

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 2-326

LIBRARY

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1985-1986 Session
 Report of Proceedings
 from 6 to 10 May 1985
 Europe House, Strasbourg

General contents

Sitting of Monday, 6 May 1985	1
Resumption, p. 1 — Minutes, p. 1 — Agenda, p. 9 — ERDF, p. 9	
Sitting of Tuesday, 7 May 1985	26
Minutes, p. 27 — Decision on urgency, p. 27 — Iron ore, p. 28 — Budget 1985, p. 33 — Action taken on the opinions of Parliament, p. 61 — Question Time, p. 62 — Budget 1985 (continuation), p. 75 — Budgetary policy 1986, p. 79 — Votes, p. 85 — Annex, p. 90	
Sitting of Wednesday, 8 May 1985	93
Formal Sitting (Fortieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War) — Agenda, p. 97 — Enlargement, p. 97 — Bonn Summit (Statement by the Commission), p. 114 — Question Time (continuation), p. 121 — Mediterranean countries, p. 134 — Votes, p. 145 — Annex (Formal Sitting on the occasion of the visit of Mr Ronald Reagan), p. 149 — Annex 'Question Time', p. 156	
Sitting of Thursday, 9 May 1985	194
Budget 1985 — Votes, p. 197 — Topical and urgent debate, p. 206 — Budgetary policy 1986 (continuation), p. 235 — Votes, p. 237 — Mediterranean countries (continuation), p. 244 — World Conference in Nairobi, p. 246 — Social Fund, p. 252 — Environment, p. 259 — Animal feedingstuffs, p. 263	
Sitting of Friday, 10 May 1985	268
Minutes, p. 268 — Votes, p. 270 — Fishery, p. 276 — Provisional twelfths, p. 277 — Animal feedingstuffs (continuation), p. 278 — Whaling, p. 281 — Toxicology, p. 287 — Adjournment, p. 291	

NOTE TO READER

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

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

SITTING OF MONDAY, 6 MAY 1985

Contents

1. <i>Resumption of the session:</i> <i>Mr Balfe</i>	1	<i>Douro; Mr Provan; Mr Arndt; Mr Balfe; Mr Jakobsen</i>	2
2. <i>Approval of the Minutes:</i> <i>Mr Tomlinson; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Huckfield; Mr Tomlinson</i>	1	4. <i>ERDF — Report by Mr Newman (Doc. A 2-5/85):</i> <i>Mr Newman; Mr P. Beazley; Mr Chanterie; Mr Schreiber; Mr Chanterie; Mr C. Beazley; Mr Valenzi; Mr Barrett; Mrs Piermont; Mr Ulburghs; Mr D. Martin; Mr O'Donnell; Mr Hutton; Mr Ephremidis; Mrs Lemass; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mrs Gadioux; Mr Varfis (Commission); Mr Pearce; Mr P. Beazley; Mr C. Beazley; Mr McCartin; Mr Sherlock; Mr Eyraud; Mr Wijsenbeek; Mr Balfe; Mr Huckfield; Mr Filinis; Mr Hutton</i>	9
3. <i>Order of business:</i> <i>Mr Chambeiron; Mr Arndt; Mr Klepsch; Mr Brok; Mr Arndt; Mr Saby; Mrs Castle; Mr Pitt; Mr Galland; Mr Balfe; Mr Falconer; Mr Balfe; Mr Arndt; Mr Møller; Mr Alavanos; Mr Staes; Mr C. Beazley; Mr Collins; Mr Galland; Mr Huckfield; Mr Falconer; Lord</i>			

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

(The sitting opened at 5 p.m.)

1. *Resumption of the session*

President. — I declared resumed the session of the European Parliament which had been adjourned on 19 April 1985.

Mr Balfe (S). — Mr President, may I begin this historic week by raising a point of order under the Rule of Proceedings relating to points of order and recalling that I raised one last time and now refer to it under Rule 25 — the accountability of the Bureau. In response to my point of order the occupant of the Chair, Mr Griffiths, undertook to raise with the Bureau the matter of the conditions under which firearms would be used in this Chamber during President Reagan's

visit, the number of firearms that would be allowed in the Chamber and the positioning of guards. You can understand that with the ability of the Americans to shoot straight, many Members are extremely worried that they should be allowed to have a gun at all.

President. — I can assure you, Mr Balfe, that no one will be allowed armed into the Chamber.

(Applause from the Left)

2. *Approval of the Minutes*

President. — The Minutes of Proceedings of the sitting of 19 April have been distributed.

Are there any comments?

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Mr President, you will recall that I am getting rather tedious in raising a particular question about the votes. Mr Nord, when he was assuming the Chair on the Friday of the last part-

Tomlinson

session, did give me an assurance that you had written to Members concerning what appeared to be irregularities in the vote on agricultural price-fixing. He said that as soon as replies had been received information would be given. Have any replies been received from the Members to whom you wrote?

President. — As stated by Mr Nord, who was in the Chair at the time, letters have been sent to four Members about this incident. So far we have had only one reply and we are waiting for the other three.

Mrs Hammerich (ARC). — *(DA)* On a point of order, Mr President. It says in Rule 47 that any Member may table a motion for a resolution on a matter falling within the sphere of activities of the Communities. This must mean that one cannot table motions for resolutions falling *outside* the Community's sphere of activities. Such an illegal motion has been printed, translated and distributed, and I wish to lodge an objection to that. It concerns motion No PE 96.910 from the Christian-Democrats and the Conservatives. The motion calls on the Community to say yes to the American 'star wars' programme — the SDI — and it is given the absolutely absurd justification that star wars are to protect mankind against nuclear war. But the fact of the matter is that military policy — including star wars — is light years away from the Community's sphere of activities. This document has therefore been distributed illegally and should be withdrawn.

It would also interest me to know whether the Danish members of the Conservative Group and the Christian-Democratic Group support this document. Denmark in its own parliament has decided that the country is against the deployment of weapons in outer space and against research on such weapons.

President. — Mrs Hammerich, I can tell you that the motion to which you refer has been submitted to the Political Affairs Committee, which will have to consider first of all the question of its admissibility, provided this question is raised in the committee by one of its members. It may be that this question will then be submitted to the House in plenary sitting, under circumstances which cannot be foreseen for the moment, on the basis of a report by the Political Affairs Committee.

Mr Huckfield (S). — Mr President, I don't wish to trespass on your generosity, but when you gave your response to Mr Balfe you very specifically said that security agents bearing arms would not be allowed within the Chamber. Now as you know, that is only one small part of the building. I am sure you do not need me to remind you that when the President of Israel was here there were people on the roofs of the buildings, there were people all the way round these

buildings who absolutely bristled with some kind of arms and some kind of ammunition.

Can we please have your assurance that no kind of agent representing any kind of power will be allowed into any part of these buildings who in any way bears arms, and if you can give that assurance, can you tell us how you intend to ensure that?

(Laughter)

President. — No, Mr Huckfield, I cannot give you such an assurance.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

You speak of the precincts of these buildings. No one can deny that when statesmen come to visit us security problems may arise. Unfortunately, in view of the terrorist attacks that have recently been growing more and more frequent — one, of which all of us here are still mindful, took place in your own country, while another directed against the premises of one of the institutions of our Community, recently occurred in Brussels — one would have to be very irresponsibly-minded to deny the need for security measures to prevent the recurrence of such attacks.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Mr President, I am grateful for the information that you gave us in your reply, but the fact that three of the Members concerned have not seen fit to respond to your office is obviously a matter for some continuing concern. Will you put a deadline on the time by which you expect a reply, and if you don't receive a reply, then advise this House accordingly?

President. — I shall send a reminder to the colleagues in question.

(Parliament approved the Minutes)¹

3. Order of business

President. — At its meeting of 16 and 25 April 1985, the enlarged Bureau drew up a draft agenda, which has been distributed. At this morning's meeting, the

¹ For items relating to membership of Parliament, a request to waive the Parliamentary immunity of a Member, membership of delegations, petitions, authorization of reports, reference to committee, changes in reference to committee, written declarations under Rule 49, carry-overs of appropriations, documents received and texts of treaties forwarded by the Council, see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

President

chairmen of the political groups authorized me to propose to the House a number of modifications.

With regard to Monday, I have received from Mr Chambeiron and nine others a request that a minute's silence be held at the beginning of the part-session in memory of all the victims of Nazism.

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — *(FR)* As you know, Mr President, France and many other countries have organized events to commemorate the liberation of the camps. These commemorative ceremonies were held on 24 April. We were not sitting then, otherwise I would have made this suggestion at the time. I consider that it would be desirable for the European Parliament to observe a minute's silence as a way of associating itself with the events organized in remembrance of those who were deported and all the victims of Nazism.

(Applause)

President. — I understand your intention perfectly. I would merely point out that on Wednesday, the day after tomorrow, 8 May, we shall be holding in the morning — you note that I say, in the morning — a formal sitting to commemorate the anniversary of 8 May 1945, and during this commemoration, it is my intention to ask the House to observe a minute's silence in memory of all the victims of the war, and in particular the victims of genocide.

Consequently, I think it is this formal sitting of Wednesday morning that should provide the proper occasion for paying homage to the victims of Nazism.

(Applause)

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — *(FR)* Forgive me, I have no wish to reopen this debate but, as I was just saying, the commemorative ceremonies held recently in France and elsewhere were concerned with deportation. But there are also going to be special events on 8 May, as you know. I feel that since the European Parliament was not sitting on the anniversary date of the liberation of the camps, it would have been appropriate if we could have shown that we wished to be associated with remembrance of the sacrifice and martyrdom of those who were deported, by simply observing one minute's silence.

To my mind, these would be two quite distinct gestures.

President. — That being so, although the matter is far from being a petty one, I have to proceed according to our Rules of Procedure. A draft agenda drawn up by the Bureau was discussed this morning by the meeting of political group chairmen, who proposed no changes

for Monday's agenda. Nevertheless, the House can always make a decision on the question of changes. I therefore put Mr Chambeiron's request to the vote.

(Parliament approved the request, and the House, rising to its feet, observed a minute's silence)

With regard to Tuesday, the oral question, with debate, by Mr F. Pisoni and others to the Commission (Doc. B 2-282/85) will be included in the budget debate.

The vote on the motion for a resolution contained in the report by Mr Schmid (Doc. 2-1777/84), which was postponed pursuant to Rule 36(2), will have to be added to those already envisaged for voting-time.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* The motion before you, tabled by Mrs Barbara Castle, has in the meantime been endorsed by the Socialist Group. We therefore ask for a suspension of the sitting on the morning of 7 May so that we can take part in the Socialist Group's demonstration at the Struthof concentration camp. I must confess that as the leader of the group I did say to you earlier that no such suspension would be necessary, but the Socialist Group considers this demonstration so important that we should not be holding a debate in Parliament on budgetary matters whilst part of the House is at Struthof.

President. — I have to point out that if the request you have put today were to be followed, the time available for the budget debate would be considerably reduced.

I must also remind you — and this was pointed out at the meeting of group chairmen — that in any case no votes will be taken and no decisions adopted or proposed during the time set apart by your own and other groups — that is to say, from 10.30 a.m. to 1 p.m. — to visiting the concentration camp at Struthof.

(Parliament rejected Mr Arndt's request)

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I must add a comment of my own, because you did not check beforehand who was in favour and who was against. I am disappointed that this vote has taken place and that as a result a totally erroneous picture has been created of the various Members' views on the demonstration. Our schedule of work has been planned during a number of negotiations by the enlarged Bureau and the group chairmen and we cannot suddenly, at the eleventh hour, overturn Parliament's entire schedule for this week. This matter has consequences for the future, and it is thus a true precedent. I very much deplore that it has arisen.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Brok (PPE). — *(DE)* May I make an observation on my own account? It is somewhat difficult for me as a German of the younger generation at a time like this to take part in a vote on agenda questions of this kind. If we wished to honour together the victims of fascism, it would in my view have been more appropriate to clarify these matters by inter-group agreement than to make them an agenda item and thus put me in the position of having to vote against honouring the victims of fascism and keeping to the agenda. I would thus ask the Socialist Group to try for such agreement in future so that you, Mr President, or other members of the House do not find themselves in a similar situation again.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — Mr Brok, I understand your sentiments perfectly, but the President is only empowered to conduct debates and to put matters to the vote in pursuance of the Rules of Procedure.

We are concerned here with the order of business for the present part-session. This was drawn up by the enlarged Bureau and, I would point out, adopted unanimously. There was no difference of views within the enlarged Bureau.

This morning there was the customary meeting of the chairmen of political groups, which discussed the question of changes to the agenda, and at this meeting, where each group was represented by its chairman, no modifications were proposed . . .

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* We did table an amendment.

President. — But you were not there, Mr Arndt.

However that may be, the matter was discussed in the enlarged Bureau, which adopted the draft agenda which has been submitted to you.

Since they are allowed by the Rules of Procedure, proposals to change the agenda cannot be avoided, and this is what has happened. We have had changes proposed by Mr Chambeiron and the chairman of the Socialist Group, and they have had to be decided by means of a vote.

Personally, I too, I must admit, am embarrassed to find that a matter on which I am sure virtually everyone in this House takes the same view has to be settled by a vote. All the same, on the way our work is to be organized and the efficiency of this work there may well be differences of view, and these differences have had the opportunity of being expressed.

Mr Saby (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, on a point of order. Members' pigeon-holes have been used for the

distribution of a text which constitutes a clear case of manipulation of documents and falsification of information.

I would like to see the Rules applied, with action taken to prevent this sort of document being put in our pigeon-holes. It is a rag in which information and documents have been manipulated to give credence to the idea that Mr Jospin is implicated in a case involving terrorism.

I take the strongest exception to this state of affairs and would ask you, Mr President, to ensure that our Rules are enforced and that unauthorized people do not gain access to our pigeon-holes to put whatever they please into them.

Mrs Castle (S). — Mr President, in view of the fact that so many people have expressed their regret that they have had to vote against our motion, are they perhaps having second thoughts? It would be quite wrong to blame us for asking for a vote on something on which our group feels very strongly indeed. As you have pointed out, it is quite normal for people to move changes to the agenda and for votes to be taken, and I object to the insinuation that somehow there was something wrong in our pressing for a vote. It has merely made a lot of people feel how legitimate and reasonable our request was. All we are saying is: Here we are having this great demonstration with representatives from all over the European countries to honour the resistance fighters and the victims of Nazism and to pledge ourselves to safeguard freedom and human liberty in the future. Surely it is not asking much, in this week of all weeks, that this Parliament should adjourn for a short time to enable everybody to attend. Will you therefore put it to the vote again, because I think some people will have had second thoughts and would wish to be associated with this great demonstration against Nazism and this pledge for the future?

President. — Mr Saby, the question of distributing all kinds of documents and depositing them in Members' pigeon-holes has already been discussed several times by the Bureau.

You ask for this to be subjected to some surveillance. You yourself have found that the number of slips, folders, documents of all kinds, deposited in these pigeon-holes is considerable. We cannot set up a system for filtering them and selecting those that are admissible. It is quite impossible. If this document really provokes the disapproval you say it does, I am sure that our colleagues will share your sentiments and in any case your remarks will be recorded in the Report of Proceedings of this meeting.

With regard to Mrs Castle, I would reply to her that I have by no means reproached the Socialist Group for making its proposal. I simply pointed out, in reply to

President

Mr Brok, that the order of business of this part-session had been drawn up in a manner that was entirely correct.

It may well be that a matter is presented in such a way that it has to be put to the vote where a vote was, perhaps, not entirely suitable, but I cannot now go back upon a vote that has been conducted absolutely correctly.

Mr Pitt (S). — Mr President, I have been trying for 15 minutes to raise two points of order on Tuesday morning's business as expressed in the agenda. When I indicated that I did not wish to be called after Mr Chambeiron, that was because I did not wish to contribute to the very valid points he was making about Monday's business, not Wednesday's, which you have now moved on to.

If you will allow me to make my two points though, it may help you to reconsider what Mrs Castle has said. The two points of order are as follows.

You were quite right a moment ago when you said that the President has the right to speak from time to time. You are absolutely right there. However, there are moments when I wonder on what authority the President does speak. My first point of order relates to your decision on 29 April, in the course of budgetary conciliation, unilaterally to propose that a research heading be added to the draft budget for 1985. I would submit, Mr President, that you had no authority from the Committee on Budgets to do so and you had no authority from Parliament to do so, since that research heading, which I understand you personally proposed, was not in Parliament's resolution.

My second point of order has to do with Tuesday morning's general budget debate. In my view it would be quite easy to curtail that, if not abolish it altogether, in order to comply with the Socialist Group's resolution. Frankly, I am appalled that the Parliament is being rushed into a debate and a vote on a new budget which presents us with two major problems. The first is that even after the four days the ministers of agriculture have spent together, we still do not know the outcome on farm prices, so what we are debating tomorrow is arithmetic nonsense. My second reason is that again no one in this Parliament has expressed any view that we need urgently to take the budget this month. So in my view it is political cosmetics.

If you will answer those two points of order, Mr President, I think you may find that we easily have time tomorrow to accede to Mr Arndt's request.

President: — With regard to the first point, of the subject of which the House, as such, may be unaware, it is true that I attended a conciliation meeting with the Council of Ministers on the question of the Com-

munity's own resources. It was a conciliation meeting, and the very term 'conciliation' implies the possibility of an exchange of views between the two parties — that is, the Council and the delegation from Parliament. Parliament's delegation is not there simply to convey to the Council of Ministers what is contained in resolutions adopted by this House: if that were so, the conciliation would have no purpose.

Since you contest my right to raise the problem of a common research policy, I must say that we asked for the proceedings to be suspended and that during this suspension of proceedings the Parliamentary delegation held a meeting attended by a number of members of the Committee on Budgets. Moreover, the chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control and all the political groups were represented. The Parliamentary delegation made the unanimous proposal that certain steps be envisaged with regard to research. I therefore consider that what you reproach me with is quite ungrounded.

With regard to the other point, you say that the budgetary debate is pointless. If that is your view, you could have proposed, one hour before the beginning of the part-session, that the budgetary debate be deleted from the order of business. I should have been surprised if such a proposition had been supported by a majority.

Mr Galland (L). — (FR) Mr President, I had no intention at all of taking part in this debate, which I find extremely unpleasant, but a serious matter has come up which I feel cannot be allowed to pass. At the end of her speech Mrs Castle asked for a second vote to be taken so that the outcome might be changed and a majority obtained — to quote what I heard in the interpretation — against Nazism and for our future.

Mr President, I voted to reject this request for the reasons which you outlined but, in common with other honourable Members who voted the same way, I am not prepared to allow my vote to be interpreted as not being a vote against Nazism.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — As regards Wednesday, . . .

Mr Balfe (S). — On a point of order, Mr President, in accordance with Rule 56(1). One hour and one minute before the part-session opened, I presented to your office a request signed by 21 people to delete the first item of business on Wednesday afternoon from the agenda. I would point out that the standing orders of this Parliament make no distinction between formal business and agenda business. It speaks merely of a draft agenda, which is the title of this document, which informs us that the first business on Wednesday afternoon is an address by Mr Ronald Reagan. Many

Balfe

of us feel that Mr Reagan is not a welcome visitor at this point of time and wish to place on record an expression of opinion to this effect. This seemed to me to be most effectively done by moving that the item be deleted from the agenda in protest at his recent policies, especially in relation to Star Wars and Nicaragua.

I would therefore ask you, Mr President — since the Rules do not distinguish between the two types of business — to place before the House, on a vote, that the first item of business on Wednesday afternoon be deleted.

President. — It is not true that no distinction can be made between these two types of business.

On 8 May, two formal sittings are to be held apart from the ordinary sitting. The first, in the morning, will be devoted to a formal commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the end of the Second World War. The second, in the afternoon, will be devoted to the speech by Mr Ronald Reagan, President of the United States.

We have always made it perfectly clear that speeches made here by Heads of State do not form part of the sittings of this Parliament as governed by our Rules of Procedure. These are formal sittings: the guest delivers a speech, and this is never followed by a debate.

This will be our procedure for Wednesday afternoon's formal sitting. I therefore cannot regard a proposal to delete this formal sitting as an admissible request for a change in our order of business.

This sitting does not figure in our order of business in the strict sense of the expression.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Mr Falconer (S). — Mr President, Mr Balfe has made a point of order which I wish to pursue. At the end of the day it is surely the Members of this Assembly who will design, draft and implement the agenda. Mr Balfe is saying, quite simply, that the matter should be put to the House for that decision to be made. With the greatest respect to yourself, Mr President, if you have decided to place this on the agenda, then it gives rise to a point of order in respect of a vote of confidence in yourself as president.

Mr Balfe (S). — Mr President, I always address myself to the rule book when I raise points of order. I respectfully submit that the rule book makes no distinction between formal sittings of the House and normal sittings of the House. Indeed, the precedent is, as most recently established during the visit of President Herzog, that the proceedings of a formal sitting are recorded in the 'Rainbow' and in the Minutes, which are placed before this House for approval, and are, in

all ways, a part of the debates of this House and they appear in the formal record of this House. We may not like this, but I would submit that the Rules are fully in line with the resolution that was tabled, and I would ask you to put it to the vote. I can only conclude if it is not put to the vote that you realize that President Reagan will be rejected by this House because we all recognize what he is.

President. — Mr Balfe, I regret that I do not share your interpretation of the Rules of Procedure.

These rules, you say, make no distinction between formal and other sittings. But this is for the very good reason that our Rules of Procedure make no allowance for formal sittings! Formal sittings do not form part of our proceedings. Wednesday's agenda, as you have it in front of you, envisages that the Parliamentary sitting shall take place from 10 a.m. to 12.15 p.m. and from 3 p.m. to 8.30 p.m.

That is the agenda for Wednesday's sitting.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, we have already discussed this matter in the House and, as you know, I told you that the overwhelming majority of the Socialist Group was in favour of these two formal sittings given the necessary conditions.

The position of the majority of the Socialist Group is thus clear. I should nevertheless be grateful if you would actually enable the House to vote on the matter. This would be the simplest solution. I am sure there will be a clear majority, since all the groups in the enlarged Bureau were in favour of holding the formal sittings given the necessary conditions.

Mr Møller (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, it seems to me that the debate we have been witnessing these last twenty-five minutes is embarrassing for us all, both because we have to sit here and listen to it and because we have to vote on it. I hear those who are somewhat annoyed with us for voting out Mr Arndt's motion, but the majority has spoken, and I think that Mr Arndt is a good enough democrat to take the consequences. If he does not wish to do so, he can leave the budget debate — as Mr Pitt says — and go to Struthof. I would point out that I myself thought it a fitting way to remember those years when we were young and war raged in Europe. I would therefore have no objection, Mr President, if you decided that we extend the lunch break tomorrow by half-an-hour — Mrs Castle said that a visit to Struthof would take two hours — so that those who want to go to Struthof can do so in the lunch break.

President. — Mr Møller, that question has been settled. We are now concerned with another problem, the

President

proposal made by the Honourable Mr Balfe, who has already twice taken the floor. . .

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, in spite of all the respect I have for you I do not think there is anything in Rule 56(1) to prevent the alteration of the agenda and that the best solution would be for us to follow the procedure proposed by the chairman of the Socialist Group. Of course, as the previous speaker has said, we are not unaware that Parliament has taken a position with regard to the visit of President Reagan. But notwithstanding this we must not make light of a new factor, namely that the formal sitting to welcome President Reagan comes just two days after his visit to the Bitburg cemetery. This visit has stunned public opinion in our countries, especially in Greece, where the Nazi and fascist occupation took 520,000 lives.

This really is a new factor, and I think that Mr Balfe's motion asks nothing more of the European Parliament than that it rise to the level of the American House of Representatives, which with 257 votes came down against Reagan's visit to the Bitburg cemetery, while 82 members of the Senate tabled a motion demanding that the visit be cancelled. I think therefore that, on the occasion of the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the defeat of fascism, and with a mind to the enormous sensitivity that exists about this business, the European Parliament should vote on the matter.

(Protests from the centre and the right)

Mr Staes (ARC). — *(NL)* Mr President, the proceedings of this Parliament depend on the correct interpretation of the Rules of Procedure. You have given your interpretation. What is clear from the debate to which this has given rise is that the situation is not at all clear. I therefore call for a vote on the interpretation of the Rules of Procedure.

Mr C. Beazley (ED). — Mr President, we have heard many interventions representing extremely small and minority views on this subject. You have given your ruling.

Mr Arndt has made it quite clear what his position is in regard to the leadership of the Socialist Group. I think it is disgraceful that we should be wasting so much time when we have far more important business to deal with, and I formally move that we proceed to the next piece of business immediately.

Mr Collins (S). — Mr President, I was intrigued by your apparent ruling on the point raised by Mr Balfe. You appeared to suggest to Mr Balfe and to the Assembly that there is a distinction between normal sittings of the Parliament and the kind that is being held to welcome (if that is the word!) Mr Reagan to this building. If that is so and Mr Reagan is not actu-

ally addressing a sitting of the Parliament, can you make quite clear what instructions you have issued to the cash office in respect of those Members who only sign in for Mr Reagan's address? Do they collect their expenses?

(Laughter)

Mr Galland (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to say that you are absolutely right as regards strict interpretation of the Rules of Procedure.

The problem with which we have to deal here is, in my view, of a somewhat different nature. It seems to me that it would not be inappropriate for us to take a roll-call vote on this matter, as Mr Arndt has requested, and I trust, Mr President, that those who are seeking interpretation of the Rules of Procedure on this point appreciate that the interpretation of the Rules will apply to them on Wednesday, when we shall be receiving a visit from President Reagan.

Mr Huckfield (S). — Mr President, surely the main point that we ought to be addressing ourselves to is whether the part of the session when President Reagan speaks is deemed to be a formal sitting of this Assembly or is deemed to be a normal part of the session. We, above all, ought to be in control of our own business. I really cannot understand why, whether it is deemed to be part of the normal session or is something slightly more elevated than that, we are now being told that in some way we cannot even vote on our own business. Now for the other point I want to put to you, Sir, and I should like to have your interpretation on this. On 14 February this year, this Parliament voted formally that we would decide to celebrate formally at its May 1985 part-session the 40th anniversary of the end of the Second World War in order to highlight in a fitting manner the importance of the victory over Nazism, without which peace could not have been restored and there could have been no true reconciliation between the peoples of Europe. When we took that decision in February, surely it was then up to you to see that that decision was carried out. When you have a resolution from the Socialist Group that suggests a way of carrying out that resolution, surely it is your duty to see that we stick to it.

Mr Falconer (S). — Mr President, I do not want to interrupt the flow of this debate.

(Protests from the European Democratic benches)

I am sorry if some Members over there are a wee bit hot under the collar. However, Mr President, if you rule that no vote will be taken, then I wish to give notice that a point of order will be raised at that stage. Do you understand? If you rule from the Chair that no vote will be taken, I wish to give notice that I want to raise a point of order at that stage.