can you, Mr Andriessen, give us more details of the measures the Commission intends to adopt to protect agricultural producers throughout the Community. You said that the Commission intends to take good care of the markets and I would be grateful if he would tell us more precisely what this will actually entail over the next few days.

The German Government's attitude has left the Community in a state of crisis. As you put it, the European Council has reached deadlock and I think it would be in order to ask the Commission how it views the Milan Summit in the light of this deadlock. In recent months, the attitude of the German Government towards European Union has been complex and ambiguous to say the least.

We must discover ways for the Milan Summit to deal with these ambiguous attitudes and guarantee real progress towards European Union. We obviously hope that all these measures without exception will be adopted and that the Heads of State and Government will express a clear political will to surmount this recent event, the crisis and the deadlock in the Council so as to open up the road towards European Union.

Would the Commissioner tell us what approaches the Commission intends to adopt both on this question and with a view to defending the more general interests of European Union.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Ducarme (L).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I would like to ask two questions concerning agriculture and one concerning the institutions.

With regard to agriculture, some people already feel that the Commission made a serious mistake in agreeing to treat cereals separately from almost all other sectors in fixing farm prices. We should consider, however, whether it was right to establish two categories for price fixing, since the Commission has always

regarded farm prices as a whole. This may be a mistake, and I think an answer is called for.

Secondly, the Council takes the view that the Commission is entering into commitments and that it should explain the reasoning behind them. I put this question to the Council: following the press statement, which confirmed the decisions on farm prices for the other sectors and which says that the Commission will take the necessary measures in managing the agricultural markets to avoid any supplementary or amending budgets for 1985, how can such a statement be made at a Council meeting when prices have still not been fixed in the cereals sector? Who can say whether this promise will be kept and, more particularly, what does 'necessary measures in managing the markets' mean? I shall gladly quote the Council's reply, even though it does not appear to know what reply to give. It says it is up to the Commission itself to state how it intends to act in practice to adhere to this commitment.

For that reason, Commissioner, I would like a reply since the whole of European agriculture and the whole of the food industry are waiting, and I think it is time that a reply was given.

To turn to institutional matters, allow me, Mr President, to address Mr Bocklet. It is too easy, in this House, to try to hold a German-style debate on responsibilities or the lack thereof. When I put questions to the Commission I expect a reply. But where there are those who are really responsible? Can the President of this House tell me, where is the Council? The Commission is present, but where are the Ministers, where are the ones who bear responsibility?

*(Applause)*

Before the Milan summit, I would ask you on behalf of Parliament to question the Council on whether it respects interaction between the institutions and whether it still thinks that a European Parliament exists. If it does not, the Council should stay away from here! If it does, the Council should be here today.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Musso (RDE).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I listened with great interest to what the Commissioner, Mr Andriessen, had to say just now, but before putting my question I would point out that I am a farmer and that I speak from a farmer's point of view. This is not a debate on the institutions. We have already held such a debate and shall do so again, and we shall take the decisions which we feel are needed, as we have done in the past.

Incidentally, I would point out that from what I have just heard, if this were a debate on the institutions, we would not just be putting the cart before the horse; it

**Musso**

would be like someone who has started a fire raising the alarm. I am astonished to hear that certain people advocate the use of the veto and accuse other countries of using it, even though they used it themselves only a few years earlier.

Be that as it may, to return to the matter in hand, I remember that a majority of this House voted for a general price increase of 3.5%. This majority cut across national frontiers and political ideologies: there was a real majority in favour of a general 3.5% increase in farm prices. We were also in favour of co-responsibility, which showed that we were thinking of the future, while wishing to safeguard farmer's incomes. We were thus acting responsibly, Mr Andriessen, in accepting co-responsibility.

What is the situation now? Prices are fixed, except for cereals.

My question is this: does the Commission intend to amend its position with regard to price increases to take account of the wishes of a majority of this House?

*(Applause)*

**Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf (ARC).** — *(DE)* Mr President, allow me to make a preliminary remark. I also cannot understand the attitude of the German delegation in this matter, since the Federal Government has not to my mind worked out any sensible alternatives. But now, after the latest elections in Germany, it finds itself with its back to the wall. A deep rift has grown between the farmers and the CDU. They are deserting the party or no longer vote — that is the real reason for the Federal Government's behaviour.

I would now like to put a number of questions to the Commission. We have always had real price cuts, also in the cereals sector, but now we are talking about a nominal price cut which would add to the real cuts. Does the Commission share my view that price cuts cannot serve to clear any surpluses and that all that will be achieved is a reduction in the number of farmers, as we are already witnessing in the dairy sector?

Secondly, is it not true that the price cut for corn is connected with the dispute between the Community and the USA over export markets in the third world or in other non-Community countries and that export subsidies are to be saved in order to achieve a better negotiation position in this trade war?

Thirdly, do you not agree that price cuts in this sector have no influence on consumer prices? I would like this question to be noted by the Socialist and Communist Groups, since this matter is always being raised here. Only 12% of the price paid to the producer is included in consumer prices. For example, wheat accounts for one pfennig in the price of a bread roll. If

the price of wheat doubled, the roll would cost one or one and a half pfennigs more. An increase of 0.8% or 3.6% would therefore not have any effect.

Fourthly, Parliament, as we have just heard, has decided in favour of price increases. Why does the Commission not take account of Parliament's proposals on this? I almost have the feeling that Parliament was glad that the Commission asserted itself. Not only does the Commission fail to act on Parliament's decisions, it actually opposes its decisions. How can this be justified?

How do you intend to compensate for the loss of income resulting from the reduction in the price of cereals — the main constituent affecting farm price levels? This affects the Community's small and medium-sized holdings, 50% of which are already unable to provide an adequate income, thus forcing farmers to live off their own capital. What will happen to such holdings? How do you intend to remedy this?

To come to my last question, if we are to reduce surpluses, surely it would make more sense to tackle the problem where the surpluses are produced, namely in highly intensive cereals cultivation which uses a large amount of chemicals. This sector would not be affected by a price cut; in fact, this would drive them to even more intensive use of chemicals. A general price cut would eliminate the borderline cases, that is holdings which are in any case no longer able to keep pace, while the others go over to intensive farming. The result of this is a lasting deterioration in the quality of our food.

Have you any other ideas? As I have said, the German delegation has none. We could try to reduce the general intensity of crop-growing techniques in the cereals sector — for instance the use of nitrogen and other yield-increasing chemicals, and pay a price for this, so that we can at last put a stop to the overuse of chemicals in farming. That would be a very sensible solution!

**Mr d'Ormesson (DR).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I would like to remind the President of the Commission that Pierre Froment, who was professor of rural economics at the Collège de France — a great European and one of the main architects of the Treaty of Rome — always warned us that the policy of guaranteed prices would cause extremely severe tension when surpluses increased on the world market.

We drew up the Treaty of Rome to ensure free movement of people, goods and capital. We also based our common agricultural policy on the need to provide farmers with an adequate income. The Community has gone through some very troubled periods which have been infinitely worse than the present crisis. I now turn, Mr President, to my two questions.

**d'Ormesson**

Firstly, could we have avoided the present crisis by asking the Federal German Government to introduce a co-responsibility levy on cereals?

Secondly, you will soon be attending an important summit meeting in Milan. Instead of arguing when we face the problem of our participation in the IDS, the Eureka project and in Europe's great plans for the future, perhaps we should ask our American allies to start negotiations on the sharing of responsibilities between the Community and the United States with regard to the main Third World markets. This morning I listened to Mr Cheysson's comments on Latin America, where our policies are opposed to those of the United States. That is not sharing responsibilities!

**Mr Pannella (NI).** — (FR) Mr President, we have read — and it seems to me that no-one has denied this — that what happened yesterday ought possibly to have led the President of the Commission to resign.

Now we are told that Mr Andriessen is off to do battle in Bavaria armed with a report. That isn't quite the same thing. But irony is perhaps inappropriate since the Council's shortcomings under the Italian Presidency have been undeniably serious and unprecedented. The Council, which permitted its presidency to come here and tell us, on the eve of the Milan summit, that it was about to act in accordance with Parliament's wishes — which for months enabled certain European and Italian politicians to gain political prestige — is absent today. Perhaps Mr Romeo and Mr Papapietro were not altogether wrong in asking us to think for half an hour before organizing this debate. Perhaps we should have asked you to insist on the Council's presence here this afternoon.

I would like to take advantage of the fact that the Commission President is here — the Commission should be thanked not only for the report by Mr Andriessen but also for his presence and that of many Commissioners — to ask the following question: Mr Delors, would it not be advisable, on the eve of the Milan summit, for the Commission to consider the present situation as a matter of urgency and recognize the extent to which its actions have so far been inadequate as far as the institutions are concerned? Can you give us an assurance that the Commission will replace the Italian presidency in Milan, which appears to have already abdicated its responsibilities and broken its promises?

**Mr Woltjer (S).** — (NL) I would like to start by expressing my respect for the way in which Mr Andriessen has operated these past few months. I highly appreciate his clarity, courage and tenacity. His last statement was lucid as well, I must say.

However, I have a specific question to put and would like an assurance from the Commissioner. I under-

stand that he intends to assume his responsibility now that the Council has failed to act. This seems to me a sensible idea, and if I understand him correctly, the Commissioner plans to fix a new price for the intervention agencies. May I therefore conclude that the intervention price will be cut by 1.8% for cereals? Is that in fact your intention? I would like to have that explained again in precise terms.

As for my second point, you might recall that a report was suddenly received from Germany in May/June of 1984 to the effect that the German Ministry was requesting an increase in the VAT rates, the VAT amount. Shortly after the dismantling of the MCAs, Germany felt it had to introduce its own funding arrangements. We later had a debate on the subject here and we clearly expressed our outrage at the matter. Now that he has rightly assumed his responsibility, may I also ask the Commissioner to assure us that this renationalization of agricultural policy will be prevented at all costs, to ensure that the German Government does not decide to make up the price cuts itself? I feel it is extremely important for the Commissioner to declare before this House that he will ensure that the German Government does not adopt a policy of renationalization, as has already happened on a couple of occasions. I think that this assurance must be given.

**President.** — I must inform the House that the 30 minutes set aside for the debate are over. However, there are still 13 speakers listed. I very much regret that a number of previous speakers spoke for too long, and that is why we are in this situation.

**Mrs Castle (S).** — Mr President, will you please give us some democracy in this place? When you call for questions, will you in the Chair insist that they are questions and not speeches, and will you limit every speaker to one question only and give everybody a chance?

**President.** — Fortunately or unfortunately, that is not within my power. I note simply that the 30 minutes are up. Ladies and gentlemen, I am prepared to extend the debate by a quarter of an hour.

*(Parliament rejected this proposal)*

**Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (NL) Mr President, I shall try to answer the questions on agriculture, after which the President of the Commission will deal with the institutional aspects raised by many of the honourable Members.

Mr President, I am grateful for the praise a number of speakers had for the Commission in general and in one case for myself in particular.

There was also criticism. One question was: did the Commission in fact act flexibly enough in these diffi-

**Andriessen**

cult price negotiations? Mr President, I cannot of course go into too much detail, but I would like to say one thing. Cereal prices are governed by an arrangement adopted by the Council in 1981, such that when a given production threshold is exceeded a certain mechanism comes into play. For the 1984/85 harvest, this mechanism calls for a 5% cut in cereal prices. That is the system. What did the Commission propose first of all? Not -5% but -3.6%. What was the Commission's final proposal after a number of provisional compromises? -1.8%. If I then add the intervention measures, the effective price — and this is what we are concerned with at the end of day, not the official price but the price the farmer actually gets for the products he produces — would be reduced by around -1%. Thus a further 0.8% off. The Commission's concession was thus from 5% to 1% while the Federal Republic went from 0% to 0.8%. So who was flexible and who wasn't? That is my first reply.

*(Applause)*

The second criticism: why did the Commission not adopt Parliament's price proposals? Mr President, we had earnest discussions on this point on at least three or four occasions. I explained to Parliament why the Commission felt we had to lower prices in the current situation, a situation in which we have a surplus in cereals, an oversupply of 134%, a situation in which we are facing problems and high costs in selling on the world market, and a situation in which there is no way of finding alternative uses because the price of cereals as a raw material is too high. I explained all this to Parliament in detail. Unfortunately, I did not manage to convince this House. I was able though to convince the Council that it was necessary to accept a price adjustment going further than Parliament wanted. I have nothing to add on this point. This is the line taken by the Commission on the basis of earlier decisions, taking into account the market situation and the budgetary situation. And I see no way we can deviate from this line.

Mr President, the international aspects were raised. I was asked to defend the Community's commercial interests vis-à-vis our partners in third countries, in particular the United States after its latest action. I can assure you that the Commission stands by everything it has said in official statements in this House and outside on commercial policy. This means that we shall respond appropriately, without lapsing into a war of statements, wherever the Community's commercial interests are under pressure for whatever product, including cereals.

It simply isn't true that our entire prices policy can be looked at solely from the standpoint of cereals exports, as a certain section in this House has suggested. Selling cereals on the internal market or marketing cereals for alternative uses also requires a cut in the price of cereals as a raw material, otherwise we can

simply forget bioethanol and the like, and there will not be enough alternative uses.

Mr President, someone asked: why no coresponsibility levy? We have some experience in the Community with coresponsibility levies and I do not rule out at all the possibility that such an instrument will need to be examined seriously in further discussions on cereals policy. We are looking at the idea, but no one can expect such a drastic instrument to be applied overnight — at a time when an instrument introduced three years ago after very careful consideration is rejected by half the Community when it is applied for the first time. One simply cannot expect such radical changes to be implemented from one day to the next. The Commission is ready to consider the matter, but not prepared to make such a proposal without adequate examination.

Mr President, I have been asked for an assurance that there will be no renationalization of agricultural policy. This morning, I gave a talk in the Federal Republic of Germany on agricultural questions — which was the reason why I was not able to be here in Strasbourg until this afternoon. I can assure you that the meeting was lively. I emphasized that in the view of the Commission a repetition of the events we faced in 1984 should be prevented at all costs and that the Commission would do its best to ensure this.

Mr President, mention was made of small farms. I am gradually beginning to get tired of the accusation that the Commission's policy is to eliminate the small family business from European agriculture. I have heard this fairly regularly from a certain part of this House. On several occasions here, I have made it clear that one of the basic principles of this Commission's policy is the preservation of the sociological structure of agriculture in the Community and that we are investigating what conditions need to be met for this purpose in our perspectives study. I simply cannot accept the repeated suggestion, as if the Commission has not said anything, that our aim is to eliminate small farms.

Mr President, there was criticism of the fact that we had earlier separated cereal prices from the rest of the package. I accept this criticism to a certain extent. Naturally, we were taking a risk, which to a certain extent emerged in the Council this week. However, I would put one question in return. Who in this House would have been prepared to accept the responsibility for leaving our milk producers, meat producers and others any longer in a situation of uncertainty as to their marketing season, which had already started in the meantime? The Commission consciously opted to defend their interests, accepting the risks; you cannot live without taking risks in politics.

Now the budget question. Criticism was expressed of the statement I made in the Council on behalf of the Commission concerning the budget. My statement can have come as no surprise to this House. I have repeat-

**Andriessen**

edly said here that, leaving aside the amounts resulting from the Commission's proposals, the 1985 agricultural operation should be neutral in budgetary terms and that the Commission was prepared to arrange compensation where necessary. Mr President, this statement stands and I think we shall be able to meet this promise.

Finally, Mr President, concrete questions were asked as to the power the Commission has to act in the legal vacuum that could result from the Council not taking a decision. I will say straight away that I cannot go into full detail, because after the events of yesterday we are naturally not in a position — that is to say neither the Commission as a collective body nor I myself is in a position — to fully assess the various possibilities and difficulties. What I can say is the following. I have said that the Commission will administer the markets prudently. What does this involve? It means that neither the markets nor the budgets will be upset and that enough money will remain in the kitty to finance spending. This we intend to do. In practice, this means that we shall fix the conditions for intervention so as to prevent speculation. In concrete terms, we shall thus be unable or hardly able to exceed the last proposals made, although the figures may vary somewhat in actual management of the markets. Were we to act otherwise the markets would be upset and numerous individual situations and rights could be at risk. These are preservative measures, however. We cannot do more, but we will also not do less. Mr President, I believe I cannot be any more precise at this stage. I shall inform Parliament as soon as possible of the concrete measures agreed by the Commission on the basis of my proposal.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Delors, President of the Commission.** — *(FR)* Mr President, yesterday I was in Lisbon and Madrid with certain Members of this House and Mr Natali, who has done so much for enlargement. But I was in hourly contact with Mr Andriessen, since I feared that something serious was happening.

This morning the Commission amended its agenda in order to prepare for this debate, which you rightly called for since such a debate is needed.

Ladies and gentlemen, the matter under discussion goes beyond the common agricultural policy and concerns only one country, the Federal Republic of Germany, which I hope you will not turn into a scapegoat.

What is happening concerns not only the common agricultural policy, since on the same day there happened to be a meeting of the economic and finance ministers, who launched a shocking attack on the Commission because Mr Christophersen, who is in charge of the budget, came before you, the directly elected representatives of the people, to defend his

budget and was therefore unable to attend the meeting of the finance ministers to present them with the figures on budgetary discipline. How could Mr Christophersen have given them any such information when there was uncertainty surrounding the decisions of the agriculture ministers?

*(Applause)*

That is a problem, ladies and gentlemen. It is not some person who is minister of some government or other, it is a question of general attitudes. I shall criticize these in a moment.

The problem concerns not just one country, the Federal Republic of Germany. I have had occasion to express certain criticisms to German officials and ask them a number of questions — albeit in somewhat agitated terms, but that does not matter since they are our friends. But I have no intention of cornering them and accusing them today, since although they invoked the vital interest clause, other countries also abstained from voting. These included countries which claim to support European union. Thankfully, then, this is not just a German problem.

*(Applause)*

Our problem, ladies and gentlemen, is something which has always destroyed the finest ideas and damaged democracy — the gap between words and deeds.

*(Applause)*

In this particular case — this has to be said even though it may sound harsh — our problem is the scorn with which these august personages treat both Parliament and the Commission.

*(Applause)*

But neither Parliament nor the Commission intends to shirk its duties, and they intend to work together as far as possible.

In this connection I would like to single out one speech among several others. What I am going to do is very unfair, since I am going to talk about Mr Pannella's speech. He does not need me since he is undeniably gifted — far more so than I — at capturing the attention of television audiences at any time. But he told me two days ago, and told me again today, that my minimalist strategy was partly in ashes and that I must now recognize the inadequacy of my approach. An explanation is called for, since we are all in the end responsible to you.

To begin with, Mr Pannella, I said in my interview with the German newspaper that if governments do not take any decisions, what purpose do they serve? You could have said the same, since this is basically true for both institutions. I wanted to explain that

**Delors**

there was a kind of imbalance and that Europe was always dominated by fairly short-term interests and the hidden strategies of governments.

But you described our strategies as inadequate. I would like to ask you four questions, and I would ask you to think carefully about them, because I always listen carefully to what you have to say.

Firstly, in proposing the creation of the large market by 1992, in asking the heads of State and government to make a firm commitment on this, and in proposing three solutions relating to the institutions in order to achieve this, are we being over-cautious?

Secondly, are we being over — cautious in acting to ensure that the creation of a large market is accompanied by a resumption of dialogue between employers and trade unions, in pointing out the need for such a market despite all objections, in taking risks in that field, in saying that there can be no lasting progress on the large market without progress on monetary cooperation, and in asking for the principle of financial solidarity to remain part of the Treaty?

Thirdly, are we being over-cautious in proposing a Community orientated toward technology rather than intergovernmental agreements, despite the fundamental interests of the European economy and its competitiveness?

Fourthly and lastly, are we being over-cautious in proposing or in intending to propose that the Council should take measures to improve the decision-making process and enable Parliament to play a more effective part?

Yes, we are being over-cautious in relation to the Treaty on which we voted. But 'we have a part to play' as they used to say in 1968, and at times you claim to be an heir to that tradition, even though I still do not recognize you in that role. I am speaking about my own institution and you about yours, and, if I may say so my work is more thankless and stressful than yours. I for my part am trying to achieve as broad a consensus as possible and produce results. But if I had to choose between the national governments' present inertia and intransigence and the Treaty adopted by Parliament, I would ask that the Treaty should form the basis of the discussion. That is self-evident.

*(Applause)*

I have always said that.

So I repeat, our problem now is our failure to match words with deeds. I ask you not to jeopardize the future and not to allow your attitudes to harden. Mr Andriessen has said everything which needs to be said about the common agricultural policy. Do not point an accusing finger at any one country. They are all to blame except one, Mr Pannella, because the Italian

Presidency is blameless in this affair. This has to be said in all openness.

*(Applause)*

The Italian Presidency could quite easily have prevented voting yesterday on the basis of the false compromise of Luxembourg. It called for a vote to protest against something which I also protest against — all the bilateral meetings between heads of government, about which we know nothing, and the lack of a real democratic debate on what is going to happen in Milan.

*(Loud applause)*

**President.** — The debate is closed.

#### 7. EEC and Central and Latin America (contd)

**President.** — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on relations between the European Community and Latin America.

**Mr Guermeur (RDE).** — *(FR)* I don't think we can have chosen a more difficult moment to discuss Latin America.

I would first like to thank the rapporteurs for the hard work which they put into a difficult subject. I shall briefly express feelings of satisfaction, as well as anxiety at the way things are developing in Latin America and shall outline the part which I feel the Community should play in that continent. Satisfaction, Mr President, at the return to democracy of several countries which have long been deprived of freedom of expression. I noticed that, as everywhere else in the world, it is the harsh 'right-wing' regimes which ultimately yield power to the people, for we all know — sadly — that with the left-wing totalitarian systems there are never any return tickets. I feel anxiety at the continent's alarming foreign debt, the poverty and misery in the huge suburbs of the South American cities, growing inequality and population growth which has got out of hand. I am anxious too about the increase in guerilla warfare, acts of terrorism, the support given to military regimes like that of Chile, and the refusal, as in Nicaragua, to permit any real democratic freedom without threats from the police or military pressure against the people.

In view of the increasing dangers threatening balance, justice and peace, the Community should act as watchdog in monitoring economic affairs and cooperation between the two superpowers, which confront one another either in the form of guerilla fighters or as puppet governments, whether we talk about Panama, which depends on one side, or Nicaragua, which is an

**Guermeur**

observer for Comecon (the common market of the communist countries) depending on the other.

The Community must see to it that its members do not fan the flames by thoughtless propaganda, or indeed by supplying arms. On the contrary, it should increase and strengthen its aid, but I stress that this must not be at the expense of our partners in the Lomé Convention. For example, Latin America should not be allowed to take advantage of public works contracts for projects to be carried out in the ACP countries using EDF funds. In this connection my Group has tabled an amendment to re-establish proper relations with the ACP countries.

As I said in my report on the non-associated countries, aid should benefit first and foremost the poorest countries and regions, in particular the rural areas. The main objective of the projects should be to improve the living standards of the farming community and promote crafts and trades of local importance and the promotion of joint investment companies set up on the basis of European venture capital.

Lastly, Mr President, cooperation should be handled as far as possible by non-government organizations. But an effort should be made to ensure that such organizations do not use their mandates or Community aid which they distribute as a pretext to carrying out political or even subversive campaigns in the countries concerned.

*(Applause from the right)*

By clearly refusing to feed the East-West conflict, Europe can play an important part on Latin America's long road to peace and prosperity.

This, Mr President, is the spirit in which my Group will be voting in favour of the reports before us.

*(Applause from the right)*

#### IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

*Vice-President*

**Mr Staes (ARC).** — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Community should realize that its main political role must be to save the countries in the region from being forced to choose between the West or the Eastern bloc. The Community must give them a chance to make an independent choice.

The Western economic model of waste and depletion of resources has plunged the world into an unacceptable crisis, with a murderous toll of tens of millions of deaths by starvation every year and an insane arms

race. We must stop forcing this disastrous un-economic model on Central America and others. Costa Rica is currently a good example of forced militarization. We accordingly need to pursue a policy condemning the approach of the International Monetary Fund. For this approach directly leads to the collapse of the domestic market in the countries involved, an incredible rise in prices, even for basic products, and an appalling rise in unemployment, resulting in mass poverty and starvation.

As to debt burden, the Community must support the efforts of the Latin American countries to create mutual solidarity, as was attempted, for example, at the Cartagena Conference. A policy aimed at bilateral negotiations between creditors and debtors should be rejected. To start with, we should consider remitting the interest burden on the billion-dollar loans of these countries. A new type of 'Marshall plan' by the West to convert debts into holdings in the local economies is to be totally rejected. It is not the task of the Community to maintain a kind of colonialism by exporting our model of democracy. The Community must ensure support for autonomous development locally until economic independence is achieved from the West, in order to create the basic conditions that will allow these countries to build their own democratic model without pressure or threat of war from the West, as is currently the case with Nicaragua.

Efforts are particularly needed to develop a small-scale, self-sufficient form of agriculture taking account of indigenous crops and not dominated by export considerations — local forms of production and a scale appropriate to the local culture. In particular, we should work through non-governmental organizations, certainly in countries with undemocratic regimes.

The Community should oppose the systematic protection of the position of multinationals in Central America, and finally it must realize the great danger posed by uncontrolled developments in biotechnology, biogenetics and telecommunications. They mainly threaten to increase the dependence of these countries on the West, in terms of Western know-how, maintenance and purchase of parts, manipulation of information, and also as regards the influence that these new technologies may have, in Western hands, on the prices of their products on the world market.

**Mr Antony (DR).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I have listened to a great deal of talk about guilt. Much has also been said concerning human rights, especially by Mr Cheysson. I must say that as a European and a Latin I feel no sense of guilt over Europe's behaviour over the centuries in Latin America, in particular in South America, where things have gone much better than in the North. It was the great ethnologist Jacques Soustelle who said that if the conquistadors had not arrived, the Indians would have committed mass suicide on a scale unprecedented in history.

**Antony**

Mr Cheysson said a great deal about human rights, but as the great French philosopher Gustave Thibon has pointed out, the over-inflation of the word reflects the distortion of reality. What is the situation, in fact? Sadly, human rights have been violated for a very long time in Latin America. Need I point out that, according to the very great historian, Meyer — incidentally, a marxist — the revolutionary party still in power in Mexico waged a war to exterminate the *cristeros*, culminating in the murder of over 400 000 catholics. Mexico still refuses to allow religious freedom, and the wearing of priest's clothes is still a capital offence in Mexico.

We have heard about the strict totalitarian regimes which have existed in Latin America, and the birth of freedom in that continent is indeed welcome. However, in Argentina as in Chile it was relentless excesses, subversive activities and the murder of tens of thousands of citizens which lead the armed forces — in many cases these have been of the left — to take power under trying circumstances, admittedly without achieving anything.

But what do we see today? A Latin America which is suffering under its own particular geopolitical problems but, like Africa, a victim to subversion which, far from enriching it, starves it a little more each day. In Peru, the terrorist and criminal groups of the Path of Light movement are attacking villages, committing murder and spreading terror. In Nicaragua the Miskito Indians are now suffering the fate of the *cristeros* in Mexico. There is murder, rape, pillage and the destruction of churches, as in Lebanon and other countries. The Miskito Indians will probably be consigned to 'the dustbin of history', to use Lenin's phrase. Then there is Cuba, with which we want to trade — Cuba which practices a system of apartheid . . .

**President.** — Mr Antony, your speaking time is up.

**Mr Antony (DR).** — . . . a system of apartheid which is all the more reprehensible for being masked by an ideology which claims to be progressive, Cuba where the vast majority of the population is black and whose government is as white as South Africa's . . .

**President.** — Sorry, Mr Antony. I know it is impossible to go round the world in three minutes. It cannot be done.

**Mr Ulburghs (NI).** — (NL) Mr President, I would like to draw attention to two questions relating to Latin America.

The first concerns the large debt burden, which requires these countries to sacrifice practically their entire earnings to pay off debts. In this connection, I would quote the Nobel laureate, Esquivel: 'Why

should the population of all Latin America now be presented with the bill for money they have never seen?'

Indeed, the billion-dollar loans that resulted in the debts did not benefit the large majority of the population. Where did the money go then? First of all on military expenditure, unfortunately. Argentina, for example, spent around 20 000 million dollars due to the megalomania of its military regime. Secondly, to finance capital exports by the local elite. For example, between 1979 and 1982 Mexico lost 54 000 million dollars in capital exports abroad at a time when foreign debt already amounted to 80 000 million dollars. Thirdly, on gigantic prestige projects. Brazil, for example, has invested billions in large-scale projects such as dams, mines, deforestation of the Amazon region etc. Conclusion: must the population of Latin America, the ordinary population, now be penalized for the mistakes of their military, economic and political masters?

The second question I would like to raise concerns an export policy that leads to the neglect of desperate domestic needs. In Brazil, for example, we witness the inhumane contrast between, on the one hand, starvation in the North-East, the storming of supermarkets, children of refuse tips and, on the other, the export of food valued at 14 000 million dollars in 1984. 9 million hectares, or 18% of farmland, is devoted to feeding our chickens and pigs.

In conclusion, Mr President, I hope that Europe will do its part to (a) put a stop to the austerity policy demanded by the IMF (b) stress the idea of an indigenous food strategy for the internal and regional markets in Latin America itself and (c) support those governments that pursue a democratic policy designed to benefit the majority of the population, as is the case with the experiment in Nicaragua.

Thank you Mr President — I have not used up all my time.

**Mrs Simons (S), deputy draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Development and Cooperation.** — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on Development and Cooperation attaches great importance to this cooperation agreement with Central America, and I would like to state our opinion on it. Development cooperation is a key element of Community policy. It is Europe's contribution towards easing the growing tensions throughout the world. The Community's North-South policy is an enlightened form of peace policy. We know that Central America's problems cannot be settled by military force but by political solutions in the regions themselves. No progress is possible in Central America unless an effort is made soon to overcome poverty and the social injustice which is rife there. The planned cooperation agreement could prove of inestimable value if it is

### Simons

applied in its broadest sense as an economic and trade agreement and as an agreement affecting development and, in particular, political affairs.

We are concerned particularly with those aspects which relate to development. Fortunately, these have been dealt with in the report before us. I would like to comment on three main areas of interest. Firstly, aid should benefit mainly the poorest groups in rural areas, as well as in the cities, where there is great suffering. Special measures, including emergency and food aid, are needed to cope with the large number of refugees, mainly women and children. Thirdly, it is very important that the measures to be carried out under the planned agreement should be coordinated with the work of the other Member States, non-member countries and donor organizations. For this reason we feel that the Commission needs a fully equipped bureau for its delegation in Central America.

This is another instance of third world countries with great expectations of Europe's peace-keeping role. We must not disappoint them. We therefore appeal to the Commission, but in particular to the Foreign Ministers, to conclude the agreement without delay and apply it on the basis of the wishes expressed at the San José conference.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Mühlen (PPE).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I shall confine myself to the subject matter of the van Aerssen report. Allow me first to congratulate Mr Jochen van Aerssen on his excellent report on economic relations between the European Community and Latin America.

I would like to say right away that my Group approves both of the general tenor of the report and of the practical proposals it makes. I would also like to underline the fact that for economic and social as well as political reasons my Group attaches great importance to good relations with the Latin America countries.

Mr van Aerssen is right in asserting that development is the key problem in that part of the world. That is what makes the Community's commitment with regard to Latin America so important. The same holds true for the promotion of trade between the Community and Latin America and for the support — both human and financial — which we owe that continent. I would also like to express my group's satisfaction that 1984 witnessed a reversal in Latin America's growth trend, which once again became positive in 1984 after declining in 1982 and 1983.

However, it would be a mistake to pin great hopes on this. For one thing, the situation differs from country to country, and for another, Latin America is still not safe from political and economic mishaps. That is what makes our commitment to Latin America so important, and the countries concerned should realise this.

With regard to trade, my Group, the European People's Party, approves of the rapporteur's call to promote trade between the EEC and Latin America and to improve trade relations with neighbouring countries to achieve greater regional economic integration. Latin America has everything to gain from diversifying its trade.

I now turn to economic and financial cooperation in the interest of development. We Europeans should not only continue to enable Latin America to benefit from our know-how but we should also provide it with the capital required for strengthening and consolidating its economic structures. Europe, it is true, is already involved in the aid programmes benefiting Latin America, in particular in connection with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, and it is in everyone's interest to continue to show solidarity with Latin America in connection with the IMF. However, we would be wrong not to develop a specifically European approach at the same time. The EEC should assert its identity still further, and we expect the Commission to intensify its Latin American programme. I also support the proposal to entrust the EIB with financial operations under its special section for South America. The Commission could submit practical proposals to the Council on this. Such an extension of its activities would doubtless also be to the benefit of the European Investment Bank.

Those are the comments which I wanted to make on behalf of the EPP Group. I shall conclude by saying that the proposals made by our rapporteurs — if we are to include all aspects of cooperation with Latin America — deserve the full attention of the Commission and the Council.

**Mr de Courcy Ling (ED).** — Mr President, I refer to Mr McGowan's report on relations between the Community and Latin America. This is a product of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, of which I am pleased to be a member. I must observe, however, Mr President, that we have many Socialist Members on the Committee on Development and Cooperation who fail to understand that the very developmental problems in Latin America, Central America and Ethiopia which tax them are the result of Socialism itself: of centralized Marxism in Ethiopia for example, of corruption on an extraordinary scale in Central and South America. We remember the way in which Cuba brought us to the brink of world war 23 years ago. We are aware now of the way in which the Sandinista movement has been corrupted in Nicaragua. Since, Mr President, there are more members of the public present in the gallery this afternoon than there are Members of this House present — and I know that many of them are concerned with developmental problems, they are concerned with famine in the world, they are concerned with equality — let me say to them that most of the problems with which we are dealing are the result of the extreme economic

**de Courcy Ling**

inefficiency of extreme left-wing governments. Nowhere is this more true than in Latin America, which, I would say, is a continent, which in many cases appears to have passed from barbarism to decadence without going through the intermediate stage of civilization.

Of course, it is wrong to generalize, but Marxism has taken a very heavy toll of human happiness and human welfare in Latin America. One of the consequences of this is that we now have a sordid equation between power, politics, pharmaceuticals and poverty, and I want to say that I hope the Community will subscribe to a voluntary system to be organized by the World Health Organization to control drugs in Latin America — not only pharmaceuticals but also the export of cocaine from countries like Bolivia.

However, let us remember, Mr President, above all, the political reality against which we, the free democracies, are operating.

**Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul (S), rapporteur.** — (DE) Mr President, as draftsman of the report on relations between the Community and Latin America, I have dealt with this subject several times and I would like to ask Mr de Courcy Ling to explain his observation that the economic situation which has developed in Latin America over decades was caused by left-wing dictatorships. Does he not share my view that the causes lie in failure to implement reforms and in the continuing unequal distribution of wealth, and that it should be our aim to change this situation rather than make general ideological statements?

(Applause)

**President.** — I am sorry, Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul, I am not going to call Mr de Courcy Ling to reply. We have gone over our time.

**Mr Van Aerssen (PPE), rapporteur.** — (DE) Mr President, as rapporteur for the Committee on External Economic Relations I would just like to say that it is very important that we should view the present situation in the light of history and not draw any false conclusions. Spaniards and South Americans refer to the story of the conquistadors coming to conquer South America as the *leyenda negra*. Some speakers have already referred to this.

The days of the *leyenda negra* are gone! We now know that Europeans have done good in South America, and I appeal to all members of this House not to create another *leyenda negra*, but to bring together all forces in this House in making a gesture of friendship to this continent, which for my generation had the good fortune not to go through the Second World War.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

**8. IMP**

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-49/85) by Mr De Pasquale, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. C 2-18/85 — COM(85) 180 final/2) for a regulation instituting Integrated Mediterranean Programmes.

**Mr De Pasquale (COM), rapporteur.** — (IT) Mr President, I think that we can say without presumption, but with a legitimate sense of satisfaction, that the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes constitute one of the rare subjects on which Parliament has succeeded in playing a decisive part in the legislative process. This fact was acknowledged by Mr Delors, the President of the Commission, who said in this House on 17 April that the proposal on IMPs owed a great deal to the debates of the European Parliament and the Regional Affairs Committee and assured us that our work had made matters a lot easier for the Commission when it came to convincing the various parties involved in the European Council.

The Regional Affairs Committee has, in a very short time, drawn up the motion for a resolution and amendments currently before you. In a letter to Mr Pflimlin, Mr Delors thanked us in advance — and I am very grateful for this — for this new phase in our work, praising its speed and quality and assuring us that our proposals will be likely to be of help in drawing up the definitive version of the regulation and implementing the programmes.

The Committee's proposal in fact exhibits a number of novel features which should be stressed. These include the proposal for an outline regulation to ensure that the programmes are flexible and adoptable to differing situations and permit the necessary supervision without blanket constraints being imposed from above, the emphasis on aid to sectors other than agriculture, the introduction of a loans policy, the role assigned to the regions and, above all, the measures aimed at ensuring effective integration of the various activities in the context of programmes covering a clearly-defined geographical area.

Overall, this constitutes a new approach and hence a challenge which we should all take up and which will mean that both the Community and the regions will have to get themselves organized in political, technical and administrative terms. However, if we are to make any progress we will need a lot more money. The amounts provided for are not enough to embark upon an overall development process, which is the professed wish. I think this should be stressed once more.

### De Pasquale

The European Council, which is an anomaly to start with, has once more, instead of merely pointing the way as it should, encroached on what according to the Treaties is the preserve of the budgetary authority with its attempts to scrimp and save on the Mediterranean Programmes. And on top of everything else, the European Council has said that these figures represented once and for all the amounts to be allocated to the commitments entered into. This is most unfortunate and we are making a big mistake if we think that this marks the closing of our accounts with the Mediterranean area of the Community, since this area is about to be enlarged and the development and cooperation problems arising will be on such a scale that operations such as these under the IMPs will not even scratch the surface.

However, we have no choice but to knuckle under to this decision, which lacks any legal basis, but in spite of this restriction we hope at least that all the amounts earmarked for the Mediterranean Programmes will be effectively, clearly and indisputably additional.

It is not acceptable that what the regions are given with one hand under the IMPs should be taken away with the other nor that the amounts allocated to the IMPs should be subtracted from the amounts paid to other regions benefitting from the funds throughout the Community. The Commission's proposal does not guarantee this principle of additionality either for non-refundable aids or for loans. The aim of our amendments is to rectify this situation.

In the interests of greater clarity, I should like to give some idea of the sort of amounts which I think will be involved in the future, starting with the budget for 1986, as a result of the principle of additionality for the IMPs and the normal increase in the funds.

A 5% increase will be needed to make up for the average rate of inflation, at least 10% for the normal increase and to cover the accession of Spain and Portugal, and a further 7% for the Mediterranean Programmes, thus making a total increase of 22% over 1985. This will correspond to an increase of roughly 1 000 million for all three funds. The Council, the Commission and the Parliament have therefore taken account of this in the preliminary draft budget for 1986.

At any rate we are pleased that the amendments by the Committee on Budgets are along these lines and I therefore support them and should like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Von der Vring. We have also proposed making an additional 400 million ECU available exclusively for providing loans to finance innovation or strengthen the capital of small and medium-sized undertakings.

If we want the Mediterranean areas to get off the ground, economically speaking, measures of this kind are essential.

I will not go into other amendments in detail, such as the one aimed at further strengthening the role of the regions as a source of proposals or advice, since time obviously does not permit. However, I deplore the fact that so little time has been set aside for such an important debate. Be that as it may, during the conciliation procedure with the Council — which will, I think, be held on 18 or 19 of this month — we will uphold the proposals put forward here today if they are adopted by Parliament, as I hope they will be.

### IN THE CHAIR: MRS PERY

#### *Vice-President*

**Mr Tharcou (S)**, *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food.* — (FR) Madam President, already in 1984 the Committee on Agriculture delivered a favourable opinion on the IMPs of the time. Budgetary restrictions and the lack of own resources appear to have delayed matters until today. We can now observe negative and positive trends.

On the negative side, we have to mention the inadequacy of the resources set aside for the IMPs. While the amount has remained virtually unchanged, we should point out that the sum concerned is 2.5 thousand million ECU transferred from existing structural funds and 2.5 thousand million in the form of loans. These funds are intended to cover a period of 12 years and should not result in any reduction in the amounts earmarked for fisheries, allocations to which are already limited.

Such figures may be misleading if we consider that the regions, many of which have been concerned about their slow economic progress and about the difficulties which will result from enlargement, have been kept waiting for the funds. However, it would be unrealistic to reject the IMPs on the grounds of insufficient funds, since this project indicates that the Community institutions are aware of the economic difficulties and of the need to mobilize local government leaders and officials.

In line with the request made one year ago already by the Committee on Agriculture, we note that the general approach to the measures to be undertaken has changed considerably. Firstly, the government leaders and officials in the regions are called upon to draw up a draft programme and to monitor its implementation by setting up a supervisory committee representing national and Community institutions. The global approach is even more important, since the principles embodied in outline regulations and programme contracts have been retained.

## Thareau

We should also draw attention to the desire to attach a broad significance to the problems and decisions affecting socio-economic sectors where there are certain to be areas of overlap, though no specific sectors should be neglected.

It is still necessary to study systematically the natural potential of each region, to help regional project groups and encourage the establishment of development organizers. Subdivisions of the regions should be affected by extension. However, the Commission will have to make a detailed study before such regions can be considered. The Commission will have to continue its efforts to simplify the use of the various funds as far as possible since these have their own rules, which are often excessively complex.

By approving the IMPs and the De Pasquale report, Parliament may help to provide the dynamism required to adapt to specific problems and problems of diversification arising from the decisions taken.

It will no doubt soon be possible to apply the same approach to all structural policies. That is the wish of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food.

**Mr Sakellariou (S).** — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, this House underlined the importance of the integrated Mediterranean programmes at its partsession in February of this year. The debate held at that time showed that Parliament was acting more responsibly than the Council and was more prepared to meet its obligations to the Community's Mediterranean regions.

Mr De Pasquale has already recognized Parliament's role in this field. Parliament appreciates that the Community can only become and remain a genuine political community if all its citizens — whether in the north, south, east or west — feel that they belong to that community. Such a feeling cannot develop equally in all regions if there are differences in income and standard of living of 1:5. The real enemies of the Community are those who cannot or will not grasp this self-evident fact. The high-flown rhetoric about European unification and the lip-service paid to political union are of no use to anyone if — as was the case yesterday in the debate on cereals prices — they are tinged by chauvinism. Such 'euro-opportunists' are completely lacking in the insight or possibly — as so often is the case — the knowledge to recognize the need for the Mediterranean programmes. It is no doubt thanks to the Commission, in particular its President, that we now have the regulation before us. The fields covered and the time-scale do not correspond to what we asked for four months ago. The regulation is still unclear concerning financing and the allocation and management of the funds to be used.

In that debate I expressed unambiguous criticism of the Commission, and I would like to be equally unam-

biguous now in stating that I regard the present regulation as a step forward. This compromise, this step in the right direction deserves our respect and support. The Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning and its chairman and rapporteur Mr De Pasquale have tried to eliminate areas of doubt in the regulation and present the political approach to implementing the programmes in clearer terms.

The Socialist Group will give its full support to the Commission's regulation, which has been slightly improved on the basis of the De Pasquale report. For us socialists and social democrats from northern and central Europe such support and our efforts to implement the Mediterranean programmes are a clear sign of our practical solidarity with our friends from the south of the Community, with those living in Greece, southern Italy and southern France. It is solidarity, not empty clichés about Europe, which in our view is the basis on which the Europe of the workers and citizens can be built.

**Mr Lambrias (PPE).** — *(GR)* Madam President, in this very last debate on the integrated Mediterranean programmes the Members of the New Democracy Party find themselves between the devil and the deep blue sea.

If they were to follow their consciences and their love of truth, they would complain about the scrapping of a shining ideal which this Parliament almost unanimously embraced, namely that of bringing the economies of the various countries closer together, which was the moral basis of the Community, and of fulfilling the commitments made to Greece, which had just joined the Community as its tenth Member State.

Today the Members of the European Parliament should also condemn the way in which the other institutional bodies have ignored the work and decisions of this House. They should also reveal the bureaucratic delays, distortions and pitfalls with which this year's new Commission is undermining an inspired policy. This means that, while it does not dare to deny it expressly, it adopts instead a complicated system made up of bits and pieces of the original idea and actually fails to fulfill its own commitments, assuming that there is continuity between this Commission and the previous one. In short, the Greek Members of the European Parliament ought simply to express here and now their dismay that after four years of discussions, and after a tug-of-war between the Commission, Parliament and the Council which has lasted two and a half years, there is a renewal of the half-hearted promises that within another seven years the regions which are beset by terrible problems and are dying out will perhaps receive what is due to them regularly and automatically thanks to the proper functioning of the Community's structural funds and the normal increase in these funds' resources. On the other hand, however, the MEPs of the New Democracy Party have to face a

**Lambrias**

harsh reality, namely that together with the Commission it is the Greek Government which is also triumphant about these integrated Mediterranean programmes which have been torn to shreds, since it stated that it was Mr Papandreou's veto in Dublin which had brought the matter to the fore, a matter which the Greek Government itself had forgotten about. It also stated that many realistic Members, not necessarily ill-intentioned, had become tired of the interminable fruitless discussions and were asking for the integrated Mediterranean programmes to be adopted without further ado, since otherwise they were likely to be put off indefinitely; and that since the Community's economic difficulties — and not only these — were well known, the principle of 'a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush' should be applied; and lastly, that in view of the mounting and constantly worsening problems of the regions this is all that can be expected. The outcome of this realistic approach, which, I repeat, is not really ill-intentioned, is the De Pasquale report. As Chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning he has done what he could to improve the draft regulation. He deserves to be congratulated for this, as do the Members who have put in a lot of work — and the number of amendments alone demonstrates this — in order to put before us today a neater, clearer, more binding and rather more manageable system than the jumble of unclear ideas put forward by the Commission.

Indeed, even the text as it stands is anything but satisfactory, but unfortunately it is not being further improved. Consequently we are bound to vote for the De Pasquale report, as amended by the committee responsible, as a desperate attempt to save something of what was the promising, life-giving spirit of the integrated Mediterranean programmes.

However, we wish to make it very clear to the Commission and above all to the Council that it is up to both of them to prove during the implementing procedure that they have not made fools of us yet again by confirming our fears and again showing up their own dishonesty.

**Mr Hutton (ED).** — In supporting the establishment of the integrated Mediterranean programmes, may I commend the Commission on producing a much more useful and comprehensible regulation than its predecessor? We have put down a number of amendments to it, which I commend to the House, for I believe that they will improve it; but I also believe that no amount of regulation will make the programmes work unless there is close cooperation between the authorities and the local people whom these programmes are intended to help.

I have recently been to see the way integrated operations are being run in the Western Isles of Scotland. I believe there are lessons to be learned there for making the best use of the European funds which will be

going to the Mediterranean regions under these programmes.

The key to the success of the Scottish operation is the local project team: that small group of people on the ground always available to motivate people locally and to act as a link between the people and the authorities.

I believe that one of the great difficulties in the poorer rural areas of our Community is that people are unfamiliar with form-filling, they are suspicious of bureaucracy and they are too busy trying to scratch a living to be aware of exactly what is available to help them. I believe strongly that the Commission should look at the success of the Scottish project and use it in the way in which it will have its best effect, and that is to make the experience as widely available as possible. In particular, the integrated Mediterranean programmes offer the Commission a golden chance to score a similar success in the Mediterranean area by establishing project teams to encourage local initiative and to help bring these areas forward and to give the people there hope that they and their children will have a future in their own areas.

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (GR) Madam President, after all the ups and downs which have lasted more than half a decade, and exactly one day after the signing of the act of accession of Spain and Portugal to the EEC, the European Parliament is debating the draft regulation on integrated Mediterranean programmes, which were presumably intended to prepare the Mediterranean regions to withstand the shock of the enlargement of the Community.

For some people the Mediterranean programmes, even in their present form, are a success for Greece as well. We should like to ask where any such success is to be seen. Can the 2 000 million ECU which Greece will receive over 7 years, i.e. approximately 30 000 million drachmas per year, even slightly make up for the consequences of abolishing protection of the national economy? Of our participation in the single internal market? Of giving up any control over external trade? Of the enlargement of the Community, the effects of which are already being directly felt by wine and grape producers? Of the limitation or abolition of the veto? Of the fact that Greece is tending to become a province of Brussels?

As far as the Greek Communist Party is concerned, the independent economic development of our country is not for sale at any price, and least of all at the price of the Mediterranean programmes.

Some might think that we are prejudiced, since our anti-EEC position is well known. But let us look at the statement by the European Parliament's Committee on Agriculture in its opinion on the Mediterranean programmes:

### Alavanos

The IMPs are no longer to be seen as a mechanism allowing a substantial transfer of resources to the Mediterranean regions of the Community, since the sums wholly given over to these programmes amount to only 4 100 million ECU.

But there is considerable doubt even about this amount, and certainly about the largest item in it, the 2 500 million ECU from the structural funds. There is no guarantee that these are additional items instead of just items disguised as 'Mediterranean' which would anyway be provided by the structural funds as part of their normal schedule. This version seems to us the most probable if we bear in mind that the EEC budget is currently subject to considerable financial pressures. I think that this view of things is also shared by the Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, Mr Seal, when he stresses that his committee

wishes to reiterate the doubts . . . as to the feasibility of allocating to the IMPs a substantial proportion of the resources from existing funds without hindering the proper functioning of these funds.

Therefore there is justification for the statement in the motion by the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning — permit me to adopt a tone very different from the rejoicing of the Greek Government — strongly condemning the fact that the resources allocated to the financing of the IMPs are insufficient overall for the structural measures needed in the areas concerned.

And so we ask the following: why is the EEC being so miserly towards its Mediterranean regions when only a few days ago, when the 1985 budget was being fixed, it decided to give Evren's junta 43 million ECU under the third and fourth Financial Protocols and under the special aid scheme for Turkey? Why is it being so miserly towards the farmers of the Mediterranean regions when only yesterday, in the resolution on the European Parliament budget for 1986, it found 26 million ECU to enable the European Parliament to move like a travelling circus between Strasbourg, Luxembourg and Brussels.

However, what is more important for us than the amount of the financing is its nature. The Commission has laid down as one of the three principles of the IMPs compliance with the Community system. And what is more, the IMP management committee is headed by a representative of the Commission. In our view, this opens another channel through which the EEC can interfere in and control Greece's development policy, which is something we also saw during the five-year programme connected with the Memorandum.

Our party disagrees with these arrangements and will struggle, together with local administration bodies and farmers' and workers' organizations, even during the

implementing stage of the IMPs, to have these programmes geared to the needs and objectives of our national economy.

In conclusion, I should like once again to stress that we are unable to accept that the cost of entry to the EEC can be offset by the Mediterranean programmes, which even the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning considers inadequate. On the contrary, we consider that we need to progress towards a reorganization of production and the equal participation of Greece in the international division of labour, which calls for resistance to the consequences of entry to the EEC, pending Greece's withdrawal.

**Mr Romeo (L).** — *(IT)* Mr De Pasquale's report highlights the fact that the amounts earmarked for the Mediterranean programmes are meagre in comparison with the importance of the objectives. A few comparisons should be sufficient to give a clear picture of the situation. The total appropriation corresponds to an average of 948 million ECU per year, which is the equivalent of 7 000 million French francs or one billion four hundred thousand lire. If we subtract the 2 000 million or so French francs intended as aid for Greece, we are left with an annual average of approximately 950 000 million lire or 4 750 million French francs for Italy and France. If we compare this figure of 950 000 million with the amount spent by Italy alone for aid to the southern regions, we find that with 10 billion per year Italy spends some ten times more — and has been doing so for several years. And even this meagre amount is only guaranteed provided it is all spent and assuming that all the funds are additional, which is by no means clear.

Obviously therefore, under these circumstances the additional 400 million proposed by the rapporteur is a mere drop in the ocean and this is why we are sometimes amazed when we are told that the amounts requested for these IMPs are excessive and that it has been necessary to bring them down bit by bit from the levels originally proposed on the grounds that they would be a major burden on the other regions of the Community. A rough calculation will, I think, show that this burden would involve less than 200 francs per head of population of the Community.

However, it is not so much the quantitative aspect of the IMPs which is important as the approach involved and their function as pilot projects which should act as a focus for other Community action, and we hope that these Community activities will in turn stimulate activities on the part of the Member States. This is doubly important at the political level because of the Community nature of these projects, and in economic terms because we hope that it will be possible, thanks to the IMPs, to introduce a greater degree of coordination into our policies on these regions.

Obviously, it has not been possible to please everybody. The Committee on Regional Policy and

**Romeo**

Regional Planning has put forward an amendment excluding certain regions proposed by the Commission. I think this is a good idea with a view to avoiding indiscriminate aid to the advantage of regions which are in fact in less need than others. The regions to be excluded — such as, Emilia Romagna — have been selected in the full realization that some of them have substantial needs, especially in mountainous areas. However, we must realize that these needs do not result from the accession of Spain and Portugal — and the basic aim of the IMPs is to cover needs arising from this enlargement. It is not intended as a replacement for or addition to general regional policy. I hope Parliament will give its support to this amendment and also adopt the new Article 7(3) which, in this new version, stresses the need for coordination.

It is often said that Community regional policy has not succeeded in reducing the disparities between the various regions. Anyone who makes such claims has not, I think, grasped the scale of the problem. The problems are enormous since economically, socially and historically speaking, the regional policy obviously cannot, by itself, replace the policies of the individual Member States. Even if it can boast partial successes its existence is justified.

In view of the fact that it is not so much the content as the approach of the Mediterranean Programmes which is important, they will, I think, be judged in terms of the use which the Commission makes of them, and the Commission in turn will be judged on this same criterion.

**Mr Musso (RDE).** — (*FR*) I think I should begin by thanking the rapporteur, Mr De Pasquale, who has had to combine the authority of the Chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy with the sensitivity of the islander which he is, in order to bring out the report before us here today in these difficult circumstances.

We should also thank the President of the Commission, Mr Delors, who saw to it that the European Parliament and its Committee on Regional Policy were involved — and effectively involved, since a good number of the points we raised have been incorporated into the Commission's proposals.

Obviously, we must deplore the fact — as other speakers have already done — that the funds allocated to the IMPs are inadequate and that there have been disturbing cuts if we compare the Commission's original proposals with those currently under consideration.

I think we will have to accept this situation since we have no choice in the matter, not because of the Commission but because of the Council, which on the one hand wishes to enlarge without delay but at the same time is reluctant to release sufficient funds for the regions which will suffer from the repercussions of enlargement.

I should also like to repeat a point made just now by Mr Ducarme, albeit during another debate. It is a pity that the Members of the Council are not here to account for themselves. It is perhaps putting it a little too bluntly but I do not think I am really overstating the case if I say that the Members of the Council are hardly playing the game and sometimes evading the issues.

I should like to say for the benefit of the President of the Commission, therefore, that there are certain points on which we cannot give way. First of all, there is the question of additionality — which is not my expression, but one used by Mr Delors himself the first time he spoke about the IMPs to this House, when stressed the importance he attaches to this principle. My purpose in repeating this term — which also occurs explicitly in Mr De Pasquale's report — is to make the point that the amounts taken from the structural funds and allocated to the IMPs should be additional funds, so that the total amount of the structural funds should remain unchanged and still leave enough for other regions apart from the Mediterranean regions.

Finally, I think we should give some consideration to the interesting proposal made by the rapporteur in Article 12, where he calls for an additional 400 m ECU. In view of all this, these are the two crucial points on which we must not give way. It goes without saying, therefore, that my Group will vote in favour of the report by Mr De Pasquale.

**Mrs Piermont (ARC).** — (*DE*) The situation facing us is clear and is spelled out in the amendment submitted by the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning. The divide between poor and rich regions within the European Community has not decreased in the past decades but has, on the contrary, widened in a terrifying manner. The declarations of intent contained in the Rome Treaties and the claims, repeated again and again, that the Community is making great efforts — especially via its Regional Fund — to help the less-favoured regions are, therefore, empty words.

It is only natural, then, that the Commission proposal for Integrated Mediterranean Programmes is in keeping with this bad tradition, and the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning has only minimally lessened the proposal's negative tenor.

Allow me to mention three things which make this clear. First, the funding of 4 100 million ECU over seven years is simply ridiculous when measured against the overall volume of the Community budget for the same period. The Committee proposal to increase this to 4 500 million ECU doesn't change this inadequate ratio one little bit, and appears to be more of an attempt to make a stand on Parliament's budgetary powers on the wrong issue.

### Piermont

Secondly, the regions whose development is involved here appear only as extras on the sidelines. The Commission proposal makes no provision whatsoever for discussions between the Advisory Committee and the representatives of the regions to evaluate the programmes planned by the Member States. The proposal submitted by the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning says only that the Advisory Committee may give a hearing to regional representatives. The programme contracts provided for in each case are to be concluded at best with regional authorities, which does not necessarily mean elected representatives of the regions. Moreover, these can be replaced by any other authority designated by the Member States, i.e. a central or national authority. Given these circumstances, what influence can the regions have, without whose support, cooperation and participation all the programmes worked out on high will never amount to anything?

Thirdly, the development sought is in the wrong direction for the most part. What words such as intensification, rationalization, increased productivity, and new technologies mean — when applied to agriculture and small and medium-sized undertakings — is obvious to each of us if we look at the regions in question. Small and medium-sized farmers will be finished; 'more productive' means that undertakings using new technologies need fewer workers, and the result will be that unemployment will grow, instead of shrinking as demanded on paper, not to mention the environmental problems foreseeable even now.

In short: too little, for the wrong people and mostly for the wrong projects. You surely do not expect us to approve such a proposal!

**Mr Almirante (DR).** — *(IT)* Mr President, at the moment, pending the accession of Spain and Portugal, the IMPs concern the three countries represented in the Group of which it is my honour to be a member. I should therefore like to thank my group for allowing me to speak on behalf of all three of these countries and repeat, broadly speaking, what has already been said by all the contributors to this debate. We go along for the most part with both the positive judgements and the criticisms of these measures contained in the De Pasquale report. We agree with the way it stresses, as a positive aspect, the new regulation which gives the Commission broad powers in approving programmes and leaving regional authorities the responsibility for settling details.

We also agree with the way in which it stresses the importance of the principle, to which the Commission has agreed, concerning the adaptation of all Community policies to the objective laid down in the IMPs. The negative aspects are those which have, I think, been mentioned by all the previous speakers, i.e. the meagre amounts allocated for a period of seven years — to three countries for the time being, but the prob-

lem will obviously be aggravated with the accession of Spain and Portugal — and above all, the lack of any firm guarantee that these scanty funds will be 'additional'.

As the Italian Member for the Mezzogiorno I should like to point out that we cannot go along with the amendment proposed in Annex 1, according to which Naples and Palermo would be excluded. Naples in particular is in great difficulties, since previous initiatives along similar lines have failed miserably in that area. I am referring to the integrated project for cleaning up the Gulf of Naples which, I think, has existed on paper for, I think, some three years now, to the great disappointment of the people who have been waiting for the benefits it would bring. I also think that we should make a firm stand to see to it that other regions are not excluded either. I am thinking, for example, of the Adriatic, Southern Venice or Polesine, which may well be in the north but is nevertheless even more depressed than a fair number of southern regions. I therefore count on the Commission to ensure, above all, that these amounts are additional and that the populations involved may be guaranteed at least a minimum of benefits.

**Mr Avgerinos (S).** — *(GR)* Madam President, the necessity for the IMPs became fully clear as soon as it was realized that, if there was to be balanced development of the Community, something would have to be done to reduce the gap between the less developed and the developed regions. The efforts which have so far been made in this direction have been half-hearted, uncoordinated and not always appropriate, with the result that already existing problems have become more acute.

I must point out that the main reasons which made the IMPs necessary were the following: the level of development and the special characteristics of the Community's Mediterranean regions, which create a 'regionality syndrome'; the Community's common policies, from which the Mediterranean regions have not benefited as much as they should have; the poor implementation of the policy of Community preference; and the social and economic effects of the accession of Spain and Portugal.

Everyone agrees on the above-mentioned reasons. But when we come to the stage of implementing the political decision taken by the European Council in Brussels, we note that the Commission is taking a differentiated approach to the IMPs. The Commission's proposal involves amended positions, i.e. it increases the duration, considerably reduces the supplementary appropriations, activates loan mechanisms and refers to repayable aids.

In particular in Article 10 there is a total and deliberate lack of clarity regarding additionality. There is an attempt to destroy the transparency of this by not

### Avgerinos

separating the funds to be given to the IMPs from those to be made available to the structural funds which will have to continue to operate normally. In Article 11 and in Mr De Pasquale's text, in order to avoid any future misunderstandings or misinterpretations, a clear distinction should be made between expenditure on the IMPs and expenditure on the structural funds, and it should also be made clear how they are to be entered in the Community budget.

In Article 12(4) and in Mr De Pasquale's text provision is made for granting loans from the European Investment Bank and under the New Community Instrument which, where appropriate, will benefit from interest subsidies. But it does not appear from any European Council text or from any European Parliament proposal that the interest subsidy will be met out of the 1 600 million ECU.

Article 12(3) states that repayable aids are to be granted. But it is not stated anywhere that the additional financing will also cover the repayable aids.

Lastly, I would draw attention to an effort to mix up the Greek Memorandum with the IMPs, and I fail to understand why this effort is continuing. Ladies and gentlemen, the IMPs form the basis of an avant-garde and important effort. They are avant-garde because for the first time fundamental problems of economic and social development are being tackled uniformly and globally at Community level, and important if we take into account the breadth and number of measures which are to be applied, the high level of appropriations, and the complicated technical and administrative difficulties which will have to be overcome.

I must congratulate Mr De Pasquale on his efforts. In conclusion, the Commission must at this stage follow the aspiration of the European Parliament with a determination to achieve the above goals as far as is realistically possible so that the problems of the Mediterranean regions, which can and must contribute to development, can be solved.

**Mr Ciancaglini (PPE).** — *(IT)* Madam President, Mr President of the Commission, the IMPs have had a long and troubled history, and any further delay in implementing them properly would be extremely damaging for all the countries of the Mediterranean region. It must also be pointed out that it is absolutely futile to scatter the limited resources available over thousands of tiny projects.

In this context, as far as Italy is concerned, it would have been right and proper to restrict the aid exclusively to the regions covered by the former Cassa per il Mezzogiorno.

If we look impartially at all the demographic, economic and social indicators, the Commission's decision appears rather strange, and all it has done is to whet

somewhat incomprehensible appetites right up to the foothills of the Alps. We, however, must return to reason and consistency and remember that this aid has to be directed towards the regions which are genuinely Mediterranean.

Moreover, the Commission publication 'The Regions of Europe' — which nobody has yet disputed — states specifically that

the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal is a fact of major political importance and one which will have considerable negative economic consequences for the Mediterranean regions.

The De Pasquale report, which I welcome, states clearly the financial limits of this operation, which is why we must strive to maintain the additional nature of the aid and regard the aid from the structural funds as strictly transitional and secondary. In future, there must be adequate and specific budget appropriations capable of providing a lasting basis for the effectiveness of the IMPs.

The IMPs are not a favour but a political act of economic compensation as a practical demonstration of European solidarity, without in any way meeting all the needs of the Mediterranean regions and their function, not least as regards the third countries in the same region and their need for mutual trade.

What is more, the IMPs must be regarded as an ideal opportunity for measures to supplement and integrate the productive and social infrastructures of huge regions, particularly inland, which have been only marginally affected by industrial development.

It is these regions, more than others, which have been affected by the consequences of the economic crisis which has been afflicting Europe for about the last ten years. For that reason, only long-term measures of this kind can help to produce local development structures, to reduce unemployment and to build up a strong network of small and medium-sized enterprises, some of them on a cooperative basis.

One of the features of the programmes should be strong links with local universities and research centres, so that they can play an active part in integrated development. The IMPs should enable them to transform underdevelopment into economic development and social progress.

In view of this we must ensure, as of now, that the regions concerned are given proper support, so that they can start immediately on the planning and administrative work. To this end, the Commission must start preparations immediately so that it can play an effective role in guiding, coordinating, monitoring and assisting the regions, as well as in encouraging the Member States with a view to the successful and transparent pursuit of the objectives of the IMPs.

**Ciancaglini**

In this context the Commission should also promote interregional projects aimed at solving identical problems and which cannot be financed directly and specifically from the European structural funds.

As far as the south of Italy is concerned, there are two projects which must have absolute priority — the bridge over the Straits of Messina and the railway line over the bridge.

In conclusion, may I recommend to the Commission that they set up an office in the Italian Mezzogiorno.

## IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

*Vice-President*

**Mr Filinis (COM).** — (GR) Mr President, as the representative of the Greek Communist Party of the Interior, I shall vote for Mr De Pasquale's excellent report concerning the regulation on integrated Mediterranean programmes.

Indeed, as we have repeatedly stressed, the appropriations for the IMPs are already below a minimum acceptable level, which makes their effectiveness doubtful. We therefore wholeheartedly support the proposal to increase additional own resources from 1 600 to 2 000 million ECU. Equally important is the demand in the report for an assurance that the funds granted for the IMPs, either in the form of subsidies from the various funds and structural bodies or in the form of loans, are additional. This means that grants from the structural funds must be entered separately in the budget (Amendment No 13) so that they are not disguised as 'Mediterranean programmes'. We should also like to state the following: in view of the delay in adopting the IMP regulation, we demand that all the measures be taken so that it can actually be adopted in June, as was, furthermore, officially announced.

As regards Greece, we must counteract the tendency on the part of certain Member States to get the European Community to back down from its commitments by asking it not to fulfil the obligation it entered into with regard to the Greek Memorandum, and more particularly its obligation to ensure that certain projects under the Greek five-year programme are financed separately from the integrated Mediterranean programmes. Mr Lambrias of the New Democracy Party, who spoke earlier, tried for a second time to use the European Parliament to settle other minor party differences, which would have been better kept out of this Chamber.

Lastly, I should like to make it clear that Mr Alavanos, as he was perfectly entitled to, expressed the views of his party and not, of course, those of the Communist

and Allies Group, in the same way as I also have expressed the views of my own party.

**Mr Mattina (S).** — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I will deal with only one aspect of the IMPs — that of the geographical area to be covered.

I intend to reaffirm the correctness of the decision taken by the Committee on Regional Policy which lays down that, in the case of Italy, the only regions eligible for aid under the IMPs are those of the south, including the cities of Naples and Palermo.

This is the region with the most serious economic and social problems in Italy. One need only read the latest report by the governor of the Banca d'Italia to appreciate the facts of the situation.

This report states that the level of unemployment in the Mezzogiorno is 14% compared with the national level of 10.4%, and that over the next five years the Mezzogiorno will have a further 150 to 200 thousand job-seekers coming on to the labour market.

When the report goes on to state that the development of the Mezzogiorno has been discontinued since 1973, it is drawing attention to the fact that the situation of the regions of the south of Italy is today perhaps more disturbing than it was in the sixties.

In addition to this report from the top monetary authority in Italy, it is worthwhile recalling some of the data in the Second Report on the situation and socio-economic development of the regions of the Community.

These show that, on the basis of the index for the seriousness of regional problems in the Community, the regions of the south of Italy head the list, with the exception of Greece. Of 130 regions considered, Calabria takes the 'wooden spoon' with an index of 30.3%, followed by the other seven regions of the south, with the best off being Molise, which has an index of 65.8% in fifteenth place.

Umbria occupies an intermediate position with an index of 72.8%, while all the other regions of Italy have indexes around or above the Community average.

In view of all this, it would be rather strange if the area eligible under the IMPs were to be extended. It would be rather strange if, with such limited resources, the number of potential beneficiaries were to be increased.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have spoken about an Italian problem, but in doing so I have raised a problem of a more general nature — that of the efficient use of Community resources. The limited nature of these resources means that not all applications can be met.

**Mattina**

Requests will have to be selected and the financial aid concentrated with a view to limiting the dispersal of the resources and to avoid thwarting the aims of the programmes.

In the case of the IMPs the criteria must be the backlog in development and the greatest exposure to the effects of the competition deriving from the enlargement of the Community. As far as Italy is concerned this means the regions of the south, and they are thus the ones which should benefit from the IMPs.

**Mr Gerontopoulos (PPE).** — (GR) Mr President, I should like to start by congratulating Mr De Pasquale on his report and by making an initial general comment regarding paragraphs 2 and 3 of the motion for a resolution. These two paragraphs, Mr President, justify — and I regret to have to say so — the action of the Commission, which, as you know, changed — despite the repeated objections of Parliament — the original IMPs and drastically cut the appropriations which had been envisaged by the previous Natali proposal, and I have the impression that today we are purely and simply debating for the sake of it while the actual decision has already been taken in other decision-making forums.

The Commission's new proposal on which the European Parliament is being asked to give its opinion is despite the fact that some points are an improvement over the previous proposal unsatisfactory, since there are gaps and unclear points regarding the exact budget of the IMPs and the way in which the structural funds are to be involved.

As regards the IMP budget, the Commission's proposal in its present version does not provide any guarantee that the 2 500 million ECU to be provided from the structural funds will be additional, since it is not at all certain whether the budget of the funds will be increased in real terms — as is expressed as a wish in Article 11 of the proposal for a regulation — during the period covered by the IMPs.

As regards the involvement of the structural funds, the proposal for a regulation provides for 2 500 million ECU to be spent under the existing regulations governing the operation of these funds. This provision and that contained in Article 11 (1) — that financial assistance from the structural funds must be without prejudice to the measures for the priority or less prosperous regions not covered by the IMPs — mean that the objective in Article 10 (3), namely that aid of 2 000 million ECU is to be granted to Greece, is impossible to achieve.

In fact, Mr President, the limits contained in the ERDF Regulation, in which the well-known 'disparities' apply, and the fact that Greece can receive only a small amount of funds from the Social Funds prevent Greece from taking up the 2 000 million ECU.

It would be possible to do this only through changes in the way the Regional Fund and the Social Fund work and by adopting *ad hoc* regulations under the EAGGF Guidance Section, but this is expressly forbidden by the provisions of Article 12 (1).

In conclusion, Mr President, with regard to the connection between the solution to the problem of the IMPs found by the European Council in Brussels on 20 March 1985 and the Memorandum of the Greek Government of 19 March 1982, I should like to ask Mr Delors the following questions.

Firstly, if the IMPs are adopted as they stand, does the Commission consider that they satisfy all the demands of the Greek Memorandum? I should also like him to say a few words about the one-sided statements made by certain Member States during the European Council in Brussels.

Secondly, if not, what additional measures does the Commission intend to take in order to meet completely the demands of the Greek Memorandum?

Thirdly, with regard to the five-year programme submitted by the Greek Government, I should like to ask the Commission whether, in its opinion, the solution found to the problem of the IMPs also satisfies the demands of this five-year programme or, on the other hand, does it intend to activate the special chapter 570 of the budget, for which, as you know, 10 million ECU were earmarked after the initiative by the European Parliament?

**Mr Saby (S).** — (FR) Mr President, while we support the political agreement reached between the Heads of State and of Government on the IMPs, we hope that the second phase, i.e. examination of the proposed outline regulation, will provide a real response to the problems enlargement entails for certain regions of the present Community.

Thanks in particular to the action of Commission President Jacques Delors, and despite the vagaries of politics we now find ourselves at the decisive juncture of elaborating the regulation governing IMPs, thus confirming that solidarity between the Community's regions works.

The Commission proposals take into account the resolutions adopted by Parliament and grants us satisfaction on many points. In this way the IMPs should, in keeping with their purpose, contribute to the general development of the regions concerned and will no longer be limited simply to rural zones. Nevertheless, we find it necessary to recall here that the so-called 'North-South' criterion should apply to Greece alone, with only the 'enlargement' factor applying to Italy and France. We must adapt the IMPs to the problems of each zone for them to be a real instrument of regional development. It seems necessary to expand

### Saby

the field of application, both from a geographical angle — by including, for example, the French departments of Drôme and Ardèche — and also as regards the measures to be taken, so that we adapt fisheries, water engineering and transport to the Europe of tomorrow, an enlarged Europe.

Although we totally agree with the Commission's desire to have flexible management of these instruments, to make for real contractual programmes and not the rigid application of a somewhat technocratic and overdetailed structure, we want to see consistency in Community measures for the IMPs without prejudicing existing Community policy lines, such as the EAGGF Guidance Section. At the same time we can only regret the relative modesty of the funds set aside, a fact our rapporteur pointed out for both the aid and the loans. Moreover, the additional character of these amounts is guaranteed only for specific resources and not for those coming from the Funds. In keeping with the wishes of the Committee on Regional Policy, the additional amount provided for the IMPs should be raised in order to remedy these shortcomings. However, this increase should be limited, realistic and well thought out.

Europe has neglected the Mediterranean regions for a long time and its regional development measures have not stopped the gap widening between the rich and poor regions.

The success in setting up the IMPs is proof that European solidarity does have some meaning. At a time of economic crisis this show of solidarity will help re-establish trust between the Common Market partners and diminish intra-Community inequalities.

Europe's credibility is measured by its ability to have its own rules of operation respected. Enlargement was something we wanted, but it was known that it could have negative consequences for the Mediterranean regions. Therefore, it is natural that the Community foresees these risks and helps these regions, more of which should be included on the list, though. One could have wished for more active solidarity but, nevertheless, we are delighted that it has become a reality.

**Mrs Boot (PPE).** — (NL) Mr President, if Parliament today approves the regulation introducing integrated Mediterranean programmes, and conciliation with the Council leads to a satisfactory result later this month, there will then be nothing standing in the way of a basic regulation on IMPs before the first of July, and we are pleased about that. It would then be exactly five years since this House called on the Commission to prepare plans for establishing a rolling fund to grant loans to the Mediterranean countries. The Commission subsequently presented its proposals for Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, which were already notorious *avant la lettre* because both their

financial scale and the way in which they were to be funded were the object of disagreement between the Member States.

The present proposal for a regulation is a sound compromise. Funding takes three forms: grants, payments from the structural funds and loans from the European Investment Bank. However, I draw your particular attention to Articles 7, 10 and 11 of the regulation. The amendment tabled by the Committee on Regional Policy to Article 7(3) places the Advisory Committee on Integrated Mediterranean Programmes above the advisory committees for the structural funds. In my opinion — which I think is well founded — Parliament should reject this amendment, because we would then be bestowing far-reaching powers on an *ad hoc* consultative committee. Secondly, I think Articles 10 and 11 should be taken together. If a total amount were to be set aside under Article 10 without provision for an annual real increase in the allocations for the structural funds as called for by the amendment to Article 11, this regulation would remain a dead letter.

We therefore support all the amendments tabled by Mr von der Vring on behalf of the Committee on Budgets.

**Mr Delors, President of the Commission.** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, like Mr De Pasquale of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, I too, regret that we have had such little time to debate a subject the European Parliament has put so much into, and thanks to which a result has been achieved, although I appreciate that it is only a compromise. But without the support of the European Parliament we would not have even had this. You were able to devote the necessary time to this at the right moment. It is a pity that I cannot comment on each amendment now since I do not wish to disrupt the agenda.

The Integrated Mediterranean Programmes come as a very important crossroads for the future of the European Community — a better balance between North and South, which not only depends on transferring funds but also on the twin prospects of deepening the internal market and successfully implementing regional development policies. As I indicated a little while ago during another debate, it is inconceivable that we succeed in obtaining a large market if this is not accompanied by joint policies. The enlarged market alone cannot bring about even a minimum of harmonization between regions. Therefore, you can rest assured of the Commission's vigilance on this matter.

We were also at pains to obtain in these Integrated Mediterranean Programmes — and the Regional Policy Committee's amendments are also along these lines — a new kind of equilibrium, in relation to the previous proposal, between the agricultural and non-agricultural aspects of the Integrated Mediterranean

## Delors

Programmes. And thus, we are trying, via an experiment which I hope we can see through to a successful conclusion, to make the so-called structural fund instruments more efficient so as to reconcile budgetary stringency, which is binding, with the dynamics of Community initiative. But as Mr Thareau mentioned, we should be under no illusions. I repeat that — given the framework we have to work in — what we have here is a compromise. But I would say to Mr Gerontopoulos that this compromise has absorbed the Greek memorandum unabridged and as far as we were able to achieve.

... I just want to focus on three things.

I would like to start by recalling — because this is really important, and we should learn lessons from this for future work within the institutions — that the European Parliament's contribution was crucial, and I would like to thank all those good enough to come and take part in this debate. According to my calculations, the number of those present is above the average, and since bliss is relative why shouldn't I congratulate myself on this?

*(Applause)*

In a certain sense the cooperation between the European Parliament and the Commission has been exemplary in this field. Each was able to play its role to the full, right up to the present moment. The Commission took the initiative to deepen and modify its proposal following the Dublin failure, and I would like to stress four areas in which the European Parliament's contribution was essential.

To begin with, through their insistent manner the Parliament members drew attention to the importance of the overall sum. You knew we had to work within the framework of decisions taken by the European Council.

Secondly, you made us very aware of the fact that the situation varied greatly from one place to another and that priorities should be set. For example it is a good thing that the Committee on Agriculture pointed out the dramatic situation existing in certain rural regions and thus reminded us that the programmes we adopt should also take this into account.

Thirdly, Mr De Pasquale's report dwelt on the role of local and regional authorities, and here we will need your political support because, naturally, — and I will come back to this in a minute — during the preparatory phase within the Council the national administrations are seeking to close the door to such direct access by regional and local authorities.

*(Applause)*

Yet how can Europe advance if we always have to go via the national authorities?

*(Applause)*

Finally, you reminded us that the IMPs must be implemented quickly and as a matter of urgency, and this is a point I will also come back to.

This, then, was the contribution made by the European Parliament. You see that it was a weighty contribution, with political clout — without you we would not have obtained the funding adopted by the European Council — and with sound proposals.

Secondly, I would like to point out the stakes involved in such an innovative scheme above and beyond the integration projects and the operations as a whole. In this context Mr Hutton was right to point out the importance of the experience gathered in Scotland, because this is one of the rare schemes which succeeded, and we will take account of this. I will be going to Scotland in a few months' time to see for myself. At any rate, I think we are witnessing an innovation and if it comes off, you, like us, will be able to draw very interesting conclusions for policies based on the structural funds. Whatever happens we will report each year on execution of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, and we will be open to any criticism and to any changes which ought to be made.

As regards the third point, I would like to talk about the IMPs as a whole. Mr Saby spoke here about the necessary financial consistency. Each year, you can be sure of this, we will have to fight to make sure that the European Council decisions are respected, with the first battle coming up in 1986. Therefore, we will have to show great vigilance on the budget, and I believe that not enough stress has been placed on the 'loans' aspect, which is important nevertheless. I know that at the European Council meeting Mr Papandreou said he was not interested in loans. Consequently, these only concern Italy and France at the moment. I believe, though, that they deserve a little more attention at least, because such loans can be an attractive proposition in an overall development programme, and especially for Greece which is experiencing general difficulties in adapting to the European economy. I hope the Greek government will revise its position on this.

Therefore, the main risks we run have to do with routine and inertia.

Why routine? Because the easiest thing is to repeat projects which have already proven successful, to copy a known model. Therefore, we will lend our support to the setting-up of responsible and effective teams in the regional bodies, and also — and here we are counting on the parliamentarians from these regions — to the establishment of a connection between the political approach and the socio-economic approach to these problems. You can be sure that by holding symposia and seminars we will be able to develop our thoughts on this and, I believe, give the vital forces in each of these regions their chance, and show them that Europe has not forgotten them, that it is in solidarity with them.

**Delors**

The second danger is that of inertia, and I would like to thank the European Parliament in particular for having understood that you cannot ask the Commission to run the Olympic 100 metres in hob-nailed boots. However, I can tell you that right now, in the departments preparing the Council Decision, senior officials from the various capitals are questioning the European Council decision.

The European Council decided to delegate certain responsibilities to the Commission. We did not ask for this just because we are the Commission, but because we do not want to have to wait three years for Integrated Mediterranean Programmes to start. If we are to be flanked by four management committees, one for the IMPs and one for each of the structural funds, with all the squabbling this implies, we will never launch an Integrated Mediterranean Programme, and this is one of the problems I hope will be raised at Milan. Unwieldy decisions and the fact that national officials take it upon themselves to change what their Heads of State and Government have decided — that is everyday reality at the Commission.

*(Applause)*

In this regard I believe that your Regional Development Committee has hit the nail on the head, and that the responsibility delegated to the Commission — which is beginning its work, by the way — is one way of facilitating the decision-making process and of generally showing confidence in the regions by giving them the chance to contribute to their own development backed by European solidarity.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

### 9. Topical and urgent debate

**President.** — The next item is the topical and urgent debate. In view of the lateness of the hour, however, and the fact that we have a heavily-loaded agenda, I propose that, with the exception of the motions for resolutions relating to the tragic events at Heysel Stadium, we deal with all the motions tabled without debate and put them to the vote immediately.

*(Parliament adopted the proposal)<sup>1</sup>*

#### *Tragic events at Heysel Stadium*

**President.** — We proceed to the joint debate on the motions for resolutions by

— Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti and others (Doc. B 2-408/85/rev.) on behalf of the EPP Group, on the tragic events of 29 May 1985 at the Heysel Stadium in Brussels;

— Mr Vandemeulebroucke and Mr Kuijpers (Doc. B 2-409/85) on behalf of the Rainbow Group, on the terrifying events at the Liverpool-Juventus football match at the Heysel Stadium in Brussels and on football hooliganism in general;

— Mr Molinari and others (Doc. B 2-419/85) on behalf of the Rainbow Group, on the tragedy at the Heysel Stadium in Brussels;

— Mr Brok and others (Doc. B 2-455/85) on behalf of the EPP Group, on the massacre in the Heysel Stadium on 29 May 1985;

— Mrs Larive-Groenendaal and others (Doc. B 2-461/85) on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on violence in sport;

— Mr Newens and others (Doc. B 2-467/85) on the tragic events at football matches in Bradford and Brussels;

— Mr Tripodi and others (Doc. B 2-469/85) on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on violence in sport;

— Mr Arndt (Doc. B 2-486/85) on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the tragic events at the Heysel Stadium and on violence in sport;

— Sir Henry Plumb and Mr Prag (Doc. B 2-494/85) on behalf of the ED Group, on the Belgian football tragedy,

— Mr de la Malène and others (Doc. B 2-498/85) on behalf of the RDE Group, on the tragedy at Heysel Stadium in Brussels;

— Mr Papapietro and others (Doc. B 2-514/85) on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the tragedy at the Heysel Stadium in Brussels on 29 May 1985.

**Mr Mattina (S).** — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the facts of what happened at the Heysel Stadium are quite clear and hence too well known for me to have to recall them again here.

I will deal with three questions — the violence, preventive measures and the future outlook.

First of all the violence. There must be unequivocal condemnation of those responsible for the massacre of Brussels, because any doubts on that score would ultimately lead to a negative opinion of the entire population of Liverpool and the people of Britain.

The violence came from a fringe of Liverpool supporters whose responsibility is not diminished by the fact that they had been infiltrated by fascists. There were

<sup>1</sup> For the votes on all motions for resolutions put to the vote without debate, see Minutes.

**Mattina**

fascists there, that is true, but the fact is that they were tolerated. Even less acceptable are the sociological explanations being put forward. We therefore welcome the rapid reaction from the British authorities, press and public in condemning those responsible.

We also welcome the decision by the sporting and political authorities to ban English clubs from international football for a time.

And now the preventive measures. We all saw the inadequacy of the safety measures taken before, during and after the tragedy. The Belgian Minister of the Interior, Mr Nothomb, has rendered his country a very bad service by refusing to live up to his responsibilities and resign. There are no mitigating circumstances, since these fans were notorious for committing acts of violence inside and outside the stadiums at international matches.

Even the decision to carry on with the match despite the massacre is further evidence of the lack of foresight and preparation characteristic of the whole affair. Those twenty young men chasing the ball, the cup held aloft, the display of joy at the end of the match added a touch of cynicism to the whole thing.

Let me turn now to the future outlook. The lesson to be learnt from what happened is clear to all of us. It is plain that there will have to be precise practical and cultural measures. There will have to be thorough investigations to identify and punish the guilty. There will have to be preventive measures, as of now and in all countries, to regulate the design of the stadiums and crowd control systems. Perhaps the clubs themselves will have to appoint voluntary marshals and accept responsibility for the behaviour of their members. Finally, there will have to be a publicity campaign to increase the awareness, particularly amongst young people, of the true values of sport.

On the other hand, we should take a new look at what football has become in our society — an enormous business with equally enormous interests, a sport which is increasingly losing the marks of a popular festival which every sport should have. If we want the massacre of Brussels to be the last of its kind, and if we want the lessons to be properly learnt, we shall have to strive to somehow reduce the money-making which is polluting the game of football and which is undoubtedly not unrelated to the manifestations of extremism which we all condemn.

Ladies and gentlemen, for all these reasons I maintain that we cannot leave this House with ambiguous pronouncements . . .

**President.** — Mr Mattina, I'm sorry, but your speaking time is up.

**Mr Costanzo (PPE).** — *(IT)* Mr President, the disaster at the stadium in Brussels and what happened

before and after the incident calls for reasoned and unemotional reflection on the part of us all, but even more so on the part of the national and local authorities responsible for the smooth running of any public event. The sociological aspects should not be underestimated, but nor should they be regarded as the only cause of the tragic degeneration. It is not enough to condemn the savage degeneration of the crowd worked up by rivalry or dulled by excessive intake of alcohol. That is not enough. The Belgian Parliament was therefore right to set up a committee of enquiry to investigate not only the behaviour of the crowd but also the behaviour and inaction or wrong action of the police and the governing bodies, who have been accused of a lack of attention or concern during the run-up to the match, during the events themselves and particularly afterwards, in the first hours and days after the disastrous encounters in the stadium.

This is why, together with other Members, I should like to table an oral amendment to the compromise motion. The wording is as follows, and I think it should be readily acceptable:

— in view of the inadequacy of the security and first aid services provided by the Belgian authorities;

I think even the Belgian Members would agree on the need to make reference to this aspect, not least because we in the European Parliament cannot be, not so much less severe, but nevertheless less concerned than the Belgian Parliament.

**President.** — Before I move to the next speaker, could I ask the House whether it is prepared to accept an oral amendment which was not the subject of a compromise.

*(Parliament rejected the oral amendment)*

**Sir Henry Plumb (ED).** — Mr President, all of us were sickened by the appalling happenings in the Hysel Stadium. Over the many years English football supporters in particular seem to have acquired a deservedly bad reputation for violence and disorder in and around football grounds. What happened in Brussels on 29 May was the terrifying culmination of the past years.

I have already made known to all our Italian colleagues especially my grief at and sympathy for the deaths and the injuries sustained by Italian spectators in that stadium. Citizens from four Community countries died in the stadium and the city of Brussels had its police and emergency forces placed under intolerable strain. I should like to repeat publicly my sadness at the tragic events in the stadium and my consciousness that the reputation of England has suffered a severe blow.

## Plumb

As you will be aware, the British Government has taken and is taking steps to remedy the disease of violence which has characterized British football over the past years. The sale of alcohol at football grounds will be forbidden. Increased powers will be given to the police to prevent public disturbance. Safety standards at British grounds will be improved and supporters more thoroughly vetted. The greatest possible cooperation, therefore, is being offered to the Belgian police in their attempts to track down and to punish those criminally involved in the deaths of 38 people.

It was inevitable that the punishment visited upon English football clubs by UEFA would be severe. The indefinite suspension from European competition reminds us that it is up to us in England to put our own house in order. Only then will we be able to participate again in European competition. But, happily, all sections of public opinion in the UK recognise the urgency of the problem. The question is not one of partisan dispute. The shame inflicted on our country by the hooligans of the Heysel Stadium affects us all whatever our political persuasion and in whatever part of the country we live. I hope and believe that this sense of shame will continue to find its expression in action both to punish and eventually to eradicate football hooliganism in our country. Such violence is a canker in society which our duty to the dead of Heysel Stadium, our duty to ourselves and our duty towards our fellow citizens throughout Europe compels us to remove from the body politic by all necessary means.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Papapietro (COM).** — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group I join in the grief expressed by the whole House at the horrible massacre in Brussels, as well as in the solidarity with the families of the victims, who saw their dear ones leave to watch a football match and support their team and saw them arrive back in coffins.

Thanks to modern means of communication, we all witnessed the violence which led to the massacre; we saw the panic and death of those who were attacked; we saw the macabre spectacle of the lifeless bodies being dragged away like sacks and left along the side of a street, while inside the stadium it was being decided to carry on regardless — purportedly for reasons of public order — and to forget the dead, with some people even going so far as to celebrate the victory.

Violent death is undoubtedly the most tragic face of this age, the shadow over our civilization. However, it is not enough to condemn it or to erect a bulwark against it. Nor, if it is to be eliminated, is it sufficient — although it is essential — to recognize its malignant roots in the violence of society itself, in unemployment, in alienation, in despair and in the ideology of success at all costs and of bullying.

What is required is effective measures to ensure public order — something which was culpably lacking in Brussels and which will have to be coordinated at European level, as called for in the motions. There will have to be sharing of practical experience, such as that gained by Italy last year with a match similar to the one in Brussels, when police, city authorities in Rome and Liverpool and fan clubs of both teams cooperated effectively in prevention and control.

There will also have to be a widespread campaign of civic education against violence, as well as steps to disengage football from interests which have nothing strictly to do with sport.

Let us not forget these victims, because life is an absolute value! Let us not make our resolution into an exculpation, because the violence would only repeat itself if those with responsibility were to neglect to take steps to combat it! Let us follow up the resolution not only with an investigation but also with measures of prevention and suppression, social reform and moral education!

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L).** — My work as rapporteur of the European Parliament on violence in sport makes me aware of two dangers. One is exaggerating and the other is minimizing the importance of the murderous riot in the Heysel Stadium last week. To look around us for one moment — in Afghanistan a battle rages, in Lebanon the murdering by rival factions takes place daily and 38 deaths in the capital city of Western Europe would hardly have been noticed in the general carnage of the Second World War.

In a sense our shock at the football riot is evidence of our success in civilizing Western Europe in the last 40 years. On the other hand, colleagues, it is a very, very serious warning, which we ignore at our peril, of how unsuccessful we have been in imbuing our society with the democratic virtues of tolerance and respect for the rights of others. What was witnessed on the television screens by millions was not only beastly but sinister. There are many signs both among the English and the Italians that the hatred was deliberately encouraged by political extremists. Enemies of our democratic values eagerly seek opportunities to exploit the frustrations and miseries that afflict so many in our society.

But unemployment and bad education do not justify crime and violence. There are millions afflicted by this evil who do humanity honour by maintaining democratic decencies. It is a betrayal of these people to excuse those who behaved as the football rioters did in Brussels. It is cultural rather than economic poverty that is the problem. This is why part of our resolution calls attention to the need for an educational programme for both adults and children. Also, police

**Larive-Groenendaal**

cooperation across national frontiers, mandatory minimum sentences internationally applied, cooperation by the sporting authorities, proper organization of the stadia, controls on the sale and consumption of alcohol, confiscations of weapons all have their part to play. But in the end the horror of the Heysel Stadium will recur in other forms and other places and on a growing scale unless many more Europeans recognize and practice what has always been the cornerstone of democracy — the recognition that freedom and responsibility are indivisible.

The Nazis came to power not because they were a majority, but because far too many non-Nazis did not stand against them when it was still relatively easy to do so. We have been warned. It is still possible to oppose the evil attitudes that found expression in Brussels. Let us directly elected representatives of the European peoples take the lead in so doing.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Andrews (RDE).** — Mr President, the Group of the European Democratic Alliance does not intend to support this compromise resolution; not because we disagree with the basic sentiments expressed in it but rather that we consider it to be too politicized. It seeks to find fault in areas where in our view none can be found. It is, of course, right that Parliament should condemn out of hand those savage thugs responsible for the massacre of the innocent in Brussels on 29 May. In passing, may I say how glad I am — and I am sure all the Members of Parliament are — that the Secretary-General of the Liberal Group is present in this Chamber despite having been injured in the stadium on that particular night. I just want to say in passing that we are pleased to see him here.

Television viewers who watched the terrifying assault by these English thugs must surely wonder if this is not going to be the norm at football matches wherever English clubs are present in the future. It is not enough, in my view, for Mrs Thatcher, Sir Henry Plumb and the British media to look for scapegoats either on the right or on the left. It does not, in my view, address itself to the causes of such catastrophes. When Mrs Thatcher was asked by the leader of the opposition in the British Parliament to hold an enquiry into the cause of violence amongst English soccer fans, she dismissed the request in her usual arrogant fashion. She does not appear to be interested in the cause but rather in the punishment. Mrs Thatcher, as we all know, celebrated, the Sun newspaper was triumphant and England celebrated the sinking of the Belgrano. What else can she expect from the example given by the 'Gotcha' headlines in the Sun newspaper to the people she represents and is supposed to lead when that kind of jingoistic journalism and that kind of leadership is given in one of the Community countries. She can expect very little in return from the people.

*(Applause from the left)*

But let us not be too smug in this Parliament on either side of this House because that tragedy in Brussels can happen in any of our countries unless we address ourselves seriously to the problems that underlie and are at the core of such riots. They are — as has been mentioned here — unemployment and the dispossession of many millions of people in Europe of their dignity.

Liverpool — and I want to pay tribute to the Liverpool Club and to the Liverpoolian people — has a magnificent record in English football and many admirers not only in England, but in Europe and the world and it should not be ostracized. It is the people and the people who are leading . . .

**President.** — I am sorry Mr Andrews, but your speaking time is up.

**Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC).** — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is somewhat bitter for me to recall that I tabled a motion for a resolution three years ago calling for an investigation into the social causes of the phenomenon 'violence in sport'. It was then remarked that such a social analysis was irrelevant and not a suitable subject for referral to Committee. Fortunately, we can now expect an own-initiative report on the issue.

As regard the Heysel tragedy, many questions can be asked and much can be regretted. Asocial hooligans and their senseless and barbarous violence are undeniably to blame. However, there are the British authorities as well, who hesitated too long before taking concrete action against such frequent supporter violence. We must also recognize that the Belgian authorities were found wanting. They were insufficiently aware of the danger, and the parliamentary committee considering the matter is to examine the extent to which the Minister concerned should accept political responsibility.

One can of course promptly submit a proposal to deal with football violence, but it is much more important to look for the reason behind such violence. Is it not because a socially rootless generation is constantly confronted with permanent forms of violence — social, economic and media violence? Is it not also because sport is being reduced to a celebration of the strongest and a paean to big profits?

**Mr Almirante (DR).** — *(IT)* Mr President, I am one of the many Italians who spent an afternoon and an evening in an armchair, overcome by anger and shame, watching the relentless television broadcast of all the details of the tragedy unfolding before us in the Brussels stadium.

Today I was pleased and moved to hear the kind unambiguous statements by the English Members of this House. This confirmed in me a feeling which I

**Almirante**

and many others have had since that day: for heaven's sake, let there be no demagoguery and no accusations against the great English people and their representatives, or against the great Belgian people and their representatives. Shame yes, because we have still not succeeded in building a civilized Europe. And anger, because certain events find us powerless and unprepared. And a firm resolve to overcome these misunderstandings in a truly European spirit. These are the feelings I would like to express on behalf of the group I have the honour to belong to.

It seems to me that these feelings and these proposals are not effectively reflected in the compromise motion. I would therefore suggest to the President that the motion tabled by our group — a motion of European inspiration and representing a specific European initiative to ensure that such situations are avoided and never recur — be put to the vote when the votes are taken.

*(Applause)*

**Mr van der Waal (NI).** — *(NL)* Mr President, according to the Netherlands Press there have been over 1 000 deaths and more than 3 500 people severely injured among spectators at international and national football matches since 1946. In our view, this is sufficient reason to ask whether it would not be better to abandon sport in this form altogether. For in our opinion these professional events have nothing to do with sport aimed at a healthy mind in a healthy body.

Now, we can of course look for the causes of the tragic events in Brussels. And to prevent a repetition, we can call for better security, more police, a ban on alcohol, for those responsible for the destruction to be brought to account etc. All measures not without impact. However, are they really the proper response to what has happened? We could also point to unemployment and the lack of job prospects for countless young people, which undoubtedly represent one of the underlying causes.

However, one may ask whether the events in Brussels are not a symptom of changes in our society with much deeper roots. Can this outburst of violence be seen apart from the vandalism that regularly raises its ugly head, from criminality, the drugs problem, the decline in the importance of the family and in general the breakdown of Christian values in our society? When, in life, nobody or authority outside this time and world, is recognized any longer and everything seems to be allowed, do not loneliness, emptiness and aggression on the part of individuals and social groups become understandable? But in that case all measures to prevent tragedies such as the one in Brussels are merely combating the symptoms.

In a short space of time the world has been shocked by two disasters. One in Brussels and one on a much larger scale in Bangladesh. They are not related. But if

we do look at them together, we are confronted with an outrageous contrast. In one part of the world, many thousands died who lacked the knowledge and the millions of ECUs to protect themselves against this kind of natural disaster. In another part of the world dozens die in a popular sport that costs millions and has become almost a religion.

Mr President, we consider the time has come to subject football as a mass sport to a radical reappraisal.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Van Miert (S).** — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my first thoughts go out to the victims of the Heysel tragedy and their next of kin, and I would also like to take this opportunity to say that, even though quite a few moves are being launched to compensate these people, this cannot of course take away the grief. These events should also give the media pause for thought. When such things happen, is it possible to justify allowing television broadcasts to continue and would it not be better to cancel them out of respect for the victims?

I would also point out that the Heysel tragedy is extremely bad for football as such. The over-commercialization and the hard-nosed business involved were revealed here in cynical fashion. This tragedy is undoubtedly bad for Great Britain as well. It would be unfair to argue that football vandalism only exists in Britain. It is nevertheless a fact that recent years have seen quite a few incidents that have cast a bad light on British football supporters in particular.

The Heysel tragedy was also bad for my country, however. Even the authorities now concede that there were shortcomings in a number of areas and the Belgian Parliament has set up a committee of enquiry to examine the matter and to take the necessary steps.

The Heysel tragedy is also bad for Europe. It is a sign of re nascent nationalism and a renewed pitting of people against people. Action is therefore called for and we endorse the ban on such fixtures for an indefinite period. The football clubs also need to be reminded of their responsibility. Too many clubs still regard football matches purely as a commercial business and are not bothered about their supporters — such outrages are the result.

**Mr Howell (ED).** — Mr President, no citizen of my country could escape the terrible sensation of outrage and shame as the full facts of tragedy at the Heysel Stadium became known on 29 May. The grief felt by all British citizens is very real, and to those injured at the Heysel Stadium and to the relatives of those who died, we express our profound grief and sorrow.

The proper role of this Chamber, Mr President, is to look ahead and help to ensure that such a state of

**Howell**

affairs is never again allowed to occur; that the sport can flourish and continue to entertain millions and to act as a force for peace and understanding between peoples. To this end the British Government has already taken a number of legislative steps and legislative process to ban alcohol and to introduce cards for identification purposes will be forthcoming. The steps already taken in Scotland will be looked at afresh in England.

We are determined, Mr President, to make sure that the perpetrators and agitators of the Heysel disaster come to justice and to alter fundamentally the character of the British game. We, therefore, welcome the involvement of Parliament and today's resolution. Already the Council of Europe's Sports Ministers have been commissioned, earlier this week, to produce model legislation along the lines of the 1984 European Council recommendations and we urge very strongly that they come into existence swiftly.

Mr President, we also ask — while in no way seeking to shed blame, that the full facts of the Heysel tragedy are made known. If mistakes were made in the choice of Heysel by UEFA or if mistakes were made in the policing of the stadium, there must be no cover up. We similarly ask for all information on those who were there to agitate to be fully made known by our Italian colleagues.

Mr President, our role is now to plan for the future, to the day when England can return with pride and to compete with the best that football can produce in Europe.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Ducarme (L).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I must say that I understand very well Mr Costanzo's indignation and sadness and also his desire to find out where the responsibility lies. But I would like to assure our colleagues, be they British or Italian or any other Community nationality, that the Belgian population widely shares this indignation, this sadness and this desire to find out who was responsible. As Mr Van Miert said, there is a very clear desire to see the Belgian Chamber of Deputies' Commission of Enquiry identify those responsible. I believe I can say that no matter where the responsibility lies at the Belgian end, this will be identified and measures will in all likelihood be taken.

As for our Parliament, I hope that the report presented by Mrs Larive-Groenendaal will have an impact, and that in this connection the Community Member States and their governments will make a point of ensuring that the law is applied.

**Mr Coste-Floret (RDE).** — *(FR)* Mr President, the Group of the European Democratic Alliance finds it impossible to support the compromise motion and upholds its own motion.

When Baron Pierre de Coubertin revived the Olympic Games he defined two principles governing sports events: first, sport should be completely separated from politics, and secondly, sport should be based on the ethics of peace, fraternity and a gathering of free men.

These principles will guide our vote. We cannot vote for the compromise motion because it denounces those responsible as being extremists and fascists. We do not know whether this is so at all. We are disgusted by the way this drama is being exploited for political ends. We bow before all the victims, whoever they may be, and we say that we do not want to disrupt the unity of the dead by dividing the living.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Staes (ARC).** — *(NL)* Mr President, I consider the scale of this tragedy so great, both for the victims and for society itself, that I do not wish to comment on these events. I will use my speaking time of one and a half minutes to observe one minute of silence in the conviction that this also amounts to a form of comment. I would ask you to respect my speaking time until it is up, so that this one minute of silence can be observed.

*(Parliament observed one minute's silence)*

**Mr Ulburghs (NI).** — *(NL)* Mr President, we live in a violent society. Sport is an accurate reflection of this society. Spectator sports in particular are being spoiled by the intense competition, and everything is subordinated to one goal: winning. How far have we now come from the idea of fair play, the practising of sport as a game that provides pleasure? Is it not time that the sports world seriously starts to reconsider the purpose of sport?

Secondly, sport should not become an object of investment, allowing speculators to become rich. At this time of crisis, how can one justify spending hundreds of millions of Belgian francs on buying and selling players? Does one buy and sell people like animals and machines?

Thirdly, sport has a social function. It should promote a sense of community, an idea now totally foreign to today's elite sports. Sport is mainly much more than a leisure pastime. It has an important educative function. I would therefore advocate making more resources available to the mass participant sports.

Fourthly, we cannot close our eyes to the Fascist infiltration of supporter groups. These movements find a receptive audience in these young people, both unemployed and employed, who have no prospects and who think they can find fulfilment through senseless violence. Who is to blame, however? I live in an area with

## Ulburghs

extremely high unemployment. I know what they are going through. This society no longer has any future to offer them. They feel abandoned.

Finally, did we not all die a little on that Wednesday evening? Shouldn't we be thinking about building a Europe in which sport provides a model for a society based on justice and peace?

**Mr Stewart (S).** — The people of Liverpool and Merseyside, just as the rest of the people in Europe, were shocked and horrified at the scenes of carnage that took place at the Heysel Stadium prior to the European Cup Final on 29 May 1985, resulting in the death and injury of many people. The misery inflicted on the families of those who died will live with them forever. So will that night live with the people of Liverpool — a night of shame. The people of Liverpool can only send their deepest sympathy to those who suffered such tragic losses and strongly condemn the hooligans who resort to such violence.

Football hooliganism is on the increase throughout the world. It is an international problem and cannot be confined to one particular nation. There is ample proof of that throughout the world from the tragedies that have taken place at various football stadiums. It is of the utmost importance that this House investigate fully all the allegations made regarding the incidents that led to the viciousness which took place on those terraces that night. Was the stadium adequate? What about policing of the stadium, organization by UEFA, ticket control, liquor consumption, participation of Fascist elements? And here, Mr President, is a leaflet which was distributed by the British Movement at the Heysel Stadium that night.

Nothing we may say can whitewash the actions of the thugs. I went with friends to the Heysel Stadium that night to watch a football match. I have followed Liverpool, as a supporter, for over 30 years. Instead of watching a football match, I witnessed scenes of violence and slaughter such as I would never wish to see again. The people and the fans responsible for that brought disrepute to the Liverpool Football Club and its real, genuine supporters and shame to the people of Liverpool.

Mr President, it is now time for this House to take upon itself by passing this resolution — which I sincerely hope will be passed — to make sure that action is taken. There has been talk and no action for far too long. Let this House pass this resolution and take the action that is really necessary!

*(Applause)*

**Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken (PPE).** — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in the mid-70s when violence in and around stadiums began to flair up, var-

ious groups concerned about sport launched initiatives to put a stop to the violence. At congresses and international meetings, they came to the conclusion that the major task was education at school, in the family, in youth sports groups and via the media to ensure mutual respect and 'fair play'. It was said that violence in sport was a reflection of violence in society. Take the cause away and the violence in sport will also disappear. However, this idealistic thought took too little account of the fact that, until good education and social change bore fruit, people had to be protected from existing violence.

International sport figurations made some changes to their rules, but did not consider that they had anything to do with violence. The indignant media condemned the manifestations of violence, and the referees became stricter. Violence on the pitch lessened, but the fans were becoming increasingly wayward. The Council of Europe and various other international organizations discussed emergency regulations, bans and infrastructure modifications, but most countries were afraid of being accused of intolerance and political authoritarianism if they implemented such strict measures in full. This has certainly been the case with those countries that do not face this problem at home, such as our own country.

The result was this terrible tragedy at Heysel. After years of preaching in the desert, we now venture to hope, firstly, that the international character of this phenomenon will be recognized and rules imposed on sports events both in Europe and in the rest of the world; secondly, that sports bodies and public authorities will cooperate in earnest instead of constantly passing the buck to and fro; thirdly, that the media continue in their clear condemnation of the facts wherever they occur. And finally the public should at last open its eyes. A large part of the public has not always appreciated the idea of fair play, but we hope that when weapon searches are carried out or bans imposed on alcohol and banners etc., the public realizes that the aim is not to harass people but to protect them. Peaceful sports fans must be protected against the widespread contempt for law and order and there can no longer be any excuses for the perpetrators.

**Mr McMillan-Scott (ED).** — Mr President, in rising to support this resolution on behalf of the European Democratic Group, I can only say, on behalf of us all, that this sombre debate has raised many issues and exposed many raw nerves. May I assure the House that for our part the lessons from Heysel have been learned and measures are being put in hand to improve the situation.

**Mr Dury (S).** — *(FR)* Mr President, speaking as a Brussels inhabitant, if shame has descended on my city and my country it is made even worse by the attitude of the Brussels city authorities, the Interior Minister and the football federations.

**Dury**

We await a gesture from them, a gesture showing their sense of responsibility, their solidarity with the victims and their families, but they have not made any such gesture. Luckily a Belgian parliamentary Commission of Enquiry will be able to point out where the responsibility lies, and I will be among those demanding that all the appropriate conclusions be drawn.

Mr President, I would also like to note that here, in our Parliament, we have a Committee of Enquiry into Racism and Fascism, and I think this Committee should also examine what happened in Brussels and see to what extent fascists and extreme-right groups were responsible, be they English or Italian, groups, moreover, which have links with the extreme right in all the countries of Europe.

Finally, I would like to say that the Heysel problem is perhaps that of sport, of profit in the name of sport and the sporting spirit, of sport, yes, but seen against the background of social policy. I do not believe that this kind of incident would have happened during a golf tournament or a tennis match. We should realise that sport cannot be considered in isolation.

Finally, Mr President, we must think of the victims. I feel that the proposed compensation is ridiculous when compared to the profits made by sports federations, especially the football ones.

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (FR) Mr President, the Commission was deeply shocked by Wednesday's horror at Heysel. My colleague Peter Sutherland, who was at the stadium, immediately expressed on the Commission's behalf our heartfelt feelings and our sympathy for the victims and their families. He denounced the intolerable contradiction between this eruption of violence and the ethics of sport, whose aim should be to foster contacts between people and also relations between communities. The Commission arranged to be represented at the funeral on 1 June by two of its Vice-Presidents, one English and the other Italian. It also decided to make 200 000 ECU available for the injured and their families.

Certain of the issues raised here are a matter for governments because they concern the maintenance of law and order. However, as mentioned by several speakers, other matters extend beyond one individual country or one region of the Community. Therefore, it seems appropriate to the Commission, as it does to many parliamentarians, that this be examined in a larger framework, a European one. The work of the Council of Europe should be taken into account here. We know that the Council of Europe has a convention which makes it possible to compensate victims of violence. We know that the Sports Ministers meet regularly.

But, Mr President, as many parliamentarians have stated, we must also reflect on the deep-rooted situa-

tions which might explain the instability, concern, and sometimes vengeful anguish of certain sectors in our countries, and youth in particular. We believe that Parliament can make a crucial contribution to such reflections.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1<sup>1</sup>, replacing the motions for resolutions Docs. B 2-408/85, B 2-455/85, B 2-461/85, B 2-467/85, B 2-486/85, B 2-494/85, B 2-514/85, rejected the motion for a resolution Doc B 2-469/85 and adopted the motion for a resolution Doc B 2-498/85).<sup>2</sup>

\*  
\* \*

**Mr Christopher Jackson (ED).** — Mr President, although I have not counted them exactly, we have had before us during the urgency debates today something like 60 resolutions grouped into six topics. We have debated one topic only and a very useful debate it was. We have spent most of our time voting. Urgency debates have not been debates, they have been reduced to a level of absurdity. . .

**President.** — Mr Jackson, I did ask the House if they wanted to undertake this procedure in exceptional circumstances.

**Mr Christopher Jackson (ED).** — I am not making any complaints about your chairing of this sitting which was immaculate. I want, however, formally to request that you and the other Vice-Presidents with the President should consider this situation and perhaps, before we have the next urgency debate, make recommendations to the House which may enable us to debate more and vote less.

**President.** — We shall take note of that comment.

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — Mr President, some of us on this side of the House were under some confusion. We thought that we were having a roll-call vote as evidence that the Conservatives were the only group in this House that voted against exhaust emission. Will

<sup>1</sup> Amendment No 1 by Mrs Larive-Groenendaal, Mr De Gucht, Mr Ducarme and Mr Romeo, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Brok, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party; Sir Henry Plumb and Mr Howell, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; and Mr Papapietro, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

<sup>2</sup> Motions for resolutions Docs. B 2-409/85 and B 2-419/85 had been withdrawn.

**Tomlinson**

you till us whether we are having a roll-call vote or not?

**President.** — We did not have a roll-call vote. We had an electronic check.

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — Thank you.

**Mrs Viehoff (S).** — (NL) Mr President, I do not agree with what Mr Jackson just said. I know it is officially called topical and urgent debate, but in my view the purpose of it should be that matters which genuinely need to be dealt with urgently can be placed on Parliament's agenda and that decisions must be taken on them quickly. That some people feel frustrated because they do not get a chance to speak and do not get into the newspapers is another matter. I think it is more important that Parliament should take decisions on urgent matters than that we should take decisions on a number of matters because other people have to talk for hours since they consider it important for their own constituencies.

**President.** — We shall take note of that comment.

(The sitting was suspended at 7.25 pm and resumed at 7.30 pm)<sup>1</sup>

IN THE CHAIR: MRS PERY

*Vice-President*

10. Votes

**Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-412/85) by Mr Christopher Jackson and others on Ethiopia**

*Explanation of vote*

**Mr Adamou (COM), in writing.** — (GR) We have every reason to believe the assurance by Mr Natali that the food aid to Ethiopia is being delivered satisfactorily, since this assurance comes after his visit to Ethiopia and a study of the problem on the spot.

On the other hand, we have every reason to reject the statements by Mr Jackson and others to the contrary. They do not provide any evidence, and so we are justified in considering that their aim is to slander the Ethiopian Government, to hamper the continuation of

the aid and to aggravate the differences among the population for very obvious purposes. With regard to the problem of famine in Africa, we should like to stress that it is not only an Ethiopian problem. Famine afflicts in all 25 African countries such as Chad, Mali, Ghana, Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Senegal, Lesotho and others.

There are two main reasons for this famine. The first is the drought and the second is the shameless exploitation of Africa under past colonialism and present neo-colonialism, which has transformed it into one enormous plantation for coffee, tea, rice, cotton and other similar products which are sold for a song in the centres of capitalism.

The only solution — besides immediate aid to combat famine — is for the regions concerned to turn to other crops to feed the population, for land reclamation projects to be set up, and for heavy and light industry to be developed. In short, independent economic development in accordance with the needs and possibilities of the region, which is something which has started to happen in Ethiopia.

The EEC, if it so wishes, can contribute towards this. The question is, will it want to? Everything else is pure hypocrisy to cover up sly and dishonest motives.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

**Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-430/85) by Mrs Lehideux and others on the famine in Ethiopia: rejected**

\*  
\* \*

**Report (Doc. A 2-50/85), drawn up by Mr Patterson on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, on consolidating the internal market**

**Mr Seal (S), Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy.** — Could we be assured that the Commission has not already prepared its White Paper on the unamended document? I have been told that it has been working on the unamended Patterson report rather than wait on the decision tonight of the vote of this House. If that is the case, then it is deplorable.

Could the Commission assure us that it is going to react to the amended document and not the unamended document?

**Mr Patterson (ED), rapporteur.** — My understanding is that it has indeed been working on the White Paper today, but it is not going to finalize the text until

<sup>1</sup> *Waiving of the immunity of a Member: see Minutes.*

**Patterson**

tomorrow, which will give it time to take into account the wishes of this House.

*Explanations of vote*

**Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S).** — (NL) After due consideration, and following a difficult vote, the Socialist Group will abstain in the final voting on the Patterson report. Together with the Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, we regret that such an important topic has had to be rushed through committee.

We were sympathetic to the rapporteur's intention, namely to provide a signal from this House to the Milan Summit. We therefore cooperated fully during the committee's discussions. Like the rapporteur, all socialists are opposed to paper mountains, the absurd red tape at internal frontiers and useless bureaucracy, which hamper the transport industry and make a true citizens' Europe impossible. However, the present resolution is full of ambiguities.

Our amendments were aimed at removing these ambiguities, stressing that an internal market must be underpinned by a common social, regional and industrial policy and that there must be a balanced regional policy together with a common fiscal and commercial policy, but they were rejected. Unfortunately, this rejection has once again shown us that at the end of the day the only thing that counts is to achieve a Europe of free capital flows and capital speculation, the Europe of bankers versus the Europe of labour. We then say clearly: Count us out.

If the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs had set aside more time for a careful discussion of the conditions for the internal market, and if we had had the Commission's white paper, which unfortunately won't be available until next week, we could then have set out well — argued guidelines of the Milan Summit. Now we can only point to the arguments of our spokesmen in this debate, and beg the Ministers in Milan to open their windows and listen to the cry of 13 million unemployed Europeans. They want work, not necessarily an opening of the floodgates of capital.

**Mr Bonnacini (COM).** — (IT) I would remind you of what I said yesterday, and the fact that the amendments tabled by Mr Besse and Mr Mattina have been approved is one more reason for our voting in favour.

**Mr Seal (S), Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy.** — I cannot support this report at all. I do, however, say I support the efforts of my colleague, Mr Rogalla, in his fight to make border crossings easier for people and for transport. I support him because he is an idealist, even though I think some of his ideals are very unrealistic.

But Mr Patterson is another kettle of fish. He represents not people in this report that he has prepared, but hardnosed industrialists and businessmen, such as Mr Ferranti! They are not interested in a people's Europe, whatever they say! They are interested in a multinationals' Europe. They favour abolition of all planned trade and they want complete freedom for the multinationals to do whatever they want, irrespective of the effect on people.

In my constituency one multinational, Philips, is making 550 workers redundant and transferring all its production to Europe, even though the factory it is closing is its only profitable factory making washing machines. The report aids this kind of action. In this report there is not enough emphasis on the social policies required, not enough emphasis on the regional policies required and not enough emphasis on the industrial policies required before borders can be abolished. Neither is there any concern by Mr Patterson and his colleagues in this report for the work of the trade unions, work that is necessary in international concerns.

I absolutely reject this report.

**Mr Cryer (S).** — In the lengthy explanation accompanying the report, which Mr Patterson has no doubt gone to great trouble to provide, he suggests that the unused resources in some countries in the Common Market can be assessed by use of the Social Fund. Now that really is laughable. The Social Fund amounts to about 4% of the budget that has been passed today. It is being cut back in Sheffield where, as a result of Tory and Common Market policies, 20 000 steelworkers are on the dole. Sheffield's local authority is finding that their applications for training schemes are being cut back. On that ground, therefore, I reject the report.

I also reject the report on the basis of the abolition of exchange controls. No elected government of the day — and it is significant that not even the Thatcher government — has repealed the legislation: it has only repealed the delegated legislation that arose from the principal Act of Parliament. We need the right to control the movement of capital because we cannot trust capitalists to work in the national interests.

Finally, Madam President, this report by calling for the removal of customs barriers is in direct contradiction to a report in yesterday's 'Times' which points out that extra drugs investigators are appointed as the number of new addicts rises. With Amsterdam in the Common Market as a centre of the drug trade, we need to exercise more scrutiny to combat what the Home Affairs Committee of the House of Commons said represents 'the most serious peacetime threat to the national well-being'. On that account I will vote against this report.

**Mr Huckfield (S).** — I would hope that every Member of the British Labour Group will vote against this report for the very simple reason that though those living in that Kangaroo zoo over the other side of the House have tried to convince us that this report is only about the reduction of customs and tariff barriers, it is in fact about something much more fundamental than that and I would hope that they will not try and conceal it from us. What they seek to bring about is the utterly free and unimpeded movement of labour and capital anywhere in the Community as long as it enables them to make bigger and more handsome profits. That is what it is all about. In fact it is basically pure Euro-Thatcherism.

Madam President, there is absolutely no way that any of the peripheral regions in the Community can hope to attract investments or maintain investments without having some control over the movement of capital. This report seeks to deny those kind of controls. Without that kind of control areas like mine in the peripheral regions of the Community simply will fail to retain any jobs at all.

*(Cries of 'Time, time')*

The other thing I think we have to stress, Madam President, is that the Members opposite seem to be absolutely obsessed with producing economies of scale in Europe similar to those obtaining in North America. Let them not forget that there are now more people classified as living in poverty in North America than there are in the whole of Europe. Let them not forget that. What we say, Madam President, is that we cannot negotiate with the principles in this report. The only thing that we can do is reject it totally.

*(Applause from the Socialist group)*

**Mr Christiansen (S), in writing.** — *(DA)* The Danish Social Democrats fully support the creation of an internal market in the Community. This will mean increased economic activity, the creation of more jobs and increased economic independence from the other large trading blocs in the world. At the same time, it will make life considerably easier for tourists and commercial travellers crossing borders.

The reason why we shall nevertheless abstain on this report is because we think that the introduction of the internal market should not prevent individual countries from taking steps prompted by health, environmental or ergonomic considerations. Likewise, we are against the general aim of free capital movements and the establishment of a totally free capital market, since this may be abused for speculative ends with just short-term profit as the motive. Furthermore, we tabled a series of amendments to those points in the report relating to the removal of fiscal barriers to the internal market, which we think take harmonization too far.

**Mr Filinis (COM), in writing.** — *(GR)* Mr President, the Greek Communist Party of the Interior will vote for Mr Patterson's report. It certainly does not escape us that in the Community there is a strong tendency to regard the process of European integration mainly as a liberation of the market, with far less importance being attached to the efforts to bring about convergence between the regions of the Community. This undermines the development of the less developed countries and, as the statistics show, the gap between the richer and poorer countries, instead of decreasing, is continuing to grow.

However, we are pleased to note that the Patterson report stresses that the useful and necessary procedures for consolidating the internal market must be combined with the development of common policies, such as the regional and social policies, the integrated Mediterranean programmes, and an increase in the Community appropriations which are granted through loans by the European Investment Bank and under the New Community Instrument. Of course these measures would have to be supplemented by other necessary measures, e.g. more effective aid from the Community budget and the introduction and development of a common industrial policy in the Community. However, this in no way detracts from the importance of the measures proposed in the Patterson report, and so we shall vote for it.

**Mr Marshall (ED), in writing.** — Although I support much that is contained in the Patterson report, I am unable to vote for it because of the section headed 'The removal of Fiscal Barriers'. In particular, I cannot support the comments made in paragraphs 48 and 58. I oppose these suggestions for several reasons.

I believe, first of all, that calls for fiscal harmonization are counterproductive. Indirect taxes account for almost 50% of the revenue in my country. Does this Parliament seriously believe that any government is going to agree easily or speedily to fiscal harmonization? By making this part of the package, we are delaying progress toward the creation of a freer Common Market.

Similarly, I do not believe that it is necessary to harmonize the coverage of VAT. To propose this is to sow the seeds of future scare campaigns. Many of the goods which are zero-rated in the UK do not — and probably never will — enter into international trade on a wide scale. To tax them in order to achieve fiscal harmony is unnecessary and unwise.

Because of these reservations, I shall abstain on the Patterson report, although I recognize the rapporteur's energy and enthusiasm.

**Marshall**

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)<sup>1</sup>*

**Mr Patterson (ED), rapporteur.** — Madam President, I have been subjected by the chairman of my own committee to almost a personal attack on the way this report was produced. I suspect that the chairman of the committee has not read the report, because it goes to very great lengths to point out that a free internal market is not enough and that you do have to have social, regional and investment policies as well. I draw to his attention what the Commissioner said namely, that it is not enough just to have a free market, you must have an expanding market to provide jobs. All that is in the report. It is not surprising that only two people voted against it in committee, one of whom was the chairman.

**President.** — Mr Patterson, I am afraid I must stop you. We really have too many votes to get through, so I should be grateful if you would please sit down.

\*  
\* \*

**Report (Doc. A 2-38/85), drawn up by Mr von Wogau on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, on the communication from the Commission to the Council (Doc. C 2-9/85 — COM (84) 717 final) on public supply contracts — conclusions and perspectives**

**Mr Bonde (ARC), in writing.** — (DA) The Danish People's Movement is against the proposal in the report that public procurement contracts for military equipment should be published in the Official Journal of the European Communities, since military matters are outside the scope of the Treaty of Rome.

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)*

\*  
\* \*

**Report (Doc. A 2-37/85), drawn up by Mr von Wogau on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-1283/84 — COM (84) 400 final) for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to roll-over protection structures incorporating two pillars**

<sup>1</sup> The rapporteur was:  
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 5, 6, 8 to 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 24, 28 to 33, 36, 37, 65 to 73, and 75;  
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 4, 11/rev., 19 to 23, 35, 41 to 54, 57 to 63, 74, and 77 to 80.

**and mounted in front of the driver's seat on narrow-track wheeled agricultural or forestry tractors.**

*Proposal for a directive*

**Mr Herman (PPE).** — (FR) Madam President, I should like to ask the Commission whether it is prepared to fall in with Parliament's position if, as seems very likely to happen, we reject its proposal.

If the Commission is unable to reply, we shall invoke Rule 35

**President.** — Mr Herman, we shall first vote on the proposal for a directive.

*After the rejection of the proposal for a directive*

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (FR) Madam President, my colleague Lord Cockfield has already explained the reasons why the Commission cannot withdraw its proposal. It regrets that the proposal is too detailed and only covers part of the subject, but it is one of a series of proposals and if we withdrew it now all of them would be held up. So we will not withdraw this proposal.

**Mr Herman (PPE).** — (FR) Madam President, I would therefore ask Parliament to decide to refer it back to committee under Rule 35.

**Mr Ducarme (L).** — (FR) On behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, I second Mr Herman's proposal.

*(Parliament decided to refer the proposal back to committee)*

\*  
\* \*

**Report (Doc. A 2-42/85), drawn up by Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the proposed cooperation agreement between the European Community and Central America: adopted<sup>1</sup>**

\*  
\* \*

**Interim report (Doc. A 2-45/85), drawn up by Mr van Aerssen on behalf of the Committee on External**

<sup>1</sup> The rapporteur was:  
AGAINST all the amendments.

**Ducarme****Economic Relations, on economic relations between the European Community and Latin America***Motion for a resolution**Paragraph 11 — Amendment No 5*

**Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul (S).** — (DE) I should like to ask the rapporteur a question. We should like to see this motion as an addition to paragraph 11, since it does not actually replace this paragraph. It is about something completely different. Would it be acceptable to you if we voted on them separately?

**Mr Zarges (PPE), deputy rapporteur.** — (DE) We consider that this subject — since we are dealing with an interim report — should ultimately be dealt with and fully discussed in the final report. So although I am not basically in favour, I do not see why we should not vote as you suggest.

*Paragraph 12 — Amendment No 6*

**Mr Chanteric (PPE).** — (NL) Madam President, I should like it to be noted in the Minutes that Mr Ulburghs considers his amendments so important that he has not even turned up to vote for them.

**Mr Arndt (S).** — (DE) I should like to ask the Member who has just complained about Mr Ulburghs to see to it in his own group that the rapporteur is here for the vote.

(Mixed reactions)

**Mr Cornelissen (PPE).** — (NL) Madam President, I should like to ask Mr Arndt to withdraw that statement and apologise.

**Mr Arndt (S).** — (DE) I really did not see that Mr van Aerssen was here. But I fail to understand why the rapporteur does not state his views if he is in the Chamber, instead of leaving it up to his colleagues.

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, we still have to vote on a large number of reports. I would ask you to bring this discussion to an end.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)<sup>1</sup>

\*  
\* \*

Interim report (Doc. A 2-44/85), drawn up by Mr McGowan on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on relations between the European Community and Latin America — development aspects: adopted<sup>1</sup>

\*  
\* \*

Report (Doc. A 2-49/85), drawn up by Mr De Pasquale on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM (85) 180 final/2 — Doc. C 2-18/85) for a regulation instituting integrated Mediterranean programmes

*Proposal for a regulation**Article 10 — Paragraph 2 — Amendment No 56*

**Mr De Pasquale (COM), rapporteur.** — (IT) The point contained in Amendment No 56 was not discussed in committee. I would therefore ask Mr von der Vring to withdraw it because of its complexity.

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — (DE) I can imagine that the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning has no clear view of the budgetary consequences. We insist on a vote on this amendment since otherwise we would be giving the Council the possibility of extending the funds over more than seven years even in the budget estimate.

*After adoption of the commission proposal*

**Mr Herman (PPE).** — (FR) May we ask the Commission what it thinks of Parliament's amendments and what it intends to do with them?

**Mr De Pasquale (COM), rapporteur.** — (IT) Madame President, in the contacts I had with the Commission before this vote an assurance was given that the Commission would take due account of Parliament's views. Furthermore, the President of the Commission has already written a letter to the President of Parliament, Mr Pflimlin, expressly stating that before the regulation becomes law Parliament's views will be taken into account. Furthermore, I do not think that Mr Herman can invoke Rule 37 of the Rules of Procedure since it seems to me that it is the rapporteur's prerogative, and as rapporteur I do not wish to make use of it.

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (FR) Madame President, the Commission naturally

<sup>1</sup> Mr Zarges, deputy rapporteur, was:  
AGAINST all the amendments.

<sup>1</sup> The rapporteur was:  
IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 2 to 5, and 7;  
AGAINST Amendment No 6.

**Cheysson**

wishes to look very closely at each of the amendments. It can already state that it takes a positive view of a large number of them. I have been given the list, which I should like to read out as an initial indication: they are Amendments Nos 1, 6, 29, 30, 53, 20, 21, 23, 37, 4, 28, 7, 45, 8, 17 and 69.

*Explanations of vote*

**Mrs Boot (PPE).** — (NL) I did my best to explain my vote on the Patterson report, but now I wish to make use of my right to do this orally. I shall abstain because of the amendment to Article 7 (3) tabled by the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, which states that the decisions to approve IMPs shall also be binding for measures that come under other Funds. If this amendment becomes a point of contention during conciliation on 19 June, then with this explanation of vote I want to indicate that Parliament's delegation could then drop this controversial amendment, since the IMPs must be approved before the first of July.

**Mr Pranchère (COM), in writing.** — (FR) The principle of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes was approved by the Stuttgart European Council within the framework of enlargement.

The French Communist and allied parliamentarians do not agree to this approach. Although they oppose enlargement, which is still not a fait accompli because the national parliaments have not ratified it, they see the IMPs as a way of enabling the Mediterranean regions to catch up and rectify the balance.

While we are satisfied by the Commission's more global and decentralized approach to drawing up the IMPs, this does not apply to the financial amounts involved, which have been shrivelled down.

That is why we proposed, in order to satisfy the large-scale needs, to increase the appropriations to 6 000 million ECU, with their allocation between the three recipient countries being fixed beforehand.

As the rapporteur noted, we are afraid that the IMPs will be implemented by drawing heavily on the structural funds, which will lead to difficulties in implementing a number of integrated operations.

It was in order to prevent such transfers that we submitted an amendment recalling the commitments entered into by the European Council on 29 and 30 March 1985 in Brussels, which recognized that the IMPs should not 'negatively affect structural fund transfers to other priority, or less prosperous, regions'. Although we recognize the value of the De Pasquale

report, which fits in with our views, we shall abstain because our amendments were rejected.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)<sup>1</sup>

\*  
\* \*

**Mr Hermann (PPE).** — (FR) Madame President, on behalf — I hope — of all my colleagues, I should like to congratulate you on the courteous, speedy and efficient way in which you have conducted this long voting session.

(Loud applause)

**President.** — Thank you. For my part I wish to thank all the staff. We shall now have one hour's break for dinner.

*The sitting was suspended at 9.30 pm and resumed at 10.30 pm.*

## IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

*Vice-President*

11. *Right to petition Parliament — European driving licence — European Passport — Obstacles at intra-Community borders (contd)*

**President.** — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on the Chanterie report (Doc. A 2-41/85) and four oral questions with debate (Docs. B 2-324/85, B 2-387/85, B 2-325/85 and B 2-323/85) on People's Europe.<sup>2</sup>

**Mr Schwalba-Hoth (ARC).** — (DE) Honourable Presidium, empty House, we have before us a total of five reports for joint discussion and I would like to say a few words about petitions in connection with the Chanterie Report.

Although we are able to communicate with one another here because we have interpreters, nevertheless we do not always mean the same thing when talking about petitions. This is not only due to the fact that we come from different cultures, but also because

<sup>1</sup> The rapporteur was:

— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1 to 25, 29, 34, 41, 45, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 67, 70 and 71;  
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 26, 30, 32, 33, 35/rev. to 40, 42 to 44, 46 to 48, 50 to 52, 55 and 68.

<sup>2</sup> See previous day's debates.

### Schwalba-Hoth

the concept petition has different connotations in our various countries and languages.

For example, there is no right to petition at all in Ireland, where — in addition to Italy and the United Kingdom — this right is not even anchored in the constitution. In Denmark, Luxembourg and Belgium collective petitions are forbidden; in Luxembourg the petitioner has to be directly affected. As for petitions with a successful conclusion, these total 61% in the Federal Republic of Germany and 94% in France.

Therefore, even if we could clear away these comprehension difficulties, we cannot base ourselves on any national system. We have to develop our own system and that is what this report has tried to do.

Let me say a few words in this connection about the ombudsman. From what I know about Scandinavia the ombudsman was a very big success, and it is for this very reason that I am against introducing an ombudsman at European level as an alternative to the Committee on Petitions. This might seem to be a paradox, but just imagine what kind of man or woman we would need who could. . .

*(Interruption)*

. . . Dear Mr Wedekind, this is an almost intimate gathering. None of us, I am sure, would be superhuman enough to carry out such functions, because this ombudsman would, at one and the same time, have to deal with trade barriers in Greece, try to uncover legal scandals in the United Kingdom or France, struggle with psychiatric issues in the Federal Republic of Germany or chase up pension problems in Italy.

The Scandinavian experience in particular has not only demonstrated that side by side with official channels an ombudsman can be successful in a small unit, where it is easy to keep track of things, but also that an ombudsman could not cope in a set-up as anomalous as the European Community, and that a committee — with appropriate support staff and corresponding parliamentary control — could carry out this task much more effectively.

When speaking forcefully here about a People's Europe and about our wanting to obtain as much certainty about the law as possible for our citizens, we have to be careful not to deceive ourselves. We must realize that an instrument such as the Petitions Committee and the possibility of submitting petitions can, in the final analysis, only compensate for injustices already done. Therefore, we are nothing more than what might possibly be the last hope of rescue in cases of real or merely perceived injustice, and this in a situation where the various Community laws are increasingly affecting citizens lives and where we — and all party groups agree on this surely — must provide for greater transparency in order to protect our citizens.

I believe we need minimum guarantees on five points: first, we must extract a commitment from governments to give information, including access to files; secondly, governments must follow any recommendations made; thirdly, we need to extend the Rules of Procedure and, fourthly, to improve the administrative structure of the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Petitions, by which I mean it should be strengthened; fifthly and lastly, we need a publicity campaign to make citizens aware of these improved opportunities for submitting petitions. Only then, at long last, will the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions stop being a tiger with no bite, and only then will we have more successful petitions.

**Mr Stravrou (PPE).** — *(GR)* Mr President, I have asked to speak so that I too can confirm what Mr Chanterie told us in his speech yesterday, and I should like to add that there is usually a predominant impression that the European idea is furthered exclusively by the major policy choices, such as the Common Agricultural Policy, which we see running into so many obstacles, the really considerable efforts made to adopt a uniform European currency, and the integrated Mediterranean programmes which we are discussing today.

However, Mr. President, there are a few other ideas and a few other minor questions which in their turn also serve to create and build the European idea and European unity. Among these I would number such things as the European passport and the adoption of a system for issuing a uniform driving licence.

Mr. President, I think that these matters also, however minor they may be, are very important for the creation of a European consciousness, and I hope that when they come to fruition — since at the moment they are being obstructed — many European citizens, who, as Mr Chanterie said, turn in their thousands to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to complain, will be rid of all this bother, and you can be sure that when these matters have been settled, it will be possible greatly to reinforce European consciousness.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Christensen (ARC).** — *(DA)* Mr President, the Danish People's Movement against Membership of the European Community warns against a common European Community passport and driving licence. These are clearly the responsibilities of the national states. The Communities are not, and will not be, recognized as a passport-issuing authority. A serious objection from our point of view is that a Community passport union will smash the Nordic passport union, and easing border controls on the scale proposed here will mean that Danish citizens travelling to other Nordic countries will be viewed and subjected to controls as

**Christensen**

Community citizens, not as Nordic citizens. A passport is a visible token of national identity. The Danes do not want to relinquish this symbol, in spite of the fact that our country will not be a sovereign nation until we free ourselves from the Community.

Nor can we accept Community harmonization of driving licences. Every year in Denmark hundreds are killed and thousands injured on the roads in spite of the fairly strict conditions for acquiring a driving licence. We cannot accept the imposition on our country of lower requirements for the skills needed to drive a car. I would like to ask the Commission whether these harmonization proposals would allow a Dane who had been unable to obtain a driving licence in Denmark to simply buy a licence in, for example, Belgium or another Community country with lower driving skill requirements?

**Mr Van der Waal (NI).** — (NL) Mr President, as regards the controls on internal borders a number of colleagues have said that customs officials at the borders can be given other work to do in the not too distant future. Controls on drugs, arms smuggling etc. will mainly have to be moved from the internal borders to the customs and investigation services at the Community's external frontiers. The argument often heard in this context is that the free movement of persons is the cause *par excellence* that would provide people in the Member States with a sense of European identity. Quite apart from the question of whether the importance of this so-called European sense of identity is not overrated, we too are convinced of the need to abolish unnecessary border controls and customs formalities and to promote the free movement of goods and services, as advocated by the Patterson report. In this way an internal market can be built up step by step.

However, as regards the free movement of persons we would like to curb somewhat the enthusiasm currently displayed by various colleagues. We would like to stress a number of facts concerning the movement of persons within Europe. If the Community were to proceed to a total abolition of controls on persons, in combination with a European passport, this would mean that citizens of the Member States could travel within the European Community without a passport. This would cause problems for the Dutch. Unlike in some other Member States, they are currently not obliged to be able to prove their identity. The introduction of an identity card would therefore be required in the Netherlands. The Dutch Minister of Justice has recently said as much. However, the many voices raised in our country on this issue show that there are many objections to the introduction of such a document.

Furthermore, it should be realized that not only would a different, through equally effective solution need to be found for the problem of border security, Legisla-

tion in the Member States would also have to be coordinated. For example, to control the traffic in arms and drugs the Member States apply differing standards, in other words the abolition of controls at border crossings would require. Europe to become a legal unit. This still seems to be quite a distant prospect. To summarize, I can therefore say that although we too believe that honest citizens should be allowed to travel unhindered from one Member State to another, time will be needed to devise adequate solutions to the complications arising from the abolition of internal border controls.

**Mr Estgen (PPE).** — (FR) Mr President, dear colleagues, we are all aware that the debate yesterday and today is essentially about a People's Europe, about which so much has been said recently.

If our citizens are forced to note each and every day, either in their working hours, while travelling or during their leisure periods, that what is true on one side of a certain fictitious and arbitrarily drawn line — which we call a frontier — is no longer true, no longer valid on the other side of this line, if they see that frontiers are in fact still barriers, how then can we expect Europe to be seen as a tangible reality in the eyes of the public?

After many discussions and difficulties we introduced a European passport. We even agreed on the colour and the design. But what happened? Although a Community decision exists, some Member States are still ignoring the decision taken at the Fontainebleau European Council to introduce this European passport Community-wide.

What are we to think of European Councils? What can we expect from future Councils if decisions deemed pure formalities are not even respected? Indeed, the European passport is much more than a formality, it is a symbol, and people need symbols to support and shore up their beliefs and convictions. Symbols are the poetry of politics, and who would want to live without poetry?

It is ridiculous that some Member States have refrained from introducing the European passport under the pretext of having to exhaust stocks of national passports first. In all our Member States public money is frittered away on far more futile things. The minimum one could expect, therefore, from governments at this time of European crisis — and I beg the Commission to insist on this — is abolition of national passports and the introduction, at no extra cost, of the European passport Community-wide and to have it recognized by non-Member countries as well.

Don't you think it is scandalous that European citizens were recently stopped at the frontier of a Member State because the customs officials had no idea what

**Estgen**

the European passport was? And a young Luxembourg girl not only found herself being refused entry to an East bloc country, she even had a stamp put inside her European passport saying 'Ungültig'.

To wind up I would just like to say a few words on the European driving licence. The pettyfogging currently being indulged in by some Member States makes the principle of free movement within the Community look ridiculous. Again as part of the efforts to make a People's Europe a reality, I beg the Commission to see that useless and annoying provisions are abolished and to ensure that the Member States mutually recognize national driving licences while accelerating introduction of a European driving licence.

At all events we must immediately free students from being subjected to petty regulations just because they are temporarily resident in another Member State and regularly travel back to their country of origin. Since it is now more necessary and urgent than ever to rekindle interest among those young generations who will shape the Europe of tomorrow, I am presenting to the Commission a file of students' complaints with the comment: *Videant consules*.

**Mr Chanteric (PPE), rapporteur.** — (FR) Mr President, in my capacity as rapporteur I would like to thank all the groups of our European Parliament for supporting the report I submitted on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

Secondly, Mr President, I would also like to thank Commissioner Ripa di Meana for the constructive reply he gave yesterday, which is proof of the good cooperation between our two institutions on petitions.

However, in order to avoid any misunderstanding about future approaches to such cooperation, allow me to stress right now two points on which I believe the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and the Commission will have to continue their discussions.

The first point concerns petitions falling under Article 169 of the Treaty and the infringement procedure it sets up. There is no doubt that the Commission has a well-defined role in applying this article. However, the possibility of such cases being the subject of a petition and examined by the European Parliament should not be ruled out *a priori*.

Indeed, Mr President, although application of Article 169 is dictated by legal criteria, it is no less subject to considerations of political expediency which the European Parliament should be in a position to study and even — if need be — to change, influence or modify, which implies that all the information necessary for this should be available.

My second comment, Mr President, concerns petitions about violations of human rights. There can be no

question, of course, of obliging the Commission to deal with such matters. However, it should no longer be able simply to plead that it has no competence in the matter when Parliament requests information about the exact circumstances giving rise to petitions of this nature.

Mr President, these are the reservations, or rather observations, prompted by the reply Commissioner Ripa di Meana gave yesterday.

I have no doubt, Mr President, that we will come back to this in the future when the final report is being drawn up, which should be towards the end of the year, I think.

(Applause)

**President.** — The joint debate is closed.

I put to the vote the request for an early vote on the five motions for resolutions.<sup>1</sup>

(Parliament adopted the request for an early vote)

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

## 12. Hydrocarbons

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-36/85), drawn up by Mr Seligman on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM (84) 658 final — Doc. 2-1244/84) on a programme of support for technological development in the hydrocarbons sector.

**Mr Seligman (ED), rapporteur.** — Mr President, in the last eight years Europe has built up its indigenous oil supplies from nothing to well over 100 m tonnes a year. Gas and oil extraction from the seabed is one of the most dangerous, difficult and brilliant achievements man has undertaken in the twentieth century. Yet 65% of our North Sea oil reserves are wasted and still left underground, mainly for two reasons. First, for tax reasons: it does not pay to get it out. Secondly, we have not yet developed the high technology we need to extract marginal deposits. Only with the help of the Commission's hydrocarbon technology development programme can the industry be induced to push back the frontiers of technology far enough to get every possible drop of oil and gas out of the seabed. That is what we need to spin out our indigenous hydrocarbon supplies and guarantee our energy security for many extra years.

<sup>1</sup> See previous day's debates.

### Seligman

This hydrocarbon programme has been one of the major successes of the common energy policy. Recently, Japan actually invited our Director-General of DG XVII to Tokyo to explain how this programme worked, as they want to imitate it. Many oil industry companies which I have consulted have said that without the stimulus and financial help of this programme they would not have undertaken marginal technological developments which would normally be regarded as too risky, too long-term or too speculative. It would have been easier for them to develop oil and gas fields in parts of the world outside the Community.

The oil companies and their suppliers are major creators of employment. Furthermore, they are creators of skills, of strategic and economic security. They are big exporters as well: they export large quantities of oil and oil-field equipment and technology.

If we vote against this programme, we will be voting against all those things, and voting for more dependence on imported oil and gas. Many of the amendments by Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz ask for more environmental consideration. In my opinion this is a matter for a different report. No doubt a report on the environmental aspects of hydrocarbon production would be useful, but tacking it on to this report and this programme, I think, would be ineffective and supererogatory.

Other amendments call for the exclusion of oil companies from the programme completely. They suggest that oil companies do not need the money and that only small companies do. That may be true. But to exclude the oil companies from the programme altogether would be like taking the engine out of a car. It is like "Hamlet" without the Prince of Denmark. The oil companies are the main buyers of technology, the main developers of technology, and without them the thing would dry up.

In any case, 75% of the 319 projects in this programme have so far gone to small- and medium-sized companies. The oil companies have taken 25% — but that is not excessive! Several amendments by the Committee on Energy will have the result of even more small companies joining the programme. In particular, we call for smaller companies not to be forced to find partners in different member countries. All these amendments will make the programme more attractive to small- and medium-sized supply companies.

Obviously, this programme over the last ten years has not been perfect. The committee amendments, however, aim to improve the effectiveness of the programme in certain aspects. First, the speed of selection. A five-year programme will replace the annual programme which required permission from the Council to select applicants. This was a major delay in the past. The second change is for a better choice of commercially successful projects. The third change is called for in paragraph 6 of the resolution: better dissemination

of the results of the projects, compatible, of course, with confidentiality of intellectual property. Better dissemination is an aspect that the Commission must take up seriously.

I understand the Commission will accept most of our amendments. But, on the other hand, if the Council does not accept the new proposals, the Committee on Budgets has demanded a conciliation procedure. I am very glad that has taken place — it is in one of the amendments.

In conclusion, I implore the House to support this practical and important programme which is as far removed from doctrinaire politics or ideology as anything this House ever debates or votes on, and to oppose it, I think, would be unnecessarily damaging.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Adam (S).** — Mr President, I commend Mr Seligman for his enthusiasm at this time of the evening for a cause which he knows has many question-marks against it. I would like just to mention some of them.

Can I begin by saying that the Commission's proposals as they stand make a lot of sense. They are, compared with the previous programme, a very big improvement. The five-year programme is a very important development. One-year programmes for any type of research and development are nonsense, and the Community has been far too fond of that nonsense for far too long! So the five-year programme is a very distinct advance.

I also believe that the decision-making process that is put forward, that the Commission should make a decision after proper consultation, is far more sensible than the Council doing it. The Council is bogged down enough with detail without being involved in this. So far as the actual proposals are concerned, I see then as a very big improvement on the previous programme.

The problem for the Socialist Group is that we are doubtful about the programme as a whole. We really do ask a number of very serious questions as to whether we should be embarking on a five-year programme which is estimated to cost 200 m ECU at a time when a great many uncertainties hang over the financial resources which are available for the research and development budget of the Community as a whole. Are we really getting our priorities right with this sort of envisaged expenditure? The documents which have been presented to us nowhere address this particular problem.

We know that many discussions are to take place in the next few months on the future of research and development in the Community. Therefore, we feel that we must reserve our judgment as to the relative priority of this project.

**Adam**

Then there is the very important question of how far this actual programme does reduce the dependence of the Community on imported energy. If you look at the Commission document, Mr President, you will find that this is a big claim that is made, but it is not spelt out — the detail is not given. In actual fact, our oil supply is only 30% of our imported oil anyway. The figure is only 26% if you include Spain and Portugal.

It has got to be proved that the money that is proposed to be spent will actually reduce our dependence on imported oil, and that is not sure.

The third point is whether we are really justified in applying this sort of money to an industry which is already, by any standards, extremely wealthy. There is nothing in the Commission document which shows us that these projects would not go ahead anyway. We do not accept that those questions have been answered in the Commission's documents and, therefore, the Socialist Group, for those reasons, will vote against these proposals.

**Mr Kilby (ED).** — Mr President, you are a Dane, and now I know what it feels like to play Hamlet before an empty House.

There will be those in this Parliament who will question the wisdom of the Commission involving itself in a programme of support for technological development in the hydrocarbons sector. It may be argued that such involvement in the market place usually does more harm than good. If we consider the statistical evidence shown on page 16 of Mr Seligman's report, which says that 30% of previously approved projects in the period 1974-79 had not led to the commercial marketing of the product or process, one could be forgiven for concluding that such involvement had not, in fact, been a raging success. But when one then compares the relatively low success rate with the rate of 1 in 10 achieved internationally on the introduction of new products, the Commission's performance results look more attractive.

When one also bears in the mind that when the Commission embarked on the energy conservation objectives in 1973, aimed at achieving a 5% per year reduction in oil consumption, following the quadrupling of oil prices in that year, and that the Community now consumes 30% less imported oil than in 1973, one has to conclude that the energy conservation programme has, in fact, been a success. If we are to avoid potential problems in the future, we must keep abreast of — and preferably ahead of — the United States and Japan in the development of new technologies in all major sectors of the market, including the vitally important hydrocarbons sector. Those are the principal reasons why I support the proposals in this report.

I want Europe to be ahead of Japan and the United States. That is the way to create jobs. The criteria pro-

posed by the Commission for evaluating projects is sensibly based on commercial liability — there is no other way. That should ensure that expenditures are subject to strict financial discipline. Well, at least, I hope so. Famous last words!

**Mr Mosar, Member of the Commission.** — (FR) Mr President, allow me to begin by congratulating the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, and Mr Seligman in particular, as well as the Committee on Budgets and its rapporteur Mrs Scrivener, for their excellent work in analysing the regulations proposed by the Commission.

The Commission's new proposal for the hydrocarbons sector is aimed, basically, at making Community action in the sector of new oil technologies more effective by adapting it to the new realities and including it in the Community's energy strategy. I am happy to note that your rapporteur, Mr Seligman, understood very well the importance of the amendments proposed by the Commission to the regulations now in force, changes which are in line with modifications this House has wished for many times in the past.

I am referring in particular to the decision-making process, the multiannual nature of the programme, the strengthening of cooperation between firms, and expanding the ways of disseminating the results.

Turning now to the amendments, I would like to say, Mr President, that — if they are adopted — the Commission has no objection to incorporating into the Regulation amendments Nos 1, 2, 3 and 4 as proposed by the Committee on Energy. These amendments, or at least the three latter ones, are an improvement, of this there is no doubt. I would also even like to stress their constructive nature. However, I cannot subscribe to the other amendments to the Commission text because they completely alter the spirit of the proposed text and undermine the whole tenor of the project.

I have heard and followed with much attention the criticism voiced just now by the honourable Members of this Assembly. In particular, I noted Mr Adam's criticism of the Commission for not having paid sufficient attention to reducing dependence on oil.

I must remind you, and this will answer this particular criticism, that for ten years now the industrialized countries, and those of the Community in particular, have focused their energy policies on two priority measures, one of which is to reduce dependence on oil no less. The result obtained in 1983 compared to the situation in 1973 is featured in our documents. The Commission is continuing along this path, and the new aims for 1995 again revolve around these two essential objectives — improving security of supplies and reducing dependence on oil.

**Mosar**

I must also remind you that spectacular results have been achieved through the efforts to reduce the use of oil, so much so that nowadays the Community consumes 450 million tonnes of oil compared to over 550 million ten years ago. In the meantime, natural gas, partly of indigenous origin and partly imported from non-Member countries, has come to play an important role in our energy supplies.

Still replying to your observations, which I noted with the greatest of attention, I would say that as part of the aims the Community has set for 1990 up to the end of the century, oil and natural gas will still account for about 60% of overall consumption of primary energy. It is clear that beyond this period hydrocarbons will continue to play a very important role in the energy balance. Because of the more limited scope of the issue before us today, I do not want to say any more, but I would recommend that you read and make careful note of the aims in this respect which the Commission has drawn up and proposed for the end of this century.

I would like to close by expressing thanks for the support you have given to the Commission on this matter, and for the encouragement you gave it to pursue the action in this sector started ten years ago to improve security of oil and natural gas supplies.

Let me say one last word of thanks to the European Parliament for what it has done during the present part-session to correct the Council tendency — let us be frank — to reduce the programme's annual appropriation year after year.

Development of new oil technologies must ensure that in the years to come indigenous oil and natural gas resources are exploited, resources, which — and this was stressed only just now, and with good reason — would not be harnessed without the aid of this programme. The Commission believes that it must take up this technological challenge and back the future. Of course, it is aware of the need to strengthen the security of our hydrocarbon supplies because, as you and I both know, an oil crisis is and remains always possible, especially since oil and gas still form the backbone of our energy supplies.

The Commission also wants to consolidate the technological advances made by the European oil industry supply sector, which consists for the most part, as you know, of small and medium-sized firms. It is our duty to preserve this advance in the face of competition, not only from the United States but also from the newly industrialized countries. Moreover, the Commission is obliged to defend jobs. Without Community support our SMEs will be unable to take the financial risks involved in developing advanced technologies. Your Parliament's adoption of the draft resolution now before you would, I am sure, encourage the Council to examine this proposal in a favourable light at its meeting on 20 June next.

**Mr Seligman (ED), rapporteur.** — I am grateful to the Commissioner, but particularly grateful to Mr Adam for speaking so clearly and giving so clearly the reasons for his preoccupations about this programme.

I hope this is not a dialogue of the deaf. I hope we are capable in debate of influencing each other. It is a pity, I think, to destroy a good programme in order to make way for some problematical research programme which may not yet exist. To destroy a good thing to make way for the unknown does not seem to be a sensible procedure. However, I am glad that Mr Adam does admit that it is an improved programme.

Finally, I would just like to quote from a French group for technological research in hydrocarbons who say:

The financial assistance which the Community gives may seem modest, but it can have a decisive effect on long-term R and D programmes. Above all it is a great help to the constellation of small, medium and large enterprises, equipment manufacturers, engineers and contractors who are largely export-orientated and are creators of substantial employment and added value.

Don't let us destroy that.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

### 13. RACE programme

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-58/85), drawn up by Mr Turner on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on:

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(85) 113 final + final/2, COM(85) 145 final — Doc. C 2-17/85) for a decision on a preparatory action for a Community research and development programme in the field of telecommunications technologies — R & D in advanced communications technologies for Europa (RACE) — RACE definition phase.

**Mr Turner (ED), rapporteur.** — Mr President, this is called 'RACE' and the present report only concerns a preliminary or what is called 'definition phase' which will last 18 months. I would just like to say a word about the main phase of RACE. It is an integrated broad band telecommunications network in Europe and the purpose of such a network — which, I may say, the Americans and Japanese are also developing in their own countries — is the transmission of vast amounts of documents at great speed, video conferencing, and in general to enable large amounts of material to be transmitted down telecommunications

## Turner

lines. If one took it at its very minimum it would affect the commercial and financial worlds immensely. Their whole business would be conducted through broadband network telecommunications. However, if it were a bit cheaper it would go to all fairly large-size companies throughout the world who would also conduct their business over such lines. If it were cheaper still it would go to medium size companies and if it were very cheap it would go to the housewife as well.

The definition phase of RACE is intended to determine the economic criteria required in Europe by 1995 for a broad-band network, and having worked that out, what are the technical innovations required in order to achieve that at an economic cost. Thus the present definition phase is concerned only with three reference models: one for a network, one for terminals and one for service and with eight associated projects. It will last 18 months. It costs 22 million ECU and it is supposed to start on 1 July 1985. The Council of Ministers is supposed to decide on this at the end of this month. Hence the report was put down for urgent debate earlier this week.

I, of course, support it. In America — as I mentioned — much work has already been done. The US Airforce has put aside \$ 4 billion for its own broad band network, and in Japan they have earmarked \$ 120 billion up to 1995 for their broad band network. In Japan, in fact, they already have the backbone of the broad band network running along the islands and they are now just extending it to all the sites on the islands.

The importance of communications is that, if you have good communications you attract growth, and I am very glad that my friend, Mr Patterson, who is a member of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy is here and so is Mr Irma, another member of that committee. General growth is attracted by good communications. Now in this decade it is telecommunications that matter. We fly about all over the place but in 10 years' time we probably will do the whole thing by video conferencing and across broad band networks. So it is telecommunications that are vital for the future of economic growth of Europe in general.

Mr President, there will be a substantial amount of research and development required in order to solve the problems which no country — Japan, or America or us — has solved yet with regard to data compression and band broadening and all the software required. The Commission has very wisely used the expertise of industry over the past two years and has had a very large number of projects prepared by experts throughout the whole of European industry on the problems that need to be solved if we are to get a broad band network by 1995.

However, as I say, we are only concerned here with the definition phase. I think it would be wrong for us

at this stage to decide on the main phase of RACE, which would last 10 years. At this stage we want to find the answers that we can get out of the reference models and the eight preliminary projects so that we know the shape of communications we want to have in 10 years' time. This Parliament will have to consider this time next year the preliminary results from the first definition phase before deciding whether to approve the main phase itself.

The telecommunications authorities are only concerned to have end to end compatibility of the frontiers between their system and the nextdoor system. However, the industry of Europe — that is the supplying industry which provides all the components for telecommunications — must have a completely standardized system of components for the whole of Europe if they are to manufacture to carry out research on a scale necessary for this great step forward. It is for them that we require RACE. It is for the supply industry. If we take this opportunity now and develop a European set of reference models and thus avoid next year having 10 models all working on different standards then we can ensure that in 10 years' time we will have a telecommunications industry which is wholly uniform throughout Europe. Therefore, Mr President, I very much hope this Parliament will support the project tomorrow.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Lizin (S).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I would like to boost Mr Turner's hopes by saying that the Socialist Group supports the RACE programme and wishes to see it move on to the application phase as quickly as possible. However, we want to stress several aspects of the programme which we believe are, in general, essential for the future and dynamic development of the European economy and which, in our opinion, will optimize the hopes placed in the programme as long as it responds to several priorities. Against this background I have to say that I somewhat regret our Parliament not having chosen a more suitable hour to demonstrate clearly that it has understood the programme's importance.

Well, as I have said, we are in favour of the project and will vote for it tomorrow.

Nevertheless, the Socialists want the matter to be examined anew when the proposals for the practical phases are set before us, and we hope that the research phase covering the first 18 months is set in motion quickly. We want the reasons given for such a programme to spell out clearly that it is linked to job creation, because the economic recovery it is to bring cannot simply mean improving firms' competitiveness and it must, as a matter of priority, be a factor for social development.

Thus, the Socialists believe that research options which ultimately involve making important social choices —

**Lizin**

as regards infrastructure, consumer habits and way of life — should be a matter for consultations with representatives of social and worker organizations at the highest level because of their decisive importance in shaping life in the 21st Century.

For this reason we are proposing an amendment — I hope Mr Turner will be able to accept it — which creates a link with the research options under the FAST programme. The Socialists stress that such services should not be reserved for business firms' private networks but should, from the very outset, i.e. the research phase, be orientated towards the broad public. The Socialists hope this programme will receive a positive and flexible response among network operators because, we believe the public sector has an important role to play in future telecommunications options.

The Socialist Group does not want such a project to be monopolized by a few major telecommunication companies, and we said something similar in connection with the Seligman report. On the contrary, it wants small and medium-sized communication companies, universities and operators to share in the projects in a very marked manner. We must also support projects aimed from the outset at covering several countries, and we must make sure that the main benefit will be felt in Europe and not by companies which are basically American.

Finally, the Socialist Group hopes that, from the very start of this new RACE project, privileged treatment will be accorded to the less-favoured regions and the new Member States.

**Mr Hermann (PPE).** — (*FR*) Mr President, the fact that the broad public, and in particular the vast majority of politicians, know very little about the technicalities of telecommunications means that national PTT administrations have been able to build a European broad band network which future generations will view with horror and swiftly banish to the Museum of Economic Monstrosities.

The fact is that the digital networks set up in the Community's larger countries are incompatible. In order to give you an idea of what this means, it is as if each national railway had built its network with a different gauge for each country in order to protect its market from foreign competition, but with the slight drawback that whenever a train arrives at the frontier the carriages and engine have to be changed.

But you don't actually see this in telecommunications. Why not? Because expensive devices — modems — are installed where the networks connect up and thus make transfers possible. But we are not aware of this. It is extremely costly and, therefore, the people of Europe, everyone, from the humblest to the others, Mrs Lizin, pay a price for their telephone calls, for

data transfers, which is two or three times higher than that in the United States. And all this because, in their great wisdom, the technocrats in our national administrations have not managed to agree on standards. Because of this stupidity Europe has missed out on several technological revolutions — in the field of mobile telephone networks and that of television. I hope that we will have learned our lesson by now and that we will reach agreement on broad band networks, which is what the RACE project is about.

There is no-one in this Parliament, whatever our priorities, whatever our views, who could be against adopting this programme. I just want to say that this evening I am both happy and frustrated. Happy because Parliament made its proposals as far back as 1980. It is now 1985. This means five years have been lost. And I am frustrated because after having wasted so much time we see that certain countries are still hesitating, and this is incomprehensible! The only thing we can do is to get annoyed with the policy-makers responsible, who have still not done what they should have done several years ago.

I, for my part, have no amendments, and I believe that the project should get under way as soon as possible, and the sooner the better.

**Mr Seligman (ED).** — Mr President, last year I was in Biarritz on parliamentary business and I had the privilege to be shown the newest telecommunication network in France. It was a fibre-optic network covering the urban area of Biarritz. The surprising thing was a television screen in which I could see the face of the girl I was talking to on the other end of the telephone. It was a pleasant but disturbing experience. She looked marvellous but I was worried about what I looked like to her. This is the shape of things to come. Doctors' visits will be unnecessary because you will be able to put your tongue out and he will be able to see if you are healthy or not. But of course, it will be a major invasion of privacy. It will be the end of telephones in bathrooms.

Worldwide video conferences will cheapen the cost of business and political travel. You will be able to judge much better whether the person you are talking to is telling the truth because you will be able to look him in the eye, and vision phone will be the end of that pest of lonely housewives — the heavy breather. You will be able to photograph him and identify him. So this is the future, as Mr Turner has described it. Unless European suppliers of telecommunications industries get together we shall be unable to compete with our counterparts in the USA and Japan.

PTTs may think they have no need of a Community-wide standardization. But surely if they do not have a healthy supply industry they will be in the hands of foreign suppliers who will be able to call the price they want. That cannot be good for the PTTS. Furthermore,

### Seligman

we need an equipment supply industry that can compete in world markets. For this we need a home market of 320 million people for telecommunications just as we do for anything else. The cost of research itself is far too great these days to be justified by one small national market.

Mr Turner's explanatory statement is one of the most brilliant I have ever read. I just wonder whether he understands it himself, that is the only thing. Some of the phrases used like 'integrated optoelectronics', 'assessment of options between low dissipation space switching, time division switching and optical switching', 'low-cost mass production of lasers and photo divides', 'high bitrate long haul links'. I do not know if Mr Turner could explain these terms but perhaps the Commissioner could do so. That would be a great help, as we might understand the report better.

Nevertheless, my group fully supports this excellent report. The Community must pull its socks up and pull together. If we act as one we will have the strength of ten.

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (FR) Mr President, this has been a very interesting debate. Not because I feel able to explain certain technical mysteries to Mr Turner, but because all of a sudden I think I have understood a little of what this is about. In particular, I now know why Mr Seligman wears a carnation — because some gorgeous beauty in the Biarritz region might catch sight of him on the telephone.

(Laughter)

But I have many other reasons, Mr President, for thanking Mr Turner, the rapporteur, for his excellent report and for the support he has given to the Commission proposal.

I am delighted at the agreement which now quite obviously exists, as previously, between the Commission and the Parliament regarding the growing importance of telecommunications in developing the Community's economic activities as a whole. What Mr Herman put in very simple terms seemed especially convincing to me in this respect.

Since 1983 the Commission has had talks with the Member States, network operators and industry in order to define measures which are gradually blending to form an overall policy with three aims: to provide users in good time with services on favourable financial terms which will bolster the competitiveness of the European economy; to encourage industry to build up a strong position in Europe and the world, taking into account the rapidity of technological advances; and finally, to place network operators in a good position to accept the technological and industrial challenges.

In December 1984, Mr President, the Commission received the Council of Ministers' formal support cov-

ering, in particular, the five following aims: creation of a Community terminal and telecommunications equipment market; implementation of joint infrastructure projects; drawing up a development programme covering the technologies needed for the establishment, in the long term, of broad band communications networks; improvement of access for the Community's less-favoured regions to the advantages arising from the development of services and advanced networks; finally, coordination of negotiating positions within the relevant international organizations.

Specific actions have been defined and in part implemented to achieve these aims. Others are still in the definition phase. As concerns the communications research and development programme — RACE for short — the definition phase aims to draw up a development programme covering the technologies required for the establishment, in the long term, of future broad band communications networks.

When preparing this proposal the Commission studied in depth the joint requirements as regards technologies and specific approaches in order to ensure that the research made an optimum contribution to development of telecommunication infrastructures and services. And this, of course, in close cooperation with the major Community companies in this field and the operators' research establishments.

It was possible to reach agreement on a gradual approach at Community level. This means starting with a definition phase which — over 18 months between 1985 and 1986 — will comprise two types of activity. Firstly, development of a reference model, i.e. development of a joint concept for integrated broad band communications — IBC — and evaluating what kind of services and networks will be necessary as 1995 approaches. This joint model, which will define the environment for IBC terminals and make provision for future applications, will also be used to define in detail the research activities under the main RACE programme.

Secondly, the exploratory studies necessary for developing the technologies to be incorporated in the future networks will be carried out on a priority basis.

Implementation of this programme in 1985 and 1986 will involve a total of 42.9 million ECU. About 50% of this, or to be more precise 22.1 million ECU, will come from the Community budget. Fifteen million of this are already contained in the preliminary draft budget for 1985, thanks in particular — and we pay tribute to you for this — to the insistence of the European Parliament.

This programme was approved in principle by the recent Council of Research Ministers. I am also assured that a formal Council decision will be adopted in good time — before the summer holidays — if the European Parliament can see its way to expressing a

**Cheysson**

favourable opinion on the basis of Mr Turner's excellent report, and if it presses for a decision to be taken quickly on the programme as a whole.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

14. *EDF— Fisheries*

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

- the report (Doc. A 2-39/85), drawn up by Mr Price on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the granting of the discharge to the Commission in respect of the Second, Third, Fourth and Fifth European Development Funds for the 1983 financial year;
- the report (Doc. A 2-34/85), drawn up by Mr Batersby on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on budgetary control with regard to the measures taken under the Common Fisheries Policy.

**Mr Price (ED), rapporteur.** — Mr President, the European Parliament attaches great importance to development policy. The main reason is, of course, the enormity of the needs of the developing countries. The lack of the basic necessities of food and clean water leads to the death of at least 15 million children each year even without a famine such as currently afflicts Africa.

No one with any sense of priorities could fail to realize the importance and the urgency of this subject. There are now 65 African, Caribbean and Pacific countries associated with the ten Member States of the European Community through the third Lomé Convention. Together this represents about half the membership of the United Nations. So the Community's links with these countries are of major political importance.

Development policy is also important to the future of the European Community because it is the only Community policy involving major expenditure which is executed by the Commission rather than by the Member States. So it is a unique test of the Commission's capacity to assume direct management responsibilities.

The discharge in respect of the European Development Fund is also important in terms of the European Parliament's powers. The power to make binding comments when granting discharge is one of this Parliament's main powers. The resolution sets out in its recitals the powers of Parliament to require action in

response to its comments forming part of the discharge decisions. We have a general supervisory role under Article 137 of the Treaty and implied powers in order to fulfil this supervisory task. Specific power to require action is found in the financial regulations applicable to the Fourth and Fifth European Development Funds. These articles require the Commission at the request of the European Parliament not only to take all appropriate steps to act on the comments but also to report on the actions taken.

If one looks at the Court of Auditors report for the relevant year we see that in its annual report the Court makes a number of highly critical observations. It alleged that the faults which they had been pointing out for years recur with disconcerting regularity and that no lessons are learnt from past experience. After careful consideration of the Court of Auditors' observations and the replies of the Commission, the European Parliament in its discharge resolution is stipulating a number of precise steps which need to be taken in order to improve the financial management. Since Parliament has unique powers in a discharge resolution to require action, it will not be content with token response. Its comments have been phrased in precise terms and similar precision will be expected in the action coming from the Commission.

One of the problems relating to development policy is the staff levels in the Directorate-General for Development. They are, I believe, significantly lower than those in comparable international aid administrations. They have simply not reflected increases in the real value of the resources administered or the number of ACP States. This issue was dealt with in detail in the discharge resolution of April relating to the main budget. The Commission was then recommended to conduct an urgent assessment of staff levels and this resolution recalls the previous words and adds a requirement that the Commission must take account of the priority attached to development policy when conducting that assessment and taking consequent action.

Let me now summarize some of the main points in the report. We deal with the rate of utilization of the fund and call upon the Commission to prepare a report analyzing the reasons for the slow rate of disbursement of the EDF and proposing ways by which it could be improved. We also call upon them to carry out an examination from the viewpoint of what the other international aid bodies do and to compare the procedures of the European Development Fund, the World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme. Perhaps some useful lessons could be learned from that sort of comparative study.

On appraisal of projects, we ask that this should be improved by the issue of guidelines which look ahead to the completed project and draw attention to some of the key things that have gone wrong in the past. We ask that those guidelines should draw attention to a

## Price

completed project being appropriately sited in relation to local needs, being financially viable taking account of the local economy, that it must have adequate managerial and technical staff and be adequately maintained. Above all, it must avoid any difficulties previously experienced with similar EDF projects.

Then on post-evaluation of projects and programmes, Parliament will call in this resolution for an increase by annual stages until all EDF projects are the subject of an ex-post evaluation study and that the information gained in the implementation of projects and from these studies should be included on a data base.

There are a whole series of detailed points in the resolution. Members can read those for themselves. I won't attempt to detail them further now. I would ask the House to bear in mind the importance of this subject, the need to achieve improvements in the management of the fund and to adopt this resolution.

**Mr Battersby (ED), rapporteur.** — Mr President, in presenting our report, I would firstly like to congratulate the Commission on the success it has achieved so far in making the new fisheries policy work. Quotas are now being set before the beginning of the next fishing season. In 1984 these quotas were set in January of that year and the 1985 quotas were set in December of 1984. This is a tremendous step forward in our management of Community fisheries.

Expenditure on the common organization of the market — that is, on withdrawal — has been contained to 20% of the 1984 estimate, compared with 95% utilization of the agricultural guarantee budget. 1985 is following a similar pattern. By holding withdrawal labels below the actual production costs, the Commission has made it difficult, if not impossible, to make a profit out of producing for surplus. I believe there is a lesson to be learnt here for other sectors of agriculture.

A Community inspectorate of the national inspectors has been established. It has been accepted by the majority of our fishermen and is working reasonably well. This, I believe, should be taken as a precedent for specialist Community inspectorates in other sectors.

There remain, however, many problems which must be resolved if the policy is to work effectively. The stocks available in our waters are limited. No longer can we look on the fish in our seas as an inexhaustible resource. Over-fishing in the late 1960s and 1970s have depleted many stocks to a critical level. Only now, due to the common fisheries policy and the responsible approach to fisheries management taken by the industry, are our stocks recovering.

The accession of Spain and Portugal means that our present fleet of 57 000 fishingboats — admittedly mainly inshore boats — manned by 154 000 men will

increase to 92 000 boats manned by 303 000 men. Our fleet of under 1 500 middle and distant water vessels will double to 3 000. The total catch of edible fish will rise from around 3 m tonnes a year to well over 4 m tonnes. Total catch — edible and industrial — will exceed 6 m tonnes every year. And we, in this Community, will become the third largest fishing power in the world after Japan and the Soviet Union.

Consequently, in representing the third largest fishing power in the world, we in this House have a great responsibility and we have to support the Commission to the hilt in making the common fisheries policy work.

However, there is continuing evidence of quota breaking — with Member State authorities turning a blind eye — of grey markets, black markets and under-declaration of catch. In this context the Commission has to be congratulated on initiating proceedings under Article 169 of the Treaty against Member States. There is an uneven sanctions structure in the Community causing over-fishing and infringement to concentrate in areas of least penalty. There is hard evidence of some fishermen's organizations — especially in Spain — establishing anticipatory fine insurance funds. This practice can only encourage irresponsible over-fishing and weaken the effectiveness of the policy.

Therefore, in my report, I am recommending that first of all the Community inspectorate of 13 should be expanded gradually to 30, that similar and non-discriminatory sanctions for similar violations should be applied throughout the Community, that those directly responsible for infringements should pay the fines and not be covered by local fleet fine insurance schemes, that there should be a register of offences and offenders, irrespective of flag or location, open to public scrutiny and published at regular intervals and that this register should be established by the Commission with the full cooperation of the Member States.

I have asked the Commission for an early response to Parliament on these proposals and would request that this be made not later than October of this year before Spanish and Portuguese entry.

Mr President, we, as I said before, have a great responsibility to our fishermen, to the great majority who are law-abiding fishermen, to future generations of fishermen and to the taxpayer. I hope that the House will support my report unanimously.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission.** — *(IT)* Mr President, I am particularly grateful to Mr Price for his report, not only because it proposes a discharge but also — and most importantly — for the political remarks he makes and which he repeated in his oral presentation, which underline the priority nature of development policy.

**Natali**

He said that this

is the only policy involving major expenditure which is executed by the Commission rather than by the Member States;

and in the light of this remark he asks Parliament to recognize the scope of this task and the scale and weight of the responsibility which the Commission must bear alone, while calling upon the Commission to put the criticisms expressed by the Court of Auditors in their proper context.

I should like to thank him for that, as well as for his report, which we will take as an opportunity to give more detailed consideration to a number of points which have been raised.

Neither the rapporteur nor myself is unaware of the seriousness of the current situation or of the tasks we are being called upon to perform. We shall strive to face up to everything with the limited staff resources which the rapporteur himself drew attention to, but at least with the maximum of goodwill.

I would like to assure Mr Price that we shall do everything possible to ensure an adequate response to the requests which have been put forward, and I would also like to assure him that, as regards the procedure for adopting the financial regulation applicable to the new EDF, the Commission will recommend to the Council that the conciliation procedure be initiated with Parliament.

Mr President, with regard to Mr Battersby's report on fisheries policy, I would like to thank the rapporteur for pointing out that our methods have led to notable results. There is undoubtedly still a lot to be done and further tasks to be tackled, but I can assure him that the suggestions and proposals which have been put forward will, as is only right, be given due consideration by the Commission.

**Mrs Boserup (COM).** — *(DA)* Mr President, I almost feel like apologizing for being present, but as I have sat through this night watch, I would also like to be allowed to speak, though not on Mr Price's report, which is only on the agenda because of the Council's dawdling — it should of course have been taken together with the other discharge reports. Mr Price has now had another opportunity to speak, which we do not begrudge him.

Instead, I want to talk about Mr Battersby's report. As can be seen from the published report, one person abstained, and it will come as no surprise that I was that person. What concerned me was Mr Battersby's proposal to apply these excellent fishery arrangements to other sectors. In his speech, Mr Battersby went so far as to say 'other sectors of agriculture'! It seems to me most peculiar that such a knowledgeable person as Mr Battersby can compare fisheries with agriculture, since

they do not really have anything in common. With fisheries, we are dealing with limited resources — we do not produce. Even though fishermen, I am ashamed to say, call themselves producer organizations, this is nonsense. They do not produce, they have a national quota they have to abide by. If Mr Battersby is now threatening an extension of this system to agricultural sectors, we may possibly get into trouble with the Committee on Agriculture. Quite apart from the thought that this threat is possibly a curb on export refunds. I believe one would be on extremely dangerous ground, or fishing in troubled waters, if one were to do this.

I am thus unhappy at the woolly manner in which Mr Battersby accuses nations and fisheries organizations or indeed fishermen for evading the fines imposed, while at the same time telling us we should harmonize these fines. Now the legal system is something we usually hold very, very strict views on, so it thus cannot be harmonized. It may be that Mr Battersby wants to have our courts harmonized as well — but I don't think so. Above all, I would ask that one should not cast aspersions by saying things like 'those responsible should pay'. Anyway, what is wrong with setting up a solidarity fund? The working class movement has had such a thing for years to help people with payments if anything went wrong, if people were on strike or fined etc. Does Mr Battersby believe that this has worsened conditions on the labour market? I don't think it has. Such funds have been in existence for a hundred years. So leave the fishermen alone! This applies particularly to that side of the Chamber which calls itself liberal. For these two reasons, I abstained on Mr Battersby's report, and I will stand by my decision. As to what my comrades in the Communist Group will do, I have been unable to find out, since they have not taken a decision.

**Mr Ryan (PPE).** — Mr President, all fraud stinks but the smell from fishery fraud is particularly odious when one considers that the principal victims are fellow-fishermen. We are dealing, as Mr Battersby said, with a very precious and limited resource in fish in European waters. If some countries exceed their quotas, it is at the expense of others.

I do not go along with Mr Battersby in his generosity towards the Commission, because the Commission has been guilty of wrongdoing. How can one, for instance, excuse the Commission for paying to the Netherlands export refunds in respect of mackerel in one year which was five times greater than the Netherlands quota for mackerel?

That was a serious case of wrongdoing. At the same time, I share with Mr Battersby praise for the later efforts by the Commission to tighten up the whole fisheries policy, because if fishermen anywhere lack confidence on the impartiality and effectiveness of the fisheries policy, there will be a strong temptation by

**Ryan**

the well-behaved to do the same as the wrongdoers — particularly if profit should follow as a consequence.

Mr Battersby is quite right in calling for an immediate and substantial increase in the inspectorate. The temptation to do wrong in the fisheries area is considerable; the opportunity to do it without being caught is also considerable. Therefore, we must have the immediate increase to thirty, which he calls for in his resolution. Although it is significant, I think, that originally forty were envisaged, Mr Battersby only asked for thirty. I would respectfully suggest in view of the fact that we are going to double the size of the fisheries fleet when Spain and Portugal become members, our target ought to be forty, but certainly we should have thirty before the beginning of 1986 and immediately afterwards we should further increase it.

Mr Battersby's explanatory statement is worthy of consideration by everybody, because he shows just how simple it is to commit fraud in relation to fishery catches. If a catch of fish is substantial, fishermen overload the boxes, because under the ordinary practice of the market a certain weight is deemed to apply to every box. If, on the other hand, the fishery catch is low, they can fill their boxes with a substantial amount of ice and very few fish and get their accounts adjusted accordingly. On top of that, we must be very concerned with the collusion and connivance by a number of national authorities with the commission of fraud. How else could we have a situation where in Scheveningen a catch of 2 500 kilos was returned as a catch of a mere 1 000 kilos? How could we have in

another Netherlands port a practice whereby two forms of receipts were issued, one white receipt going to Brussels and a grey receipt being used at the local market for figures which were quite different from those returned to Brussels? How can we tolerate a situation where in Italy the sardine catch was reported as being double that which was actually caught? I do not want to be identifying particular sinners in the past, in the hope that all may behave themselves in future, but I think we have sufficient evidence of wrongdoing to make us very, very cautious indeed and to urge the Commission to proceed with effective controls so that in this area of fisheries policy all fishermen can have confidence that nobody is doing wrong and, consequently, everybody should do right.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

**Mr Price (ED), rapporteur.** — Mr President, it strikes me that there were further speakers inscribed and it is now five minutes past midnight. Rather than close the debate, I would ask that it be adjourned until tomorrow and to remove any doubt about that, I move it formally under Rule 87.

**President.** — Mr Price, the sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 12.05 a.m.)<sup>1</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> *Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.*

## SITTING OF FRIDAY, 14 JUNE 1985

### Contents

1. Minutes . . . . .	278	<i>Schleicher; Mr Guermeur; Mr Cryer; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mr von der Vring; Mrs Veil . . . . .</i>	288
2. Votes <i>Mr Christensen; Mr Herman; Mr Cheysson (Commission); Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mr Aigner; Mr Vandemeulebroucke . . . . .</i>	278	6. Emission of pollutants — Supplementary report (Doc. A 2-57/85) by Mrs Schleicher <i>Mrs Schleicher; Mr Collins; Mr Sherlock; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Cheysson (Commission) . . . . .</i>	291
3. Regulations on the officials of the Communities in consequence of the accession of Spain and Portugal — Report (Doc. A 2-35/85/rev.) by Mr Rothley <i>Mr Rothley; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Rogalla; Mr Evrigenis; Mr Price; Mr Cassidy; Mr Cheysson (Commission); Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Cheysson; Mr Ford; Lord Bethell . . . . .</i>	281	7. Foodstuffs and plastic-materials — Report (Doc. A 2-52/85) by Mrs Squarcialupi <i>Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs Schleicher; Mr Bonde; Mr Cheysson (Commission) . . . . .</i>	294
4. Approval of the Minutes <i>Mr Patterson; Mr von der Vring; Mr Ford; Mr Price; Mr Elliott; Mr Prag; Mr von der Vring; Mr Cryer; Mr Christopher Jackson . . . . .</i>	286	8. Importation of meat products — Report (Doc. A 2-56/85) by Mrs Lentz-Cornette <i>Mr Estgen; Mr Natali (Commission); Mr Sherlock; Mr Pearce . . . . .</i>	297
5. Quick-frozen foodstuffs — Report (Doc. A 2-53/85) by Mrs Schleicher <i>Mrs Schleicher; Mr Collins; Mr Bombard; Mr Cheysson (Commission); Mr Patterson; Mrs</i>		9. Adjournment of the session. . . . .	298

IN THE CHAIR: MRS PERY

*Vice-President*

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

#### 1. Minutes

**President.** — The Minutes of yesterday's sitting have not yet been distributed in all the languages.

They will be submitted to Parliament for approval during this sitting.<sup>1</sup>

#### 2. Votes

**Report (Doc. A 2-59/85) by Mrs Weber, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(85) 57 final — Doc. C 2-5/85) for a directive amending Directive 72/461/EEC on health problems affecting intra-Community trade in fresh meat and Directive 72/462/EEC on**

<sup>1</sup> Procedure without report — Petitions: see Minutes.

## President

health and veterinary inspection problems upon importation of bovine animals and swine and fresh meat from third countries: *adopted*

\*  
\* \*

Report (Doc. A 2-60/85) by Mrs Weber, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public health and Consumer protection, on the proposal from the Commission for a Council Regulation (COM(85) 128 final — Doc. C 2-16/85) amending Regulation (EEC) No 3626/82 on the implementation in the Community of the Convention on international trade in endangered species of wild fauna and and flora: *adopted*

\*  
\* \*

Interim report (Doc. A 2-41/85) by Mr Chanterie, on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, on strengthening the citizens' right to petition the European Parliament

*Explanation of vote*

Mr Christensen (ARC), *in writing*. — (DA) The Popular Movement against the EEC believes that the Community's decision-making processes should be made public. This is a more urgent demand than the motion for a resolution in the Chanterie report on the creation of a parliamentary committee for petitions. We have therefore written to the Market Committee of the Danish Parliament putting forward a series of practical proposals on public scrutiny of EEC documents at the various stages of the decision-making process to enable citizens and undertakings affected by them and the public in general to influence them and to put forward their points of view and interests in time. We cannot support the Chanterie report.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

\*  
\* \*

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-411/85) by Mr Amadei and Mr Chanterie, on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, on the European passport: *adopted*

\*  
\* \*

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-427/85) by Mr Rothley and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the European passport: *adopted*

\*  
\* \*

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-472/85) by Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, Mrs Flesch, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and Mr Prag, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the report from the Ad hoc Committee for a People's Europe to the European Council meeting on 29 June 1985 in Milan: *adopted*

\*  
\* \*

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-415/85) by Mr Seefeld and others, on the removal of obstacles to traffic at the Community's internal borders: *adopted*

\*  
\* \*

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-428/85) by Mr Visser and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the removal of obstacles at the Community's internal borders: *adopted*

\*  
\* \*

Report (Doc. A 2-36/85) by Mr Seligman, on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 658 final — Doc. 2-1244/84) for a regulation on a programme of support for technological development in the hydrocarbons sector

*After the vote on the Commission proposal*

Mr Herman (PPE). — (FR) Madam President, could we ask the Commission what it intends to do about our amendments?

Mr Cheysson, *Member of the Commission*. — (FR) Madam President, as I think I already pointed out to Mr Mosar yesterday, the Commission accepts Amendments Nos 1, 2, 3 and 4 but cannot accept the others.

*Explanation of vote*

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC). — (DE) My group will vote against this report, not because we are opposed to further research in the area of hydrocarbons. It is just that we are totally opposed to using our limited EEC budgetary resources to support large multinationals or undertakings and that we take the view that we would be better off using the small amount of money we have in the area of renewable raw materials.

**Bloch von Blottnitz**

Moreover, once again ecology has been left out of this programme. It has once again been completely ignored! As Mr Seligman said quite clearly, that is a matter for the Committee on Technology and not the Committee on the Environment — a further reason for us for rejecting this report.

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)<sup>1</sup>*

\*  
\* \*

**Report (Doc. A 2-58/85) by Mr Turner, on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(85) 113 final + final/2, COM(85) 145 final — Doc. C 2-17/85) for a decision on a preparatory action for a Community Research and Development Programme in the field of Telecommunications Technologies — R & D in Advanced Communications — technologies for Europe (RACE) — RACE definition phase: adopted<sup>2</sup>**

\*  
\* \*

**Report (Doc. A 2-39/85) by Mr Price, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the granting of discharge to the Commission in respect of the financial management of the Second, Third, Fourth and Fifth European Development Funds for the 1983 financial year.**

*Explanation of vote*

**Mr Aigner (PPE), Chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control.** — (DE) My explanation will be very brief. I would ask the Council representative, Mr Mestdag, to convey on our behalf the following request to the Council. Yesterday we insisted upon budgetization, and our demand was supported by the Commission. The Community's Lomé operation is one of our most important policies, and the time has come for it to be taken out of the hands of the national bureaucracies and entrusted to the Community. We therefore demand — and I ask for the Council to be told this — that a conciliation procedure take place at the first opportunity on the new financial regulation for the EDF. I insist upon this, as I insist that the Council, if it wants to implement this policy in national terms, should introduce a discharge, a more precise justification and more incisive criticism when this policy goes

<sup>1</sup> The rapporteur spoke:  
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1 to 4, 16, 18 to 22, 24 to 26;  
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 5 to 15, 17, 23, 30 and 34.

<sup>2</sup> The rapporteur spoke:  
— AGAINST Amendment No 1.

off the rails and not leave it all to the Parliament. The Council too has a part to play here, even though it is we who have the final word. We have a right to expect the Council to contribute to this discussion.

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)<sup>1</sup>*

\*  
\* \*

**Report (Doc. 2-34/85) by Mr Battersby, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on budgetary control with regard to the measures taken under the Common Fisheries Policy**

*Explanation of vote*

**Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC), in writing.** — (NL) The countless reports on breaches of the common fisheries policy must give us pause. Given the presumption of transgressions of one sort or another, the present report is a welcome initiative.

However, I cannot but feel that this report was drafted from an excessively budgetary point of view. The second section makes this abundantly clear.

Furthermore, far too little account is taken of the position of the fishermen themselves. Ostend fishermen tell me they are increasingly bothered by red tape which even pursues them onto their own vessels.

Checks on observance of legislation under the common fisheries policy is surely necessary but at the same time we must ask ourselves whether the quota system is indeed the most suitable method to attain our ultimate goal: to prevent overfishing and to manage fishery stocks efficiently. Strengthening the team of inspection to 30 persons hardly guarantees this.

I therefore intend to abstain in the vote on this motion for a resolution.

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)*

\*  
\* \*

**Proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. C 2-34/85 — COM(85) 182 final) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2969/83 establishing a special emergency measure to assist stock farming in Italy**

\*  
\* \*

<sup>1</sup> The rapporteur was:  
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendment No 1.

3. *Regulations on the officials of the Communities in consequence of the accession of Spain and Portugal*

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-35/85/rev.) by Mr Rothley, on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizen's Rights on:

the proposals from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 680 final — Doc. 2-1539/84) on the regulations

- I. introducing special and temporary measures applicable to the recruitment of officials of the European Communities in consequence of the accession of Spain and Portugal
- II. introducing special measures to terminate the service of officials of the European Communities
- III. amending Regulation (EEC, Euratom, ECSC) No 260/68 laying down the conditions and procedure for applying the tax for the benefit of the European Communities
- IV. amending Regulation (Euratom, ECSC, EEC) No 549/69 determining the categories of officials and other servants of the European Communities to whom the provisions of Article 12, the second paragraph of Article 13 and Article 14 of the Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the Communities apply

**Mr Rothley (S), rapporteur.** — (DE) Madam President, of the four proposals for Council regulations I do not need to go into Regulations III and IV in presenting this report, as they are mainly of a technical nature. The first regulation concerns the introduction by 31 December 1985 of special and temporary measures applicable to the recruitment of officials of the European Communities in consequence of the accession of Spain and Portugal. In our discussions in committee one important point that arose was the question of what should be required of Spanish and Portuguese officials by way of qualifications and tests. The Commission has proposed that in the course of the recruitment procedure all officials must either undergo tests or else be selected on the basis of qualifications *and* tests. This regulation is at variance with what was agreed on at the time of Greece's accession to the European Community and also with what the Commission itself originally agreed on with the Spanish Government — before it changed its mind. That is why, in the amendment tabled by the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizen's Rights, we have made a distinction between grades, asking that the higher grades be recruited on the basis of qualifications only while the other grades would be recruited on the basis of tests or of qualifications and tests. As I have just been saying, this is in line with what was originally agreed between the Spanish Government and the Commission.

The second regulation concerns the termination of service of officials of the European Communities. In the Commission's original proposal this was intended to apply to officials only. We feel — and this is also the view of all the political group chairmen in this House — that these measures must be extended to all temporary staff. The reason for this extension is that social justice demands that the measures should also benefit temporary staff. The Commission's argument is that it is legally possible anyway for the temporary staff to have their service terminated, whereas in the case of officials a legal basis of this kind would first have to be created. However, establishing a legal basis for termination of service is only *one* aspect of the problem. The other aspect is that these measures for the benefit of the officials are socially advantageous to them, and it is hard to see why this should not hold good also for temporary staff.

I should point out in this context that the measures envisaged here for terminating the service of officials go beyond the legal provisions hitherto applicable to officials and can only lead to the elaboration in the future of new staff regulations which will probably have to be uniformly applicable to all staff members. Incidentally, I should also draw the attention of the House to the fact that when the report was being drawn up, a mistake crept into the definition of temporary officials, which we have put right in a corrigendum. The first important point therefore is the extension of these measures to all temporary staff.

The second important point is which categories of staff the measures should actually apply to. The Commission proposal does not include grades A 1 and A 2, whereas our amendment does. This is also at the request of all the political group chairmen. I should point out in this context that no time-limits have been set to the measures for terminating the service of officials — and temporary staff, if our view is accepted. They are not therefore temporary measures but will enable the European Communities at any time in the future to terminate the service of officials and other servants on temporary contracts before retirement age is reached. We consider this to be a very sound and sensible regulation in that it permits of greater flexibility in adapting to new needs. I should point out too that Article 1 of the Commission proposal says that these measures are intended to help to — or arise from the need to — 'acquire staff with new skills'.

A further important point in relation to these measures for terminating the service of officials and temporary staff is the principle of voluntariness which is contained in Article 3 of the Commission proposal. This makes it clear that service will be terminated only at the request of the official concerned. In its opinion the Committee on Budgets has expressed certain reservations with regard to this principle of voluntariness. However, there is no way around the fact that for legal reasons this principle of voluntariness will simply have to be upheld. The option of terminating their ser-

### Rothley

vices is granted in the Commission proposal to officials who are 55 years of age or over and have ten years seniority. We have tabled an amendment to which we attach great importance, to the effect that officials may also request termination of their service even before reaching 55 years of age provided they have a correspondingly longer seniority. If the Commission proposal were left as it is, you have the absurd situation that someone of 55 years of age and 10 years seniority could leave with 70% of his basic salary, whereas someone of 50 years of age with 26 years seniority would get only 26% of basic salary if he were to leave. That is not acceptable. That is why we have proposed a solution on the basis of a sliding scale. It is also important that officials who are 60 years of age or over should have a legal right to termination of service, that is to say, to submit a request for termination of service which must be granted.

We left Article 4 of the Commission proposal unchanged. It is important that officials or temporary staff whose service has been terminated should have their salaries adjusted to take account of any earnings subsequently accruing from other work. The Bureau of Parliament had put forward another proposal. However, it is unacceptable that someone who has left the service of the Communities and then acquires other earnings should not have his salary adjusted to take account of the latter. It is not in order for someone with a good salary to earn an income on the side like this and thus deprive others of a job.

**Sir Fred Catherwood (ED).** — Madam President, I am speaking on behalf of Mr Curry who was draftsman for the opinion for the Committee on Budgets. I would like to ask the Commission to produce some estimates of the cost of these proposed measures. The Committee on Budgets can see the need for them. Retirement at 55 seems the best way to provide the vacancies needed for the Spanish and Portuguese, and for those who do retire at 55 without the prospect of new jobs, 70% is not an unreasonable proportion of their salary for those with over ten years' service. We agree that it should not apply to the top two grades.

However, the total absence of any financial estimates has enabled the press to run stories giving ludicrous figures, and so we absolutely insist that the Commission should give upper and lower estimates of departures over the first five years of the measures so that we, as part of the budgetary authority, can see what the demands are on our resources and as representatives of the Community's citizens, reassure those who have put their trust in us by putting us here that the taxpayer's money is not being squandered, as some papers are alleging. The Commission must have this information and it should let us have it. They must have some estimate bands of what it is going to cost. It would be very foolish not to have any estimates and it can do absolutely no harm to give us the likely band of estimates. No one is going to blame them if the rate of

redundancy is a bit faster or a bit slower, but we do blame them for the quite unnecessary secrecy which has given rise to the wildest and most damaging rumours concerning a move which is in the interests of every Community citizen and which meets the Community's proper obligation as good employers who have to set a public example. So we do ask the Commission to produce the estimates that they have and to put an end to these foolish rumours.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) Madam President, I speak here in a twofold capacity. On the one hand, there are a number of points on which I should like to speak on behalf of my group. However, my special personal experiences in this entire area also prompt me to rise. I intend to be very brief and to make only those points that I consider most important.

As far as the Socialist Group is concerned, the most important point of all is that we are in agreement with these measures, subject to the amendments put forward by Mr Rothley as rapporteur but also as a Socialist. However, we would point out that in the regulations which he describes as being of a technical nature, particularly the regulation on taxation, there are a number of particularly interesting features. It is shown, for instance, that officials of the European Communities have a relatively light tax load to shoulder. There is no harm in mentioning that here on an occasion like this.

The second point I would make is that I can honestly say here today, in the light of my personal observations, that the European public service deserves our tribute. It is only right that it should be mentioned here as a group of people who, whatever criticisms may be levelled at them — they are many and they should not be swept under the carpet — have nevertheless by and large contributed greatly to the good image that the European Community enjoys amongst the public in general.

My third point is that we, as Socialists, naturally have certain misgivings about the fact that in the Member States, but also in the European Community, there are permanent officials, the essential distinguishing feature of whose work is that never in their whole lives do they have to take a single risk. The reason given for this is that by being 'independent' these officials can perform particularly valuable services. Yet everyone knows that in many Member States, but also in the European Community, this independence has been infiltrated by certain party political affiliations. The fact that, on the one hand, they are 'independent' and yet linked to a political party and that, on the other hand, they can go through their whole working lives completely free of risk is what keeps many of these officials from adopting an imaginative and spontaneous approach to their work and being aware of and open to new ideas. This prompts the following reflection which I should like to throw out in this debate —

## Rogalla

it has already been mentioned by Mr Rothley. In view of our present high levels of unemployment and of the fact that in the process of modernization every industrial worker is exposed to a certain amount of risk, is it not essential that the regulations governing service in the European Communities and in our Member States should be brought up to date in such a way that they do not automatically guarantee completely risk-free permanent employment for life, the feeling of having it made for good and all?

There is one sole exception that I would allow, and that is for those officials that are obliged to put their lives at risk, such as, for example, policemen, firemen and soldiers. In their case the principle of permanent employment for life must still apply. However, in other areas — in the so-called service administrations, which include the Community — some rethinking must be done. I should like to urge today that we set this rethinking process in motion.

**Mr Evrigenis (PPE).** — (GR) Madam President, the Commission's four proposed regulations dealt with in the report by Mr Rothley are a necessary consequence of Spain and Portugal's accession to the Community. Their purpose is to regulate the participation of the two Member States in the staffing structures of the Community's mechanisms. They constitute an expression — indeed, a particularly substantial one — of accession to the Community.

Each new accession entails the introduction, for a limited time, of exceptions to the general principle that forbids the restriction of appointments to candidates of specific nationalities. This matter is dealt with by the first of the proposed regulations.

The other three proposed regulations allow the institutional bodies to vacate certain posts, whose present holders will retire from service under special conditions of social protection, so as to create vacancies to be filled by new employees who are citizens of the Member States joining the Community. This mechanism of equalisation has been tested in the past, and satisfies the special needs created by enlargements of the Community.

My political group is in general agreement with the rapporteur's proposals, and consequently also with the amendments approved and proposed by the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights. There are just two specific point on which I must comment, on behalf of the group I represent.

The first point concerns Amendment No 1 by the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights. We cannot agree with the proposed amendment of Article 1(2) of the first proposed regulation, an amendment which envisages the appointment of officials to certain grades and categories solely on the basis of the candidates' qualifications. We think that

the solution proposed in the Commission's original draft regulation is more correct, namely that appointments should be made on the basis of competitions, or qualifications and competitions together. This measure allows the limitation of national political controls on the appointment procedures, and favours appointment to the service of the Community on the basis of the merits of each candidate. In that spirit, we will vote against Amendment No 1.

The second comment refers to the amendments by the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights that envisage extending the second proposal for a regulation to cover additional staff working under contracts of unspecified length, in accordance with Part 2 of the Staff Regulations. In a letter addressed to Commissioner Christophersen by the leader of the Socialist Group, Mr Arndt, he explained, on behalf of the leaders of all the political groups, the reasons that dictate this amendment of the text of the proposed regulation. Those reasons have been repeated today by Mr Rothley. Acceptance of Amendments Nos 3 and 4 is called for by all the political groups. My own group expects the Commission to adopt a clear attitude towards that demand. The Commission's answer will determine our position during the remainder of the debate, and we reserve the right, if needs be, to agree to apply the procedure of Rule 36 of the Rules of Procedure and send the matter back to the relevant committee.

Finally, Madam President, please note that on behalf of my colleague Mr Langer, I withdraw Amendment No 11.

*(Applause from the centre)*

**Mr Price (ED).** — Madam President, when Spain and Portugal join the Community we shall need, of course, Spanish and Portuguese officials. In order to avoid increasing the overall size of the staff unnecessarily, my group recognizes the need for terminating the service of some existing officials. We therefore support all four proposals made by the Commission for specific regulations. We also support bringing the staff of Parliament's political groups within the ambit of these proposals. We support the amendments proposed to the first, third and fourth regulations and so I am going to confine my remarks to the second regulation, namely that dealing with termination of employment.

We cannot accept the addition of directors-general and directors to the categories concerned since their contracts already provide for termination if it becomes necessary in the interests of the service. Nor can we accept the lowering of the age from 55 to 50 since this would substantially increase the numbers involved and the cost.

The level of compensation is a controversial matter. Our group is prepared to face reality. People who have given many years of service and whose contracts

### Price

entitle them to remain at their posts until the age of 65 are obviously entitled to substantial compensation if they prematurely have their service terminated. However, we support the view of the Committee on Budgets that the scheme cannot be entirely voluntary. I mentioned that the level of compensation has proved controversial. Despite the fact that this proposal to make the scheme more generous and to add to its cost, stems from a Socialist group rapporteur, backed by his group, certain British Members of the Socialist Group have used the opportunity to attack the Community once again. In a press release issued by a press officer of the Socialist Group, Mr Ford says that he calculates the cost at 12 million in the first year for senior staff alone, rising to as much as £ 75 million a year after just a few years.

Madam President, the total salary bill for all Commission officials was 300 million ECU last year. £ 75 million is about 125 million ECU. If we just look at that in comparison with the total salary bill for all officials of the Commission of 300 million ECU, we get some perspective.

However the total number of staff affected from all the institutions put together would be a small proportion of that total Commission staff. Then only certain grades of staff are included in the scheme.

Finally, the compensation is 70% not 100% of salary, so the cost would be a small fraction of the Commission's total salary bill. Following Greek accession we had a similar scheme and it is costing less than 1 million ECU per annum. I estimate, on the basis of the Commission's proposal, that Mr Ford's calculation is about 1 000% wrong.

Nevertheless, we have a responsibility as one arm of the budgetary authority to manage the Community's finances as efficiently as possible. With that in mind my group will be adopting a cautious and selective approach to the amendments. At the same time we shall face our responsibilities and approve the general principles involved.

**Mr Cassidy (ED).** — Madam President, I find myself, not for the first time, in agreement with Mr Rogalla, who always strikes me as being one of the more sensible Socialist Members of this House. He points out, quite rightly, that in many respects Community officials are extremely privileged people, both in the matter of tax and in the matter of security of tenure. You, Madam President, who have been a Member of this House much longer than I have will know that it is impossible to sack a Community official whether he be incompetent, whether he be dishonest or whether he be caught *in flagrante delicto* with his secretary.

There is no other organization in Europe, either in the public or private sector, where people could enjoy such privileges. For them therefore to be given the

opportunity of getting 70% of their salary from the age of 55 until the age of 65, while being left free to look for employment elsewhere, seems to me to be icing an already very luxurious cake. I would agree with Mr Rogalla that really we should look at this again. We should look at the principle of whether or not this redundancy should be voluntary. Experience in the private sector shows that when you offer voluntary redundancy invariably it is the best people you lose because they are the ones who know that they will get themselves a job elsewhere. You finish up keeping the incompetent.

I see that in Article 3 of the regulations it is stated that consideration should be given to ability, efficiency and conduct in the service. Surely we should have looked at ability, efficiency and conduct in the service in deciding who should go and who should stay. It seems to me that we should be setting an example in this respect. The Commission should be able to be set up as an example of efficiency to national civil services and also, I hope, to the public sector. So let the Commission next time think much more carefully before embarking on such generous provisions.

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (FR) Madam President, this debate is important to all officials of the institutions and to the States which, tomorrow, will take their places among us. I should therefore like to set out very clearly, as has been requested by several Members, the position of the Commission.

First, on recruitment. I would remind you that the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities provide that recruitment shall be directed to securing for the institution, the services of officials recruited on the broadest possible geographical basis, but that no posts shall be reserved for the nationals of any specific Member State. To reconcile these two requirements, when new States join the Communities, special and exceptional statutory measures must be taken to ensure that nationals of the new States are recruited in a satisfactory manner. The procedure is now a familiar one as we have already employed it for the first and second enlargements. It involves taking measures derogating from various regulations so that nationals of Spain and Portugal may be appointed, as officials, to posts that will be set aside for them in the establishment plan attached to the budget.

But the Staff Regulations also provide that recruitment shall be directed to securing for the institutions — it is in their own interest — the services of officials of the highest standard of ability, efficiency and integrity. This is a rule which involves the organization of competitions with the sole exception of posts at the highest levels: A 1 and A 2. A competition may be based on candidates' qualifications or solely on tests they have sat, or on a combination of qualifications and test. On the accession of Greece it was decided in the case of

## Cheysson

certain intermediate or higher grades in certain categories, to base competitions on qualifications only. With regard to Portuguese and Spanish accession the Commission has finally proposed for all grades competitions based on tests or on qualifications and tests, on the understanding that in the case of certain intermediate or higher grades in the various categories, the test will be oral.

The statutory body which covers the administrations and staff of all the institutions has delivered an opinion to this effect. Amendment No 1, tabled by the legal Affairs Committee, with the support of the Committee on Budgets, seeks to restore for this occasion the rules adopted on the accession of Greece. The Commission appreciates that this amendment reflects Parliament's concern, a concern shared by the two acceding States not to create any differences between those States and the State which preceded them.

Amendment No 2 tabled by the Legal Affairs Committee does introduce a difference which is not in the Commission text. The principle behind the first amendment thus makes it acceptable to the Commission but if it is to be implemented, the second amendment must be rejected, so that the text applicable to Greece is restored in its entirety in relation to Spain and Portugal.

I now turn to the more difficult matters connected with release from employment. The obligations involved in the accession of Portugal and Spain in the matter of recruitment also entail, failing the creation of numerous new posts, provision for early retirement for a certain number of officials. This is obvious. Our proposal is not addressed to this problem alone, since it was considered appropriate to use the opportunity offered to set up a permanent instrument. This is why Amendments Nos 16 to 20 seem to us fundamentally at variance with this position and cannot be accepted by the Commission. By means of this permanent instrument it will be possible, year after year, and whenever considered appropriate by the budgetary authority, to meet the wishes of various officials desirous of terminating their employment at an earlier date, and of those officials only. It is this, also, that prompts us to reject Amendment No 12 by Mr Ford. Nor is it possible for us — and I must emphasize this — to assess in advance the resultant expenditure, which will vary considerably according to the rank, seniority and capabilities of officials volunteering therefor.

We ought thus to enable the institutions to take on younger staff by securing — and this is vital — the services of officials possessing the skills rendered increasingly necessary by the development of technology and Community policies.

The proposal for a Regulation is thus inspired by two ideas: accession and the acquisition of new capabilities.

I should like to take up in this connection a number of observations made in this Parliament. First, our proposal, as I said, deals only with the case of permanent officials, those whose cessation of employment cannot normally take place before retirement. The case of contractual staff, and temporary staff in particular, cannot be dealt with on the same criteria. I have been asked to take up a clear position: well, here it is. An appointment for life, practically unconditional in the legal terms in which it is couched, is not the same thing, legally speaking, as a contractual appointment, even were it for an indefinite period. To terminate an official's employment the legal position must be radically altered. To end a contract it is enough to terminate it after due notice and subject to possible compensation, on terms explicitly provided by the contract, freely entered into.

The Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights is reflecting the concerns of temporary staff. The Commission sympathises with these concerns. Don't forget that it employs a large number of temporary staff some of whom have been in its service for many years and deserve tribute. But these concerns cannot legally be tackled in the same text and in the same way as for permanent officials: the legal situations are fundamentally different. The Commission therefore cannot accept Amendments Nos 3, 4 and 11. No 11, it should be said, has been withdrawn.

The Committee on Budgets has well understood the difficulty of settling at one and the same time questions relating both to officials\* and to temporary staff. In its opinion it advocates special measures to deal with some of the problems of temporary staff. The Commission hereby states categorically that it is ready to consider their solution for tackling the very real difficulties encountered in the Parliament, in the Commission and in the institutions, and which are common to all temporary staff. Proposals could be presented by the Commission before the end of this year.

Second, the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights accepts and approves the principle whereby the cessation of an official's employment can only be on a voluntary basis. Our thanks for this. It has seen fit, however, to add to the list of grades A 1 and A 2 posts. This amendment would deprive the institutions of their power to terminate the employment of their most senior staff notwithstanding that the Staff Regulations permit it — the Court of Justice has recognized this. Amendment No 5 of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights does not appear acceptable to the Commission. It would considerably diminish the powers of the institutions' authorities.

Third, the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights has further proposed to extend the ambit of the text to include officials between 50 and 54 years of age, subject to a certain period of seniority, whilst the Commission, I would remind you, proposes that it be limited to officials of at least 55 years of age with sen-

**Cheysson**

iority of ten years or more. Amendment No 7 would involve a substantial increase in the cost of the operation. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the Commission's proposal has a character of permanency. It is not advisable that the opportunity for retirement which would thus be afforded on a permanent basis from the age of 50 should have the effect of weakening existing rules.

As to meeting the requests of all officials who have reached the age of 60, it is true that this principle did underline earlier releases from employment, but it was only intended to apply for a limited period. As seen by the Commission, Amendment No 8 appears calculated to limit the discretionary power of choice which the Community institutions want to retain in respect of staff wishing to retire. And I would remind you that it is intended that this possibility of choice be based on the interests of the service.

Fourth, the Legal Affairs Committee has tabled an Amendment No 9 which seeks to renew for officials to whom they applied up to 1981 the rules applicable to ECSC officials until 1962. In this way Community officials are subject to identical arrangements. To revive old rules after a lapse of 23 years would be a fitting tribute to those who have rendered the ECSC long service. There is of course a difficulty here: What should be the transitional arrangements to revive rights which have long since ceased? Nevertheless, the Commission can endorse the amendment of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights provided that it contains no reference to A 1 and A 2 posts to which the measures terminating employment must not be extended.

A final word, Mr President, to clarify things. If voted by this Parliament, the Commission will accept Amendments Nos 1, 9, 10 and 21, but cannot accept the other amendments.

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

*Vice-President*

**Sir Fred Catherwood (ED).** — I did ask a very simple question and that was how much this was going to cost? What were the estimates? My colleague, Peter Price, said that the published estimates were 1 000 % out. I would have thought, in view of that, it would be in the Commission's interest to give us these figures.

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (FR) Mr President, the financial estimate per person and per year of the cost of termination of service varies between 28 000 and 65 000 ECU according to grade. How can we possibly give an *a priori* estimate when

we do not know how many volunteers there will be in each grade?

**Mr Ford (S).** — Mr President, this debate has been an extremely thin debate. The Commission has failed to produce any figures. We have had some allegations from one of the Conservatives opposite about how much it is going to cost. We clearly need to have some time for the Commission to prepare the figures . . .

**Lord Bethell (ED).** — Can I propose, Mr President, under Rule 85(1), that this matter be referred back to committee?

*(Parliament adopted the proposal)*

#### 4. Approval of the Minutes

**President.** — I am now in a position to put to the House the Minutes of yesterday's sitting. They have been distributed in all the languages.

Are there any comments?

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — Mr President, do the division lists form part of the Minutes or not? We have the Minutes proper, but we do not have the lists of those voting. When you approve the Minutes, do you also approve the accuracy of the division lists? I should like you to clear this matter up, because it has not been quite clear in the past.

**President.** — Mr Patterson, that is normally the case. However, we have not got the division lists in front of us. I will therefore rule that we can only accept what we have in front of us at the moment. If, at the next part-session, there are some mistakes on the division lists, Members will have an opportunity to raise the matter then.

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — (DE) Mr President, that was my point too. But I presume that the budget will be adopted this week in accordance with Parliament's decisions and that any reservations can only lead to technical and not to financial adjustments. Am I right there? If so, I would assume that the decisions of yesterday are to be considered confirmed.

**President.** — That is so, Mr von der Vring.

**Mr Ford (S).** — Page 44 of the Minutes, in relation to Document B2-489/85, states that the roll-call vote was requested by the Socialist Group. In fact it was requested by 21 Members.

**President.** — Mr Ford, this matter will be taken into account when the Minutes are revised.

**Mr Price (ED).** — Mr President, I would like to ask for the matter that arose at the end of the topical and urgent debate to be referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. Following the debate and vote on a number of urgent resolutions concerning the tragic events surrounding the recent European Cup football match in Brussels, Parliament proceeded to vote on a number of other urgent motions for resolutions without any debate at all.

For this Parliament to vote on important texts without any prior consideration can only bring it into dispute, especially when the resolutions concerned may affect foreign governments with whom the Community maintains close and friendly relations.

It seems to me that the rule implies that there should be a debate. And whilst individual speakers may waive their right to speak, for Parliament to take a decision that there will be no debate seems to me to be an infringement of the rule. I would invite you to refer this matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

**President.** — Mr Price, Mr Jackson raised a similar point yesterday. In fact, I was in the Chair when the event you referred to took place. I did expressly ask the Members who were due to speak if they were prepared to waive their right to speak. It was not a decision of Parliament as a whole. It was a decision taken by each Member who had the right to speak in those urgent debates.

I agree with you that this is not a procedure we should follow again, and I will ask the chairmen of the political groups, who have responsibility for deciding what items will be presented for urgent debate, to look at the way in which that part of our business is conducted so that we can ensure that the three hours will be usefully spent in a proper debate on urgent matters.

**Mr Elliott (S).** — Mr President, I am very pleased to hear what you have said on this, because I think the matter does need further examination, but not, I would submit, in the way that has been suggested from the other side of the House. Quite frankly, it seems to me that if we are to proceed as we have done in previous months, we are never going to be able to debate some of the key issues of importance.

Time and time again crucial issues of human rights have not been debated because they have been squeezed out. If there was a preparedness to put these very important human rights issues higher on the agenda in the urgency debate, in preference to some of the more technical points that are sometimes put earlier on, we might not be in the difficulty we are.

I think the House felt this week — and I sympathize with it — that we must be able to deal with these issues and vote on them. If there is a better way of dealing with them — and you have suggested that we look into this — then by all means let us do so. Whilst I would welcome a debate — I am not running away from a debate — I think we cannot accept a situation where important issues, particularly those on human rights that Members are profoundly concerned about, never get debated because there is never sufficient time to deal with them.

**President.** — I note your remarks, Mr Elliott. I have undertaken to see that the proper people investigate a way in which we can have the full three hours and a proper debate on urgent items. I do not think we can do any more here to advance that item this morning.

**Mr Prag (ED).** — Mr President, I am sorry, but it is not just a matter of the urgency debates. It is really a question of the organization of our work in the plenary part-session. All I wanted to say was that it surely raises the whole question of our four days in Strasbourg, which have now manifestly become quite insufficient for the volume of work we have to deal with.

**President.** — Mr Prag, the Bureau will be discussing this at a meeting to be held before the next plenary part-session. I can give you that assurance now.

**Mr Prag (ED).** — It is nice for us to know that. It is right that we should know it, and I shall be very interested in what comes out of it. The whole reputation of this Parliament depends on the chaos of yesterday not being repeated and on our getting through our Community business and our urgency debates.

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — (DE) With regard to the Minutes, pages 38-39 contain the entry relating to this. What you have just said means that in your view Parliament did not decide there should be no debate but the Members present waived their right to ask for the floor. I recommend that the wording be changed at the top of page 39, where the impression is created that Parliament agreed to this procedure. I suggest we read: 'There were no objections from the Members present.'

(Applause)

**President.** — I will take note of that, Mr von der Vring, because that, in fact, is what happened. I know, as I made the announcement.

**Mr Cryer (S).** — Mr President, you will no doubt be aware of Rule 89(1), which says specifically:

**Cryer**

The Minutes of Proceedings of each sitting, containing the decisions of Parliament and the names of speakers, shall be distributed at least half an hour before the opening of the next sitting.

So far as I am aware, this did not take place today: they were distributed during the sitting and, therefore, we are in breach of Rule 89.

In addition, because of the late distribution of the Minutes, I wonder whether the rule that requires all our documents to be in all the Community languages has been adhered to.

The breach of Rule 89 occurred because of the decision by the enlarged Bureau, spurred on, I gather, by the President, to adopt a theme for each week. I hope that you will draw to the attention of the President of the enlarged Bureau that rather than decide in their little tiny enclaves that a theme should be adopted, such a recommendation should come before the whole of this Assembly, because the truth of the matter is that in order to adopt a theme the Patterson report, for example, which was a very lengthy report, was shoved in this week, as were several other resolutions and reports dealing with the internal market. As a result, we have Minutes some 90 pages long! As a result of having Minutes some 90 pages long, most of which, in fact, were taken up with voting and very little with debate — which is contrary to any sort of democratic procedure anyhow — we have breached, as I understand it, Rule 89. Mr President, will the Minutes be carried over to the next part-session in view of the breach of Rule 89, or will we carry on with the breach and take the vote now?

**President.** — Mr Cryer, you have raised a technical point relating to the amount of business we carried through yesterday, which prevented the Minutes being here half an hour before the sitting started this morning. I am in the hands of the House as far as your feelings about the breach of this Rule is concerned: if the House feels that it wants to approve the Minutes today, then I think we can approve them, whilst very carefully noting your comments and the need to make sure that our business is better organized in future sittings. I assure the House that all those comments will be taken on board by the Bureau and the enlarged Bureau.

*(Parliament approved the Minutes)*

**Mr Christopher Jackson (ED).** — Mr President, I am raising a point of order under Rule 83(1), and I am asking for your guidance on that very Rule. I wish to know specifically at what point a Member wishing to raise an important point about the conduct of business of this Parliament, as Mr Prag was seeking to do, can in fact do so. My understanding of Rule 83(1) is that a Member can raise a point of order and may speak for

not more than three minutes about it, but I would be very grateful for your guidance on that matter.

**President.** — Mr Jackson, as you have referred to Rule 83, you can see that this point of order can be made during a debate, so it would be up to the Chair to give the Member making the point of order the time he needs under the Rules to make his point of order provided, of course, it relates to the matters that Rule 83 refers to.

### 5. *Quick-frozen foodstuffs*

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-53/85) by Mrs Schleicher, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 489 final — Doc. 2-777/84) for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to quick-frozen foodstuffs for human consumption

**Mrs Schleicher (PPE), rapporteur.** — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the European Parliament welcomes the proposal for a Council directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States on quick-frozen foodstuffs. This measure will put a stop to distortions of trade in these goods among Member States, distortions which have existed hitherto either because a Member State requires special certificates for the import of these foodstuffs or because differences in national legislation seriously impede trans-frontier traffic in these goods. Further — and this is for me as rapporteur and for the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection the essential point — this proposal will very appreciably improve the protection of the consumer of quick-frozen foodstuffs.

Whereas all other very important legislative proposals for improving the consumer's situation have been blocked in the Council for years, we trust that this proposal will soon jump the Council hurdle. After many years' preparation, the Commission has now submitted a proposal which offers a sensible compromise on all essential points concerning the low temperatures to be observed during the manufacture, transport, storage and sale of quick-frozen foodstuffs. This proposal has the European Parliament's full support.

The committee's amendments relate to further points designed to improve the labelling and so offer the consumer better information when purchasing quick-frozen foodstuffs. I may point out that both the Commission's proposal and the amendments tabled here were approved in committee by a large majority repre-

### Schleicher

senting all political groups. It must, however, be pointed out that this directive will mean increased costs for the trade, because half the deep freezers now in use fail to meet this directive's requirements and will have to be adapted before it finally comes into force in 1992, so that the trade will have seven years to comply.

Moreover, the temperatures laid down will probably result in increased energy costs. This will be inevitable, but in our view it is justified by the need to protect the consumer.

**Mr Collins (S).** — Mr President, I cannot say that this is the most riveting subject on which I have ever addressed this particular Assembly.

I think that Mrs Schleicher has more or less said the kinds of things that were said in committee. There is a general feeling that consumers must be protected in their purchases of these particular products. We want to make sure that the consumer knows what is being bought and that there are no risks to the consumer. All these points are, I think, embodied in the text and in the amendments which the Socialist Group will support.

I want to draw attention, in particular, to Amendments Nos 15 and 16 which I hope Parliament will support. Amendment No 15 is about the fluctuation of temperatures. Recent research has shown that there are no technical difficulties with deep freezers which would cause fluctuations of more than 3 degrees centigrade. If you leave a deep freezer open for 30 minutes, Mr President, you will be happy to know that the temperature only rises by 3 degrees. I am sure that you did not know that before and I am sure that your life is immeasurably improved by the new knowledge which you have just acquired! But the point is that we are trying to minimize these fluctuations in order to protect the consumer.

Amendment No 16: again you will be very interested to know that we are trying to distinguish between meat which is partly thawed and other materials which might be partly thawed. Thawed meat, we say, should be offered for sale only after having been cooked. For example, if you grill a chicken afterwards it is all right, but not otherwise. Products which contain no meat components can be offered for sale once they have been thawed only if they have a clear warning on the label. We are quite insistent on the labelling.

I hope that this has clarified matters for you and that your fund of knowledge has improved and that the Assembly itself has been edified by this debate on such an important subject this morning!

**Mr Bombard (S).** — (FR) Mr President, I cannot agree with the charming irony of my friend Mr Col-

lins: it is my opinion that Mrs Schleicher's report is of great importance.

It is of great importance in that it brings out — in my country at any rate — the distinction between *deep-freezing* and *quick-freezing*. It is no easy matter to get across to people that -30 degrees and -18 degrees are not all the same thing.

Quite simply, I should like to underline the problems inherent in the cold chain and the maintenance of the cold chain. Why are there bans at the moment between countries? The reason is that there are certain countries, which rightly are very strict about the cold chain — and here I am thinking, for example, of the case of Switzerland which I know very well — are extremely wary in importing frozen products from neighbouring countries since they are not happy about the transit phase. Neither are they happy about the maintenance of the cold chain. I know that only one chain of French stores has access to the Swiss Confederation because it monitors the cold chain from one end to the other.

The public itself has to be informed about the various stages of the cold chain.

I have had an amendment tabled, Amendment No 6, asking that a thermograph be installed in retail display cabinets so that the purchaser can be sure that the temperature of the product has not risen above -18 degrees. If it has, it must be possible for the consumer to be warned with a view to immediate consumption.

This is why I should like to emphasize the fact that deep frozen products are intended for two different types of use. Either they are intended for consumption on the same day or in the next 48 hours, in which case a slight variation is not serious, although, once the temperature rises above -16 degrees, bacterial activity may begin. [If you have frozen the products yourself, you know that your hands were clean, but you do not know this if your goods came from a store.]

Alternatively, the food is intended for storage one week, two weeks, a month. I think this distinction should be shown on the label. It is necessary, therefore, that the cold chain should be fully safeguarded, which obviously means a period of adjustment for the smaller traders. But I consider that, in fact, all deep freezers should be fitted in the near future, 1989 in my opinion — both the household deepfreezers and the display cabinets in the shops — with a thermograph indicating to the purchaser, in case of a power failure, for example, whether food is still perfectly sound or whether it should be rapidly cooked.

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (FR) Madam President, for the same reasons as those given by Mr Bombard, the Commission thanks Mrs

**Cheysson**

Schleicher and her committee for their statements and their report.

We are happy and indeed not surprised to note the large degree of convergence between our views. The lack of common rules in this area is one of the main causes of the low level of Community trade — Mr Bombard has just added 'and with neighbouring countries as well' — in quick-frozen foods. The effect of the proposal will be to facilitate trade while at the same time respecting the needs of commercial transactions and those of protecting the health of the consumer.

The proposal will therefore help to bring about the realization of the internal market which we intend to achieve by 1992.

Turning to the amendments: the Commission can accept the first part of Amendment No 1 and Amendments Nos 2, 3, 7, 9 and 11. The second part of Amendment No 1 and Amendments Nos 4, 6 and 10 deal with monitoring. These measures to monitor compliance with the directive are not exactly part of what the present proposal aims at, but they will, as far as possible, be accepted as part of the implementation procedure provided for in Articles 11 and 6 of the proposal.

The idea set out in Amendment No 5 is good. However, the Commission is not in a position to accept it since it appears it would freeze a particular situation and put a brake on technical development. The Commission cannot accept Amendment No 8 since it excludes monitoring by means of spot checks provided for in Article 11. There is, therefore, a contradiction.

Amendment No 12 calls for the use of a system of stars. It is not easy to accept this suggestion for the moment since this is a private system whose standardization at Community level has not yet been studied. This system is used primarily as a means of indicating the level of performance of certain electrical refrigeration appliances and not for the products themselves.

The principle of dating deep-frozen food has been accepted in line with the directive on foodstuffs labelling. It is based on the date up until which the product retains its specific properties under appropriate conservation conditions i.e. the minimal durability date.

For the reasons which the Commission has explained to Parliament on many occasions it cannot accept Amendment No 13 on the procedure to be followed by implementing committees.

The Commission is clearly unable to accept Amendment No 14 which proposes as the date of application the date on which the directive is adopted by the Commission. Moreover, since the dates envisaged in the proposal are not any more realistic, the Commission intends to adopt a timelimit of 12 months for the

amendment of national legislations and of 24 months for the full application of the rules. This approach is in line with the wishes of the national parliaments.

Finally, Mr President, I would add that, in the Commission's view, Amendments Nos 15 and 16 do not correspond to any health or technical need. They cannot, therefore, be accepted.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

*After the approval of the Commission's proposal*

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — Mr President, in the absence of Mr Herman, who has been doing this for some time, could I ask the rapporteur whether she would ask the Commission to comment?

**Mrs Schleicher (PPE), rapporteur.** — (DE) The Commission has already stated its position.

*Explanation of vote*

**Mr Guermeur (RDE), in writing.** — (FR) I welcome the Commission's initiative in proposing a directive to standardize practice with regard to deep-frozen food.

Those in the trade deserve special praise for the willingness they have shown right up to the present to join with the Community in promoting protection of consumer health and liberalizing trade despite the technical and financial constraints which the strict application of the new regulations involve.

I wholeheartedly approve Mrs Schleicher's excellent report which is both ambitious and realistic. It demands the maximum possible and shows exemplary vigilance on the matter of carelessness which might interrupt the cold chain which is the surest guarantee where quality is concerned.

However, I feel that there is one point which, if included in the directive, would be going too far. It concerns the provision accepted by the Committee on the Environment concerning one of the amendments. The amendment would make it mandatory to equip retail display cabinets with thermographs. The intention of having the consumer monitor changes in temperature is praiseworthy. However the drawbacks of such a measure would be as great as effectiveness would be questionable.

The cost of new equipment, if it were introduced too rapidly, would hold back the development of deep freezing at trade and, in turn, production level.

Moreover, these appliances are still relatively unreliable so that insurance companies refuse to lower their

**Guermeur**

premiums in return for the offer to instal temperature recording systems in display cabinets and cold rooms.

There is nothing against promoting technical research in this direction with a view to encouraging progressively the construction of appliances, particularly domestic appliances, equipped with devices for recording variations in temperature.

With these reservations I shall be most happy to vote for Mrs Schleicher's report.

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)*

\*  
\* \*

**Mr Cryer (S).** — Mr President, it may well be that we need a little time during the morning in which you could investigate this point of order and report back to the House.

Mr President, earlier you put to the vote the Minutes of yesterday's sitting. The handful of people present voted. Rule 89 states that the Minutes shall be distributed at least one half an hour before the opening of the sitting. Now that is a safeguard to ensure that Members have adequate time to examine the Minutes and raise issues on them. In effect, what the House did was to change Rule 89 to say that they shall be distributed half an hour in advance except under special circumstances where they are very thick and the printing cannot be done in time.

Rule 112(2) says that amendments to the Rules should be adopted only if they secure the votes of a majority of the current Members of Parliament, namely 218 Members. There patently were not 218 Members present when you put it to the House. Obviously that was an alternative which sprang to mind, but the patent fact of the matter is that Rule 89 was not followed; Rule 89 can only be amended if 218 Members vote for the change. Therefore, what I want to raise with you, Mr President, is the status of today's Minutes because it would seem to me that the Minutes should be carried forward to the next part-session at Luxembourg together with a statement from the enlarged Bureau that there has been a breach of Rule 89 and that the motion for approval of the Minutes should carry a waiver of that section and a note to the effect that it will take at least 218 Members to carry that resolution. That would seem to me to be the legal way out of this matter, but it may well be that there is some ruling by a past President which we do not have in the rulebook or some rule that I have overlooked but I would be very grateful to know.

**President.** — Mr Cryer, without being able to quote chapter and verse, I am sure that there have been similar occasions when the Minutes were not distributed

half an hour before the start of the sitting and they were approved. In addition to that it could be that Rule 71 does allow the Parliament to approve the Minutes of proceedings whatever the number of Members present. However, I am quite prepared to accept your point and ask the Bureau to look at it. Nevertheless, I feel that on previous practice we have properly approved the Minutes today.

**Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC).** — *(DE)* I should like to ask Members to finish this endless and sterile procedural debate on whether the Minutes were available five minutes earlier or five minutes later. We are getting nowhere and making ourselves look ridiculous. Take up the matter again at the next part-session in Luxembourg but drop it for now.

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — *(DE)* Would you please convey to certain colleagues here that others are urgently interested in the taking of a few votes on environmental matters? They have all due respect for the questions of others relating to procedure, but these have now been put and can be settled by the usual methods.

**Mrs Veil (L).** — *(FR)* Mr President, in my view, the task of this Parliament is to represent the people of Europe. We have working here people, officials, whose job it is to draw up the Minutes. I do not see how the minutes can be made available half-an-hour before the beginning of our sitting when we have a sitting like that of Thursday which ended at midnight!

*(Applause)*

## 6. Emissions of pollutants

**President.** — The next item is the supplementary report by Mrs Schleicher, (Doc. A 2-57/85), on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection on:

— the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(83) 704 final — Doc. 1-1304/83) for a directive on the limitation of emissions of pollutants into the air from large combustion plants, drawn up in response to the submission of an amended proposal (COM(85) 47 final).

**Mrs Schleicher (PPE), rapporteur.** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this supplementary report, containing the European Parliament's opinion on the Commission's amended proposal for a directive on large combustion plants, is of the greatest importance for the following two reasons: first, the European Parliament cannot accept the Commission's actions, and

**Schleicher**

secondly, it does not accept the continuation of consultations in the Council bodies.

In November last year, this Parliament submitted 22 amendments to the Commission document, which were adopted by a large majority of this House. They expressed the view of the House that in some essential respects the Commission's proposals would not be adequate to cope rapidly and efficaciously with the problem of air pollution from large combustion plants.

These stricter provisions concerned in the main the limit values for sulphur dioxide, nitric oxide and dust, the time beyond which these values must be observed and provisions for old plants drawn up by the Commission. Of these 22 amendments, only 8 were incorporated in the Commission's amended proposal to the Council, one of them in part. This may not sound too bad, but all the same it is not exactly gratifying, for we find that the most important of our amendments were not taken over. These concerned the levels of the limits, the time of their introduction and provisions for old plants.

Having requested urgent procedure from the Parliament, the Council of Ministers for the Environment had an opportunity in December 1984 and again in March 1985 of adopting this proposal; but from what we hear the amended proposal is a subject of violent disagreement in the Council bodies, and those of Parliament's amendments that go further are not being discussed at all.

The conduct of the governments of our ten Member States appears here as being astonishingly contradictory. Whereas the Heads of State or Government, in the conclusions of the European Council of 29-30 March 1985, virtually decided that specific progress was to be achieved as rapidly as possible, the representatives of the very governments that expressed this demand as, as it were, a mandate to the Ministers for the Environment are now arguing once more in the Council bodies and are unable to produce the decisions urgently needed to reduce the air pollution. This schizophrenic attitude on the part of the governments and their representatives can be greeted by the citizens of Europe and their representatives here only with the greatest disfavour.

*(Applause)*

The Parliament now has to stick up for itself after being contemptuously ignored by the Council. In a letter of 16 April 1985, President Pflimlin requested the Council, under Rule 37, to consult the Parliament on the Commission's amended proposal, and to this day the Council has seen no need even to reply to this letter. In view of such inadmissible conduct on the Council's part, there was nothing but to submit a supplementary report if this Parliament wanted to have any opportunity at all of commenting on the Commission documents. This seems to the Parliament to be

urgently necessary — and I, as rapporteur on the directive on large combustion plants fully agree — if the Council of Ministers for the Environment, at their meeting on 25 June or whenever it may be, is to recognize at least that the peoples' elected representatives do not accept the conduct of either Commission or Council in this matter.

This indignation is fully expressed in the committee's motion for a resolution, which was approved there by a very large majority. One can have different views about the wording. As rapporteur, I thought it was not very helpful to criticize the government of one Member State when all the other governments are certainly not much better.

The European Parliament calls upon the Council of Ministers for the Environment, meeting at the end of June, to adopt a directive, a piece of Community-wide legislation, on large combustion plants which we may expect to lead to a reduction in the emission of the most important air pollutants. This will not result from the Commission proposal, even in its amended form. The European Parliament therefore urges the Council to take careful account of its opinion and to be guided in its decisions by the European Parliament's conclusions.

The directive on large combustion plants is only *one* element in the Community's programme for dealing with the mounting pollution of the air. I must therefore remind you that the Council of Ministers has not only over this draft directive failed miserably: over air pollution through the exhaust fumes of motor vehicles, too, the Council, in contrast to this Parliament, has put up a miserable performance, even though these two factors, taken together, account for about 75 per cent of the pollution of the air.

Parliament's proposals would result in the elimination of about 90 per cent of the air pollution due to exhaust gases and about 80 per cent of that due to large combustion plants — and that by the year 1990, whereas the Commission's proposals will lead to a reduction of no more than about 30 per cent in both cases — and that by the year 1995. This we, as a Parliament, cannot and will not tolerate. Either there is the political will to limit drastically the air pollution from all sources, in which case the appropriate action must be taken; or the will is not there, and in that case Commission and Council must face the people and say that they *abandon* all thought of a European environmental policy in future.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Collins (S).** — Mr President, I would like to begin by congratulating Mrs Schleicher on the work that she has done not only on this report but generally on the question of large combustion plants and air pollution. It is good that we have a rapporteur who recognizes the problems.

**Collins**

This House has debated acid rain at fairly regular intervals over the last few years. On every occasion the general view has been that the Community should be taking rapid and clear action and that it should be taking strong measures to tackle the problem of acid rain. The view has been so generally held, so universally accepted in this Chamber, that I do not think I need to labour the point. I only need to make a few brief points.

Firstly, the question of acid rain is obviously and fundamentally an international one. The origins of acid rain, the origins of long-range air pollution and its results may often be separated by hundreds of miles and by many international boundaries. A unified international response is therefore necessary. Unilateral action by individual Member States is a waste of time. Bilateral arrangements are frequently, or would likely be, in conflict — utterly useless. Therefore, the European Community — with ten Member States, soon to be twelve — is potentially an important agency for dealing with this problem. It is the right size, it is the right scale and it does have legislative teeth.

Secondly, as to the measures themselves, I think Mrs Schleicher has made the point very clearly — and this Parliament has made it clearly in the past — that they must include a clear commitment by Member States to rapid and significant reductions in emissions from large combustion plants. There are other measures too, but this is what we are talking about this morning. We want greater use of desulphurizing technology and so on, the use of low sulphur fuel, control on the height of stacks and so on. All of that is clear, all of that is known and it has been said in this Chamber many, many times.

However, in spite of that, we find that neither the United Kingdom nor Greece nor Ireland has even joined the 30% club. They are not committed to joining the 30% club. We find that, in spite of all the fine statements that have been made in here over the years, the Council continues with its complete failure to make real progress in the matter. And it is true what Mrs Schleicher says. They have come along here and actually asked for urgency. They actually bullied us into granting urgency on a set of proposals and then they have delivered nothing.

My own country — well, what can I say? My own country resolutely refuses to acknowledge the severity of the problem in the first place, or to acknowledge its responsibility for the production of more air pollution than any other country in the Community. The United Kingdom, therefore — hardly surprising — stands condemned by the international community for its behaviour in this matter. I, as a British member of the Socialist Group, join in that universal condemnation. That is why, for example, Dr Sherlock's Amendment No 3 will be supported by the Socialist Group only if it is an addition to the text, not if it is a replacement. We want to make it quite clear in the text that the

United Kingdom Government deserves to be named in this respect.

There is one final point that I want to make as I stand here representing the Socialist Group in this Parliament. This Socialist Group last year — or about a year-and-a-half ago — agreed a manifesto in Luxembourg via the Confederation of European Socialist Parties. That joint manifesto made it clear that we on this side of the House are totally committed to a set of policies to protect and enhance the environment throughout Europe. That manifesto bound together all the Socialist Parties of all the Member States, including my own party. There is therefore no question but that action at this level by the Community itself is our best defence against those who, like Mrs Thatcher, would cling to outdated and useless national solutions to problems that are self-evidently international in their scope.

We appeal once again to the Council to take action at its next meeting and we appeal once again to the United Kingdom Government, and other governments, to back the Commission and Parliament in their efforts to put an end to air pollution at its present level in the Community.

*(Applause from the Socialist group)*

**Mr Sherlock (ED).** — Mr President, I shall decline to use my speaking time save for making the observation that we have the customary 40 enthusiasts for the environment present here on a Friday morning. I am very pleased they are here!

They are all, of course, sufficiently expert down to seven decimal places of all the arguments. I shall therefore not put them again.

**Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC).** — *(DE)* Mr President, there is no other policy where there is such a discrepancy between words and deeds as the environmental policy.

*(Applause)*

I must remind you once more: on 30 March, the Council decided that environmental policy is very important, it must have first priority and it is decisive for economic, social and agricultural policy. Last part-session, the Commission told us that the damage due to acid rain amounts to thousands of millions. I won't go now into the details of the tremendous damage we are subjected to by the lax policy we are offered here. Parliament has adopted, quite clearly, a conclusion supported by all groups and all countries which could have been accepted with regard, not only to large combustion plants, but also to petrol and lead. But the Council ignores it, as though we had never discussed the subject at all.

**Bloch von Blottnitz**

Here I have to ask, who is taken seriously here — we, the elected representatives of the people, or the representatives of industry? In the latter case we can save ourselves the trouble in future, for we all assuredly have something better to do with our time. If we are not utterly to waste our time, I urge both Commission and Council to follow, at long last, our resolutions.

This would help us all — you, us and, above all, the citizen, who must by now be feeling that he is being made a fool of. The time is approaching when all citizens will have to be urged to take matters into their own hands, for the Council of Ministers seems to be utterly incapable.

**Mr Ulburghs (NI).** — (NL) I congratulate Mrs Schleicher on her report and hope that all these fine wishes become reality. I would, however, like to see this report become rather more comprehensive and specific. I would like to point out that it is in fact the poorest in our society who are hit hardest by an economic policy which is geared solely to profits.

Let me take as an example the municipality in which I reside in Belgian Limburg, namely Genk. There we have the electricity company EBES. It is one of the most powerful electricity companies in Belgium which more and more is now switching to nuclear energy. It is even intended to build an eighth nuclear plant which it is known will cause a lot of pollution. In our municipality EBES uses oil and this greatly pollutes the area, perhaps even across the borders, since we live close to Netherlands Limburg. However, I should like to deal chiefly with the Sleddelo district which is the neighbourhood around EBES. It is a very crowded immigrant locality containing many unemployed and underprivileged people against a background of political and social deprivation. It is not easy to live in this locality because the air is completely polluted and the natural environment is steadily deteriorating.

Now EBES, under pressure from the local population, is switching over from oil to coal since there are many coalmines in our area, as there are in England. These coalmines are now under threat, and this could have important consequences for the people and thus for the residents of Sleddelo. EBES, which last year had profits of FB 4 000 million, has no interest in the local environment. It continues to pollute the air and, in particular, the underprivileged locality of Sleddelo.

And it is not just the air that is being polluted. It appears that this company, because it is now using coal, will be dumping coal ash. EBES now wants to deposit this toxic waste in a large hollow which is used by this poor locality as a place of recreation and which is situated in a magnificent natural environment. EBES is actually threatening not to purchase coal if it cannot dump the ash on this site. EBES is polluting the air, the soil and surface water, and at the same time it is depriving these people of what is virtually their only

chance of recreation. They cannot afford to go to the seaside or other places of recreation.

From the foregoing, Mr President, I should like to draw a few conclusions. First, there must be no split between the economy and the environment; the polluter pays. Second, the people must be supported in their legitimate demands for healthy and decent living conditions. Third, stringent measures and guidelines must be applied, and here I agree with Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz. And, finally, a committee should be set up to investigate the antisocial practices of EBES in Belgium.

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (FR) I shall begin by thanking Mrs Schleicher for initiating discussion of the highly important problem of emission of pollutants into the air from large combustion plants.

Last November my colleague, Mr Narjes, who was then responsible for this question gave the reasons why the Commission could not accept all the amendments tabled by Parliament. Nonetheless let me, on behalf of the Commissioner now responsible, Mr Stanley Clinton Davis, strongly affirm that we side with Parliament in the struggle against this particularly dangerous form of pollution which is the subject of this proposal for a directive. We have insisted that the topic should be on the agenda of the next Council of Environment Ministers on 25 June. Although we cannot guarantee that a decision will be taken then, we shall continue to move forward in the direction Parliament is calling for. We believe that our position is the right one.

It is possible, of course, that governments have special national or regional problems. Nonetheless, we do not regard any of these problems as insoluble.

Without attempting at this point to adopt a position on every aspect of your supplementary report or on the three amendments, the Commission wishes to give an assurance that it will do everything it can to ensure a successful conclusion of the discussion. My colleague, the Commissioner responsible for the environment, will be happy to take part in any meeting which the Council may organize on Parliament's proposal.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)<sup>1</sup>

### 7. Foodstuffs and plastic-materials

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-52/85) by Mrs Squarcialupi, on behalf of the Com-

<sup>1</sup> The rapporteur was:  
— AGAINST all the amendments.

**President**

mittee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 152 final — Doc. 1-197/84) for a directive laying down the list of simulants to be used for testing the migration of constituents of plastic materials and articles intended to come into contact with foodstuffs.

**Mrs Squarcialupi (COM), rapporteur.** — (IT) Mr President, with this report we are moving on from our concern about the air we breathe to our concern about the food we eat.

Different periods in the history of mankind have been given different names, such as the Stone Age and the Iron Age. We are now in what might be described as the Plastic Age. This is something that may indeed be welcomed, because plastic is a durable and cheap product with many other fine qualities. However, it does also give rise to some regrets, because it does cause serious environmental problems, and there is also a general feeling of uncertainty about the dangers that plastic materials can cause to human health when they come in contact with foodstuffs.

The directive that we discussed in our committee was about the plastic materials used in wrapping foodstuffs. Over 3 000 different chemical components can be used in making these plastic materials, and only in the case of some of these do we really know the toxic effects they can have. We are quite happy with some of them. With others, however, we are far from happy, and their toxic effects can make themselves felt when the plastic material comes in contact with foodstuffs. These toxic effects can arise for a whole variety of reasons connected with the actual elements of which the plastic material is composed.

The Commission tackled this problem by means of a previous directive laying down the basic rules for testing how these elements which make up the plastic can be transferred into foodstuffs. It provided that the plastic materials would be subjected to tests with one or more simulants, depending on the foodstuff they were supposed to contain. These tests were designed to work out the kind of wrapping most suitable for each food product.

This directive therefore indicated the simulants that must be used depending on the content of the foodstuffs, the choice being between water, acetic acid, ethanol and olive oil.

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection welcomed this proposal from the Commission. There was a large majority in favour of this document. However, it was generally felt that more could be done, since certain doubts remained with regard to some plastic substances.

The committee is prepared to accept this present proposal from the Commission and has not introduced any amendments to the Commission's text, regarding it for the moment as perfectly adequate to deal with the problem.

However, it is not only a question of today. Tomorrow is also coming, and with it even more intensive studies on other plastic materials. The consumers are also asking for greater safety. That is why more effective safeguards are asked for in our motion for a resolution.

In the case of the tests on plastic materials, for example, we are asking that those intended for wrapping foodstuffs should be subjected to an even greater number of checks in order to make the customers feel more secure and to give them greater confidence in these modern materials, which, however useful they may be, still lend themselves to certain doubts. This is why very often the consumers themselves harbour serious misgivings about them.

This proposal for a directive therefore is concerned only with one aspect of plastic materials, that is to say, the tests to which they should be subjected. We feel that this is a positive approach, even if we do want to make some suggestions to the Commission for future action.

Foremost amongst these suggestions is that more intensive studies should be carried out and, as I have said, that the number of tests done on these materials should be increased, because we do not wish these plastic products to give rise to such uncertainty and, above all, we do not want them to harm human health.

Of the amendments tabled, one, by Mr Bonaccini, refers to the directive on packaging. We hope that this will be adopted as soon as possible by the Council of Ministers, since it provides in particular for the possibility of recycling plastic products, thus keeping us from drowning, as we are doing at the present time, in a sea of plastic.

As far as the other amendment tabled by Mrs Schleicher is concerned, I must say that this was rejected in our committee. I shall be asking that it be voted on in separate parts, since all in all it does somewhat weaken the thrust behind our motion for a resolution, which was to provide the Commission with all the ammunition it will need for improving matters in the future.

**Mrs Schleicher (PPE).** — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my amendment concerns a point on which I disagreed with the rapporteur, and I should like to explain why.

My point of departure is that this directive is primarily concerned with protecting the health and safety of

**Schleicher**

consumers as regards the packaging of foodstuffs. Mrs Squarcialupi, however, has brought up another matter, which our committee has already tackled in the past, and that is the desirability of putting less packaging material onto the market and re-using that which is already on the market. She considers, therefore, that packaging should be used for something more than the purpose for which it was originally intended, and since the directive is designed to deal only with the question of the materials used, Mrs Squarcialupi is attempting to deal with an additional problem. My group takes the view that these two problems cannot be put together in one directive. It is impossible to provide for the consumer's re-use of packaging for other purposes: no protection can here be provided by law.

I should be grateful if the Commission could throw some more light on this question. There is no disagreement between us on the main subject, only on this point concerning the purpose of the directive. As we see it, the object of the Commission is simply to ensure that the packaging materials used for foodstuffs which are put onto the market are no cause for uncertainty to the consumer and that health protection is assured. No further concerns can, in our view, be covered by this directive.

Moreover, no especial health problems have so far emerged in connection with what is the object of this directive, and in our opinion the Commission's proposal meets perfectly the exigencies of health protection. We can therefore give it our full support. The only purpose of my amendment is bring out this aspect once more in the motion for a resolution.

**Mr Bonde (ARC).** — (DA) Mr President, according to the Danish consumer Magazine *Taenk*, a Swedish study has shown that a piece of cheese wrapped in softened PVC plastic and kept at room temperature will within half-an-hour have absorbed 25% of the softening agent from the plastic film. Polythene film which does not contain softening agents should be used for foodstuffs which contain fat, but the information on the wrapping of different film is more misleading than informative. This is a small example from everyday life but it is quite typical of the way EEC directives fail to take account of dangers of which we are currently unaware. That shows the danger of the directives. Once a common Community norm has been adopted a qualified majority or a unanimous vote of all the Member States is needed to introduce improvements so that directives which are intended in principle to promote safety, health and environmental protection in fact militate against them.

Consequently the Popular Movement Against the EEC proposes that, to have any meaning, all directives should contain the provision that any Member State has the right to introduce additional measures to protect public safety and health and the environment. In this way directives could remain genuine minimum

directives. At present they aim principally at placing a ceiling on protective measures and in many cases they have the direct effect of lowering the level of safety in those countries which have gone furthest in that direction.

Another solution would be to extend the directive to those countries which so request. It is nowhere written that the directive should apply to all Member States.

In our experience rules on labelling and other provisions are unfortunately regarded as technical barriers to trade and that more importance is placed on industry's right to sell what it likes wherever it likes than on the consumer's desire for protection against risk. If we accept what appears to be a totally harmless directive we shall be handing over responsibility for taking decisions on risks which may only become evident at a later date to the Commission and in the last instance to the Court of Justice in Luxembourg.

That is the reason why the Popular Movement Against the EEC cannot support any proposal for a directive which affects people's health, safety or the environment.

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (FR) Mr President, the Commission welcomes the interest shown in our proposal by the rapporteur and his committee. Allow me however to point out that our proposal is limited in scope. It is a simple text applying Directive 82/711 of 18 October 1982. It is purely technical in nature. It is necessary to stress the fact that the basic rules for testing the way in which plastic materials behave when they come into contact with foodstuffs, for example as recipients or wrapping material, have already been laid down in the directive of 18 October 1982. This directive also provides the legal basis for the proposal being considered today. We must therefore observe the rules laid down therein or run the risk of infringing Community law.

One of the rules set out in the annex to Chapter I of the directive provides that in testing plastic material it may be necessary to use substances, referred to as simulants, which imitate the characteristics of real foodstuffs. On the other hand it stipulates that where the plastic material is only intended for a specific use, it is sufficient to choose the simulant corresponding to this use. A bottle intended to contain oil should clearly not be exposed to the action of alcohol since this would not reproduce in any way the real conditions of use of the bottle in question.

The proposal under consideration is solely intended, pursuant to the directive, to clarify situations where doubts may arise, i.e. to indicate what foodstuffs can be validly represented by one or the other simulant. i.e. by water, oil, alcohol or an acid.

I feel that this reminder answers the first series of comments made by Mrs Squarcialupi which concern

**Cheyssou**

the very limited scope of the directive and propose the adoption of additional short-term measures. The Commission clearly agrees in principle with this request, but the proposal under consideration is not the right place to comply with it.

With regard to the number of simulants to be used — and Mrs Schleicher has raised this question with us — the Commission is unable to increase it since it has to comply with the directive which is clear on this point. I understand the rapporteur's concern to protect people tempted to re-utilize a wrapping which had previously contained a food product. However, we feel that the method proposed is not the best way of solving this problem which is not one of great practical importance. Perhaps on the other hand it would be better again to remind consumers that they should not store oil in a bottle which contained mineral water. This is clearly a much more flexible solution and economically more acceptable than subjecting the bottle in question to numerous tests unrelated to its real use.

Finally, on the question of labelling plastic materials intended to come into contact with food, I would point out that this question has already been dealt with. Commission Directive 80/590 of 9 June 1980 introduced a symbol which is both clear and aesthetic but which regrettably too few manufacturers are using at present. With regard to Amendments Nos 1 and 45 which are the only two currently tabled by Parliament, the Commission wishes to state that it is very happy to accept them.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)<sup>1</sup>*

### 8. *Importation of meat products*

**President.** — The next item is the report by Mrs Lentz-Cornette (Doc. A 2-56/85), on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 530 final — Doc. 2-939/84) for a directive on public health and animal health problems affecting the importation of meat products from third countries.

**Mr Estgen (PPE), deputy-rapporteur.** — (FR) Mr President, I want to begin by asking you to excuse the rapporteur, Mrs Lentz-Cornette, whom I thank for her report and who could not be here today as she is a

member of the European Parliament delegation travelling to Brazil.

She has therefore asked me to present her comments and views. I am speaking in this capacity and also as spokesman of the Group of the European People's Party.

The proposal for a directive which we are considering today is the follow-up to a series of directives on meat products and fresh meat. According to the present directive, meat-based products imported into the Community from third countries should offer the same quality guarantees as products produced within the Community. As a result establishments in third countries will be bound by the same norms and subjected to the same controls Community establishments.

The checks will be carried out in two stages and in two places: in the third country, i.e. at the place of production and then on Community territory, at the point of entry. Where a contagious disease breaks out or spreads the country may immediately prohibit imports. This country will immediately communicate its decision to other countries. The directive before us sets out the sanitary conditions in general, the animal health measures, checks by Member State and Commission veterinary experts and transport and transit conditions.

The purpose of the directive is to protect the health of the people of the Community and that of herds against contagious exotic diseases. The effectiveness of this protection clearly depends on the effectiveness and the integrity of the checks carried out at both places mentioned i.e. in the third country, at the place of production and also in the Community country of entry.

Let us hope that the example of unguaranteed kangaroo meat from Australia, which transited across certain Community countries and was sold in our countries as game will not reoccur, both for our sake and for that of the kangaroos.

To summarize then, the directive before us is clearly useful and indeed essential. Nonetheless, we are not entirely satisfied since what is lacking and what we are urging on the Commission is to submit at an early date a proposal for a directive on the import of game and poultry from third countries. At the same time we wish to see as a matter of urgency regulations on the way products made from internal organs such as liver, kidneys, fat etc. are imported. Finally, I wish to stress that the opinions of the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection concur in accepting the proposal for a directive in the form in which it has been submitted to us.

As spokesman for the Christian Democratic Group I hope that this directive will be adopted quickly by the Council.

<sup>1</sup> The rapporteur spoke:  
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1 and 4 (1st part)  
— AGAINST Amendment No 4 (2nd part).

**Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (IT) Mr President, I should like first of all to thank Mr Estgen for the report he has presented and for the support he has given to the Commission's proposal. As he pointed out, it is only a logical follow-up to the policy which the Community has been pursuing in the matter of imports of meat and meat products.

At an earlier stage provisions were laid down governing imports of fresh meat. Now this proposal lays down provisions for imports of meat products. In reply to Mr Estgen's remarks, I should also like to give an assurance that later on health rules will be laid down for the importation from third countries of poultrymeat and poultrymeat products. In addition, we will submit a proposal on the importation of game, as requested in the European Parliament's motion for a resolution.

Mr Estgen has also asked that regulations should be introduced to govern certain other products. He will be aware that imports of internal organs, such as liver and kidneys, are already covered by the directive at present in force. There is also the problem of a substantial amount of trade arising from imports of meat meals, blood plasma, dried blood and prepared fats and intestines. This trade is not covered by the proposal before us. We feel that an in-depth study of the whole subject will be needed before we can submit a proposal on it. However, I want to assure the House that as soon as that study has been carried out, we shall submit a proposal, because this sector also can be harmonized.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)*

**Mr Sherlock (ED).** — Mr President, if I may claim such a point of order, this is, of course, the last time we shall be sitting on these chairs at these desks in this House. I would like first of all to say that for you yourself I am intending to nominate you for this morning's work for the order of toleration (second class) and I would offer you, if I can get my penknife out in time, a carved signed copy of the desk at which I am sitting as a memento of the occasion. You have sat through it all, including the ingredients of the cauldron in Macbeth with the exception of the pilot's

thumb and those parts unmentionable as having been 'ditch-deliver'd by a drab'. It has been a little drab at times this morning. I hope perhaps I have cheered your heart, Mr President, before you leave.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Sherlock. I will have some trouble in getting that desk in my suitcase.

*(Laughter)*

**Mr Pearce (ED).** — Mr President, I want to refer to a request that was made some while ago that at the July part-session there should be an oral question with debate on hard drugs. This week the Bureau decided not to take it on the grounds that a committee of enquiry into that subject is to be set up. The concern of some of us was that this committee of enquiry is quite some way into the future. I want to give notice at this time that I would like to try an reinstate that item on the agenda for July.

My purpose, Mr President, in raising it now is that if I am successful in getting it back on the agenda in July, I would hate the Council to be able to use the excuse that they have not had the due period of warning. I hope you will take note of that and see that, notwithstanding whatever decision that Parliament comes to, the Council is not let off the hook because it is in the end they who have to do something about this terrible and mounting problem.

**President.** — Mr Pearce, as you know, under Rule 56 the appropriate time to do that is at the start of the next part-session. However, I am sure the Council has noted what you have to say. You might like to write to them to reinforce it.

#### *Adjournment of the session*

**President.** — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.<sup>1</sup>

*(The sitting was closed at 11.50 a.m.)*

<sup>1</sup> *Written declarations entered in the register (Rule 49) — Forwarding of resolutions adopted during the sitting — Dates for 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**

Breite Straße  
Postfach 01 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  
Tel. 322 22 55  
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. 68 90 66

---

**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  
CCP 49242-63

---

**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 56 56

Sub-agent:

**Alan Armstrong & Associates Ltd**

72 Park Road  
London NW1 4SH  
Tel. 01-723 39 02  
Telex 297635 AAALTD G

---

**ESPAÑA**

---

**Mundi-Prensa Libros, S.A.**

Castello 37  
E-28001 Madrid  
Tel. (91) 276 02 53 - 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**

61 Sparks Street  
Ottawa  
Ontario K1P 5R1  
Tel. Toll Free 1 (800) 267 4164  
Ottawa Region (613) 238 8985-6  
Telex 053-4936

---

**JAPAN**

---

**Kinokuniya Company Ltd**

17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome  
Shinjuku-ku  
Tokyo 160-91  
Tel. (03) 354 0131

**Journal Department**

PO Box 55 Chitose  
Tokyo 156  
Tel. (03) 439 0124

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 1985-1986    ECU 63.90    BFR 2 900    IRL 38.20    UKL 31.25    USD 55

Single issue price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

---

ECU 21.80    BFR 1000    IRL 16    UKL 13    USD 20



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS  
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

