

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 2-325

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1985-1986 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 15 to 19 April 1985

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Sitting of Monday, 15 April 1985	1
Resumption, p. 1 — Minutes, p. 1 — Agenda, p. 2 — Tabling of amendments, p. 4 — Waiving of immunity, p. 6 — Employment and unemployment, p. 9	
Sitting of Tuesday, 16 April 1985	28
Discharge for the 1983 budget, p. 29 — Migrant workers, p. 51 — Action taken on Parliament's opinions, p. 60 — Question Time, p. 62 — Migrant workers (contd), p. 75 — Topical and urgent debate: Announcement, p. 89 — July 1985 part-session, p. 90 — Votes, p. 90 — Annex, p. 97	
Sitting of Wednesday, 17 April 1985	101
Minutes, p. 102 — Social security, p. 102 — European Union, p. 107 — European Council in Brussels, p. 128 — Minutes, p. 137 — European Council in Brussels (contd), p. 137 — Question Time, p. 149 — Votes, p. 161 — Annex: Written answers to questions which could not be answered during Question Time, p. 176	
Sitting of Thursday, 18 April 1985	214
Minutes, p. 215 — Topical and urgent debate, p. 216 — Commission statement, p. 241 — Internal border controls, p. 247 — European Environment Summit, p. 254 — Rail-mounted vehicles, p. 264 — Votes, p. 265 — Rail-mounted vehicles (contd), p. 267 — Indication of prices, p. 270 — Turnover taxes, p. 274 — FAO World Conference on Fisheries, p. 279 — Customs debt, p. 284 — Transport, p. 288	
Sitting of Friday, 19 April 1985	301
Minutes, p. 301 — Votes, p. 301 — Adjournment, p. 305	

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, 15 APRIL 1985

Contents

1. Resumption of the session	1	<i>Didò and others to the Council; (Doc. B 2-93/85) by Mr Didò and others to the Commission (Doc. B 2-6/85) by Mr Klepsch and Mr Ciancaglini to the Council; (Doc. B 2-4/85) by Raggio and others to the Council; (Doc. B 2-111/85) by Mr Tognoli and others to the Commission and (Doc. B 2-124/85) by Mrs Squarcialupi and others to the Commission:</i>
2. Approval of minutes	1	
Mr Tomlinson; Mr Marshall	10	
3. Agenda: Mr Aigner; Mr Arndt; Mr Price; Mr Welsh; Mrs Hammerich; Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mr Arndt; Mr Fich; Mr Hutton; Mr Arndt	2	<i>Mr Didò; Mr Ciancaglini; Mrs J. Hoffmann; Mrs Salisch; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr De Michelis (Council); Mr Pfeiffer (Commission); Mr Sutherland (Commission); Mr Bachy; Mr Brok; Sir Jack Stewart-Clark; Mrs Larive-Groenendaal; Mrs Chouraqui; Mr Ulburghs; Mr McCartin; Mrs Daly; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Fitzgerald; Mr Seligman</i>
4. Deadline for tabling amendments: Mr Ciccimessere; Mr C. Beazley; Mr Hutton	4	
5. Waiving of immunity — Reports (Docs. A 2-13/85 and A 2-14/85) by Mr Donnez: Mr Donnez; Mr Plaskovitis; Mr Alavanos; Mr Donnez; Mrs Fontaine	6	
6. Employment and unemployment — (Oral questions with debate (Doc. B 2-5/85) by Mr		9

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

Are there any comments?

President

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

1. Resumption of the session

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament which was adjourned on 15 March 1985.

2. Approval of minutes

President. — The minutes of the sitting of 15 March 1985 have been distributed.

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Mr President, as the Minutes of Proceedings of the Friday of the last part-session will show, I raised at the beginning of that Friday morning what appeared to be an irregularity in the voting that had taken place on the agricultural price-fixing. I enquired at that time whether there would be a full investigation by the Bureau into those irregularities but so far nothing seems to have emerged. An examination of the voting lists will show quite clearly that during the vote on the agricultural price-fixing votes were recorded of Members who were not recorded as being present during the Thursday sitting. I would appreciate your advice and guidance as to what action the Bureau have taken because, in view of the very small majority against the Commission proposals, any appearance of irregularity makes that vote very suspect indeed.

President. — I must point out, Mr Tomlinson, that even Members who have not signed the record of attendance may take part in a vote. The record of attendance may be consulted to check whether a Member was present, as in the payment of allowances, but it has nothing to do with the right to vote; they are two quite different things.

Mr Marshall (ED). — Mr President, many will not find your answer very satisfactory. There have been occasions in the past when Sir Peter Vanneck and Mr Cottrell have pointed out cases of double voting. Could you not at least ask for a sworn statement by those who are alleged to have voted but are so public spirited that they do not want to claim their *per diem*, that they were in fact here? At least some attempt should be made to investigate what could become an international scandal.

President. — Let us not exaggerate! There are so many other occasions on which the word scandal can be properly used that it is really going too far to use it in this context!

(Applause)

That said, I am perfectly prepared to make a formal request to our colleagues concerned. I believe that their statement will be accurate.

*(Parliament approved the minutes)*¹

3. Agenda

President. — At its meeting on 12 March 1985 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed.

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

*(The President read out the amendments to Monday's agenda)*²

Tuesday:

At the meeting this morning the group chairmen decided not to propose amendments to business and thus to continue the social debate tomorrow morning at 9 a.m., reports on the budgetary discharge to be considered after the social debate.

We have, however, received a request from the Group of the European People's Party and the European Democratic Group to amend tomorrow's business by scheduling from 9 a.m. the debate on discharge and, at the end of the debate on discharge, continuation of the social debate.

Mr Aigner (PPE), chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control. — *(DE)* Mr President, the discharge can be granted by a single legislative act, with the corresponding consequences for the Community. That is why I considered it wrong for that particular debate to be interrupted. I would also ask you to remember that ten other committees worked on the report too. It is an important report by Parliament, an annual report, so I ask you to show sympathy for the request by the committee and the groups that we should debate the discharge first thing tomorrow morning.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, I object to the idea of splitting the debate on such an important question, the question of social policy, which we have put off for so long that it has only just come on to the agenda in April, by holding part of the debate this evening, then interrupting it with the budgetary control debate, and continuing to debate social matters tomorrow afternoon.

That will not produce any results, for as I have heard, the issue is simply that the vote must take place at 6 p.m. on Tuesday. In my view we will manage that anyway — and if not we can still vote at 6 p.m. on Wednesday.

So I am opposed to this attempt basically to split the social policy debate, which this Parliament considers at least as important as the debate on the discharge, by inserting the latter in between.

Mr Price (ED). — Mr President, I should like to support the proposal made by Mr Aigner and also to put forward the one on behalf of my group which is identical, namely to take the continuation of the social affairs debate after the joint debate on the discharge on Tuesday. If this request is not agreed, it is very likely that our discharge debate will take place in three small parts: the latter part of Tuesday morning, the last part just before the vote on Tuesday afternoon and, finally, on Wednesday morning. Three small parcels of time.

In the discharge we are dealing with one of the Parliament's main powers — not just the expression of its views, but the actual exercise of one of Parliament's powers — and attached to discharge we have a quite unique power, namely to pass comments which are binding on the other institutions.

Mr President, if we are not to give that sort of matter priority on our agenda, what will we be saying on

¹ *Petitions — Authorization to draw up reports — Referral to committee — modification of referral — Transfer of appropriations — Written declarations (Rule 49) — Documents received — Texts of agreements forwarded by the Council — Request to waive immunity of Members: See Minutes.*

² See agenda.

Price

Wednesday when we come to talk about the powers of this Parliament? This Parliament must first exercise the powers that it has and then go on on Wednesday to claim more.

(Parliament approved the request of the EPP and ED Groups)

President. — The group chairmen decided this morning that tomorrow evening we shall be voting, first on the motions for resolutions on discharge, next, on the motions for resolutions on social problems and, finally, on the report by Mr Tuckman carried over from the previous part-session (Doc. 2-1753/84).

I would just point out that there are 271 amendments to these texts so voting may continue until around 9 p.m.

Mr Welsh (ED), chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. — Mr President, I would like to make a proposal which I hope will help you. There are, I understand, over 160 amendments tabled to the report by Mrs Marinaro on migrants' rights. Unfortunately, these have not yet been circulated and therefore Members have not had time to have a look at them. Indeed, I have not myself had time to look at them but I understand that no less than 76 come from one particular group who did not even have the courtesy to send a representative to speak at the committee meeting when the report was discussed.

Under those circumstances, Mr President, I would like to propose that we defer the vote on the Marinaro report until Thursday's voting time which will give all Members time to look at the amendments and perhaps give that particular group the opportunity to reflect whether it would not be more polite to their colleagues not to insist on tabling all the amendments. I would like to propose that.

(Parliament approved the request by Mr Welsh — the President read out the amendments to the agenda for Wednesday, Thursday and Friday)¹

Mrs Hammerich (ARC). — (DA) I am not particularly surprised to note that an illegal question has been tabled for question time on Wednesday. It is question No 110 by Mr Toksvig, who is from Denmark. He is keen to promote greater Community solidarity, and he thinks the way to bring that about is for the Community to produce military aircraft.

I should like to point out that military production falls outside the ambit of the European Community and is not covered by the Treaty of Rome. And I would remind Mr Toksvig that the Danish government and

his own party, the Konservative Folkeparti, is opposed to Community production.

I wish to lodge an objection to the inclusion of this question in the agenda.

President. — Mrs Hammerich, this is a question to the Council which will be taken at Question Time. It will not therefore be appearing on the agenda we are now considering. Nonetheless, we take note of your statement.

Dame Shelagh Roberts, chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations, and 13 other signatories request the inclusion on the agenda of the Aerssen report on trade relations with Taiwan (Doc. 2-1765/84).

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED), chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations. — Mr President, I would like to speak in support of the proposition that the Van Aerssen report on Taiwan should be placed on the agenda of this plenary.

The position is that this report was adopted by the REX Committee on 21 February. It was adopted unanimously with only one abstention so there is clear support for the report. I was asked by the committee to write to you to request that it be placed on the agenda for either the March or the April plenary. It was agreed by the meeting of committee chairmen, which takes place at each plenary session, that it should be proposed to be put on the agenda for the April part-session. By some curious mishap, Mr President — and I choose my words carefully — that proposal did not seem to get properly considered, if it was considered at all, in the enlarged Bureau before the agenda for this part-session was published.

It is an open secret that there has been a certain amount of activity to persuade members of the REX Committee as to the shape that this report should take. There has also been a certain amount of activity to persuade Members that perhaps the report should not be taken at all. I submit to the House that it would be bad for the democratic rights of Members and for the integrity of this House if Members were to succumb to such persuasions.

If there are Members who are opposed to this report then the democratic thing for them to do is to speak and vote against the report and not to try to suppress its debate. I hope, therefore, Mr President, that the House will agree that we should take the report at this part-session.

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, that report is not shown in the agenda before us. Nor was it included at the last meeting of the enlarged Bureau. So it is not a question of taking away anyone's demo-

¹ See Minutes.

Arndt

cratic rights but of whether we will stick to this agenda.

There are in fact very good grounds which, alas, were not put forward now, for deferring this debate. All the groups, and the members of the delegation for relations with the People's Republic of China who have concerned themselves with this question, were not in fact against the report, but they were not in favour of discussing it now, preferring to take it at a later date.

That is partly to do with certain diplomatic customs. For we now have an agreement to be signed, and it is possible that if the Taiwan report is adopted now it will not fit into the diplomatic timetable. So may I urgently request that we keep to the enlarged Bureau's proposal for the present. The President once again expressly agreed today that of course the report will be placed on the next possible agenda — but I beg you, not before the signing of the agreement with the People's Republic of China on 22 May!

(Parliament rejected the request)

Mr Fich (S). — (DA) Mr President, I am surprised that there is no item on the agenda under which the Commission can present its new provisional proposal for the 1985 budget. It can only be because it has not made any request to do so, and that rather surprises me. It is after all normal for the Commission to present its proposals in plenary here in Parliament, just as it does to the Council of Ministers, so that we can inform the Council of Ministers in advance of our expectations in respect of its forthcoming first reading of the new provisional proposal for the budget.

Mr President, I therefore request that we give the Commission an opportunity to reconsider whether it would not be worthwhile to inform us of its decisions regarding the new provisional proposal for the 1985 budget so that, if appropriate, we can have a short debate here in plenary. I realize that the Commission has only produced a corrected version, but the extent and significance of the corrected version is such that there is, in the nature of things, some justification for us to deal briefly with it here. In my opinion, it is up to the Commission. But I ask you, Mr President, to approach the Commission and inquire whether it intends to inform us of its decisions.

President. — May a Commission spokesman reply to the question put?

Apparently not.

Mr Fich, I shall put the question to the Commission.

Mr Hutton (ED). — Mr President, I think I may have been absent from the Chamber when you told the House that the Newman report was to be deleted from

the agenda. Is this correct, and can you tell the House what reason there is for deleting this report from the agenda?

President. — It was the committee responsible that asked for this report to be taken off the agenda, with the Commission's agreement.

Mr Hutton (ED). — Mr President, I am informed that this matter was not put to the committee but that it is perhaps the wish of the chairman acting by himself. I wonder if the chairman, if he is present, could say what his reason is.

President. — We have received a letter from the committee chairman. One can normally assume that when a committee chairman writes to you, it is on behalf of his committee. We shall try to locate the letter, and I shall then acquaint you with its contents, Mr Hutton.

Mr K.H. Hoffmann and 20 other signatories asked for the report by Mr Marshall (Doc. A2-9/85), now entered on the agenda for Thursday under No 52, to be taken on Friday as the first item after voting.

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, the group chairmen discussed at great length whether we should do so or not. For if the Chamber starts to decide on Monday what the best times are and at what point this or that report should be discussed, we will never settle our agenda.

I do not think any serious practical consequences are involved anyway, for at present, as I see, The Marshall report is the last report with debate on this agenda. So we would either have to discuss it as the final report on Thursday — then simply vote on it on Friday — or we have votes on Friday and then debate the Marshall report, which means it would be debated exactly when they wanted it. But in principle I do not think it is a good thing for Parliament to decide on Monday at what point — whether Thursday evening or Friday morning — a report should be debated, for that way will lead to chaos in fixing the items of our agenda.

(Parliament rejected the request and adopted the agenda as amended)

4. Deadline for tabling amendments

President. — The deadline for tabling amendments to all the reports has expired with the exception of the following reports for which the deadline is extended until 8 p.m. this evening:

- report by Mr Seeler (Doc. A 2-16/85)
- report by Mr Beumer (Doc. A 2-15/85)

President

— report by Mr Marshall (Doc. A 2-9/85)

The deadline for tabling amendments to all the reports added to the agenda is set at 12 noon on Tuesday, 16 April.

The deadline for tabling motions for resolutions on the European Council Meeting and on the oral questions added to the social debate is set at 8 p.m. this evening, and the deadline for tabling amendments thereto at 12 noon on Tuesday, 16 April.

Mr Ciccimessere (NI). — *(IT)* From the draft agenda it is apparent that the deadline for submitting amendments to certain documents was set at Thursday, 11 April. This means that the Assembly would be adopting a retroactive deadline for the submission of amendments. That goes against every principle of parliamentary law. Obviously, if this Assembly were to support such a principle, then a majority of the Assembly could, in theory, suppress the very right to submit amendments.

The Assembly can fix the deadline for even a minute after the vote, but it cannot fix a deadline that obviously precedes the vote by several days.

Therefore, Mr President, I ask for the deadline to be moved to 8 p.m. this evening, the same as for the other cases.

I should like to point out that this is not a question that concerns my Group specifically — in regard, that is, to any amendments that may have been submitted — it is a question of principle. It is possible to fix a deadline one minute after the start of the sitting, but not three days before the vote.

President. — I wonder if there has not been an error in the interpreting, Mr Ciccimessere. In point of fact, there is no question of taking retroactive decisions. It was the Bureau, when drawing up the draft agenda, that set for a number of reports deadlines that would expire on 11 April. I indicated to you a moment ago that the deadline for tabling amendments to a number of reports had run out since 11 April is now past, and I also mentioned that the deadline was extended till 8 p.m. this evening in the case of three reports: those of Mr Seeler, Mr Beumer and Mr Marshall.

Mr Ciccimessere (NI). — *(IT)* I beg your pardon, Mr President, but I would point out that the proposal of the Bureau must be approved by the Assembly, which therefore cannot approve — as it is now attempting to do — a retroactive deadline.

This is the basic problem. Although the enlarged Bureau can propose a deadline that follows the approval of the document, it cannot propose a dead-

line prior to approval of the draft agenda. This appears to me more than logical.

President. — The Bureau, which set these deadlines for tabling amendments, has not exceeded its powers. Setting the deadline for tabling amendments is within its sphere of responsibilities. That is why I did not ask the Assembly today to fix deadlines expiring on 11 April. This decision was taken previously and prior to 11 April, of course, by the Bureau. The proposal being made today is that the deadline be extended until this evening in respect of three reports. Any member of the Assembly may, if he so wishes, request similar extensions on other reports provided he does so for good reasons and can justify the request. The position is that we have not received any request to extend the deadline with the exception of the three I have mentioned twice already. Consequently, I think we can now move on.

Mr C. Beazley (ED). — Mr President, I do not wish to delay the business of this House, but I would like to refer to the question put to you by Mr Hutton in reference to the Newman report. He did ask you for what reason this report has been withdrawn, as it was not withdrawn with the agreement or approval of the committee in question — the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning. You did undertake to find the letter and to report back to this House. I would not like to see that report being removed without your specific ruling, as it certainly was not removed with the approval of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning.

President. — I have in front of me a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy, Mr De Pasquale, dated 2 April, informing me that the Commission representative has notified the wish of the Commissioner responsible, Mr Varfis, to have this report entered on the agenda for the May part-session since the Commissioner cannot be present in April. This same letter from Mr De Pasquale states that the rapporteur, Mr Newman, also prefers this solution, namely that the report be held over until May. Thus Mr De Pasquale himself requests the inclusion of the Newman report on the agenda for the May part-session. So the position is extremely clear: when a committee chairman makes a request of this sort, and gives reasons therefore, it is perfectly proper, it seems to me, that we take account of it. This is why I have proposed that the report be deleted from the agenda for the present part-session.

I hope this time I have managed to convince you.

Mr Hutton (ED). — Mr President, I quite see the problem that you are faced with. You have received what appears to be a perfectly proper request from the chairman of a committee. However, I would not like it

Hutton

to be thought that the agenda of this Parliament is decided by the availability of commissioners. The report refers to a period when Commissioner Varfis was not in his present post and his contribution therefore could only be on the advice of officials. It would be unthinkable, therefore, if the agenda of the Parliament were to be made up on the advice of officials of the European Commission, able as they all are and dependent as we are upon them for our work.

President. — To repeat, Mr Hutton. When we are settling the agenda, as we are today, it is natural that we take account of the positions of the committee responsible, that is the committee of the European Parliament. It so happens that that proposal takes account of a wish expressed by a Member of the Commission — this is a sound enough reason — and I feel that we really should abide by what has been decided. This matter will be taken up again at the next part-session, in May, and I do not think that this deferral will have serious consequences.¹

5. *Waiving of immunity*

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Donnez, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, on the request to waive the parliamentary immunity of Mr Michael Klöckner (Doc. A 2-13/85).

Mr Donnez (L), rapporteur. — (FR) Ladies and Gentlemen, this afternoon we have to consider two requests for waivers of parliamentary immunity, one concerning Mr Klöckner, the other, to which we shall be coming in a few moments, concerning Mr Klöckner and Mr Härlin.

In referring immediately to both cases, I of course have no intention of treating them as being on a par with each other, but simply wish, in connection with both, to draw your attention to the principles that we have established in what I for my part would describe as a consistent body of case law, which the House reaffirmed in its unanimous vote in the case of Mr Tortora, which is no doubt still fresh in all your minds. These principles are derived from Article 10 of the Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Communities annexed to the European Communities Treaty defining the respective roles of the Council, the Commission and the Parliament. Under Article 10 when they are on the territory of their respective countries, Members of the European Parliament enjoy the same immunities as those granted to Members of their respective national Parliaments.

It is on the basis of this legislative text that we have established this body of real case law to which I have

just referred, and to which we have thus far adhered very strictly, for two essential reasons: first, out of respect for the nationality of each of us; secondly, out of respect for the political allegiance of each of us. And we have always tried to ensure that, irrespective of political allegiance, irrespective of nationality, these principles were scrupulously adhered to, especially since, as far as nationality is concerned, our various national Parliaments have their own case law, which does not necessarily coincide with our own and sometimes varies from one country to another.

This said, we have always maintained that our parliamentary immunity is not a privilege but a guarantee for our parliamentary institution, a guarantee of its independence in relation to all other authorities. In addition, we have held that a waiver of immunity by a Member against whom charges have been laid has no legal effect, precisely because our purpose is to safeguard the independence of Parliament, sometimes even where our action conflicts with the opinion of the Member concerned.

We have further decided that the immunity covers the whole period of a Member's term of office, regardless of the date of any offence that he or she may be alleged to have committed, on the understanding, of course, that this parliamentary immunity may be waived by the House.

This afternoon we have to deal with two requests for waivers.

I would add, to leave nothing unsaid, that, under the terms of a judgment of the Court of Justice, since the parliamentary sessions are annual, Members' immunity subsists even during recesses; in other words, it is annual throughout our term of office.

It is on the basis of these principles that we have established the fundamental criterion according to which parliamentary immunity can apply only to matters falling within the scope of Members' political activities. In applying this criterion, we have also adopted the familiar Roman law rule of *fumus persecutionis*, or the presumption that the inspiration behind a criminal prosecution is the intention to do harm, where this is indicated either by the form of the information laid or by a delay in bringing the prosecution.

Finally, it goes without saying that we refuse to allow parliamentary immunity to be extended to actions which, by their very nature, are abhorrent. These principles are now fresh in our minds, and we must apply them today to the request that we have received concerning Mr Klöckner.

The Presiding Judge of the 32nd Criminal Chamber of the Berlin Landgericht has made this request for a waiver of parliamentary immunity on the following ground: on 11 June 1982, when on his way, without official authorization, to a political demonstration, Mr

¹ *Speaking time:* see Minutes.

Donnez

Klößner was in possession of a stone and a corrosive gas aerosol spray which he had ready for use against persons or property at the scene of the demonstration.

Mr Klößner was subsequently prosecuted before the Landgericht for Berlin-Tiergarten, which acquitted him. This judgment was upheld by the 33rd Criminal Chamber of the Landgericht for Berlin in a judgment which was subsequently set aside by the Oberlandesgericht for Berlin. The case is currently pending before the 32nd Criminal Chamber of the Landgericht for Berlin, the Presiding Judge of which has made this request for a waiver.

According to this now well-established case law which I have referred, we must decide whether or not the facts alleged against Mr Klößner are connected with his political activity, and we must do so without examining the merits of the evidence. I must emphasize this last point. The very terms of our Rules of Procedure preclude us from considering the evidence; we cannot discuss the evidence. We must simply decide, in the light of the charge that has been laid, whether or not we should maintain parliamentary immunity, whether or not we should waive parliamentary immunity.

In the present case, I for my part am not saying that the circumstances as set out by the judge seeking the waiver are accurate. Mr Klößner denies that they are — perhaps with some justification, it would seem to me, since the first two judges dismissed the charges against him.

However, that is not our concern. We do not have to ask ourselves whether or not, specifically, Mr Klößner was in possession of an aerosol containing corrosive gas. He maintains that the gas was not corrosive. The first two judges found that this was true. The prosecution maintains the opposite. Once again, this is not our concern. Our only task is to decide whether or not, in the light of the charge, there is in this case a criterion of a sufficiently political nature to justify, if appropriate, a waiver of Mr Klößner's parliamentary immunity.

Clearly, taking part in a political demonstration is a normal political activity in a democratic country. But taking objects capable of causing personal injury or damage to property, possibly with a view to using them for such a purpose, is not a democratic political activity in law-abiding countries such as ours.

Democracy means not only freedom of expression but also respect for the rest of society. We would be in dereliction of our duty if we did not reaffirm these elementary principles, in the light of which, and having regard to the nature of the charge, of which you are now aware, the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights recommends that parliamentary immunity be waived in this case.

I thank you for your attention.

(Applause)

Mr Plaskovitis (S). — (GR) Mr President, since the rapporteur has already maintained that Parliament is not competent to examine the essentials of a case in deciding whether or not immunity is to be waived, but only to assess the extent to which an action of which one of its Members is accused constitutes a political activity, I feel that taking part in a demonstration, as the rapporteur has already accepted, is indeed a political act. Whether and to what extent it is true that the Member brought with him potentially offensive objects is a question relating to the essentials of the case, and is thus subject to judicial judgement and establishment of the facts of the matter. I therefore think that our Parliament is not competent to decide on this point; it suffices that the participation of one of its Members in a political demonstration has been substantiated, and this is a political fact, a political action. Clearly he cannot be expelled for this political action. As for the rest, these are matters concerning judicial judgement, and we should not go into them here.

Consequently, I am in favour of rejecting the report by the Committee on Legal Affairs, because what is involved is clearly a political action concerning which Parliament cannot approve the waiving of immunity.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, I would like to say that the Members of the Greek Communist Party will vote against the Legal Affairs Committee's proposal, for the reasons explained by Mr Plaskovitis but also because we think this creates a dangerous legal precedent, in that for example in Article 5, it is mentioned that while the action was a political one, it was only loosely connected with political activity as such. Now, this permits the intrusion of subjective criteria in deciding whether or not matters of this kind are political in nature.

Secondly, we also disagree with Article 4 of the report, which states that a Member is not covered by parliamentary immunity for events that took place before he acquired the immunity in question. We think that the aim of parliamentary immunity is to protect a Member in relation to events that took place either before he acquired parliamentary immunity, or after. And one final point. We think this proposed resolution comes at a critical time, and we consider that it constitutes an encouragement, a guideline as it were, for the adoption of certain — one could say intimidatory — measures against the Members themselves in view of the forthcoming visit by Mr Reagan to the European Parliament. Finally, I would like to say that the Legal Affairs Committee and its former Chairwoman Mm. Veil sometimes exceed their authority, both by going into matters such as the waiving of parliamentary immunity and in other ways that constitute interference in the internal affairs of Member States.

Mr Donnez (L), rapporteur. — (FR) I should like to make a final point, Mr President, in connection with what was said by the last speaker.

No pressure was brought to bear on the Political Affairs Committee, since the matter was not referred to it, so I can reassure the Honourable Member. It was to the Committee on Legal Affairs, not the Political Affairs Committee, that the matter was referred. Otherwise there was an error in the interpretation, in which case I apologize.

But nor was any pressure brought to bear on the Committee on Legal Affairs. So far is this from the truth that, in the next case, which also involves Mr Klöckner, I shall be asking you not to waive parliamentary immunity. And as you will see, it is a considerably more serious matter than this one.

I trust this will convince you that we have been at pains to apply the principles rigorously, and nothing else.

In reply to the first speaker, I would say this. You refer to the political nature of the demonstration. I agree with you. But that is not relevant to the charge. The charge on which the competent German judicial authority is relying is that Mr Klöckner went to a demonstration carrying objects which could possibly have been used against persons or property. It will indeed be for the judges to decide whether or not the charge is proven. But before they can do so, we will have to waive immunity.

And, up to a point, Mr Klöckner hopes that his immunity will be waived. This is something which has far wider implications. I therefore urge you to rest assured that the Committee on Legal Affairs has endeavoured to be as objective as possible in its examination of this request, as in all such cases, and to be guided by the principles which the House has now adopted and must apply strictly when discharging our task of recommending responses to the questions put to us.

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the proposal for a decision)

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Donnez, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, on the request to waive the parliamentary immunity of Mr Michael Klöckner and Mr Benedikt Härlin. (Doc. A 2-14/85).

Mr Donnez (L), rapporteur. — (FR) In fact, we have prepared a single report concerning both Mr Klöckner and Mr Härlin. For two basic reasons we opted for a single report, whereas we could have considered submitting a report for each of the Honourable Members.

A single request alleging identical facts in both cases was referred to us, as I shall be explaining in a moment. Since a single request was made, I consider that a single report from the Committee on Legal Affairs and a single decision by Parliament in plenary sitting will be perfectly adequate to satisfy the competent German authority.

This matter was referred to us, as I was mentioning, following a request submitted by the Presiding Judge of the 2nd Criminal Chamber of a Landgericht in the Federal Republic of Germany, the competent authority in the matter, in which it is alleged against Mr Klöckner and Mr Härlin that, as publishers of the magazine *Radikal*, they approved arson, bomb attacks or other acts of violence, giving support through propaganda to the activities of the 'Revolutionary Cells', an organization dedicated to the subversion of the legal and social order in the Federal Republic of Germany.

On 1 March 1984 the 2nd Criminal Chamber of the Landgericht sentenced Mr Klöckner and Mr Härlin to prison terms of 2 years and 6 months respectively. Their cases are currently pending before the Court of Appeal, where the proceedings have been stayed by the parliamentary immunity enjoyed by our two colleagues, a waiver of which is now being sought by the Presiding Judge.

The facts as just set out can, in my view, be clarified by the following further details: Mr Härlin was involved in the formation of two publishing firms or cooperatives, where he worked in a managerial capacity; these firms allowed publication of the magazine *Radikal*, and Mr Klöckner, for his part, is said to have given material and financial support for publication of this magazine. In other words, the primary charge against Mr Härlin and Mr Klöckner is that they allowed publication of this magazine. To avoid any misunderstanding or misinterpretation of what I am saying here, I must of course immediately make plain that there can be no question, to my mind, of regarding terrorist activities of whatever nature or complicity in such activities as coming within the definition of political activity in respect of which parliamentary immunity is guaranteed.

Let us be clear about this, we shall never condone terrorism: In the present case, however, it has to be acknowledged that the charges against Mr Klöckner and Mr Härlin are not of such an order. Publication of a magazine, freedom of expression, freedom to publish, these things are of the very essence of political activity in a democratic community such as ours.

Publication of *Radikal* has not, to my knowledge, ever been suspended or banned. Mr Klöckner and Mr Härlin have not been accused of having written published articles alleged to have supported a terrorist movement. The conclusion therefore becomes clear. The activities forming the basis of the charges against

Donnez

Mr Klöckner and Mr Härlin undoubtedly fall within the scope of their political activity, even though they predate their election to this Parliament. To demonstrate what I was saying to you in connection with the first case, namely that the Committee on Legal Affairs approached both these requests with all the objectivity at its command, I now recommend, following the very long discussion of this case — as of the other one, at the same meeting — that Mr Klöckner and Mr Härlin's parliamentary immunity be maintained and that the request for a waiver submitted to us be rejected.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

Explanation of vote

Mrs Fontaine (PPE), in writing. — (FR) I should like to thank Mr Donnez for the clarity, balance and coherence of the report that he has just presented to us.

Once again Mr Donnez has demonstrated that the often very delicate issues involved in these requests for waivers of parliamentary immunity can be dealt with satisfactorily by reconciling the demands of law, equity and the principles which we in the European Parliament have adopted as our own on this subject.

In considering the two cases referred to him on this occasion, which he has presented to us today, Mr Donnez has reaffirmed the distinction between 'political activities' and those which cannot be regarded as such.

As we know, this distinction is of paramount importance since, as we have just seen, it has a very strong influence on the position adopted by the European Parliament to each brought before it.

In the second report, concerning Mr Klöckner and Mr Härlin, the nature of the charge, in the strict sense of the term, namely incitement to violence, could well have prompted Mr Donnez to take the opposite line.

Mr Donnez has of course offered no opinion or judgment as to the substance or seriousness of the charge; that is no part of the European Parliament's role in such matters. But he has adopted a broader view of the circumstances of the case, concluding that the activities in question came within the scope of the exercise of freedom of opinion, one of the basic freedoms in our democracy, and that they were closely connected with the political activities of the persons concerned. We agree with the rapporteur on this.

Secondly, Mr Donnez has pointed out in his report that Mr Klöckner and Mr Härlin have not been

accused of any terrorist activity, or of incitement to such activity, not least because they were not the authors of the articles in question.

We thank him for having taken the trouble to check this. This is an important fact, perhaps in this context especially, since, as Mr Donnez himself has said, it is obvious that such activities could not be regarded as 'political activities' warranting the maintenance of immunity.

In the light of these additional details, and also bearing in mind the grounds stated in the first report which we have now adopted, we accept our rapporteur's recommendations.

(Parliament adopted the proposal for a decision)

6. Employment and unemployment

President. — The next item is the joint debate on the following oral questions with debate:

- by Mr Didò and others, to the Council (Doc. B 2-5/85) and the Commission (Doc. B 2-93/85), on the special Community job creation scheme for unemployed young people;
- by Mr Klepsch and Mr Ciancaglini, on behalf of the EEP Group to the Council, on a European employment plan (Doc. B 2-6/85);
- by Mr Raggio and others, to the Council, on youth unemployment in the Community (Doc. B 2-4/85);
- by Mr Tognoli and others, to the Commission, on measures for a policy to assist SMUs and the craft industries: creation of a European Centre (Doc. B 2-111/85);
- by Mrs Squarcialupi and others, to the Commission, on the new professions (Doc. B 2124/85).

I extend a respectful and cordial welcome to Mr Michelis, Social Affairs Minister of the Italian Government, who is with us in his capacity as President in Office of the Council.

(Applause)

Mr Didò (S). — (IT) Mr President, Mr President-in-office of the Council, the debate on the dramatic question of unemployment, and above all, youth unemployment, seems finally to have entered a new, more concrete stage. This was apparent in the speeches made by President Jacques Delors, and in the programme presented by the Commission. And there was evidence of it also in the speeches made at the recent Conference in Venice of the OECD countries on the same subject, which was organized by the Italian Gov-

Didò

ernment — just as there was in the proposals that you, yourself, put forward, Mr De Michelis.

As Members of Parliament we can only note this with satisfaction, having regard to the many resolutions long since adopted by this Parliament and its predecessor — resolutions that, in all truth, have always received scant attention.

At a time when unemployment in Europe is assuming proportions that are intolerable from the social point of view, and dangerous from the political point of view, because of the destabilizing potential of such a situation for the democratic life of our countries, it is no mere rhetoric to recall that mass unemployment was an essential factor in the rise and spread of fascism and nazism — whose defeat, forty years ago, we shall be celebrating in a few weeks' time — just as it is today for the drugs scene, delinquency, terrorism and resurgent racism.

What we call for, Mr President, is a move from words to deeds. We propose to suggest once again concrete measures for a drastic reduction, in the short term, of present levels of unemployment, aware as we are of two things. The first is that in the next ten years the problem will be very serious because we are going through a phase of far-reaching change, and hence, transition. The second is that the problem of unemployment cannot be solved by spontaneous market mechanisms, which means that at every level — Community level, and national, regional and local government level — the public authorities have a direct responsibility.

In addition, we are equally convinced that we have to stress the principle of seeking agreement with and between the social partners in tackling the necessary modernization of the economy, and in maintaining, moreover, the essential guarantees for the protection of the workers. We have to do away with certain traditional but old-fashioned attitudes: flexibility and mobility are the inevitable result of the use of new technology. But the way to tackle the question is not through wild 'deregulation' — the abandonment of all controls: we need instead new regulations that must be negotiated between the social partners, and that must respect the fundamental rights of the workers.

On this basis we give our agreement and all our support to the efforts of the President of the Commission to promote a real resumption of the social dialogue at Community level, and in this context we call upon the Council to approve, finally, the 'Vredeling' and Fifth directives.

Our proposal for employment covers a number of aspects — it can be summed up in the call for a multiannual European plan for work and employment. It consists of the implementation of specific, complementary policies in support of employment generally and the employment of youth in particular, in parallel with

the policies for economic recovery and the revival of investment that the Commission has already outlined. The measures to be adopted, which include Community support for projects for major infrastructure in the field of transport, telecommunications, the protection of the environment and the new technologies, are however specifically concerned with the creation of new jobs. All of these measures ought to be co-financed by the Community, exploiting all the possibilities offered by the ECU, including a Community maxi-loan, which should be made available to the European Social Fund and Member States. The policies should cover various aspects. In the first place, the labour market must be up-dated, from the standpoint of mobility and flexibility. For this reason we call on the Council to approve the directives on part-time working and temporary, fixed-duration working. Secondly, we have to reduce and reorganize working time so as to safeguard and increase employment, using for this purpose part of the productivity gains resulting from the introduction of new technology, from the increased utilization of plant, from a balanced wages policy, and from any help that is forthcoming from the public authorities or the Community, as is already provided for by the Social Fund. Any action in this field must obviously be the result of agreement between the social partners, not least at Community level.

Thirdly, there has to be forward-looking management of the employment situation; through the identification of employment 'catchment areas' that can consist of regions or territorial areas with the same economic and social characteristics. We have to set up 'employment monitors' who must be in a position to collect data for forecasting the prospects as to the type and number of jobs in relation to the prospects for production and the need for services — whether these are in support of production or for the satisfaction of social needs related, for example, to those fields which are of communal interest, such as the protection of the environment, the use to best advantage of cultural assets, and so on.

The aim of these action must in the first place be to plan a training programme, with concrete job prospects in view. Another aim of prime importance is the creation of new jobs, in both the production and services sectors. Using analytical forecasting techniques we have to make use of existing structures — public or private enterprises — or we have to create streamlined structures of expert 'development agents' — as envisaged by the Social Fund — so as to introduce promotional initiatives that will create new jobs or small craft undertakings or cooperatives recruited from the young or the unemployed, who will be offered appropriate training, even of an entrepreneurial nature.

The European Social Fund already provides for the co-financing of measures of the type referred to, but there is dissipation of the Fund's resources, so that it is not possible to implement meaningful experiments that

Dido

are recognizably maintained by the European Community. For this reason we ask that the Commission should be made responsible for drawing up and managing — in agreement with the authorities and the social partners, both national and regional, in Member States — a programme of pilot schemes designed to create new jobs for the unemployment and, in particular, the young. This experimental approach, under the direct responsibility of the Community, should enable Member States to gain valuable experience in the field of job creation.

Mr President, these proposals, which are set down even more precisely in the resolutions that will be presented, at the end of the debate, for the Assembly to vote on, are the outcome of an initiative taken by the Socialist Group, but which have been drawn up in collaboration with members of the PPE and of the Italian Communist Group, and they also take account of the views of the European Trade Unions Confederation. We trust, therefore, that they will receive the broadest approval of Parliament, and will be given serious consideration by the Council and the Commission.

Modernization and full employment represent a difficult challenge for Europe, but we have the resources and the instruments to meet this challenge and thereby to confirm the superiority of the European social model, which is the result of victory in so many democratic workers' struggles. It is a challenge that we can win, provided — and this is essential — that Europe is united, and really does exist.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

Mr Ciancaglini (PPE). — (IT) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr President-in-office of the Council, the question presented by me on behalf of the PPE Group is no mere chance question, and neither are the other questions included in this discussion. They express the anxiety of this Parliament at the meagre results so far obtained, and for the lack of firm initiatives, coordinated at European level, in the fight against unemployment.

Despite the existence of proposals and assumptions that are valid from the macro-economic standpoint, such as the Herman Report on economic recovery, and the Council's resolution on long-term unemployment of 19 December 1984, we are still waiting for something concrete to be done about them.

Despite some signs of economic recovery, unemployment in Europe continues to grow. The number of unemployed has reached 13 million, and represents

12% of working capacity. Of this 12%, 40% are young people. I cannot, today, Mr President of the Council, avoid a reference to the comparison between the United States and Japan and ourselves, in the light of the Venice Conference on new technology, from which it emerged that, whereas in Europe we are continuing to lose jobs, the United States created 15 million jobs, reducing their unemployment level from 12% to 7%.

These figures, far from tempting us to try to emulate them the easy way, make us understand that the trend is not irreversible, but that — at the same time — it cannot be tackled, using ordinary methods. Hence the idea of a European plan which will go further than mere general statements of principle and superficial commitments, and will enable us to mobilize all the forces and resources that we have available in Europe, calling on the responsible cooperation of the authorities at Community, national and local level, as well as that of the social partners and individual citizens.

The creation of new jobs can no longer be seen as an issue separate from the impact of new technology. This does not mean that new technology automatically creates jobs: however, the fact remains that there is no longer any choice, and new technology is a necessity with no alternative, if we are to improve our productivity and make our economies more competitive. New technology can create, indirectly, many jobs, especially in the service sector, and can sometimes bring new jobs into existence — provided, however, that the available manpower can meet the new requirements. Hence the importance of a European policy for the job market, together with forward-looking management of the employment situation, which will adapt the vocational training systems to the new requirements arising from the process of technological innovation, and will also consider the restructuring of working time. Such a policy would of course not be entirely painless, but it would be the expression of genuine social solidarity designed to promote the broader sharing of the work that is available. We see this measure as being directly linked with the more intensive utilization of more productive plant, by very virtue of the new technologies that make it possible to produce more, whilst at the same time distributing more work.

These efforts would be in vain unless there is coordination at European level as far as both the new technology and the reorganization of work are concerned. One indispensable prerequisite for successful Community action is the establishment of a single big European market in high technology. As far as the public sector is concerned, we wonder whether the relaunching, on a European scale, of major infrastructural works that are indispensable for the development of the regions of the Community — including transport, trunk communication, plant for the protection of the environment — might not represent a worthwhile means of absorbing manpower.

Ciancaglini

One favourable field for job creation is the small and medium-sized undertakings sector, together with that of the craft industries and cooperatives which, partly because of their smaller size, offer better guarantees in terms of flexibility and the ability to accept change. It is on the small and medium-sized undertakings, and on local initiatives for job creation, that the Community's financial instruments must be concentrated, especially the new Community instrument.

The Social Fund must have the essential role of stimulating initiatives for vocational training and job creation through a programme of pilot schemes that are an urgent priority for the less advantaged regions, but which at the same time, once and for all, must go beyond the mere provision of aid.

Finally, we call upon the Council to adopt the idea of launching a Community loan in ECU, for the direct purpose of creating new jobs. The success of our initiatives will however depend also on the ability to associate them firmly with the social forces in Europe. In this context the idea of a European dialogue between both sides of industry — which the Commission already referred to when first it was appointed — seems to us of fundamental importance.

On these questions and these aims, Mr President, we await concrete initiatives from the Council.

There must be a European way of beating unemployment.

Millions of young people are awaiting an answer from this Europe that otherwise would have no reason to exist.

(Applause)

Mrs J. Hoffmann (COM). — *(FR)* Youth unemployment is probably one of the most serious problems of our time. It is a tragedy not only for young people themselves but also for the economic future of each of our countries. Many statistics have been quoted in the debate, but figures alone can give no idea of the anxiety and instability to which these young people are prey. These are people aged between 20 and 25, sometimes more, for whom it is impossible to plan ahead, impossible to know what the future holds. Can there be anything worse than to be starting out in life with a feeling of being unwanted, of being rejected by society?

A survey carried out in France has found that 89% of young people consider work to be very important in their lives. What they want is to have a place in society and to be really valued by others. They want to play a full part and to take advantage of all the opportunities offered by the scientific and technical advances of our age. What they in fact aspire to is interesting, skilled employment. But all their aspirations are confronted

with the harsh and disabusing realities of capitalist society in the throes of crisis. And so they are reduced to taking whatever jobs are available. In France half the young people under the age of 25 are in unstable employment. The employers are taking advantage of unemployment to accentuate their exploitation of those who are in work and to undermine job stability. Experience shows, however, that less stability of employment does not reduce unemployment but on the contrary makes for higher unemployment.

The failings of the training system, and of the school system in particular, are a further cause of the rise in unemployment among young people, which is unfortunately more marked among young women than among young men. Government and employers have taken various forms of action supposedly aimed at combating unemployment in recent years. It can only be said that this action has merely exacerbated the problem. In France, the effect of various schemes, such as the community jobs scheme, has been to protract the experience of crisis and underemployment for young people. Unstable, low-paid, unskilled jobs are being institutionalized, but this is doing nothing to prevent the growing shortage of useful skilled jobs.

This extremely serious problem of youth unemployment cannot be solved by the policies of austerity and industry-wrecking currently pursued in Europe. There must be an end to the layoffs and action to create jobs in industry and services in which all available financial and material resources are mobilized at national and Community levels. Only a new approach to the use of these resources will develop employment and training for workers and meet the needs of millions of young people who want jobs. Even allowing that the new Social Fund places greater emphasis on combating youth unemployment, the Community has yet to take action on anything like the scale of the challenge confronting it. It has merely been patching up, as best it can, the disastrous consequences of austerity policies.

In our view, on the contrary, economic development and social progress are intimately bound up with each other. Instead of opposing them, instead of bowing to the employer's dogma which is plunging our societies deeper and deeper into crisis, the Community would have the means, if it really had the political will, with which to launch initiatives combining technological progress, vocational training and job creation. Young people are entitled to modern training and jobs. In order to modernize it is necessary to train workers in new technology. So is it possible to claim to be engaged in modernization while leaving the vast majority of young people on the sidelines? Of course not. Young people do not want the language of demagoguery, they want to hear the truth. This is why we tell them that they must not give way to despair, because they represent a tremendously powerful force, once they get together and organize. We call upon them to make the International Year of Youth a year of resistance to the underhand treatment that govern-

Hoffmann

ments and employers throughout Europe have in store for them.

Mrs Salisch (S). — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it may be a coincidence that this part-session is taking place two years after our Parliament met for a special session on employment in Brussels where it adopted a comprehensive plan to combat youth unemployment.

I am now speaking mainly to the question to the Commission and addressing myself directly to Commissioner Pfeiffer. I can only hope that his endeavours to combat youth unemployment will be crowned with greater success than those of his predecessor.

I know that the Commission was committed to this objective, and I am certain it is equally committed in its new composition, but it all came to nothing because of the Council's failure to act, and I very much hope that Parliament and the Commission can achieve more in future, working together.

I consider it very narrow-minded for Conservative governments, associations or organizations to believe they can still apply old models to the drastic worsening of the situation. Those days are past and enough crocodile tears have surely been shed about these poor young people looking for work! Now is the time for action — that is to say it is really past the time! We should have done something ages ago, but this House — Mr President of the Council, I am addressing myself to you here — can no longer accept that although a general consensus exists, in the final analysis the resources available to us are being cut and cut again. That means we can certainly call for pilot projects, but afterwards the Council is not prepared to make the necessary resources available. Mr De Michelis, I am aware of your concern in this question and I know we have you on our side. But do please urge your colleagues to ensure that this does not remain some cut-price arrangement and that something really comes of it in the end.

We are at present betraying millions of young people in Europe because in the end we are really offering them nothing. I just said we were applying old models. We are trying to shove young people into a siding, perhaps to quieten our consciences, but these young people then reappear on the labour market and have no chance of being integrated in it.

What is the background to our renewed discussion of this problem? Since direct elections, there has not been a single part-session at which we have not discussed it. We are discussing it — and Mr Ciancaglini spoke of it again — against what I regard as the wrong background, namely the myth of the success in the USA. We referred to this last time too, when we were talking about the Commission programme.

The myth is for us to believe — my dear Mr Ciancaglini, I would be glad if you would listen to me — that we really could create jobs for young people by means of the key technologies. The USA case has shown that the mass of young people who have found work there are employed in 'bad jobs' and have certainly not discovered any future prospects in the key technologies.

On the contrary! I can refer you to the IG Metall figures. They show that by the mid-1990s we will lose 170 000 assembly jobs by the introduction of micro-electronics, and of these 120 000 are women's jobs, some of them young women's. Anyone who pretends high technology will create jobs is not telling the truth! We will maintain our competitiveness — that may be true — but at the price of jobs. I think we really should consider this properly.

One thing we must do — and I would ask the Commissioner to take very careful note of this — is to denounce the insidious effects of actions by the public authorities, for neither the governments nor the public administrations feel embarrassed about using resources we make available in the European Social Fund to finance projects which they ought to have carried out in any case.

I think, Commissioner Pfeiffer, that in future one of the Commission's major tasks will be to take care in the reform of the Social Fund that precedence really is given to the employment effect.

The motion for a resolution before us calls not only for training measures but above all for jobs to be created. May I now ask you, Commissioner Pfeiffer and Mr President of the Council, to excuse my discourtesy in not being able to be present for the answers to these questions, because I must urgently return to my home town tonight. Perhaps, though, I will have a happy surprise tomorrow, when I read your answer in the verbatim report of proceedings.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — (IT) Madam President, I ought to thank the Bureau for having this morning included my question on new jobs on the agenda, but I consider that, in effect, this question — which was presented many months ago, and the text of which has still not been distributed — did not deserve to lie forgotten in some drawer. Despite its not having been circulated, therefore, I shall still explain it, because I consider that, in the end — that is to say, when this debate is concluded — a note as definite and topical as this is may be of use.

The points around which it revolves are the following: how many jobs have 'died' in the last fifty years, or even more so in the last thirty years — not to speak of the last five years? How many jobs become pointless in the space of a few years, and how many people will

Squarcialupi

this happen to in the space of even fewer, very few years; how many job skills will then be wasted and destroyed, with really harmful consequences, especially where certain categories who are new to the employment field are concerned — and I mean women in particular?

Which are the new jobs?

Various research reports originating in the United States — and studies have moreover been made in my country as well, and in other States — list hundreds of new types of job with, as a result, the possibility of creating millions of new jobs. It is true that new technology sheds jobs, but it can also help to create others, aimed above all at satisfying new needs — needs relating to the environment and the abolition of discrimination against the aged and the handicapped — and at solving the problems regarding new rights, the new organization of society and even the new dimensions of the economy. At the same time, changes are taking place in the type of employment and the spirit with which young people approach work. No young person today, I believe, would do what we have done — take on a job for a lifetime. Youth today likes a different approach to the world of employment, but above all it likes, and shows that it wants, an independent, self-managed approach to enterprise, with a preference for independent professions. In this connection may I be allowed to make an observation regarding a 'class' problem: generally speaking, where these independent approaches to enterprise are concerned, it is mainly the young people from well-off families who do best. In Milan, for example, which is my city, the young people, who come mainly from professional families, have set up an organization for the door-to-door delivery of letters and parcels, and it is hard to find the son of a manual worker amongst these young people.

Other preferences find expression in the configuration of jobs based on solidarity, such as, for example, co-operatives. Young people, moreover — and I would say particularly women — are inventing a whole range of new jobs. And they have to be identified: we have to identify these vacant slots in the market, in civil society, and we have to help by distributing loans for carrying on such activities, at the same time providing administrative information and information on taxation. In short, we have to help those who want to do something, who want to work, who want to invent.

And, in identifying the new jobs, we must also identify the possibilities offered by new technology, which is a subject that is far from new, but one that we have still not examined in sufficient detail. And these possibilities can only be identified if an increasing number of young people will make contact with these new 'languages' so as to be able, through them, to identify where and in what way the new technology should be used, and for whose benefit.

I put various questions to the Commission and I will read them, since many members are probably without

the text. First, the studies and forecasts that have been made in various countries have to be gathered together, amalgamating and consolidating them at Community level. The forecasts regarding the decrease or increase in job opportunities in the various sectors of agriculture, industry and the services must be studied; guidance must be given — and this is very important — on teaching methods and training initiatives to enable the teachers to cope with the new job changes; we have also to check, gentlemen of the Commission, to what extent the Social Fund is monitoring this need for new professional skills; and finally, we have to study the experiments relating to self-employment and creative work, and the support that the public authorities are able to give to this type of work. Finally, we have to check the extent to which Community policies — above all in the environmental field and the fields of development, culture, transport, agriculture and social affairs — could contribute to the creation of new professional skills.

Mr De Michelis, President-in-Office of the Council. —

(IT) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I think it should come as no great surprise that the questions from Messrs. Didò, Vetter, Salisch, Raggio, Hoffmann, Klepsch, Cincaglini and others should confront the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers of Social Affairs with the problem of unemployment and, in particular, youth unemployment. It is not surprising, because I think that — not only as far as the leaders of all political parties are concerned, but in the eyes of public opinion as a whole in the countries of Europe — the social, economic and, I would say, ethical urgency of the problem is now accepted as a fact. Hence the absolute necessity for democratic institutions — both national and supranational, starting with this European Community — to be able to respond, with action, to this urgency and the awareness that everyone has of it.

Moreover, as we can see month after month, in this field the situation is not merely serious — it is getting worse. Whereas in other sectors — the economic and social fields, for example — the trends in recent months have taken a turn for the better, where unemployment is concerned the situation has gone on deteriorating. And, of course, there can be no consolation for us in the fact that the figures for February indicate a halt to the increase in a statistic that, both qualitatively and quantitatively, is already totally unacceptable today.

Every day there are signs — in the debates, the discussions, the statements at national, European and world level — that this urgency is being acknowledged. As far as the European countries are concerned I would remind this Assembly, as a last example, of the very recent presentation, at the end of March, of a white paper by the British Government, entitled 'Employment: the Challenge for the Nation'. I would also recall numerous official statements on different deci-

De Michelis

sive occasions emanating from the European Community — the European Summit at Fontainebleau, the Dublin Summit, the annual report on the economic and social situation of the Community for 1984-1985, which was adopted by the Commission at the end of 1984 and, one more example, the last European Council meeting in Brussels at the end of March.

Throughout the world this subject is now also being discussed as a matter of urgency in countries in geopolitical areas such as the Far East of Asia and in North America. And again, recently in Venice, at an international conference in which 24 countries took part, as well as at the OECD in Paris, this question was considered one of the questions to be tackled.

I repeat that the matter is all the more urgent since the situation is getting worse and, amongst other things, is taking on aspects of an absolutely new kind. I should like to refer to one aspect that is mentioned in the questions — the problem of so-called long-term youth unemployment, which is a euphemistic way of saying that we are running the risk that, in the near future, part of the new generation in Europe will never work: and that is something totally without precedent in the recent or less recent history of the advanced industrialized nations of the European Community.

It must be said, amongst other things — for the sake of realism and not out of any preconceived pessimism — that we have to recognize that from some angles the worst is still to come, because the phenomenon of change, transformation and technological innovation that will go on — as it is only right that it should go on — during the next few years will create further problems from this point of view, in many sectors of production and the economy. And, in the short and medium term, neither demographic development nor the legitimate, natural tendency of women to enter the labour market on an increasing scale, is any help. We have, therefore, to act, and act quickly.

I said last week in Venice that, as in previous years, the leaders of the democratic countries, the countries that are governed democratically in Europe and elsewhere in the world, were able to face up to and take decisions on such delicate and urgent problems as inflation or the indebtedness of the developing countries. It would be beyond all understanding if we could not immediately succeed in taking decisions and taking steps to bring to a halt a state of affairs that is just as dangerous as inflation or the indebtedness of the developing countries. That is true everywhere, but it is particularly true in Europe.

Since we know that, today, the challenge for Europe is its strengthening, its enlargement, its progress towards an increasingly broad union on an increasingly generalized scale, there is scant possibility of our making progress in this direction unless we are successful in creating strong confidence in Europe, in public opinion, in the foundations of our societies and above all,

amongst the young, for whom this better, stronger Europe that we wish to construct is intended.

But how can there be this greater confidence in Europe, if this Europe is not able to give these young people concrete proof of action and efficiency as far as their main worry is concerned, which, today, is about their future in terms of work?

It is therefore in order to strengthen Europe, to make concrete progress towards greater and increasingly better European unity, that the Community and Member States must succeed in showing effective capacity for action regarding this problem of unemployment.

Moreover, this is in the spirit of the Treaty — may I recall Articles 145 and 103. I think that this is the logic that induced the governments at that time to voice such precepts. I also remember a great, important decision of ten years ago, at the beginning of this crisis and this change. I refer to the decision of the European Council of 18 February 1974 when, in the immediate aftermath of the first oil shock, a policy for the convergence of economic and social policies was agreed in order to cope with the problems which at that time were new, so as to guarantee, so it was said, then — better, more durable growth, in relation also to levels of employment.

Ten years later, that decision has not been sufficiently translated into action and deeds, above all in this field — above all as an answer to the problem of unemployment.

I would recall the decision of the Council of Ministers of Social Affairs of June 1984, which was repeated by the Fontainebleau Summit, at which we decided to implement what we called a 'medium-term social programme for the Community' which was an important political decision, which however will only become credible and effective to the extent that it is translated into directives, programmes and concrete action.

Let us be frank about this: as I reply today on these subjects on behalf of the Council of Ministers, I can only give disappointing answers. The text of the official speech prepared on behalf of the ten governments that I represent as President-in-Office will be circulated. I only propose to summarize it now, seeing that, whilst I consider that this answer — a 'photograph' of the situation — is due, I want also to state that this answer is totally inadequate to the situation. It is a photograph of the situation up to today, and, as far as the Italian Presidency is concerned, up to December 1984, because — as you know — the first concrete opportunity that the Council of Ministers of Social Affairs, of which I am Chairman, will have to take decisions will be in June, because it is only then that there will be a formal meeting and, until today, I have only been able to have informal talks with my colleagues.

De Michelis

Naturally, the answer, inadequate as it is, acknowledges what has happened; it summarizes what the Council of Ministers have wanted or been able to do in the past, where this problem is concerned — a list of important statements, on important points, indicating also solutions tackling the problems in terms of vocational training — vocational training connected with the new information technology — and in terms of the harmonization of professional qualifications and the promotion of youth employment; in terms of longterm unemployment, and policies regarding social security and retirement in relation to the need to give the young greater access to jobs; in terms of knowledge of the employment market and how it operates, and in terms of guidelines for the management of the European Social Fund.

What the Council of Ministers have achieved is considerable. But I think I must sincerely tell this Parliament — which now raises this very delicate and urgent problem — that these statements, which are always or nearly always totally ineffective documents that are never translated into either Community or national action, now represent an absolutely unacceptable answer.

And it is for this reason that, aware of this as I am, as President-in-Office, trying to interpret as best I can what was informally discussed in the Council of Ministers at Venice — and, yet again at Venice, last week, in a meeting that was not a Community occasion, but which enabled all the countries in the Community to express their views on these matters — I think I can go some way towards answering the speeches that I have listened to, and the questions that have been put, because the Italian presidency attaches great importance to the guidelines, the indications, the impulse that can be given to the Council of Ministers — and, I also think, the Commission — by Parliament, by whatever resolutions it may adopt, not least on the basis of this debate.

I think we have to work pragmatically and realistically, and, at the same time, with a strategic plan, coming in some way to a decision as to what the priorities are, and what changes need to be made in the way our economic and social mechanism works, as well as what decisions can be taken — also at European level — without in this way clashing with the peculiarities of individual national situations, so as to do something already in 1985 to reverse this situation.

I do not want to make a long speech, not least because I think that the speeches that I have heard already contain much along these lines, but I think that some points can be emphasized.

These strategies, for the truly successful reversal of a situation such as that in which Europe now lies — without abandoning what President Delors described in Venice as the 'European model' and without betraying the specific ethical, social and political

aspects of what has been the economic and social history of our continent — can, I think, be summed up in the following way. First, large-scale, completely new measures are needed in the field of education and vocational training: greater resources must be devoted to this, and they must be used in a way that is better suited to the changing world and to the need to keep abreast of innovation and new technology. The operation of the employment market must be made more flexible. As I took the liberty of saying to the OECD in Paris — we need more 'market' in the employment market. This does not mean abandoning the necessary protection for the workers, and it does not mean violating principles that are the fruits of social struggle that has been carried on for decades. It simply means taking into account, and recognizing, the fact that this is a changing world. Moreover, when we speak of greater flexibility in the employment market, we have to take into account all those factors that go to make up the way this market operates. Some of these concern interests that are more specifically those of the workers; others concern interests that are more specifically those of the employers. We must however speak of them both together, and against this background I think we should emphasize the importance of what we today refer to, very briefly, as 'the restructuring and reduction of working time'.

To create more employment, we have to apply ourselves, energetically, to the creation of new enterprises. Experience has now shown us that new jobs are not created, broadly speaking, in existing enterprises, but by creating new enterprises, mostly small and medium-sized, in all sectors, in manufacturing industry and in the traditional fields. Those companies that have used their human capital to best advantage in recent years are the ones that have created conditions in which new enterprises could be set up more easily and more freely. In a situation such as we have in Europe today, however, it is necessary to proceed intelligently, to enable enterprises to develop freely, and to allow the entrepreneurial spirit, the potential for which is so great in our societies, to express itself.

Together with these measures there has to be a macro-economic policy energetically aimed at growth without inflation, orderly growth, growth that can endure in a stable manner and with continuity in the medium term, without being interrupted by set-backs of a recessionist nature. This must take place in a context of social dialogue, avoiding what President Delors recently called 'social dumping' — a kind of rivalry within the Community itself, between one Member State and another, between one national and social situation and another, using the play of social factors in a 'dumping' context.

These indications are general but not generic, and they can be translated into deeds, decision and action. Moreover, to emphasize the importance that the Council of Ministers of the Community attaches to these points, I need only recall the document that was

De Michelis

adopted a few days ago at Brussels, which not only reaffirms the priority of the fight against unemployment but, on the specific points that it emphasizes, shows four fields of action, three of which go exactly in this direction. The Brussels Council spoke firstly of action to promote the creation and development of small and medium-sized undertakings, particularly through a significant reduction of the administrative and legal obstacles that they encounter. Secondly, it spoke of action to change and update the working conditions and the new social, economic and technological situations, so as to increase the efficiency of the employment market. Thirdly, it spoke of specific action to expand employment, including a study by the Commission on the possibility of using the Social Fund to promote innovatory, exemplary experiments, as well as programmes for solving the employment problems of certain disadvantaged categories.

This is a political decision that the governments of Europe have taken, to give a political answer to these questions. Our task today — the task of the European Parliament, the task of the Commission, the task of the Council of Ministers — is to translate these indications, these fields of action, these guidelines into acts, deeds, decisions, and operational programmes.

From this standpoint, in answer to certain precise points contained in the questions, which I have also heard repeated in the speeches that preceded my own, I want particularly to emphasize — regarding the third point that I referred to earlier, the document of the Brussels Council of Ministers — the need for special action, that must be planned, programmed and implemented at European level, action that will be directly effective — albeit, obviously, partially so — in reducing the level of unemployment. That is to say, special, exceptional action. Naturally, such special, exceptional action must be selective, because we cannot think of general programmes of this type: it must be aimed at very clear priorities. I think that the question that have been submitted contain the elements for identifying these priorities, and from amongst them all I pick out one — the priority of the long-term young unemployed. Moreover, let us not forget that 1985 is International Youth Year and, perhaps — rather than having all those conferences, events of one kind or another, posters, or heavens knows what — a concrete programme of this kind, a programme, along these lines, would be the best way of marking this International Youth Year.

This programme presents various problems, especially to the Commission, which has the honour and responsibility of being the operational arm of the Community, just as it will, in turn, present problems to the governments, who will obviously have to respond with the necessary decisions. It presents problems of resources, and from this standpoint. I think that the suggestions contained in the question and the speeches, regarding the possibility of using loans expressed in ECU, can be 'explored' positively; it pre-

sents methodological problems, and I think that it must be said quite clearly that the methods used must be such as to avoid any step in the direction of providing aid, or towards operations that are not in some way or other able to give the young people, at whom they are directed, an effective start in the real employment. The methods must have a definite purpose.

I spoke, in Venice, using a metaphor that may probably seem somewhat journalistic in character, of the desirability of a new European 'Marshall Plan', a Marshall Plan that we ourselves finance — because the one of forty years ago was financed by another part of the world.

President Delors was kind enough, at that same conference, to recognize — shall we say — the possibility of 'exploring' this line of action. The self-financing of a special operation is also along the lines of what, today, many people consider to be necessary — that is to say, a concerted, non-inflationary operation of reflation of the European economy. I realise, however, that, to carry out an operation of this type, we must have clear ideas as to what has to be done. Moreover, we must not forget that the official name of the Marshall Plan was the 'European Recovery Programme' — ERP. Probably at that time 'recovery' signified 'post-war reconstruction'. Today, we have not just finished a war, but 'recovery' can best be translated as the 'relaunching' of growth.

This is, I think, something that can and must be discussed. The Italian Presidency, with the agreement of the Commission, intends to take to the Council of Ministers of Social Affairs in June a set of concrete proposals, on which we are working and which are partly — as I can see — covered in one way or another by the questions.

There are areas that we might describe as being on the fringes of the market that have an economic significance, in which modern democratic civilized societies, that want to be able to look confidently towards the future, can invest their resources in the knowledge that, in the short term, the market as such would not invest resources. They are the areas connected with the modern infrastructuring of our countries, with the protection of the environment and the territory, with the utilization of what we might today call the 'cultural deposits', that is to say, cultural assets in the sense not only of something to be protected or to be exploited, but something to be used from an economic point of view in a society that is not called by coincidence the 'information society'. They are areas where it is possible to 'explore' concrete programmes which involve private operators — who would be allocated resources — and which would employ a considerable extra number of young people — men and women — who otherwise are in danger — and I say this again — of facing the prospect not of long-term unemployment, but of unemployment for life.

De Michelis

Obviously, we have to discuss, to examine in detail, to have very clear ideas; but we also have to have the courage to make mistakes, because when we act we can make mistakes provided we do so realistically and pragmatically. The grave danger would instead be to do nothing, for fear of making mistakes; to surrender, to give the outside world, public opinion, the feeling that these democratic societies of ours, this democratic leadership, is not capable of coping with what we ourselves say is the main problem.

That is why — and I am about to finish — the proposal that I have seen in a number of questions for the formation of a plan — it was called a ten-year plan, at any rate a long-term plan — for employment also appears to the Presidency of the Council of Ministers to be of interest. We have naturally to proceed in a concrete manner, because the young unemployed do not need words and plans that are nothing more than empty shells. I think that this is a direction in which, where social problems are concerned, we can really show that Europe exists, has a meaning, is a force to be reckoned with, and that it is something worth fighting for, worth strengthening, worth enlarging, whilst at the same time enhancing its unity.

This, then, is my answer to the questions that have been put to me. So far as the Italian Presidency is concerned, we shall be able in the next few weeks, taking the opportunities provided by the European timetable, and especially at the Council of Ministers of Social Affairs on 13 June and the European Council in Milan, to have these indications recognized, and to see that note is taken of what the European Parliament, at the end of this debate, tells the Council of Ministers and the Presidency.

(Applause)

Mr Pfeiffer, Member of the Commission. — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission welcomes the fact that Parliament is once again drawing attention to one of the most urgent Community issues with these questions. It surely needs no further confirmation that the Commission and Parliament are at one as regards this depressing phenomenon. No responsible person in Europe can tolerate the serious effects of unemployment, especially youth unemployment, both for the individual for society in Europe as a whole. The questions before us today concern many aspects of this complex problem. Mr Sutherland will deal mainly with the question of vocational training and the use of the Social Fund while I will try to discuss economic and employment policy aspects.

In agreement with the European Parliament, the Commission has repeatedly and insistently emphasized that unemployment is the most important issue facing the Community today. That means that we must use all possible resources to make tangible and sensible pro-

gress in this area. That is why President Delors gave priority to this subject when he presented the Commission's work programme to you here. In that programme, the Commission emphasized that the Community's economic policy and the macro-economic policy mix must be directed more firmly towards more employment-intensive growth and stability. I am happy to add that in formulating its economic policy, the Commission was naturally also guided by this Parliament's economic and employment policy initiatives.

In its work programme, the Commission established the following: although we must primarily seek to resolve the employment problem at general economic level, complementary specific policies are a necessary component of any employment strategy likely to succeed. Special emphasis must be placed on combating youth unemployment and long-term unemployment. Even in its earlier communications to the Council on promoting youth employment, on the role of local employment projects and the problem of long-term unemployment, the Commission underlined the need for an active labour market policy to create new long-term jobs.

Moreover, in its programme for 1985 the Commission announced that it will draw up communications, and where appropriate proposals, in the course of the year on general and specific economic and employment policy questions, the details of which I cannot anticipate. But these activities will look at the following priorities: principles and procedures for a forward-looking labour market policy, sectoral employment trends with special reference to the introduction of new technology, the adaptability of the labour market and the reorganization of working hours. The Commission will also endeavour to ensure that the employment policy measures already decided by the Council really are implemented. This is especially true of those aimed at promoting youth employment and helping the long-term unemployed.

The Commission proposed a package of measures to combat youth unemployment, which is the central question put today, in its communication on the promotion of youth employment. Can I just remind you briefly of the four main ones: when shortening and reorganizing working hours, attempts should be made to reach agreements that ensure that a substantial number of new jobs are filled by young people. Recruitment aid should be given to promote the employment of young people in undertakings. Young people must be given support in the founding of undertakings. The employment prospects for young people in the public and non-profit-making area must be expanded. The advice and care facilities for young people for their vocational career and the fulfilment of their interests must be improved. On the basis of this communication from the Commission, the Council took a decision last year following which the Commission is implementing various measures to give young people more information on the labour market. Mr

Pfeiffer

Sutherland will report in detail on the special vocational training measures and the aid under the Social Fund.

In this context may I simply add that the Commission is working on a memorandum on youth policy to ensure the effective integration of the various policies. The Commission hopes these proposals will give rise to Community-wide discussion and act as an impetus for further measures to help young people.

As for granting Community loans to promote employment, may I point out that the Commission has long since been carrying out active borrowing and lending operations to promote investment and economic recovery. In this way it is also contributing to the creation of new jobs and the maintenance of existing jobs. The conversion loans granted under Article 56 of the ECSC are specifically directed at the creation of new jobs. In the past the Commission has granted loans of over 1 000 m ECU for this purpose. In view particularly of the worsening situation on the labour market, the Commission will pursue this policy intensively and vigorously.

As stated in its work programme, the Commission will also submit proposals for extending the New Community Instrument which will, things, among other promote specific investment by small and medium-sized undertakings. You know that the investments of these undertakings generally produce more employment than the investments of large undertakings. We are also considering whether and to what extent we can also embark on fairly large-scale infrastructure measures in the interest of the Community.

As part of its borrowing and lending activities, the Commission has also made quite considerable use of the ECU in the past. It will continue to pursue that policy, but we must point out that further progress also depends on whether the Member States give more access to the capital markets. The Commission will endeavour to secure this wider access; and the support of the European Parliament, with which the Commission knows it is in agreement, is of special value here.

May I conclude by stating clearly once again: measures to combat unemployment, especially youth unemployment, need the resolute use of all the forces and all the resources of all those concerned at all levels. The very scale of the problem of youth unemployment and the millions of jobs needed to overcome it make it clear that the only way to resolve the problem on a wide scale is at general economic level.

What is important is to have a general economic policy whose instruments are resolutely aimed at combating unemployment as the top priority. In its proposals the Commission has tried to show ways and means of tackling this problem and will continue to do all in its power to achieve practical improvements. Whether and to what extent that works will very much depend,

however, on whether all the others concerned are equally prepared to make the same effort.

Lastly, may I ask for your understanding for the fact that I have not answered every single question in detail. As I have said, the Commission is currently working on communications and proposals on this range of questions. I have thrown light on some central issues. Naturally the Commission will take serious account of all the views put forward and of any additional opinions of the European Parliament in its own considerations.

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I also hope that I can be brief in response to the issues which have been raised pertaining to the Social Fund. I can do so, I think, because I have already discussed in some detail a number of these issues in the debate on the Bachy report.

I would like to take the issues specifically as they have been raised. In the first instance, the suggestion has been made that the Fund budget should be doubled in five years. Let me preface my remarks in regard to that particular issue by saying that the resources are clearly totally inadequate in terms of the application of the Social Fund to the problems of unemployment. Of course, we all know that a number of factors have combined to increase the demand made on the Social Fund budget. The most important of these is the rising trend of unemployment in the Community, especially amongst young people. As a reflection of increasing demands, the volume of applications for Social Fund assistance in 1985 increased by 39 % in comparison with 1984. The value of applications was 5 000 m ECU compared to the draft budget availability of 2 010 m ECU. There is no reason to doubt that those trends will be continuing in the coming years. So the Commission's long-term policy objectives also include, as has been indicated to be the view of many in this Parliament, that there should be significant increases in real terms for all structural funds of the order of magnitude indicated by the question and that the current budgetary situation requires that proposals for the budget of the Social Fund in 1986 must be within an overall framework which is reasonable.

The second point that I want to deal with is that of innovatory pilot projects which have been referred to by a number of questioners. At present the part of the Social Fund budget reserved for specific operations cannot exceed 5% of the entire appropriations available in any one year. This limit, as Parliament will be aware, was imposed by a decision of the Council on 17 October 1983. This and other features of the current rules of the Fund will be looked at again at the next review of the regulations which will be scheduled for 1988. However, it must be said — and perhaps this is pertinent to some of the contributions which have been made — that the resources at present available for

Sutherland

experimental or innovative projects are not fully taken up for applications. So whilst there may be demands for more money, the existing resources are not even being fully utilized. Supply of Fund aid for this type of scheme therefore already exceeds demand and it is difficult therefore to see how at present an increase in this part of the budget could be justified, however apparently justified it may be as a matter of logic. The pressure on resources therefore does not lie in this area but in the main part of the Fund, the purpose of which is the funding of mainstream schemes in the Member States.

As an addendum to this question, the issue has been raised as to whether the Commission itself should organize job creation schemes directly. It is very doubtful, I think, that the Commission would fulfil such a task better than the Member States themselves, having regard to the very limited available manpower and resources which the Commission can rely upon. The Commission lacks the specialized local knowledge that is a basic requirement for setting up and running such schemes, as opposed to applying parameters within which those schemes can operate.

I would like to mention now very briefly the question of the introduction of new technology and the reconstruction and reconversion of farms and the reduction in working time. The activities outlined in this question are central to the aims of the Fund as it exists now. A major part of the Social Fund resources is already being spent on training for new technology, restructuring operations and local job creation schemes. There have been plenty of applications in this area during the course of 1984. In particular, aid for young people's schemes was concentrated largely on basic training which had to include an introduction to new technology. This is an essential element, and schemes offering a high job creation potential were also required. The guidelines for the Social Fund which are now being considered and which the Commission will adopt on 30 April will reinforce the concentration of the Fund on such schemes and pilot projects, especially as regards the introduction of new technology.

Finally, dealing with the issues raised by Mrs Squarciapini, the Commission has already launched several comparative analyses of the position in regard to the adaptation of traditional occupations to new production and the maintenance and management situations as well as new occupations affected by the automation of production. Specific attention has been paid in this context to problems encountered by young people and also to new didactical approaches such as the use of computer-related technologies as tools for education and training. Further, in relation to both the Council resolution of June 1983 and the resolution adopted on 19 September 1983 concerning the introduction of new technologies into education, the Commission has adopted two specific work programmes in which priority is being given to the training of teachers and

of trainers. In this context a European seminar will be held in Bologna in May 1985 and a further seminar will take place in Berlin next November on the specific subject of the training of trainers and vocational education in relation to new technologies.

Finally, as indicated in its work programme for 1985, the Commission intends to put forward specific and concrete proposals regarding university-industry cooperation and advanced training in response to technological change in relation to present and foreseeable developments. Therefore I think that there are concrete proposals which have been made.

In conclusion, I would say, taking up the point made by Mr De Michelis, that the approach which will be taken by the Commission and, we hope, by the Council will be pragmatic and realistic but nonetheless will conform with an overall design or policy and will have an effect, we hope, on the developing problem of unemployment.

Mr Bachy (S). — (FR) Ladies and Gentlemen, this is not the first time that Parliament has debated the employment situation. As a rule, when it has done so in the past, the initiative has come from the Socialists, and so it is again on this occasion, with the oral question put by Mr Mario Didò, on behalf of our group, and the accompanying motion for a resolution.

There ought to be a consensus in this House on the need for action on this front. Unemployment is very costly to industry. It represents the most phenomenal economic waste imaginable, since the community has to foot the bill for benefits. Above all, however, it is an aberration that millions of workers should be excluded from the labour market and hundreds of thousands of young people in Europe who want to find work should be driven to despair.

High-flown principles aside, is there or is there not a European political will to defeat unemployment? The answer to this question, as we Socialists see it, depends on three factors in particular.

The first of these is the credibility of Community machinery for action. As long as the financial resources allocated to the European Social Fund remain so meagre, credibility will be lacking. We are fully aware of the budgetary constraints, to which Mr Sutherland has just referred. But we hope that there will very soon be at least a significant increase in the funding of pilot schemes to finance net job creation.

The second factor is the organization of a European plan for employment. The parties of the Right often tell us that planning kills initiative. And yet everyone knows that, in order to succeed, it is necessary to look ahead. Let us therefore hear no more of the myth of the bogus liberalism after the American example which would provide a so-called miracle cure for the crisis.

Bachy

What is it that the large private-sector firms do, if it is not forward planning? Why is it that what is good for the multinationals should be wrong for the European institutions?

Dispersal of effort and scattering of resources obviously make for inefficiency. Efficiency demands forward management of the labour market and Europe-wide coordination, spanning several years, of policies on vocational training and job creation, especially for young people.

The third factor, which we regard as decisive, is the negotiation of a pact for employment among the social partners. Are the European employers' organizations willing or not to give workers the right to be kept informed about companies' investment plans, which have such a vital influence on job numbers? Are we or are we not going to see the conservative parties and governments in Europe desisting from their obstructive tactics and prevarication over implementation of the draft directives on this subject which are unfortunately still gathering dust?

Everyone is in favour of businesses modernizing and improving their productivity. But who is to benefit from improved productivity? Can we or can we not take it that all the parties in this House, all the groups, agree with us that industrial modernization must not result in wave upon wave of redundancies? Will they agree to make a serious examination of ways and means of channelling the resources derived from increased productivity into the creation of new jobs? Everyone knows that the combination of improved productivity and job creation cannot be achieved without economic regeneration and a reduction in working hours. Are all the parliamentary groups prepared, as we in the Socialist Group are prepared, to support the proposals that have been made by the European Trade Union Confederation, among others, on two points: first, the earmarking of 1% of Europe's combined gross national products for stimulation of job-creating investment; secondly, support for the idea of a European programme for a simultaneous phased reduction in working hours until the 35-hour week is reached?

Ladies and Gentlemen, one cannot build Europe's economic recovery, one cannot combat unemployment effectively on the basis of retrograde social policies. On the other hand, it is possible in the short term to make significant gestures on the three points I have raised here, which are contained in the motion for a resolution tabled by the Socialist Group. In the circumstances, I hope that this motion for a resolution will be widely supported by the House.

Mr Brok (PPE). — (DE) Madam President, I would like to ask the Socialist Group not to start creating any legends here suggesting that this subject is being discussed mainly at their initiative. For instance, we also have the Ciancaglini question before us. We must also

note, I think, that the decisive reports and initiatives of this Parliament, for instance on youth unemployment, have not come from the ranks of the Socialists. We must also realize — and it so happens I have figures, namely a comparison of youth unemployment in the OECD countries — that in those countries where Socialists form part of the government, the proportion of unemployed young people in the total unemployment figure is highest.

So if we have to argue in party political terms like Mr Bachy, we should put the true facts on the table. Just to speak from the heart and then not to offer anything useful does not seem the right way to help people! Surely the point is that we in the European Community must finally take measures in the field of youth and long-term unemployment, which has reached an alarming scale, that are not just confined to new plans — *vide* 1% of GNP — but finally put an end to the mental block against investment.

When I hear Mrs Salisch say that new technology may improve competitiveness but also destroys jobs, I find that a rather ridiculous argument. If we create competitiveness, then that alone creates jobs, since uncompetitive technology will not help us create any more jobs in future. We are not living on some heavenly island, but in a world subject to a variety of influences.

We earn 30% of our GNP from exports and we cannot pretend that this is not so. We must also accept that we are often in danger of losing out against non-European competitors because of our lack of competitiveness. That is why we should overcome the mental block against investment and at the same time take sensible accompanying social measures. That will enable the state to create a margin for manoeuvre for the two sides of industry by means of framework conditions such as making working times more flexible or shorter or taking the necessary vocational training and further training measures. If we want more say for the workers in the decisions of undertakings, as called for in the Vredeling directive, we must also take the appropriate measures. But what is most important is for the Council finally to decide on what is lying on the table before it, for instance the question of part-time work that was referred to it and on which it has not decided, the achievement of the European internal market, European research, European Economic and Monetary Union.

Mr Pfeiffer, I thank you for wanting to extend the Community's borrowing and lending activities to smaller and medium-sized undertakings in order to improve the infrastructure. The necessary proposals exist, but alas the governments, which often argue only on a national basis, have not understood the signs of the times. What we want here is not new programmes but a decision at last on matters that have been on the Council's agenda for weeks, months and years, so that we will have a sensible and forward-

Brok

looking research policy in the European internal market, for that is the way to create jobs again in Europe.

Sir Jack Stewart-Clark (ED). — Madam President, my group welcomes the presence of the Italian President-in-Office of the Council here this evening and also of both Commissioners dealing with employment. Unemployment is the most crucial problem facing the Community today. 13.7 million people in the European Community find themselves today without work and often, as a result, without hope for their own future and that of their families. What can we offer them? What will get nearly 14 million people back to work, into jobs, producing and creating wealth and building the prosperity of Europe?

The President-in-Office of the Council has referred to the informal summit which took place in Venice of leading ministers from the major industrialized countries last week on the question of unemployment. At this summit an American spokesman asked the very legitimate question: 'Why is Europe falling behind?' Why are we failing to create viable new jobs? Why, indeed, do we continue to lose net jobs at a time of alleged recovery?

I believe that to find the answers, one must look at the USA itself. Between 1973 and 1983 employment in the United States rose by 13 million people whereas in Western Europe the numbers fell. Jobs in the US were created primarily in services and in small businesses. Why did the US succeed where Europe failed? I believe because of a bigger internal market; a more dynamic recovery; an encouragement of small businesses, particularly in the public purchasing sector; by greater flexibility; higher investment in high technology; a more simple and homogeneous taxation system and less bureaucracy.

To find the solution to our own unemployment problems we must emulate the United States of America, to create a single market with freedom of movement for both goods and people, to generate a society where it is more satisfying and rewarding to work than not to work, to create the philosophy in companies where the importance of being competitive is recognized, where modern methods are introduced but where profits are shared between the owners and the employees but on a basis of performance. We must continue to invest in high technology. It is pure fallacy to believe that high technology is the cause of unemployment. It is quite the reverse. Technological advance creates its own demand. Look at calculators, home computers, video recorders. All of these are the products of high technology. We need technology to be competitive. If we are not competitive, we shall lose ground more than we do already to the Americans and the Japanese. We must recognize that large-scale high-technology production enables prices to come down and workers to be paid more and, therefore, the demand for products to increase.

However, this does not mean that we have to see a de-manning culture overall. Fewer people may not always be the answer. We must encourage growth in the service sector. In the United States, 70% of all those employed are in services: in Europe, it is only 60%. We want to see a society which demands to be served, in shops, banks, petrolstations and restaurants. To recognize better service not only satisfies the customer but it maintains more people in employment.

Finally, training. We need to see a programme for the whole of Europe which will emulate what one sees in Germany. In Germany, all young people are guaranteed training until 18 years old. The result is that 24% of the unemployed are under 25. Compare this with the figure of 40% in the remainder of the Community. We want to see retraining to create flexibility and in high technology, and I welcome Commissioner Sutherland's remarks about training trainers.

Therefore, to sum up, we need to see action, and future generations will judge us by our policies for employment today. We must get those decisions right.

Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L). — (NL) Madam President, I am ashamed to see that the galleries are fuller than the Chamber, but I will not go into that.

The fight against youth unemployment is indissolubly linked to a general policy of restoring our economies to health. The Community cannot and must not take the place of the national authorities, but what it can and must do is pursue a policy that creates appropriate conditions. We sometimes wonder, Madam President, what our countries still have in common now that cooperation is so difficult. What they do have in common now is a lack of dynamism, a lack of flexibility and a lack of pluck as well as a rigid labour market and a reluctance to seize on innovations. These are the worst enemies of employment. More market in the labour market, as the President of the Council put it.

Our economies are so badly off that even the European Community has had to decide who are to have top priority, the young unemployed or the older unemployed, and the older unemployed are of necessity beginning to become an almost abandoned category. That is precisely why the policy aimed at achieving lasting economic recovery must be continued with vigour, in the interests of young people and of older workers. But the millions of young people out of work in the European Community cannot wait for this. A lost generation is beginning to emerge. And unemployed young people will eventually become unemployed older people who have never been involved in the work process. A combination of orthodox and unorthodox measures is therefore needed to get them to work now. We Liberals therefore call for coordinated specific measures, in which the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training has a major role to play: youth work plans, practical

Larive-Groenendaal

training places, work experience projects, growth jobs. But let it be remembered, ladies and gentlemen, these specific measures will be no more than palliatives unless they are aimed at integration into normal working life. Otherwise, they will even distort competition and merely serve to make the rising unemployment figures look as good as possible, which is, of course, advantageous when elections are in the offing. This reminds me of the promise made by Mr Fabius, the French Prime Minister, that by the end of 1985 all young people under the age of 21 would be offered a job or training.

But the best way we have, Madam President, of ensuring that young people enter the labour market and stay there is to give them vocational training that is attuned to the requirements of the labour market. You may feel you are listening to a gramophone record, but we must never tire of saying this. It is no panacea. What is obvious is that general training makes it more likely that a young person will become unemployed than training in a specific field and that a full course of training is better than half a course. The hard core of young people who remain unemployed for more than a year mainly consists of those with a poor training and early school-leavers.

In this respect, we must find the courage to allow early school-leavers to benefit from the generosity of the political system, the generosity of the large majority of the political system, the generosity of the large majority of the electorate who are prepared to pay for a liberal social system, so liberal in fact that benefits are paid to those who are not inclined to complete a good course of training and do their homework properly. Instead of reporting this to those concerned, we all implicitly adopt the 'progressive attitude' that society alone is responsible. On the other hand, increasing numbers of young people are fortunately taking their destiny into their own hands, taking the initiative themselves, and we must therefore seize the opportunities presented by these developments by giving young entrepreneurs financial support, for example, and assisting them with words and deeds, as I urge in the resolution I have tabled on behalf of my group.

If it is to create more jobs, European industry needs young people whose training has prepared them for innovations. The European Social Fund has a major task to perform here. We therefore call for training which meets not only quantitative requirements, meaning that every young person must be able to qualify for a given occupation, but also the qualitative requirements that will enable Europe to keep up with its competitors, meaning training that is adapted to the real needs of the labour market and to technological developments. This entails the systematic inclusion of practical training in existing courses and the organization of training in close consultation with industry.

Positive action must be taken to put girls on a par with boys. And if the Council gives its perennial and non-

committal answer it shares Parliament's concern, I will say that we are quite willing to share — trouble shared is trouble halved — but what we need are not shared declarations of intent but a practical demonstration of political will and thus practical European action.

Mrs Chouraqui (RDE). — (FR) Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen, last January the President-in-Office of the Council declared before the European Parliament that unemployment was the vital problem to be solved.

At the end of 1984 the number of unemployed in the Community was 13 million, representing 11.6% of the labour force. Only a month later the figures climbed to 13.6 million and 12% of the labour force. Of this unemployed population, 38% are young people, or in France 40%. We are already more than halfway through the Italian Presidency, and the employment situation is not improving.

The issue of new technologies which I wish to raise today is part of this debate, just as it was an important consideration in the Tuckman report, and I cannot overemphasize the importance of a debate on this problem. Although new technologies may represent a threat to employment in certain sectors in the short term, the fact remains that in the long term their introduction offers the best means of making European industry more competitive, bringing about a return to economic growth and boosting employment in the Community.

We bitterly deplore the Member States' lack of political will and the Community's impotence to tackle the problem of unemployment, which has been rising steadily for 15 years.

We invite the Council to give expression to its determination and coherence in a draft budget for 1985 which not only doubles the resources of the European Social Fund over the next 5 years but above all allows scope for the adoption of new policies in the technological sector, especially in biotechnology, data-processing and information technologies, robotics, research and development, transport, manufacturing, the building industry, service industry, and small and medium-sized businesses.

To this end, it is essential to expand the coverage of the ambitious FAST programme, the main aims of which are to identify long-term priorities for research and development in the Community and to examine the possible social and economic effects of technological changes. This programme is concerned essentially with the interactions between technology, labour and employment, the emergence of systems of new industrial strategies and the integrated development of renewable natural resources.

It is an important programme which, coupled with the Esprit projects, represents a step forward for the Com-

Chouraqi

munity. Any fresh training programme undertaken in the Community could possibly be tied in with these developments in the field of technology. There must be no discrimination between men and women as far as training programmes are concerned since, as for many years past, levels of unemployment in the population under the age of 25 are even higher among women than among men.

We also call upon the Member States of the EEC to make a joint, simultaneous effort to develop a policy to boost investment and the creation of productive jobs, as an accompaniment to a policy for the social treatment of unemployment, which is insufficient in itself.

In this connection we stress the need to enable employers to operate under conditions allowing them to work to margins and generate profits sufficient to enable them to develop their businesses on a sound basis and thereby create jobs.

Madam President, there will soon be 320 million Europeans in the Community market. We must complete the process of creating the single internal market, which will strengthen the competitiveness of Member States' economies and establish the Community on a solid foundation from which it will be able to withstand competition on external markets and therefore to preserve jobs and create new ones.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (NL) Madam President, youth unemployment is one of the greatest disasters for our industrialized society. It can be compared to such natural disasters as famine and earthquakes. It can also be compared to world wars in which millions of people die.

Those of us who, like myself, live in a region where youth unemployment is high feel a deep sense of shame. We have a worthwhile job, but these young people do not. We have good salaries, but the young unemployed have hardly enough to live on. Over 13 million young people capable of work are unemployed, they are discouraged, they have become fatalists and aggressive, and they feel helpless.

Why, Madam President, can we not, firstly, redistribute what work there is in Europe, giving priority to young people?

Secondly, why can we not create new employment in such new social sectors as adult education, public health, environmental protection, meaningful farming and horticulture and so on?

Thirdly, is it normal for scientific and technological progress to reduce rather than increase employment? Can the European Social Fund not assist

(a) special projects which encourage science and technology with a view to creating worthwhile employment for young people and

(b) basic projects in which young people themselves take the initiative?

To conclude, Madam President, let us build a Europe in which young people still dare to believe, in which they can play a responsible part, a Europe in which economic competition is not the central feature, but where the economy and technology serve the people and above all young people.

Mr McCartin (PPE). — Madam President, in Europe the fight against unemployment is the story of a search for soft options. The individual States of the European Community have been engaged in this chase for the past 10 years and the institutions of the Community are plodding along on their heels. All the time, the object of full employment is receding and in many regions of the Community it has disappeared entirely from view. Until such time as the governments of Europe and the institutions of the Community come to a clear realization that there are no soft options, the problem will remain unsolved.

Occasionally in this Parliament a realistic solution is proposed. Briefly we toyed with the idea of introducing effective measures such as were proposed in the Herman report, but most of what we in this Parliament have been proposing is more in the nature of a drug to kill the pain than a cure that will eliminate the disease. Continually we talk about youth unemployment. Of course, if we fail to create jobs it is the young people coming onto the labour market who will first be affected. We continually talk about training and retraining, but we forget that in the years when this Community was leading the world in economic growth the State was not nearly so much engaged in training as it is today. Industry provided its own training schemes in those years and State interference over a wide area was considerably less than it is today. Rules and regulations governing employment were not nearly so complicated or so restrictive. The State did not regulate national wage agreements. Every industry paid what it could afford. In the European Community of the present day, there is a widespread belief that the State can resolve every problem, that the State can organize an insurance policy against the failures of society and the weaknesses of every individual. The lesson we do not seem to have learned is that human nature, by and large, is much more interested in the standard of living than in the volume of production, and that given a choice between an income with hard work and an income without work, a large number of people would choose the latter.

We do not seem to realize that if we provide pay-related benefits, redundancy pay and everything else, it is quite natural that those at work do not fight so hard to maintain their competitiveness and keep their jobs and their companies on the road. Recently it has become very popular — indeed, in this debate too — for politicians to hold up the American economy as an

McCartin

example of what can be achieved in the way of economic growth, but nearly always we focus on this question of small and medium-sized industries in the United States and we neglect to compare the legal environment in which this success was achieved with our own. Rarely is it pointed out that wages in Europe have grown much faster than they have in the United States. Inflation-adjusted figures show that costs since 1970 have grown by 5% in the United States and by 40% here. In industrial employment the gap is 10% there, as against 65% in Europe. Rarely is it pointed out that in the European Economic Community it is more difficult for industry to reduce its labour force in changing times, and almost all the plausible solutions to the unemployment problem being put forward by European politicians involve the spending of more money, which in turn involves an increase in taxation, and this, again, reduces opportunities for employment.

Madam President, I have not quite finished what I wanted to say, but I see my speaking time is up.

Mrs Daly (ED). — Madam President, Sir Jack Stewart-Clark has very ably presented the case for economic recovery in Europe. Working from the Herman report, voted by this Parliament a year ago, my group supports the coherent approach which the centre-right groups have set out, designed to complete the internal market, contain budget deficits and tackle labour market rigidities. We endorse the Commission's commitment to effective completion of the market by 1992.

One very important aspect of this new approach is the upgrading of the Social Fund and a greater emphasis in Community decision-making on training for the young and the long-term unemployed. A restructuring of the Community budget based on the doubling of Social Fund expenditure within the Community's new own resources is the best possible assistance that this Parliament could give to the unemployed of Europe. The Social Fund is the sole immediate instrument in the hands of the Community to help restructure the labour market and ease the plight of unemployed. Parliament put forward its precise views on the new Social Fund guidelines at its plenary session last month. In this we stressed the need for these guidelines to help those most in need by encouraging practical training on the job and productive job-creation schemes. These are at risk in the latest draft of the guidelines which we have seen. Equally we have stressed the need for the so-called weighted reduction procedure in the Social Fund to reflect real criteria based on the quality of the project rather than an arithmetical reduction on indiscriminate grounds.

The Social Fund, Madam President, is a scarce resource. It must be used wisely and carefully, as Commissioner Sutherland emphasized last month. I would like to stress to the President of the Council today that it is very important to help ensure that the new guidelines issued by the Commission reflect the

two priorities I have just mentioned. The young, unskilled unemployed cannot be abandoned by some hasty decision to move the Social Fund up-market in the way many Members of this House fear.

My group recognizes that economic change will necessarily produce new patterns of work and employment. We want to see more flexibility in the organization of working time which preserves the competitiveness of European industry. We want to see the implementation of new policies in the technological sector and continued action to improve training and retraining so that we have a fully-skilled workforce in Europe.

We believe that closer coordination of the Community financial instruments would help support productive investment.

Finally, If we are to achieve the kind of economic modernization necessary in Europe, we must have the active participation and agreement of the social partners. A basic essential is, therefore, a genuine system of worker participation where workers' representatives are elected by secret ballot from all of the workforce and where management representatives are genuinely committed to participation. Such a system would, I believe, lead to the social dialogue necessary for decisions to be taken which can create real jobs for the future.

Madam President, we have heard many words. What we want from both the Commission and the Council now are proposals for urgent effective action to combat the problem of 13.6 million unemployed, particularly the 40% under the age of 25.

Mrs Tove Nielsen (L). — (DA) Madam President, the Liberal Group strongly endorses the question which has been put by a number of our colleagues concerning the arrangements the Commission intends to make to create better conditions for small and medium-sized undertakings and craft industries. The question makes special reference to the setting up of a centre for small and medium-sized undertakings. I think it is an excellent initiative because it gives us a clear indication of the reasons why we want a centre. Parliament and the Commission have for some time had a genuine desire for such a centre to be created.

It is therefore extremely regrettable for us in the Liberal Group to note that a good and sound idea, which has been put forward and even adopted on a number of occasions here in Parliament, is meeting with such a dismal fate in these months. For what happened on 31 December 1984?

Commissioner Narjes signed a contract — or it may have been an agreement, I am not sure exactly what it was — under which the Commission undertook to pay a sum, which is entered in the 1984 budget, to certain

Nielsen

organizations. I say advisedly 'certain organizations', for what does that phrase cover? At all events they are not representative of the small and medium-sized undertakings. And in any case item 7777 was not used for this purpose, in which it was Parliament's wish to get something started which we could build on: a centre for small and medium-sized business. We do not have much money for our work here in Parliament, the Commission and the Community as a whole, and we should not squander this 100 000 ECU item in the budget and throw it about without knowing what it is to be used for. We want a centre for small and medium-sized undertakings in Europe. We do not want an office which is left to work out after the event what in the world it is to do with those meagre funds.

We genuinely want to do something to create better conditions for the many people who eke out a precarious existence from day to day. It is symptomatic to hear talk of reductions in working hours, but the many people employed in the small and medium-sized business and in craft enterprises, who work 45, 60 or 70 hours per week, would be glad if we only placed some value on their work. It is not they who shout and scream about shorter working hours and compensation for all kinds of things. Let us help them, let us give them the information they need, for it is they who will create the new development that is needed; it is they who have the will to make use of new technology; it is they whose firms have a structure which allows them to be flexible. We need new jobs and, if we in Parliament have the will, we can create those jobs we talk so much about today. All these years I have been a Member we have been declaring our wish to get to grips with unemployment, but it has gone on rising, and now we are frittering away 100 000 ECU which ought to be promoting better conditions for these enterprises and hence for all those people for whom we seek to provide lasting employment!

Mr Fitzgerald (RDE). — Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of my group I would like to thank the authors of the three oral questions for raising the issue of the employment crisis in the Community, particularly as it affects young people. At the end of December 1984, over 5 million young people under 25 were registered as unemployed in the Community. According to recent figures supplied by Eurostat, the 13.6 million unemployed at the end of January this year represents the highest figure ever. If we could take into account those who are unemployed but not registered, the overall picture would, I fear, be considerably worse.

Presidents-in-Office of the Council go in and out as regularly as cuckoo clocks. As time moves on they each declare that the unemployment crisis is their major priority. Yet the reality is that more and more people are joining Europe's lengthening dole queues. Europe, if it acts together, can bring about a change by strengthening and consolidating the internal mar-

ket, by becoming more competitive. A strong European economy with its 270 million consumers can be a springboard to success in markets outside our ten Member States. The creating of real employment prospects will follow.

There is what has been described as 'a black hole of information' on two-fifths of the labour market in Ireland. It cannot be proved yet but there is considerable speculation by Irish economists that the reduction in the rate of increase in unemployment is accounted for by a new wave of emigration. This must be for Ireland one of our saddest tragedies.

My group deeply regrets the ineffectiveness of the Community's institutions in dealing with the unemployment problem which has been steadily worsening for the past 15 years. The eternal wrangling over the Community's budget has dragged down the EEC. The Community's budget, while not insignificant, represents approximately 1% of the gross domestic product of the Community and less than 3% of public spending by the ten Member States. The time for political pointscoring is over. The development and prosperity of the Community for all its people and the creation of new jobs is far more important. Settle the budget issue once and for all. We need action not meaningless repetition about unemployment as our priority. The Social Fund as a real Community instrument of employment is pedalling backwards fast. Not only the percentage but also the total amount actually paid out in 1983 was lower than the previous year, despite an overall 35% increase in the total payment appropriations available.

It is essential that the Council acts decisively in providing a budget which will not only double the resources of the Social Fund over the next five years but will enable the introduction of new policies especially in all the related areas of new technologies and also transport, the construction industry, the service sector, SMEs and local employment initiatives.

Financial assistance should be provided for supporting existing employment initiatives in Europe such as Community enterprises centres which have also been successful in the US in creating employment opportunities.

Madam President, we have debated the issues of long-term unemployment, questions of statistical machinery, the new guidelines for the Social Fund. We have put forward all views and social priorities. We can wait no longer for the Council to shoulder its responsibilities. We want action for jobs now.

Mr Seligman (ED). — Madam President, a major reason for high unemployment is mismatch between the shortage of jobs in one area and the shortage of skilled workers in another area. High technology firms have serious shortages of skilled technologists at all

Seligman

levels, yet schools are pouring out large numbers of unskilled young people who have not a single qualification relevant to doing a useful job.

What could the EEC do about this mismatch? Unless we can raise the proportion of young people and adults who are technologically literate, we shall continue to lose jobs to Japan, the USA and the newly industrialized countries. I attended recently an excellent EEC conference on training in new technologies, organized by James Elles and Lady Elles in Britain, which brought together politicians, educationalists, local government and, most importantly, industrialists and employers. There should be more of these local conferences, Mr Sutherland. I am sure you can help in that.

The main conclusions of this conference were as follows: First, industry must make a greater financial and organizational contribution to training in high technology at all levels — and when I say industry, I mean trade unions as well as employers; they must collabor-

ate. Secondly, industry must release their specialists to act as teachers for limited periods. Thirdly, industry must release adult workers for retraining in high technology. It is quite wrong to think that employees should only have one skill throughout their life. Technology is changing much too fast. Training and retraining of the work force should be continuous throughout a worker's life. Fourthly, collaboration in programmes like the Esprit programme of research and development in high technology will make jobs by recapturing from the USA and Japan a share of the high technology market that we are losing the whole time.

Upgrading in our industrial ability in high technology may not be the only answer to youth unemployment, but it is certainly one of the main solutions.

President. — The debate is closed.¹

(The sitting was closed at 8 p.m.)

¹ *Motion for resolutions with request for an early vote — agenda for the next sitting: see Minutes.*

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 16 APRIL 1985

Contents

<i>Mr Fich</i>	29		
1. <i>Discharge for the 1983 budget — Reports (Docs. A 2-10/85 and A 2-8/85) by Mr Price; (Doc. 2-1802/84) by Mr Harlin and (Doc. 2-1800/84) by Mr Schön:</i>			
<i>Mr Price; Mr Schön; Mr Aigner; Mr Christophersen (Commission); Mr Wettig; Mr Aigner; Mr Simmonds; Mrs Boserup; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Ciccimessere; Mr Ryan; Mr Schreiber; Mr Marck; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Cornelissen; Mr Vergeer; Mrs Ewing; Mr Price; Mr Christophersen</i>	29		
2. <i>Migrant workers — Reports (Doc. A 2-4/85) by Mrs Marinaro and (Doc. A 2-12/85) by Mr Papapietro:</i>			
<i>Mr Le Chevallier; Mr Ducarme; Mrs Dury; Mrs Marinaro; Mr Papapietro; Mrs Piermont; Mrs d'Ancona; Mr Pisoni Ferruccio; Mrs J. Hoffman; Mr De Gucht; Mrs Chouraqui; Mrs Heinrich</i>	51		
3. <i>Action taken on the opinions of Parliament:</i>			
<i>Mr Pranchère; Mr Ripa di Meana (Commission); Mr Cryer; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mr Maffre-Baugé; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mr Wurtz; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mr Collins; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mrs Daly; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mrs Caroline Jackson; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mr Balfe</i>	60		
4. <i>Question Time (Doc. B 2-104/85):</i>			
• <i>Questions to the Commission:</i>	62		
• <i>Question No 1, by Mr Ford: Severn barrage:</i>			
<i>Mr Sutherland (Commission); Mr Ford; Mr Sutherland; Mr Cottrell; Mr Sutherland; Mr Stewart; Mr Sutherland; Mr Smith; Mr Sutherland</i>	62		
• <i>Question No 2, by Mr Rogalla: Abolition of personal checks at the internal frontiers:</i>			
<i>Lord Cockfield (Commission); Mr Rogalla; Lord Cockfield; Mr Wijsenbeek; Lord Cockfield; Mr Patterson; Lord Cockfield; Mr Cryer; Lord Cock-</i>			
<i>field; Mr Gerontopoulos; Lord Cockfield; Mr Habsburg; Lord Cockfield; Mr Moller; Lord Cockfield</i>	63		
• <i>Question No 3, by Mrs Chouraqui: Effects and consequences of demographic change:</i>			
<i>Mr Sutherland; Mrs Chouraqui; Mr Sutherland; Mrs Lebideux; Mr Sutherland; Mr Wijsenbeek; Mr Sutherland; Mrs Lizin; Mr Sutherland</i>	65		
• <i>Question No 4, by Mr Flanagan: Cut-backs on Social Fund aid for the handicapped:</i>			
<i>Mr Sutherland; Mr Flanagan; Mr Sutherland; Mr Hughes; Mr Sutherland; Mrs Dury; Mr Sutherland; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Sutherland</i>	67		
• <i>Question No 6, by Mr Lalor: Imports of Swiss milk:</i>			
<i>Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Lalor; Mr Andriessen; Mr Simmonds; Mr Andriessen; Mr Pasty; Mr Andriessen; Mr Morris; Mr Andriessen</i>	68		
• <i>Question No 7, by Mr Roux: Rhine-Rhone river link:</i>			
<i>Mr Clinton Davis (Commission); Mr Roux; Mr Clinton Davis; Mr Wijsenbeek; Mr Clinton Davis</i>	69		
• <i>Question No 8, by Mr Alavanos: Proceedings against Greece under Article 169:</i>			
<i>Lord Cockfield; Mr Alavanos; Lord Cockfield</i>	70		
• <i>Question No 9, by Mr Christodoulou: Availability of lead-free petrol in countries which are not members of the EEC:</i>			
<i>Mr De Clercq (Commission); Mr Christodoulou, Mr De Clercq</i>	71		
• <i>Question No 10, by Mr Stewart: Barrage across the Mersey:</i>			
<i>Lord Cockfield; Mr Stewart; Lord Cockfield; Mr Ford; Lord Cockfield; Mr Smith; Lord Cockfield</i>	71		
• <i>Question No 11, by Mr Pasty: Increase in suckler herd premiums:</i>			

<i>Mr Andriessen; Mr Pasty; Mr Andriessen; Mr Pranchère; Mr Andriessen; Mr Guermeur; Mr Andriessen</i>	72	<i>Welsh; Mr Bachy; Mr Maher; Mr Elliot; Mrs Marinaro; Mr Le Chevallier</i>	75
• <i>Question No 12, by Mr Evrigenis: Protection of confidentiality of legal documents: Mr Sutherland; Mr Evrigenis; Mr Sutherland</i>	74	6. <i>Topical and urgent debate (announcement): Mr Ephremidis</i>	89
5. <i>Migrant workers (continuation): Mr Le Chevallier; Mrs Dury; Mr Le Pen; Mr Ulburghs; Mrs Peus; Mr Barzanti; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Hindley; Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti; Mr Adamou; Mr Avgerinos; Mrs Lenz; Mr Filinis; Mr Sakellariou; Mr Brok; Mrs Giannakou-Koutsikou; Mr Ducarme; Mr Sutherland (Commission); Mr</i>		7. <i>July 1985 part-session</i>	90
		8. <i>Votes: Mr Price; Mr Pitt; Mr Guermeur; Mr Price; Mr Filinis; Mr Bonaccini; Mrs Lemass; Mr Christensen; Miss Tongue; Mr Elliot; Mrs Salisch; Mr Brok; Mr Welsh; Mr Tuckman; Mrs Salisch; Mr Adam; Mr Bonaccini; Mr Fitzgerald; Mr Kolokotronis; Mrs Larive-Groenendaal</i>	90
		<i>Annex</i>	97

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 9 a. m.)

Mr Fich (S). — (DA) Mr President, we were informed yesterday in the Committee on Budgets that it will be possible to get a statement from the Commission concerning letter of amendment No 3 on the question of the budget for 1985, followed by a short debate.

I note that this item is not included in the printed agenda; but I expect that it will be debated as announced yesterday at 3 p.m. in the Committee on Budgets.

President. — Mr Fich, you are quite right, this agenda was adopted yesterday by Parliament. But we are looking into the possibility of having a short statement and debate this afternoon.¹

1. *Discharge for the 1983 budget*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on four reports by the Committee on Budgetary Control:

- by Mr Price (Doc. A 2-10/85) on the decision granting a discharge in respect of the implementa-

tion of the budget of the European Communities for the 1983 financial year

- by Mr Price (Doc. A 2-8/85) on the deferral of the decisions on the grant of discharge to the Commission in respect of the implementation of the Second, Third, Fourth and Fifth European Development Funds for the 1983 financial year
- by Mr Härlin (Doc. 2-1802/84) on the proposal for a decision on the discharge to be granted to the Commission in respect of the ECSC accounts for the 1983 financial year
- by Mr Schön (Doc. 2-1800/84) on the discharge to be granted to the Management Board of the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training and to the Administrative Board of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions in respect of the implementation of their appropriations of the budgets for the 1983 financial year.

Mr Price (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, in presenting the annual report on discharge, I am conscious that Parliament will be exercising one of its major powers. Under the Financial Regulation we may attach comments to the discharge which are binding on the other institutions. This is an exercise of the supervisory role assigned to Parliament under the Treaties.

In order to make our comments more effective there are a number of innovations this year. We have defined our terminology so that it is clear whether or not we are using the full extent of our power to require action.

Furthermore, instead of making a criticism and leaving it to the Commission to devise a remedy, this year

¹ *Approval of the Minutes — Documents received — Topical and urgent debate (Announcement): see Minutes.*

Price

every criticism is followed by a prescription of the action which should be taken. In some cases this is a complete remedy, in other cases further study is necessary and that is what we require. The important point is that Parliament is playing a constructive role as discharge authority. The objective is to build rather than to demolish.

Each year a different rapporteur brings a fresh approach to the task. My contribution has been a detailed examination of how we implement Community policy and whether our financial machinery enables us to achieve our aims. Of course such machinery should be subservient to the policies adopted. However, adopting policies without adopting the means of implementing them is a grand but ineffective view of politics. The proposals put before Parliament in this motion for a resolution represent probably the biggest overhaul of the Community's financial machinery ever undertaken by the European Parliament.

No doubt some Members will dismiss the report as being essentially detailed and technical. They will say that it does not lay down any new policy. They will have missed the point. It is for other reports from other committees to devise new lines of policy. It is the function of this report to concentrate on how those policies can be implemented. Even the most promising of new policies will fail if it lacks the necessary financial resources in the right place at the right time. Financial mechanisms often dictate the political results.

This year's discharge must be seen against the background of the refusal of discharge last year. Five points of the resolution refusing discharge are of continuing relevance. Remedies are proposed for all of them in this year's discharge resolution. More important, it is even more essential for Parliament to lay down in specific terms the action which it requires so that we do not find ourselves in that situation again.

The motion makes a significant contribution to improving the effectiveness of Parliament's budgetary and budgetary control powers. More up-to-date and relevant information will be available when we adopt the budget. Similarly, more relevant and comprehensive information will be available to enable us to monitor and control implementation of the budget. Finally, more information will be available for us to examine the situation later. Some of this will focus on Parliament's amendments to the budget so that we can ensure that they receive the priority that we intend. Other information will be in the form of Commission documents so that we can understand and better appreciate the reasons for Commission decisions having financial implications.

Community revenue has received close scrutiny this year. The committee considered tables which are reproduced in my explanatory statement. Tables 1 and 2 concern value-added tax. They show that whereas

the authorities in Germany and Ireland and other Member States collect most of their VAT — and in other Member States they do quite well — in Italy there seem to be large underpayments. Similarly, there seems to be an even greater undercollection of customs duties in the same Member State. The reason for these disparities is clear: they result from the so-called black economies. In all Member States there are people who fail to pay their taxes. We know that the Italian Government is concerned that it loses far more than other governments on that account. The fact is that the rest of us lose too.

The figures in the tables are based on the official government statistics of the Member States for production, consumption and trade. On this basis if VAT and customs duties were collected in Italy to the same extent as in other Member States, the Italian contribution to the Community budget would be at least 700 million ECU per annum more. It would probably be higher. But I stress that these calculations are based on official government statistics. If the statistics themselves are not uniformly accurate, and the pattern of discrepancies is the same as for the collection of revenue, my estimate might even be doubled.

There is a great deal of supposition about these figures. The only statistics showing precisely the amounts of VAT due are those based on what taxpayers declare to the authorities. Practically all of this money is collected. It is by constructing a model of what payments would be expected for an economy of that size and with that spending pattern, if everyone declared and paid their tax liabilities, that one can build up the basis of comparison. It can do no more than act as a pointer.

What should we do about it? The first thing is that we cannot simply ask the Commission to be more efficient in collecting Community revenue. The regulations bind them to accept what the Member States collect. The Council seems determined to prevent effective control by the Commission over Community revenue. They have even refused for six years to pass regulations which would require Member States to pass on regular information on frauds and irregularities relating to the Community's own resources.

The answer lies more fundamentally in the system itself. In this resolution the Commission is asked to examine the possibility of devising a fairer system. They will need to face the reality that Community VAT is simply a set of statistics on which to base national contributions. Community VAT is not identified to the taxpayer. He thinks that he is paying national taxation. It is the only tax I have ever heard of which goes up or down, but where the taxpayer pays exactly the same sum irrespective of the level at which the tax is set.

In reality we replaced one system of national contributions with another. The first was defective in being

Price

arbitrary and inflexible. Its replacement must now be seen as inaccurate and unfair. So radical proposals are required from the Commission at the appropriate time.

I now turn from revenue to expenditure and I start with the largest element in it — agricultural guarantee expenditure. The central problem of the common agricultural policy is manifested in the multitude of its financial mechanisms. The common agricultural policy lacks coherence as a Community policy.

It should serve the needs of the Community as a whole. Instead it has become a Christmas tree with presents on all the branches for different Member States. They all abuse the system of unanimity to get something for themselves. As a result, all pay more and the policy lacks coherence.

If we are to give better value for money to the taxpayer, we must restore coherence by a radical reappraisal of the policy. One way of setting this in motion would be by the Commission inviting a small independent group to produce a speedy report, the concept of three wise men. This idea might be considered. In the meantime, the Commission has set up working groups to study separately each of the main sectors of agricultural policy. We ask for early reports from them.

In a series of paragraphs in the resolution, we identify breaches of the principle of annuality. This is not simply a point of philosophy, it is essential to proper budgetary control to incur and attribute expenditure on an annual basis according to consistent principles. If they are lacking, expenditure is moved backwards or forwards at the end of a year. As a result it becomes impossible to compare like with like and make a proper financial assessment.

One of the most glaring examples is the failure to write down the value of agricultural stocks consistently. This has an even more important effect. It increases Community expenditure in the long run because it is more difficult to sell off our stocks when opportunities arise. If we wrote down the values of commodities coming into stock to their true market values in the first year and reflected any further falls in value in subsequent years, there would be far less expenditure attributed when these stocks are sold. That would make the Community's sales policy more flexible and better able to meet market opportunities.

At the end of each financial year, the Member States are required to submit their EAGGF accounts to the Commission within three months and the Commission is required to clear the accounts by the end of that following year. These are the requirements of Community law. However, Member States are actually months late in submitting their accounts and the Commission takes years to clear them. Five years is not untypical.

1979 is the last year for which clearance has taken place. Until the time of clearance, billions of ECU of

Community money are vouched for only by the requests made by the Member States themselves and their own accounts. When clearance takes place, large sums are often repayable to the Community. It is totally unacceptable that we should have to wait five years to have accurate and final figures for the majority of the budget. It makes a nonsense of discharge that most of the expenditure is — for all practical purposes — excluded from it.

In November 1982, the European Court of Auditors published a report showing how matters might be put right, essentially by moving from a consecutive system of clearance to a concurrent one. In other words the Commission would have to start checking during the year in question and simply tie up the accounts during the succeeding year. This would enable mistakes to be remedied quickly before they grow to astronomic figures. I do not doubt that annual average savings of over 100 m ECU could be achieved by such a change, simply by putting matters right more quickly and more efficiently.

The Commission services do not like this radical approach but it must be forced upon them. There have been promises in the past from the Commission to get clearance up to date. They have always failed — partly because the Member States treat the matter as non-urgent and partly because the Commission has got so far behind that the work is twice as difficult as it would otherwise be.

I have satisfied myself that the scheme put forward by the Court of Auditors is a sound one. I have developed it and the Committee on Budgetary Control has heard and rejected the Commission arguments to the contrary. I hope that Parliament will be equally resolute so that after years of complaint we shall put in place a far better system.

I mentioned a few moments ago some of the problems caused by failing to write down promptly the value of agricultural stocks. There is a similar but different problem relating to food aid. Around 40% of our food aid budget is spent on milk products. Parliament has said on several occasions that these products are far less cost-effective as food aid than grain or certain other commodities. But the heart of the problem lies not in food aid policy but in the interplay between two aspects of our Community budget. We charge the food aid budget with world market prices for milk products. Yet we have no hope of selling larger quantities on the world market so our mountains of milk powder will simply remain in storage costing us money. The marginal value is very small and may even be negative, so why charge these inflated values to the food aid budget? All it does is to reduce the amount of food aid the Community can send and leave us with the stocks still in storage.

If we sent more food aid for the same amount of money, in the first year we would have to find some

Price

extra sums on the agricultural budget. But in the second year, reduced storage charges would counter-balance this item and from the third year onwards there is no reason why we should not achieve both more food aid delivered and lower agricultural spending. This is a prime example of how a budgetary mechanism has distorted an important policy.

In my main report there is one glaring omission and that is development policy. Some readers of the report may well wonder whether this is a reflection of a low priority attached to that subject. They would be completely mistaken, and if they look further amongst their documents they will find that there is a separate discharge decision given in respect of the European Development Fund. This year, sadly, all that you have at this stage is an interim report asking that there be a postponement of that decision. The reason for that is that we have not yet received the Council recommendation for the grant of discharge relating to the development funds. When we receive it, we will be, of course, submitting to Parliament the appropriate decision and resolution on that subject. It is a very important one to which this Parliament is attaching increasing importance.

Another major section of the resolution deals with investing in the future of Europe. Here we are talking about accepting the technological challenge of the Americans and the Japanese. It is an area where Community action to share the massive costs of research and development is highly cost-effective but implementation of Community policy has so far been disappointing. The main reason is the Council's long drawn out decision-making procedures in which advisory committees, groups of experts and working groups within the Council all participate. It is an area in which speed of decision-taking is essential. So we call upon the Council to review and streamline its decision-making procedures relating to research and technological cooperation.

This year the role of the Council is highlighted in a number of ways. So the Council is being asked to respond, like the Commission, with an interim and final report on the implementation of this resolution. It is the first time that Parliament has made such a request. It reflects our desire that the Council should join with us in improving the Community's financial machinery. We respect the institutional competences in all our requests to the Council and so we expect implementation from them as we do from the Commission.

Mr President, this resolution illustrates the determination of this Parliament to play a constructive part in the development of the Community — to be a force for Community cohesion and coherence. If Europe is to achieve the great goals it has set itself, it must have the means to do so. This resolution seeks to improve these means across the whole budget and all our

spending policies. I hope that the House will approve it.

(Applause)

Mr Schön (PPE), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. My report on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control is concerned with the so-called decentralized bodies, autonomous organizations and so-called satellite bodies of the European Community. All these are institutions funded out of the European Community's budget, some of them receiving 100%, others up to 80% of their money from this source.

I should like to start by taking each of these institutions in turn, taking it as read that the Committee on Budgetary Control has for years kept a careful eye on these institutions, for it is the European taxpayer's money which is being spent here.

The criteria in our examination are the same as those we apply to the Commission, for our aim is to check that the money spent is being spent effectively, to prevent waste and to ensure that the objectives set for these institutions are fulfilled as effectively as possible.

And so we have for years considered it important that internal control within these institutions should work properly. I am happy to be able to say that some of these institutions have acted on criticisms expressed by the Committee on Budgetary Control, for example the Centre for the Development of Vocational Training in Berlin, a Community body, and the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. Excellent work was done here by one of our predecessors in the Committee on Budgetary Control, Mr Kellett-Bowman, who is no longer a Member of the House, and the results are most satisfactory.

The same is also true of the Euratom Supply Agency where we were happy to find that the European Court of Auditors had no objections to make. As regards the European Computer Centre, a very important instrument for the Commission, the Committee on Budgetary Control considers that the time is ripe for a further effectiveness study. An extremely important body is the Joint Research Centre. Although a number of improvements have already been made — the Commission must be credited with having acted on the criticisms it received — we must also remember that this research body is, as Mr Price has just said, a prime investment for the future of Europe. Only recently a European Foreign Minister called for a European technology community. If we need one, and it is agreed that we do, then we should note that in 1983 150 million ECU was invested and spent in this field, but that the use made of these funds by no means yielded the desired results.

The Committee on Budgetary Control thus believes that the Court of Auditors should compile a new

Schön

special report on the budgetary conduct of research activities, with particular reference to the Joint Research Centre.

I come now to the JET project. This too is an extremely important project. Strictly speaking it is the biggest single project of the European Atomic Energy Community and aims to do something for future energy supply to the Community now that thermonuclear fusion is feasible as a new source of energy. I would remind the House that over 1 000 engineers and scientists from 12 countries are engaged on this project. There is no disputing the fact that the estimated cost for this project has been closely adhered to, and the Court of Auditors has also found that there are no objections to granting a discharge to this institution. We shall thus do so without reservation.

Another, somewhat worrying, question is that of the European Schools. Our European Schools enjoy a good public image and it is not our intention, in criticizing the administration and budgetary conduct of these schools, to criticize the schools themselves and their achievements, but after all they did cost us 38 million ECU in 1983. I would ask you to study closely the detailed criticism of the Court of Auditors which I have reproduced in my report. There have been some strange things going on, and it is not good enough that the senior inspector of schools, who is after all responsible for these autonomous institutions, should have failed over the last few years to take these criticisms as seriously as he should have done. There have been irregularities over staff administration, salaries, the taxes paid by European School teachers and the rendering of accounts, so that the Committee on Budgetary Control can grant only a conditional discharge. In our discussions with representatives of these schools this fact was accepted. We shall see that pledges to improve matters are in fact kept. Here too, then, we may have to call for a special report, and we fully endorse the criticisms expressed by the Court of Auditors. For this reason it was necessary to include the demand on efficiency and effective use of funds in these schools as a separate point in the Price report.

A few more observations on behalf of my group: as the group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) we fully endorse Mr Price's report. We shall have to consider the proposed amendments to it this afternoon, as they were late in reaching us. Despite considerable reservations, and I would remind you that we refused to grant a discharge to the Commission in spring, we shall vote in favour of granting one for 1983. One behalf of my group I should like to explain why.

Our impression is that the new Commissioner for financial affairs is extremely cooperative *vis-à-vis* the European Parliament. We shall take his promises seriously. But, Commissioner Christophersen, we shall hold you to your word. We respect the independence of the Commission just as you respect the indepen-

dence of the European Parliament. Of particular importance to us were your pledges to review the control procedures for the Member States' expenditure. That is important for the Commission because public opinion very often castigates the European Community, viz. the Commission, viz. Brussels, for abuses which are in reality the fault of Member States.

We therefore urge and encourage you, Mr Commissioner, to review these procedures. Take seriously our call for a 'roving patrol' — we shall support you. We shall then of course have to discuss in the Committee on Budgetary Control whether you have the staff you need to do this, and if not, they should be found, for millions of taxpayers' money can be saved here.

My second observation concerns revision of the system of advances in the EAGGF — Guarantee Section. Doubtless the chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control will cover this in greater detail. My third point deals with speeding up the clearing of accounts specifically in these areas. If we consider that only half the total guarantee funds disbursed so far have been cleared, then Mr Price is right; this is no way to do things. How are we supposed to check, if we are years behind and have to settle for figures which we can no longer verify for ourselves?

My fourth observation: we need a more realistic budget, particularly in the light of our excess commitments. Any increase in own resources would already be absorbed and spent, because of this excess. This must be allowed for in the Commission's financial planning and we must also, again I agree with Mr Price, move via a three-year plan to medium-term financial planning covering a greater number of years. We can assure you of our group's fullest support if you make use of your right of initiative and your competence as the Commission, particularly *vis-à-vis* the Council of Ministers which has hitherto been the true culprit as regards holding back the Community.

My final remark: a number of committees have criticized some of the explanations given: I am thinking of the problems of social security and equal rights for women. How have these items been spent or realized? My group would have appreciated details on this.

(Applause)

President. — As Mr Härlin does not appear to be present, I call Mr Aigner, chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control, to present the report on behalf of the committee.

Mr Aigner (PPE), Chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control. — (DE) Mr President, I do not know why the rapporteur has not arrived yet, but as we are dealing with these four reports in a joint debate, I ought perhaps to step into the breach as

Aigner

chairman of the Committee and briefly introduce Mr Härlin's report.

The subject at issue is the granting of a discharge for the accounts rendered by the European Coal and Steel Community for 1983. It is doubtless interesting to note that the ECSC is somewhat better off than the Community as whole. We have here a balance sheet totalling over 8 400 million ECU, in which disbursed loans alone amount to 6 600 million ECU. I think these figures say more about the effectiveness and efficiency of the ECSC than any words could.

We propose that the discharge be granted although, and I refer you here to paragraphs 6 and 7ff of the motion for a resolution, we have made a number of further requests to the Commission. We wish in particular for more detailed information on a number of problems, namely the formation of surpluses, the liquidity position and above all the position as regards reserves. A community whose industry is, to put it mildly, in a somewhat precarious position, should not at such times have to make provisions which, in view of the position of its reserves, are not necessary. Mr President, I shall confine myself to this brief expose and should be grateful if the Parliament would vote for Mr Härlin's report.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, on behalf of the Commission I should like to thank the Committee on Budgetary Control, its rapporteur, Mr Price, and the other rapporteurs for the work involved in the preparation of the discharge resolution for the 1983 financial year.

I was able to attend a number of the committee's meetings and felt encouraged by the committed atmosphere that prevailed in the discussions. We did not agree on everything; it might look somewhat suspicious if we were agreed on every detail, but I nevertheless felt able to conclude from our discussions in the committee and from the report we are primarily concerned with today that we are in full agreement on the central issues.

The Commission and Parliament are in complete agreement over the need we are now experiencing for a radical improvement in the control of the administration of the Community's funds. We are agreed in the first place because it is clear that in a number of areas there has been or still is waste or bad administration; in the second place because we know that all the Member States in these times are obliged in their national context to impose strict financial limits, often accompanied by increases in taxes, contributions or duties or by cuts in social services and benefits; and in the third place because the citizens of the Member States — whether as taxpayers, recipients of social benefits or wage-earners — are keenly aware of the economic problems. In these circumstances the Community cannot expect its Member States or its citizens

to tolerate inefficiency in the administration of its resources or losses as a consequence of bad administration.

I wanted to emphasize this at the outset, although of course in certain areas there is not full agreement between the Commission and the Committee on Budgetary Control, and perhaps Parliament as a whole, depending on how the vote goes on the conclusions to be drawn with regard to the individual problems which have been highlighted. But as in any parliamentary process — and that is what we are involved in — I feel nevertheless that a result will finally emerge from the cooperation and the debates, and also from the disagreement which exists between us. This result will improve the entire control function and, moreover, I can inform you that the Commission is to decide on a proposal which I have presented concerning a lasting improvement in the whole process of scrutiny and control of our resources. I have already said to the Committee on Budgetary Control, and I will repeat it here: it is my hope that it will be possible for the Commission to take a final decision on this proposal at its next meeting.

An important part of the work on the discharge resolution has of course already been done in the context of the report of the Court of Auditors. The Commission has also read the report very attentively and perhaps, as it is the first time I have had the opportunity to speak to Parliament on these matters, I should stress the importance I attribute to the work of the Court of Auditors. But I would warn against overdramatizing the conclusions of the Court of Auditors; there is a tendency to do this in some quarters. Overdramatizing matters may cast doubt upon the legitimacy or capacity to function of the Community as a whole. That is something I would warn you against, because it was presumably not even in the intentions of the Court of Auditors. On the contrary we should look seriously at the specific points of criticism, and the comments of the Court of Auditors are of course the right basis on which to proceed in the work on a discharge resolution.

I should like to take up some of the main problems raised in the reports, and it is no doubt the most practical procedure to start with one or two problems on which the Commission and Parliament definitely disagree. Once we have got them out of the way, I can pass on to the points — and fortunately they include almost all of the others — on which there is extensive agreement.

The first point was touched on very briefly by Mr Price in his intervention; I shall not therefore dwell on it at length either. It is in part a semantic and in part an institutional problem. It is the question how the requests, proposals and demands which Parliament might decide to present to the Commission are to be interpreted.

Christophersen

I shall not deal at length with the semantic aspect, although the proposal put forward by the committee could have prompted a very long linguistic and historic discourse on my part. As I pointed out in the Committee on Budgetary Control, the Académie Française, for example, has for over 300 years, week in week out, devoted all its deliberations to the interpretation of a single word. Now we are taking it upon ourselves here, over a shorter period of time, to interpret three different words in seven different languages. That in itself is ambitious. I have some difficulty in understanding all the interpretations and will content myself with addressing the institutional problem linked to the little semantic exercise which emerges from the report.

The institutional problem of course arises from the process by which the conclusion is reached, adopting a linguistically dubious interpretation, that Parliament can by using certain words instruct the Commission, and here I am bound to say — this is of course where we disagree — that the Commission cannot accept that view. It is in conflict with the Treaty since it implies that the Commission should function as a secretariat for the other institutions for, if Parliament were able to instruct the Commission, I assume that the Council would also have this prerogative. I do not know whether that is what the interpretation means but, if the Council calls on the Commission to do something, then that must also be an instruction. That is how I understand it. But the Commission will not be instructed. The Commission will read and listen attentively to the opinions expressed by the institutions on its work. The Commission will study carefully the conclusions reached and the decisions taken following the discharge debate. The Commission will take those decisions which it feels are called for. The Commission will inform Parliament and the Council of these decisions and, if Parliament — I have said it before but I will repeat it — is dissatisfied with the Commission's responses, the appropriate sanctions are provided by the Treaty. Parliament can express its dissatisfaction, and it can go a step further and take a vote of no confidence. I am not now challenging Parliament to take this step, I just refer to it in passing, since we are discussing the institutional distribution of powers.

The Commission has its own responsibility and moreover is prepared to shoulder that responsibility. When we get down to the substance — for we should not allow ourselves to be divided by an institutional or semantic argument — of the account Mr Price and the other rapporteurs have put before us, we see that the points of disagreement are very minor ones. My only intention in presenting these comments on matters of principle was to provide a record from which it will be possible to see when the time comes that the Commission has already stated its views on this proposal in Parliament, should it make its appearance again at some future date.

On matters of substance, on the other hand, there are grounds for a meaningful dialogue between the Com-

mission and Parliament on the basis of the two reports presented. I will therefore address myself to them since they contain a number of interesting analyses and, more especially, proposals. To begin with there are a number of proposals for improvements to the budget process itself, as far as the control of the utilization of appropriations and estimates for future appropriation requirements are concerned. Here the Commission agrees with what emerges from the various proposals, and we shall be glad to give both Parliament and the Council the information they require when the time comes and at the same time endeavour to devise the most effective method. I welcome this proposal from Parliament all the more, if it is adopted, since I am convinced that the period of budgetary restrictions we are at present passing through will necessitate the tightening up of a number of budgetary measures with regard to both forecasting and control.

Clearly — and it was kind of Mr Schön to point this out in his intervention — this also means that the Commission should have the working resources to carry out its task in this respect. That is something to be borne in mind, namely that, as Mr Schön kindly pointed out, Parliament would be sympathetic if there were needs to be met in the economic and staffing areas — although I am also responsible for ensuring that the Commission is not overstuffed.

Fourthly, and this is a point which is closely related to forecasting and control, the motions for resolutions demand that Parliament be given better information on the unavoidable burdens which will bear upon future budgets owing to commitments the Community has entered into in the past.

That is a view I very much share, a view to which the Commission attaches considerable importance. This is not just because the Court of Auditors has identified the problem, not just because we are forced to acknowledge it. We consider it important because it emerges particularly clearly from the developments of recent years — if we analyse them — that there has not been a reasonably proportional relationship between the trend in appropriations for commitment and that in appropriations for payment. It is a question I shall return to later, but the result is that there is an accumulation of commitments which do not immediately feature as a demand for payment in favour of the Member States but which suddenly reappear at some future date. I do not know whether it can be compared with the process which has been observed in another context. It is like getting ketchup out of a bottle: first you bang the bottom of the bottle and nothing comes out, then you hit the bottom of the bottle again and still nothing comes out. When you bang it a third time, the whole lot suddenly shoots out. We also get this 'ketchup effect' in the accumulation of appropriations for commitment.

As far as the Commission is concerned, we agree that there should be more clearly defined rules as to the

Christophersen

distribution of payments still outstanding in relation to commitments previously entered into and the number of years over which they should be spread. Such an analysis would relate essentially to the Community's structural funds and would of course cover the dissociated appropriations. Clearly also, multiannual budgeting would necessarily take account of these elements, but it is equally clear that that is one of the main reasons why multiannual budgeting is important. It is all the more important since prospects for the Community's own resources in the coming years are not particularly encouraging. Certainly it is to be hoped that a clear and binding decision will soon be taken on an increase in own resources; but that does not change the fact that the development in our revenue position will be slow and unsatisfactory, in view of the continuation of the difficult economic situation and the simultaneous accumulation in our commitments.

Forecasts of the requirement in payment appropriations must therefore be analysed as closely as possible in the future. But I should like to return to what I said before on the relationship between appropriations for commitment and appropriations for payment. The existence of unused commitments is not wrong in itself. It follows from our system of payments that there will always be a certain number of commitments which have not yet been used. There will always be a certain number of commitments arising from our various policies which will only be released for payment at a later stage. It is not the commitment system itself which gives grounds for criticism. What creates the abnormal situation is the fact that, in order to overcome a difficult budgetary situation, we have saved on appropriations for payment and instead have made political concessions on appropriations for commitment. At first this looked to be an easy way out. It meant making a political concession in the form of an expected supplementary appropriation. It is these supplementary appropriation problems with which we are now confronted and which both the new Parliament and the new Commission have to face up to. It is these burdens from the past which are now giving rise to all the difficulties. We must first get out of this situation and then prevent it being repeated. It is the Commission's intention in the preparation of the budget for 1986 to devise mechanisms by which these problems can be solved. I do not say that they can be solved immediately, but we can set the process in motion. We must start by identifying more clearly the commitments we have, those we should use and the demands from the past which are now presenting themselves. Secondly we must devise mechanisms which may perhaps make it possible to phase out these anomalies over the next few years.

A second aspect of this whole discussion is that of the hidden commitments which have arisen as a consequence of the agricultural policy, in accordance with which the large quantities of food in storage will suddenly trigger a demand for payment for the Com-

munity when the time comes to dispose of them. Here I should like first to stress — it is something that is very often overlooked in the public debate — that the Commission has endeavoured to approach the problem in good time. For example there was an item in the Commission's budget proposal for 1985 specifically to cover expenditure for the reduction of stocks or to cover the effective loss which was already incurred when the stocks increased. The Council removed that item from the draft budget. I therefore call upon Parliament to give political support to the Commission for a policy which the previous Commission had instituted and which it is this Commission's wish to pursue: to identify what commitments we have and to provide the financial means of phasing them out. That too will be easier within the framework of multiannual budgeting, because we are dealing here with a problem of such magnitude that it can only be phased out over a number of years.

We can argue about ways of presenting information on the commitments we have. It has been suggested that we could present it in the revenue and expenditure account which is published on 31 May each year. I am not certain that that is the right place. I think instead that we might consider presenting it in conjunction with the budget documents, but that does not alter the fact that the Commission itself also wants this information to be brought to the attention of the budgetary authorities and published — indeed it is in its own interest. My idea was therefore to do it in conjunction with the budget documents, mainly because the information in question is not the kind which can be presented in the form of precise accounts but must be seen in terms of an evaluation of its current relevance. At all events it is clear that it must form part of the long-term examination of budgeting trends we so urgently need.

Fifthly, if I can return to the reports we are discussing, a more delicate problem arises which has to do with the entire budget procedure. It is the question of the value of the so-called Joint Declaration of 30 June 1982. The declaration in which Parliament, the Council and the Commission jointly determined a better procedure for the completion of the budgetary process. I can understand that there may be wishes for the alteration or improvement of that procedure in all three institutions. On the other hand, speaking for the Commission, I would warn against abandoning that agreement which we achieved in spite of everything. It is constructive to discuss ways of improving the system, but to abandon it would lead us into an institutional conflict at a time when the Community is beginning to function and a number of decisions of substance are being taken. The Commission feels that it is important that we do not dissipate the momentum which the Community is about to regain through the decisions on enlargement, on the integrated Mediterranean programmes, on the solution of the 1985 budget problem and on the strengthening of technological and scientific development by getting bogged

Christophersen

down again in institutional conflicts. Speaking for the Commission, therefore, I readily concede that there may be problems in connection with the Joint Declaration, but I would warn against abandoning it.

The motion for a resolution calls for dissociated appropriations to be given a greater role than they have played in the past. I can be brief on that: it is a view the Commission shares with the Committee on Budgetary Control. We want to examine each of the non-dissociated appropriations in order to see to what extent we can meet that wish. We shall stay within the terms of the Financial Regulation, but we can go along with the wish which has been expressed, and moreover we have already taken a step in that direction in the context of food aid. I just want to stress one point: the fact that we are discussing the question of more dissociated appropriations also increases the need for multiannual budgeting. I have nothing against that, for it gives us scope for longer-term planning. I merely mention this consequence which will flow from the wish expressed.

Mr President, there is in the motion for a resolution a long series of proposals, important demands and suggestions concerning the common agricultural policy and the clearance of accounts for the EAGGF Guarantee Section. I would stress that the Commission is in agreement with most of the points in the motion. With regard to the efforts to achieve better coherence in the common agricultural policy, Mr Price has already mentioned the initiative taken by the Commission to set up six working groups to assess various aspects of the policy, and the main aim here was precisely that of developing a common agricultural policy with built-in forward planning.

Clearly if the common agricultural policy in the years to come is exclusively given over to quota arrangements and measures to limit price increases — and perhaps also efforts to reduce price levels — it may easily give rise to frustrations among the Community's millions of farmers. It is important therefore to find a positive element in the common agricultural policy, which will ensure that each farmer still has something to work for in his life. I think that the six working groups can make a worthwhile contribution, and of course the Commission expects that Parliament will also make its contribution through a debate on the future of the agricultural policy. I think that is better than a panel of wise men — I have said so before to Mr Price and the Committee on Budgetary Control. Over the years I have seen so many wise men invited to study Community affairs that I have begun to doubt whether they are really all that wise. We could turn it round and say: do we not already have the wise men? Do we not have a Parliament which by definition, together with the other institutions, has found the philosopher's stone?

With regard to the two other key points in the motion for a resolution, namely the conducting of cost-benefit

analyses in a number of sensitive sectors and the need to account for expected losses in value of intervention stocks, I have already touched upon this area. I will return to it again in the committee, when I report on what we intend to do to strengthen the means for controlling and monitoring the use of Community resources.

Now we come to the question of the clearance of accounts for the EAGGF Guarantee Section. The Commission sees no problem in following up this proposal almost in its entirety. We should like to institute a timetable for the clearance of the accounts for 1980-84 so that we can quickly get into a normal rhythm for this procedure. I also agree that, if we note that during the year expenditure has been defrayed without sufficient basis, the Commission will seek to act immediately — this is a question to which Mr Price gave great prominence — so as to prevent unnecessary difficulties arising subsequently in the actual clearance of accounts. We are quite willing to make a special effort in this area. It is deplorable that, after 25 years with a common agricultural policy, we still have problems of a purely administrative nature.

On the other hand I should like to make one comment on the time limits for the settlement of accounts, and here there is perhaps a difference between the Commission and Parliament. It is the demand that the accounts should be cleared at the latest 12 months after the end of the financial year in question. That is fine as far as I am concerned; I might even say that that is the intention, but in my estimation it is not realistic at the present time, and that is because it is unfortunately not the Commission alone which is responsible for the clearance of accounts. In many areas we are entirely dependent on the procedures of the national administrations: they have their own deadlines, and they are perhaps more exacting with regard to time than we are in the Community. This problem means that delays accumulate, and we have to wait for the national administrations to supply the necessary information, for neither the Commission nor Parliament like to conclude accounts on a basis so unsatisfactory that the final accounts have to be accompanied by a whole series of reservations or provisos. This is not proper clearance of accounts but provisional clearance. The Commission is thus willing to make a proposal to the Committee on Budgetary Control on ways of improving and shortening the present time limit, but I have to say today that the demand for 12 months is not realistic. I cannot therefore give any assurance that it will work: it will not.

The report refers to certain problems relating to the structural funds and to research, information and innovation policy. The Commission can accept most of these views and is happy with the positive results we have seen since the 1983 financial year, namely the review of the regulations governing the activities of both the Regional Fund and the Social Fund and, I hope, very soon too the reorganization of the EAGGF

Christophersen

development section. We can see that these results will provide scope for a substantial improvement in the administration of these financial instruments as a whole. We will gladly speed up the implementation of the guidelines detailed in the Commission document of July 1983 on improving the efficiency of the Community structural funds, which moreover won broad support in Parliament.

I should like now to deal with a number of proposal concerning food aid and cooperation with the developing countries. On food aid, I should like to say first that this is one of the areas in which criticism — at times very forceful — from the Court of Auditors is often given too much general significance. It is a very delicate area — we all know that — for it is a concrete human problem we are faced with, which we want to solve by giving the help needed. It has to be done quickly; it often has to be done under conditions which are difficult to gauge in areas in which the infrastructure has perhaps more or less broken down, in which there is no real local administration on any scale, and this combination of factors of course often results in mistakes and failure to use resources effectively.

Even so I do not think that we should generalize on the basis of these experiences, for we can ask ourselves whether it is at all possible under the conditions in which food aid has to be given always to provide the administration which we are able to see, after the event, would have been most effective. The lack of knowledge and information on the possibilities present at the precise moment at which we have to take the decisions and distribute the aid is bound to result in mistakes in many cases. We should not therefore generalize from this criticism; we should instead try to improve our system wherever we can. There are a number of possibilities, and for that reason the Commission will examine carefully any suggestions from Parliament.

I can also say that for some considerable time already we have been studying the advantages and disadvantages of the proposal to use our stocks of farm produce for food aid. It is a proposal which is often raised in the public debate, but I think there is reason to stress, since it has been raised in the discussions here, that it will be costly for the Community to have such stocks in any circumstances, regardless of whether they are used for food aid or not. A genuine policy of food aid cannot be based exclusively on the existence of such stocks, for they do not in many cases meet the real needs for support around the world. Finally it is also clear that the European farmers cannot themselves, as an isolated group, be expected to part-finance the Community's food aid. I merely mention these three points, because they form a necessary element in the debate.

With regard to support for the developing countries, I realize that the comments in the motion for a resolution

are correct. The Commission is faced with a number of structural problems in this area which we must try to overcome. They are not straightforward ones, but I agree with the comments.

Finally I should like to say a few words on the question of discharge for the ECSC accounts for 1983. The rapporteur, Mr Härlin, was not present, but Mr Aigner stood in for him. It was proposed that discharge should be granted. I welcome that, but the proposal contains a number of comments and requests to the Commission. To begin with, in point 5 of the motion for a resolution there is a demand that the Committee on Budgetary Control be supplied both with information on loans which are covered by the banks' rule of confidentiality and with the names of the officials who dealt with the business in question. I cannot meet that request. I do not think that it will make for sound administration in these matters if the private banking system is obliged to provide information on its affairs in areas in which it is subject to the rule of confidentiality *vis-à-vis* customers and consumers. I also do not think it reasonable to supply the names of the officials who handle the business. The Commission, which carries the political responsibility, must also be answerable for mistakes. The responsibility cannot rest on people performing a task in an administrative capacity. If the Commission learns that the officials in question have made errors, it must take the necessary action in respect of those persons.

The second comment concerns various other points in the resolution, in the first instance the request for information on a long list of technical matters regarding control, which are normally examined by the Court of Auditors. I think that these requests should be looked at more closely. To the extent that it falls within Parliament's brief, clearly Parliament should have the information, and I will certainly come back and discuss the matter with the Committee on Budgetary Control if this wish is upheld.

As I stated at the beginning of my speech, Mr President, the Commission will take steps to act on the points set out in the motion for a resolution. We shall report on the matter first in the form of a preliminary report in September 1985 and then in the report which accompanies the revenue and expenditure account for the financial year 1985. Clearly we shall do all we can to accommodate the wishes Parliament puts forward on the initiative of the Committee on Budgetary Control. We shall also not forget the wishes contained in the Council's detailed proposals, and the same applies to the wishes of the Court of Auditors. Equally clearly, the many proposals and requests put to us will strain our working resources, not just for one year but for several.

The Commission therefore hopes that, in cooperation with Parliament and the other institutions, it will be able to solve the problems which we are now taking up so much time to discuss and which in the vast majority

Christophersen

of cases are real problems. I should like to express my appreciation for the interest taken and efforts made by both Parliament and the other institutions. Clearly, as I said at the beginning, the Commission is perhaps not able to agree with all the conclusions reached, but that does not alter the fact that we have a common ambition which we wish to bring to fruition.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER*Vice-President*

President. — I should like to thank Commissioner Christophersen for his very profound, conscientious and detailed answers to the comments made so far.

I should also like to thank Mr Marcel Mart, President of the Court of Auditors, who is following the debate from the gallery.

(Applause)

Mr Wettig (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. Mr Price's report on the discharge for the 1983 budgetary year contains no spectacular criticisms by the Committee on Budgetary Control of the European Community's spending policy. Nor does the Committee propose, as it did last year, that the Commission be refused a discharge for this budget, although there were also a great number of points in the 1983 budget year to which we had objected in earlier years and which could have prompted us to refuse the Commission a discharge for 1983 also.

The Committee deliberately refrained from doing this and thus accepted the proposals of the rapporteur, who wished to compile a kind of interim account, summarizing the experience of the various discharge years since 1979 and submitting this to Parliament in the form of a wide-ranging report, from which conclusions for the future could be drawn. The proposals put forward today by the rapporteur on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control are a major contribution to improving the discharge procedure. This is one of the achievements of latter years. If they are accepted here they will also help in future to strengthen the European Parliament, and for this reason they are fully endorsed by the Socialist Group.

We should have liked to see some passages formulated more precisely, but this readiness on our part to say things rather more clearly will not cause us to vote against this report, should our amendments be rejected. We shall continue to support it. Not only in committee, but also here today in the plenary sitting we have noted with pleasure that the new Commis-

sioner for budgetary affairs has emphasized the Commission's readiness to open up an intensive dialogue with the European Parliament. What he said in committee and here too at the plenary sitting goes beyond a formal pledge. He has touched on a large number of points which, if adopted in the Commission's budgetary policy, could mean great progress in the future. I think this is essential, for the constant criticisms levelled at the Commission's spending policy harm not only the Commission but the Community as a whole, and we must thus all work together towards finding a solution at least in the next few years.

Let me first of all deal with two criticisms which the Commissioner has rejected. I think the Commission would be well advised to listen to the rapporteur when he proposes greater precision, when Parliament says 'calls on', 'recommends', etc. I do not think it would be right for Parliament always to have to fall back on its two instruments of sanction against the Commission, i.e. the vote of no confidence and the refusal to grant a discharge. These are crude weapons which can be used only rarely and which are not usually adequate to express criticism of the Commission's budgetary actions. And I do not think that Parliament's competence as part of the budget authority and its full competence as regards the discharge can be properly appreciated if its only recourse in this area is to use its two sanctions.

The second point concerns the confidentiality of documents. I believe that as part of a parliament's full responsibility for supervisory control it must have access under a special procedure, which we lack at present — a weakness in our Rules of Procedure — to documents which are confidential, or at least to documents on which Commission decisions have been based. No one in the Committee on Budgetary Control proposes to plough through mountains of paper, but important documents used as a basis for significant Commission decisions must also be available to the Control Committee, and they must also be available for the reason that such documents have been taken account of in the Court of Auditors' decision and report. If this House wishes to do justice to the Court of Auditors' comments it must also, where necessary, be able to refer to confidential Commission documents.

Permit me now to make a few comments on a number of points which the Socialist Group endorses particularly warmly. Firstly, there is the question of how to introduce greater transparency into the Commission's budget activities, starting with the balance sheet of the Communities' assets and liabilities. The Commissioner has said a lot of sensible things on this, and we endorse his efforts to create greater transparency here. He also supports the Budgetary Control Committee's proposal for three-year financial forecasts and has taken a positive attitude towards the problems which have arisen in recent years over the uses of the European Community's budget and have caused us concern

Wettig

particularly in connection with the budgetary control procedure.

I will also consider the very serious questions raised by the rapporteur in his report concerning the European Community's income and own resources. I believe this is a most important point to which we and the Commission should give joint consideration in the next few years. It is, I think, no longer acceptable that we should have a system of own resources but that these own resources are raised by Member States in a widely varying fashion and that the varying administrative practices of Member States are making the problems in this area ever more acute.

Our problem child in recent years has always been the common agricultural policy, especially expenditure under the EAGGF Guarantee Section. The rapporteur's report makes once again a whole range of old criticisms. We look for results from this year's proposed review of the common agricultural policy which will then have practical consequences for the European Community's spending policy. In particular we hope that the cost-benefit analyses we keep hearing about in this report will lead to changes in the CAP especially in those beleaguered areas where we have increasingly been forced to wonder in recent years whether our conduct of the common agricultural policy was making any sense.

This area also includes the point which the Commissioner covered very positively, the question of value losses which has caused us many problems over the last few years. We must now find a solution which meets the requirements of budgetary transparency. The present system, under which the Commission has considerable freedom to manipulate these losses and include them in the budget or not, is no longer acceptable.

May I also raise a few points on the subject of food aid. I think we need to pay greater attention to this subject in the immediate future, especially in view of the public expectations of food aid from the European Community. The rapporteur's actual report contains only a small number of points. If we take the working document, the opinion of the committee responsible, we find regrettably that of the 24 paragraphs adopted no less than half begin with the words 'regrets', 'criticizes', 'is concerned at'. These are all the central points of the committee's opinion, in which it disagrees with the way in which the European Community administers and gives its food aid. Action is really required here, and we shall concern ourselves with it in the course of this year when the Commission submits its reports on the implementation of this resolution. I can say this quite emphatically on behalf of my group: in the conflict with the Council which will certainly ensue the Commission will have our full support, for it is also clear that although we criticize and revile the Commission, the real fault lies with the Council and the Member States. The Commission can

be confident of having the full support of the European Parliament in this matter. We hope for positive cooperation in the years to come.

Mr Aigner (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. The members and associates of your Committee have worked hard in close cooperation with many of Parliament's committees over a period of months. In my capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control I should like to say a word of thanks to all those involved and especially to Mr Price, who has produced a remarkable report.

I do not think that all our colleagues have an opportunity of following the work of the Budgetary Control Committee actively, so I will describe it briefly. In close cooperation with the European Court of Auditors, the Commission and particularly its internal audit departments together with individual Commissioners and officials, necessary corrections to the work of the European Community are often made — unbeknown to the public — and these are often preceded by months of discussion and argument.

In this context I should like to express special thanks to the members and officials of the European Court of Auditors. I am glad to see its President here with us today. The Court of Auditors and parliamentary control are to some extent fingers on the same hand. The European Parliament relies on the control mechanisms of the Court of Auditors and the Court relies on Parliament's potential weapon of political sanction. But precisely because each party acknowledges the independence and areas of competence of the other this particularly happy working atmosphere has grown up between us and is evident in our relations. Mr Vice-President, you spoke of the Court of Auditor's tendency to dramatize. I agree that when isolated examples are picked out and an issue is subjected to public scrutiny using those isolated examples, that could lead to a kind of dramatization. But on the other hand the Court of Auditors is able only to take samples, and isolated examples are then indicative of the fact that something is wrong. That is then not dramatization but, I hope, a tangible illustration which enables us to secure the blessing of public opinion.

This year's discharge discussions naturally took place against the background of last year's refusal. Ongoing responsibility is not denied by any of the parties concerned. The proposal for a discharge, now before you, does not mean, however — and we are all agreed on that — that we think the old Commission's policy in 1983 was any better than it was in 1982. Many, indeed most of the European Court of Auditor's criticisms are acted upon, and appropriate requirements are introduced. The decision to grant a discharge does not mean that indicated shortcomings no longer exist, but that they can only be evaluated in connection with the recommendations and requirements expressed.

Aigner

It would be wrong for anyone in the institutions to conclude that the granting of a discharge removes all objections — on the contrary, it imposes a pressing obligation actually to fulfil the instructions and directives contained in the resolution.

In this report the Committee has made clear distinctions — the Vice-President has gone into them — between recommendations, suggestions or instructions and demands to the various institutions.

Mr Vice-President, you spoke of the semantic problems entailed over the various words. I think the discussion has made clear to all those involved what is meant by Parliament's demands to the Commission or the other institutions. But the proposal for a discharge is based particularly, and I can say this most emphatically, on the attitude of the new Commission which has shown that it fully recognizes the European Parliament's claim under the law concerning the discharge and is prepared to take follow-up measures as a result. What we have heard today was somewhat more cautious. I should thus like to say a few words on the legal position surrounding the power to grant the final discharge.

The decision to grant a discharge can only be understood as a legislative act whose directives have binding legal effect. If Parliament has the right to dismiss the Commission, then this greater right encompasses the lesser right to impose requirements where it possesses legislative powers — and the decision to grant a discharge is a legislative act — and this lesser right must be acknowledged as part of the greater right.

I am also convinced that the European Court of Justice would uphold our interpretation in any contentious lawsuit, provided of course, and I say this most clearly, that the decision to grant a discharge and its requirements did not go beyond the limits of the European Parliament's legal position.

I would remind you, Mr Vice-President, that the report's first version contained a proposal and demand on own resources policy. We explained that this would be exceeding Parliament's legal position, and after detailed discussion we voted by a large majority and with the approval of the rapporteur to drop this demand. So we are well aware of the legal limitations surrounding the decision to grant a discharge. But we shall not cease to regard the demands as pressing ones.

Permit me a further comment on the subject. I myself am convinced that this Parliament will, together with the Council, obtain legislative powers. It would thus be a good thing if the Commission and the individual institutions would slowly get used to fulfilling the majority wishes of Parliament. You rightly pointed out, Mr Vice-President, that to ensure the upholding of the lawful position the EEC Treaty granted the European Parliament an appropriate instrument in the form of the power to refuse a discharge and the conse-

quent vote of no confidence, which it is compelled to use in cases of urgent need.

This also means a voluntary commitment by the European Parliament for the next few years. Let me say it again: if this resolution and the decision are adopted, this constitutes a voluntary commitment by Parliament to follow up the requirements consistently in the next few years. Your Committee will take great care to see that this is in fact done.

I believe that these comments of mine on the legal position were necessary following the Vice-President's statement, as I think not all of us are as yet familiar with the significance of the vote to grant a discharge.

Unfortunately there is not enough time to repeat even the most important of the demands made of the Commission. But I would ask you to pursue the following concerns with particular energy and enthusiasm. The system of advances, primarily in the agricultural market sector, together with its controls up to and including a faster rendering of accounts, needs to be thoroughly reviewed. I believe there are many ways of disciplining the Member States. Appropriate instruments must be created. If the Member States are obliged to reckon with financial disadvantages, even the poorest administration will often operate rather better and faster than it would if the threat of sanctions were not present.

We cannot concern ourselves here with financial reports which are often submitted for our appraisal when they are already five years old. We know that it is then no longer possible to safeguard the Community's interests as regards its income and claims.

In future budget negotiations in the Council and Parliament, commitments entered into which are not covered by appropriations for payment carried forward — we have heard of this today from a number of speakers — should be updated. I am always fascinated to see that our colleagues in the national parliaments have absolutely no idea of the huge commitments which face us.

We shall probably, Mr Vice-President, see the example of the ketchup bottle becoming reality next year. I am convinced that Parliament and its Committee on Budgets will very soon realize that even if the Community's share of value-added tax is raised to 1.4% we shall again find ourselves scraping the barrel next year. We cannot discuss and impose a new income policy with the Member States every year. This would also go beyond the limits of what the national parliaments can do.

The ongoing conflict between Parliaments's budgetary powers and the legislative powers of the Council over initiatives for new policies in which Parliament has the last word must not, and this is an inescapable appeal to the Commission, lead to the blockading of Parlia-

Aigner

ment's budgetary powers and powers of initiative. Mr Vice-President, I call on the Commission urgently to give a lead here soon. If the Council blocks our budgetary powers we must, on the basis of the draft budget which is so to speak a budgetary law, try to push through these new policies.

With a view to stricter supervision of own resources by the Commission we submitted draft legislation to the Council in 1979, 1982 and 1983 without the slightest reaction. I believe your Committee ought soon to hold a hearing so that the Council is forced under threat of public sanction to do what is necessary.

May I in conclusion thank the Commissioner most warmly. He has followed our discussions in committee for days with sensitivity, insight and great willingness, and has provided us with answers. I greatly appreciate this new style on the part of the Commission. But there is one thing, Mr Vice-President, which you must on no account sweep under the carpet. We insist that in cases where your own financial controller has refused to give his approval, you should make the relevant documents available to us.

You told me face to face that we should get these papers from the Court of Auditors. Of course we could do this, but I must tell you that it is a prime right of parliamentary controls *vis-à-vis* the institutions to see the necessary papers which led to the refusal of approval, for it is after all Parliament which has to make the decision here. I should be sorry if this case led to conflict.

Mr Simmonds (ED). — Mr President, I should like to start like other Members by congratulating the rapporteur and thanking him for the vast amount of work that he put into the preparation of this report. It is traditional for Members of this Parliament to congratulate rapporteurs, but I think members of the Committee on Budgetary Control know that this year has seen an exceptional amount of work go into what I believe is a very good report.

Mr Price's explanatory statement, which I commend to all Members of this House for bedtime reading, starts with the quotation: 'No taxation without representation'. And it is interesting, Mr President, to note that the Members of this Parliament who normally make the most noise about abuse of Community's or taxpayers' money are not here this morning when we are discussing the accounts of the European Communities.

(Applause)

It is also interesting to note that those people who moan that this Parliament has no power are missing on the very day when one of Parliament's major powers is being exercised and its muscles are being flexed. There can be no clearer evidence, Mr President, of the difference between those who merely talk in this place

for the benefit of their national newspapers and those who work to promote the good of the people of Europe and of its institutions — the job that they are actually paid to do.

Mr President, the rapporteur has made the most of the discharge process this year. Some Members of this House regard the discharge procedure as being only of retrospective and historical interest. But Mr Price has introduced genuinely constructive criticism and recommendations for resolving the shortcomings of Community expenditure and hence of Community policy. For example, for how many hours has the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food and the Committee on Development and Cooperation complained about the cost of surpluses and how difficult it is to get food to the hungry nations? Mr Price has spelt out very clearly the sensible bookkeeping exercise to make more aid available quicker at little or no extra real cost. In the coming year, we in my group — and I hope the Committee on Budgetary Control as a whole — will monitor very closely the implementation of this recommendation and also those relating to the understaffing of the food aid section in the Commission. The bureaucratic procedure between the development and the agricultural directorates of the Commission is far too cumbersome for implementing food aid decisions when they are most needed. It is all very well for the Commissioner to say that actually food aid is not what the hungry nations really need. It was six months ago and that is when we should have been acting rather faster. I accept that there is a need now for more diversified aid.

But, Mr President, this is just one of many policy areas which must be regularly reviewed by the committee, and the reports which Mr Price has produced must be very much part of an ongoing exercise by the Committee on Budgetary Control to make sure that the criticisms we have identified are actually heeded.

Mr Christophersen, I was particularly disappointed with your argument about semantics and the difficulties of interpretation into the seven languages of the Community. Nothing, but nothing, could be clearer than the definition in paragraph 1 of the resolution which states that when Parliament calls upon the Commission to do something in the discharge decision that institution is required to take action and to take the action called for, failing which, a motion of no confidence in, and to dismiss the Commission would follow. Last year, Parliament wasted its power of refusal of discharge by failing to have the proper grounds to dismiss the Commission in a subsequent resolution. I give notice that when my name is on the list of those refusing discharge, it will also be on a motion to dismiss the Commission. But having said those harsh words, Mr Commissioner, may I say that my group are very impressed by your enthusiasm and your direction in the first months of your new job and we intend to support you in that role and to urge you

Simmonds

to even greater things in reducing bureaucracy and increasing efficiency.

Mr President, this report is a major step forward in the constructive work of Parliament and that is why my group will support it.

Mrs Boserup (COM). — *(DA)* Mr President, I should like to point out that I am not speaking on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, which takes very little interest in the budget and discharge debates and has granted me two minutes to deal with the matter. I do not therefore have any time for thank yous or pats on the back. I can only explain why I am the reason that Mr Price's report has not been adopted unanimously. I have a serious objection to Mr Price's attempt by means of semantics to enable Parliament to arrogate to itself power which it does not have. I could not vote in favour of that.

I am very dissatisfied with the rather vague way in which it gets round something that was a problem last year, namely the provision of documents to Parliament. This is a step backwards which I cannot support. I am equally dissatisfied with the fact that we have had to take a step backwards — or the rapporteur proposes that we take a step backwards — in respect of information on smaller organizations which receive money from the Commission. For that reason I have tabled an amendment. With regard to the amendments in general, I can also say that broadly speaking I support what has been proposed by the Socialist Group, which of course will not be a surprise to many people.

Regarding the Communist Group and its votes, I can only say that those communists who happen to be present at the time will support Mr Price's report. But I cannot be expected to do so. I think that Mr Price in his eagerness to support the new Commissioner — and that is very laudable — has gone a little too far. After all we cannot assume in advance that the new Commissioner, on the strength of diligence and fine words, will also be able to implement our wishes. The Commission is a collective body, and the new Commissioner may, with all the will in the world, still meet with difficulties. At all events it is not our experience that such talk of changing the Commission's working procedures comes as an easy task for the individual Commissioner.

Mrs Scrivener (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I of course join all those who have thanked the rapporteur for the enormous amount of work that he has done and should also like to tell the Commissioner how much we appreciate the efforts that he has just made to make matters as clear as possible when dealing with a difficult subject.

I shall confine myself to presenting the amendments which I tabled on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

First of all, we have called for the insertion of a paragraph at the beginning of the motion for a resolution restating in clear terms exactly what is entailed in the power of discharge conferred upon Parliament. This power consists in a political evaluation of the financial and budgetary management of the Community. In exercising this power, Parliament, having reviewed the management of the Community, states its position in a series of comments on which the Commission is required to act by reason of its responsibility for carrying out the budgetary and financial activities of the Community.

It is out of the question for Parliament to allow its role to be restricted to a purely book-keeping approach to the financial management of the Community, since Parliament is a political institution and must conduct itself accordingly. On the other hand, the discharge should not be looked upon as an occasion for debating all aspects of budgetary policy. In other words, the budget forecast should not be the subject of the discharge: there is a Committee on Budgetary Control to perform the watchdog role, there is a Committee on Budgets to attend to matters of budgetary policy. We are therefore slightly disappointed that the report submitted to us today has failed to make this distinction sufficiently clearly and to limit its field of investigation. It is regrettable that there should be two parliamentary committees which sometimes say different things.

Our second amendment is concerned with the Joint Declaration of 30 June 1982, on the subject of which I am afraid that I cannot entirely agree with the Commissioner. At the time, which was of course before you took up office, Mr Commissioner, the Liberal and Democratic Group was opposed to the signature of such a declaration, which had been described in some quarters as the miracle solution which would put an end to the successive budgetary wrangles between the Council and our institution. We said that this declaration would not result in any improvements but that, on the contrary, we were going to lose one of our essential prerogatives, since a budget entry constituted a sufficient legal basis for implementation of appropriations.

We should have been only too pleased now to admit that we were wrong. Unfortunately, there is no evidence to suggest that we were, and the susceptibilities of people in certain quarters will do nothing to change that. In such a context, we find paragraph 23 of the motion for a resolution inadequate, since it simply issues a warning to the Council which will have no effect whatever on its attitude, of that we may rest assured.

We therefore hope that the Committee on Budgetary Control will be charged with the preparation of an alternative to the machinery designed to prevent the blocking of appropriations, since this machinery has

Scrivener

prevented nothing at all. If I am wrong, I should like to hear of just one example.

Mr President, these are the essentials of the amendments proposed by the Liberal Group. For the remainder, we shall of course be supporting Mr Price's report, granting a discharge to the Commission in respect of its implementation of the 1983 budget. On the other hand, as proposed by the Committee on Budgetary Control, we shall be calling for adjournment of the decisions on granting a discharge in respect of the second third and fourth European Development Funds.

Mr Cicciomessere (NI). — *(IT)* Mr President, I think that Parliament is now evading the fundamental issue. We cannot in fact disregard the decision to refuse discharge for 1982, just as we cannot belie or disown the judgements, the requests underlying that decision.

The question, therefore, to which we must now reply is very precise. In executing the 1983 budget, have the problems that were raised in connection with 1982 been solved? If we did not make this check, we should be placing a question mark not only over the previous decisions, but also over the very protection of the powers and prerogatives of Parliament itself. All the other questions, therefore, seem to me quite irrelevant in relation to this basic problem.

If we read the report of the Court of Auditors and the observations contained in Mr Price's report, in fact, the answer to this fundamental question can only be negative.

Because time does not allow me to go further, I will refer only to a sector on which the attention of the European Parliament was focused when 1982 came under examination — that is to say, technical cooperation with the developing countries. I now ask again the same question: has the situation in 1983 improved in relation to 1982? Has positive action been taken, have the problems raised in 1982 been solved? If that is not the case it is obvious that Parliament cannot contradict the very decisions of 1982. Well now, if we read the report of the Court of Auditors regarding the level of utilization of allocations for this sector, we can see that, from a 65.3% rate of utilization in 1982, we have fallen to 62.6% for 1983.

How, ladies and gentlemen, faced with that decision for 1982, can we now, when the situation has got worse, grant budgetary discharge? It is not sufficient to limit our action to the allocation of funds: we have to check how they are used. Well now, as far as the programming and coordination of aid are concerned, and the quality of the results, the reports are disturbing.

I therefore propose, Mr President, that discharge be refused for 1983, or alternatively that Parliament

investigate certain problems raised in the report of the Court of Auditors and in Mr Price's report, postponing, therefore, the granting of discharge.

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR*Vice-President*

Mr Ryan (PPE). — Mr President, I wish to speak on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control on the very important matter of revenue. There are a number of quite unacceptable disparities in payments by national treasuries to the European Community of revenues which are the property of the Community. Equity demands that financial authorities everywhere should have common standards of honesty, efficiency and interpretation and that each Member State should pay over the revenues due to the EEC on the same date. Quite clearly, if the authorities in some Member States fail to meet their obligations, radical changes will have to be made in the system of collecting taxes. If needs be, inefficient national authorities will have to be replaced by Community tax collectors. At the very least the national administrations will have to be subjected to systematic and rigorous inspection.

Parliament deplores the crass failure of the Council of Ministers to take corrective action on tax collections, as sought again and again since 1979 by the Commission, Parliament and the Court of Auditors. It is intolerable that necessary reforms can be blocked by the worst offenders using the veto in the Council so that they can continue to pay less than their fair share of revenue because of their own notorious inefficiency and guile. They will continue to get away with this financial scandal until the veto is abolished and Parliament's powers are increased.

The Committee on Budgetary Control notes with alarm and anger that while some Member States consistently pay a higher proportion of the EEC's revenue from VAT than is called for by their respective levels of wealth and a higher proportion of customs duty than is required by their share of total Community imports, others get away with collecting less VAT than their level of wealth and consumption would justify and apparently with under-collecting customs duty. For instance, whereas domestic consumption in Italy represents 18.9% of total EEC consumption, Italian VAT returns are only 13.1% of total VAT payments by Member States of the EEC. Italy imports 15.7% of total imports into Europe from outside the Community, but customs duties remitted by Italy to the Community are only 9.4% of total EEC customs duties. By way of comparison, Ireland's consumption is only 0.8% of total European consumption, but Ireland's VAT payments to the Community represent 0.9%. Ireland's imports from countries outside the

Ryan

EEC are 0.9% of total EEC imports, but Ireland pays 1.4% of total customs duties received by the Community. These figures suggest that Ireland is obliged to carry a VAT burden of 12.5% in excess of its fair share and a customs duty burden of 55% in excess of its share, while Italy pays only 66% of its due share of Community revenue, or 34% less than it ought to be paying.

Marginal differences in tax collections and payments might reasonably be expected when 10 different national administrations are involved, but this scale of discrepancy and distortion is too large to tolerate any longer. Parliament must insist upon extensive and immediate corrective action. It is to be hoped therefore that there will be unanimous support for the resolution today.

The reasons for discrepancies in tax payments, assessments and collections are many. Some governments are more efficient than others. The black economy thrives to a greater extent in certain countries than in others. There are immense national differences in legal provisions, law enforcements, penalties and, indeed, attitudes relating to tax avoidance and evasion. Unfortunately there are less savoury reasons for variations, including fraud and other criminal activities such as drug trafficking. For example, it is known that in one region VAT revenues are only one-quarter of what would be appropriate to the local level of consumption, but expenditure in that region is believed to be fed by incomes criminally derived from traffic in drugs and the repatriation of monies extorted elsewhere in protection rackets.

When to inefficiencies in tax collections are added deliberate delays by certain Member States in making due payments of revenue to the Community, inequities grow to scandalous proportions. It is right that Parliament should supervise Community expenditure, but, equally important is overseeing the collection of revenue, particularly when, as now, the Community is short of cash for vital policies.

Mr Schreiber (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. May I say a few words in this morning's debate on the discharge concerning the subject of fruit and vegetables with reference to the EAGGF Guarantee Section.

We have often been concerned in recent weeks and months with this subject and I expect that we shall shortly be concerning ourselves with it again when the reports which have been called for are forthcoming. I am glad to see that Mr Price has incorporated the necessary conclusions in his report and I am confident that Parliament will endorse them today; I shall be happy if it does.

Fruit and vegetables, accounting for some 7% of total expenditure in the Guarantee Section, is relatively

small. But it is politically very important to the Community. We all know that there is great public indignation over campaigns to destroy foodstuffs. MEPs from the Federal Republic of Germany in particular are constantly asked about this abuse, and in view of the problems of feeding the Third World it may fairly be described as a scandal. I think it is intolerable that we in the Community have to spend 1 200 million ECU on intervention for fruit and vegetables when we could use this money far better as future expenditure by our Community.

In my view such words are necessary even in a discharge debate, for the budget figures show us that we can assume the Community to be financially in trouble. The Commission would be well advised not to play down the undesirable situation in the fruit and vegetable sector, as one so often has the feeling that it does.

Again in 1983 large quantities of fruit and vegetables were produced virtually for intervention alone. Let me give a few examples: in 1982/83 75% of lemons taken off the market, 83% of mandarins and no less than 97% of oranges ended up by being destroyed. These figures prove to my mind that the Commission oversimplifies when it just lumps the enormous quantities of products which are not marketed and are — as in the case of citrus fruits — virtually all destroyed, together with total fruit and vegetable production, then concluding that only about 1% of the Community's total fruit and vegetable production remains really unused.

In my view there is room for change and improvement here. It should start with decisions on prices which are needed in the fruit and vegetables sector and not only for cereals, of concern to the northern regions, if clear signals are to be given for production so that surpluses do not increase even further in the next few years. The Commission's proposals for the coming farm year seem to be a step in the right direction.

But in this connection we should remember another point which reflects badly on the Community, viz. the frauds and irregularities which regrettably have become wide-spread in this sector also. In January our honourable friend Mr De Pasquale revealed that the Community, and thus the tax payer, had sustained great financial losses through fraudulent practices in the fruit and vegetable sector. And so in future the numbers of Commission staff carrying out on-the-spot checks must at all costs be increased so that such irregularities and frauds can be looked for consistently and with hopes of success.

When we hear from one Member State that 400 000 tonnes of an expected harvest of 900 000 tonnes are to be exported to the Member States, and 500 000 tonnes withdrawn from the market, then all the alarm bells should ring and something must be done urgently to remedy this abuse — even if it means the financial

Schreiber

consequence of reducing advances or reclaiming funds.

Our amendment calls for a special report to investigate these practices. We Socialists would be glad if this amendment were endorsed by a majority of the House. We also ask that quality controls should be improved, production structures adjusted more quickly and non-marketable qualities made ineligible for intervention so that the deplorable practice of destroying fruit and vegetables can be consistently countered.

We think it very important that the distribution of surpluses should be better organized. In the Federal Republic of Germany, for example, we have found it to be very unsatisfactory. To date there has been too little distribution free of charge of intervention fruit and vegetables. But this is a sensible way of getting rid of production surpluses. Welfare and charitable organizations can benefit, and there is much ground to be made up here. Over the last ten years, for example, in the Federal Republic of Germany on average only 4% of apples withdrawn from the market were distributed and, as our honourable friend Klaus Wettig has said, potential beneficiaries such as welfare organizations, old people's homes and prisons are largely unaware that these intervention products can be had free of charge.

I think the European institutions have a public relations job to do here to make the populace more aware. Consequently we call on the appropriate national ministries and other government bodies to organize the distribution of these products, with the ensuing freight costs also being subsidized by the Community. Finally, the Commission should lay before us as soon as possible proposals for the effective organization of free distribution.

Spending under the Guarantee Fund for fruit and vegetables is in my view following a dangerous course. Commitments here to date suggest that the Community's agricultural policy can no longer be allowed to rest on the crumbling foundation of subsidized surplus production followed by some destruction of food-stuffs. The 1983 budget discharge report thus shows us that swift correction is absolutely essential.

(Applause)

Mr Marck (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, as my particular brief in the Committee on Budgetary Control is the consequences of the dairy policy, I shall confine myself to this subject.

1983, on which we are now called upon to grant a discharge, is emerging as a key year in the assessment of the dairy policy. The fact that in 1985 we have 300 000 tonnes of butter more than 18 months old in cold store in Europe is due to the pursuit in 1983 of a storage

policy which now seems extremely questionable. The policy which the Commission adopted in 1983 was short-sighted. It was better for the budget in the short term to store butter, and the Commission consequently failed to sell it to potential customers. At that time the world market price was some 400 dollars above the lowest GATT price. At that time a more active marketing policy would have stood a better chance than the year before. Today a million tonnes of butter has a value of 3 180 m ECU, which at financing costs of 8% is already costing about 260 m ECU a year, and to this must be added storage costs and loss of value. You can work out for yourselves what impact so short-sighted a policy, geared entirely to the budget, will have in the long term. You have mortgaged the future by failing to take appropriate measures at the right time. The management of stocks in the dairy sector must be thoroughly reviewed, and it is all too easy to shift the burden of responsibility for this on to the common agricultural policy. As part of the budgetary authority, Parliament has a right to be fully informed of the marketing and storage policy.

And now just a few words on the co-responsibility levy. Not even half the revenue was spent on promoting sales, developing new markets and improving products, although this is what the additional revenue was intended for. That at least was the reason you gave the farmers for this new levy. But this ultimately reduces the resources set aside for agricultural expenditure and disguises the appropriations for purposes like those I have just mentioned. Parliament must be kept fully informed about this too.

In short, Mr President, the dairy policy, which the public watches closely, is devoid of openness and transparency and is all too heavily inspired by mere budgetary motives. Only an active marketing policy will improve matters, and I hope that the new Commission will adopt such a policy. The proposals which Commissioner Andriessen has now made for the examination of the marketing policy point in this direction. I hope that we can talk about this at greater length next time and perhaps detect a clearer line in this dairy policy.

(Applause)

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Mr President, first of all, I like many of my colleagues, would like to begin by congratulating Mr Price for the very valuable work that he did, for the great efforts that he put into this report; a report which the members of the British Labour Group will be voting for, but a report which we, notwithstanding those comments, believe can be improved if the amendments from the Socialist Group are adopted.

We will be voting for the report not because we are fully satisfied with the way in which the Community's finances were handled in 1983, but because the deci-

Tomlinson

sion and resolution highlight many issues and give us a basis which we will expect to be observed fully in future years. Vice-President Christophersen's statements of intention to the committee were well received. The discharge resolution will form an important basis upon which we will make judgments in future years about how he has translated his good intentions into reality.

I would just like to highlight particularly three or four parts of the report before coming on to the major thing that I want to discuss, which is Community fraud.

We will expect the Commission to observe very strictly paragraph 4 concerning documents. It is an untenable position for the Committee on Budgetary Control not to have full access to the documentation which has been made available to other Community institutions. If we are asserting our rights as parliamentarians, we cannot and will not allow that situation to continue. We will give notice in passing this resolution today that the Commission's activities in relation to paragraph 4 will be fundamental to our future thinking.

Equally, paragraph 14 about 3-year financial forecasts is important to ensure that we are not living year to year, but have the opportunity of seeing what progress is being made on the 3-year forecasts and the liquidation commitments. Again we will look very closely in the future to see how the Commission is responding.

But the most important parts of the report are contained in a number of paragraphs: paragraph 24, concerning the substantial under-collection of VAT, paragraph 30 which points out that there is no regular provision for systematic and obligatory transmission to the Commission of information on frauds and irregularities. There is a whole series of areas like this which cause us concern because we do not believe that this Parliament is satisfying the citizens of Europe that we are taking our responsibilities seriously enough where the elimination of fraud within Community institutions is concerned.

Fraud is a major problem, and the disillusionment with Europe inside the United Kingdom is caused by the fact that the main news they get through the media is about fraud on a regular and systematic basis and the apparent unwillingness of European institutions — in particular the Council — to take the necessary action to deal with this problem. I want to emphasize that the fight against fraud, which is reflected but not dealt with in any great detail in today's contributions, has to be a major priority of this Parliament and of the Committee on Budgetary Control.

Fraud diminishes our own resources. Fraud falsifies the impact of Community expenditure and diminishes its efficiency as a catalyst for Community involvements in projects across the board, not merely in agriculture. Fraud leads to a diversion of funds from legitimate to

illegitimate activities and the diversion of Community resources acts as a support for terrorism. Fraud tarnishes the Community image in the eyes of the general public. Fraud typifies the failure of the Council to do what is necessary to meet its responsibility to legislate in the Community interests.

This must be an important aspect of Parliament's control duties in the coming years. To that end, the recommendation that comes in paragraph 93 is fundamentally important. By passing this decision we have decided to examine the following matters in separate reports by the Committee on Budgetary Control. That includes as a major report the examination of fraud, the fraud that not only diminishes us as having failed to deal with our discharge responsibilities properly, but diminishes the image of the Community in the eyes of the citizens of Europe. This is a major task that nobody else will take on and for which this Parliament must accept the responsibility.

Mr Cornelissen (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, it is my task to make a few comments on the research policy. The great source of anxiety in our Community is high unemployment. If this problem is really to be solved, it is essential for Europe to catch up with the United States and Japan in the field of technology. The Community must therefore join forces in research. I will give you a few catchwords: information technology, telecommunications, biotechnology, energy generation. These industries may be more important to the economy in the coming decades than the coal and steel sector has been this century. And let there be no misunderstanding: the Community can only hold its own in these sectors if joint action is taken.

If a European approach is adopted to research, Mr President, a guilder will be worth as much as an ECU. But this presupposes that we are decisive in our attitude and decision-making. The Court of Auditors refers to a lack of consistency in the honouring of commitments in research. Clearer instructions and better guidance are needed. The procedures for the conclusion of contracts and the supervision of their execution also leave something to be desired, according to the Court of Auditors.

Mr President, the Council and Commission can help out here. I therefore hope that the Commission and above all the Council will take this harsh criticism to heart, and I would ask them in particular to read paragraphs 59 to 66 of the resolution carefully.

I would also call on the Council and Commission to pay special attention to the interests of small and medium-sized undertakings. They can make a significant contribution both to research and to the creation of new jobs, as the United States has shown.

Those who want Europe to emerge from the *impasse* must invest in its future. Joint research is a golden opportunity for this.

Mr Vergeer (PPE), draftsman of an opinion for the Committee on Development and Cooperation. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to say a few words on the granting of a discharge for 1983 in my capacity as draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Development and Cooperation.

The Committee on Development and Cooperation is, of course, seriously disturbed about the criticism expressed by the Court of Auditors, especially as much of this criticism is voiced year after year. We also note — and I want to emphasize this — that significant improvements have been made in the meantime, in the two years that have elapsed. I would remind the House, for example, of the great effort that has been made to alleviate the shortage of food in Ethiopia. I hardly need dwell on the mistakes which have been made, because everyone is familiar with them: food aid that arrives too late, unacceptable losses of quality *en route*, projects that grind to a halt because local authorities do not know how to meet recurrent costs, supply routes which do not work, and so on. What does the Commission propose should be done about these things? We should like to see a study made of all the procedures adopted from the time it is decided to grant food aid until it actually reaches the people, with the object of reducing the time involved and maintaining quality until the final stage is reached.

As regards quality control, the appropriations provided are not being put to optimal use. Will the Commission say what problems stand in the way of effective utilization? I realize that so wide-ranging a study will again impose a burden on scarce manpower. But we should like to see it undertaken for two reasons: firstly, different procedures at various stages may lead to the more effective utilization of manpower and resources in the future, and secondly, the criticism levelled at major aspects of our cooperation policy year after year may affect public support for this policy. We certainly cannot blame the bearers of the news for that. But it must spur us on to make improvements. Here again, taking a greater interest now will be an investment in the future.

In its report the Committee on Budgetary Control makes a suggestion which our committee was unable to discuss. It proposes that the possibility of charging food aid from intervention stocks at reduced values should be investigated. I assume that the intention is not to reduce the total budget for development cooperation. It would therefore mean either more food aid or additional resources for other items in Chapter IX. In my opinion, the idea put forward by the Committee on Budgetary Control should be carefully examined by the Committee on Development and Cooperation, which should also consider what is to be done with the resources that then become available. For these reasons, Mr President, I have tabled an amendment to the relevant paragraph, and I hope that Parliament will approve it.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — Mr President, I rise really just to ask a question which will take only half a minute. I had a long series of questions on agricultural frauds which are a matter of record. With the new Commission I am sorely tempted to put another series because I never seem to get satisfactory answers.

My question is this: why should perpetrators of sometimes quite vast frauds enjoy anonymity? The smallest, pettiest criminal in our systems, if he steals five pounds or defrauds someone out of five pounds, is disgraced in the eyes of his fellows by the fact that his name and address is published. For some reason best known to the system here, when a fraud is committed — sometimes involving a vast amount — anonymity is the result. I find this a very strange thing and quite against the jurisdictions of the Community. I would like at some point to get an answer to that.

Mr Price (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, I think we have had an excellent debate this morning. I would just like to take up three issues that emerged particularly from the Commissioner's speech. The first relates to the terminology being adopted in paragraph 1 of the report. The Commissioner raised the point that this was to a large extent a question of semantics. He asked how we can establish the exact meaning of words when, for example, the *Académie française* has spent 300 years trying to do so. The fact is that our definitions are designed particularly to avoid the problems of misunderstandings. If we simply use words that take the *Académie française* 300 years to establish the meaning of, we shall never get our motions implemented. We need to say precisely what we mean. It is to avoid misunderstandings that we are adopting definitions.

I think the Commissioner has understood that point, because he then goes on to object to the Commission having to take the action that Parliament requires of them. His point is that the Council could also then start instructing the Commission. Really? What has the Council been doing for years but instructing the Commission? The Council has tied them up in every possible degree, in every possible regulation. That is what has been happening for years! If the Commission is to secure independence of action, the only way is for the European Parliament to be an adequate countervailing force to the Council. It is for the Commission, therefore, to start taking notice of this Parliament.

Furthermore, we are not talking about creating new powers. We are talking about the exercise of powers that are there in the Financial Regulation, there in the Treaty. Parliament has a supervisory role, and what we are now doing is making sure that we effectively exercise that role.

On the question of clearance of the agricultural accounts, the Commissioner points out reasonably that much of the blame lies with the Member States who

Price

fail to make declarations on time, and so on. But the only way of putting matters right is for the Commission to change the system that they adopt for clearance. Most of the changes can be accomplished within the Commission's existing powers. Their approach to clearance must be to start the work during the year in question and put matters right immediately, rather than waiting for years afterwards.

Finally, on food aid, the Commissioner should note that we are totally with him in saying that food-aid policy should be determined by the needs of the countries involved and development policy considerations. The suggestions we make in this field are in no way simply an effort to get rid of our agricultural stocks. The first objective must be to meet the food aid needs. The agricultural objectives that we attain by the same changes of bookkeeping are actually a by-product, but an extremely useful one.

It is not possible to cover all the points in this debate, because the resolution has something like 80 specific proposals. Most of them have simply remained undebated here although they have received very detailed consideration in the Committee on Budgetary Control.

I would like to thank particularly the chairman of the committee, who is, of course, one of this Parliament's most experienced Members. That experience has been very much to the benefit of the committee, both on this occasion and on so many others.

I would like also to thank the sub-rapporteurs — 17 members of the Committee on Budgetary Control — who have produced reports which are annexed in part D of the report, and also the draughtsmen from the eight spending committees whose reports are contained in part C. For the first time the motion for a resolution draws specific attention to those documents in paragraph 92, and they are important.

The starting-point for our work, apart from the accounts themselves, is the Court of Auditors' annual report. I would like to thank the Court of Auditors not only for that report but also for the help which they have given me during the course of my work. Finally, I thank the Commissioner, because he has already shown his determination to achieve greater control over the Community budget and greater effectiveness in Community expenditure. This Parliament shares most of his objectives and looks forward to working with him on them.

The Commissioner, of course, has the support of the Commission staff. May I draw Members' attention to Annex 15, in the working documents in part D, which shows the dedication of many of the Commission staff? We depend for the implementation of Community policy on the Commission. In that document you will find examples of how over 10% of the Commission's A-grade staff on any typical weekend actually come in

without any payment to continue their work. You will find examples in the Development Directorate-General of how members of the staff show their commitment to the cause that they serve by making payments to charitable bodies in the development aid field out of their own salaries and in other ways.

I think the praises of the so-called 'bureaucrats' in Brussels are usually unsung. I mention them because I think it is important that we work with the Commission to ensure that we build a strong and united Europe.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission.

— (DA) Mr President, thank you for giving me an opportunity, since I realize that the debate is drawing to a close, to present some supplementary points against the background of the very positive discussion we have had here. Clearly I have not been able to comment on every detail of the very wide-ranging proposal which has been under discussion here today. In my first speech I touched upon what I considered to be the most important points. That does not mean that I am not attentive to other aspects which have been raised in the report. A number of matters have been taken up in the debate, and I should like to comment on some of them.

To begin with I should like to thank the chairman of the committee, Mr Aigner, for the expert way in which he directed the cooperation in the committee between the Commission and the committee members. It is not always such an easy matter. I myself, in my earlier days as a parliamentarian, had to act as a committee chairman, and in the European Parliament, where all the members belong essentially to the opposition, clearly the task is even more difficult. I say that because I want to repay Mr Aigner for what he said on his attitude to the Commission by mentioning that I am very attentive to the questions raised by him both on appropriations for payment, which constitute a major problem we have simply not talked about as yet, and on all the appropriations for commitment which are in the pipeline but in respect of which we do not know whether or when they will become active. This is one of the problems raised by the Court of Auditors. Should we consider at some point — and I think we should — how we can change our practice so that unused appropriations for commitment at some stage become dead, if I can use that expression, i.e. are cancelled, or is there some other way to get better discipline into our appropriations system? I also think we are in agreement on the EAGGF accounts — it is only a matter of timescale which separates us here — but I would stress that the Commission has the same intention as Parliament, i.e. action should be taken as soon as at all possible. It still remains to convince the national authorities, but there is no disagreement between the Commission and Parliament with regard to a rapid conclusion.

Christophersen

We are of course also ready to undertake an analysis of the system of advances. This is a key point in the whole process of financial planning and it is clearly in the Commission's interest to have a system which is as finely tuned as possible.

Mr Aigner, together with many others who contributed to the debate, raised the question of access to documents, and this is an issue which has been current for a number of years. Some decisions have indeed been taken in the meantime. There is a reference to this in Mr Price's report. I think that Mr Aigner gave a more precise indication of what he envisaged, but I am not naive, I am well aware that I cannot avoid dealing with the subject by simply referring to this question and, if Parliament presents an opinion in one form or another, clearly we must continue the discussion with a view to devising some procedure which will be satisfactory to us all. But I will take the liberty of mentioning some points which rather surprised me, and that is the extent to which you are preoccupied with document access as such. Is it all that relevant to gain extensive access to information of every conceivable kind? Some of course will say: that's all very well, but the Commission can make a selection. I think that on the face of it an arrangement which ensures greater access to information would indeed be interesting from a scrutiny point of view. But I think we shall have to return to this question. The Commission cannot get away from that, and we shall therefore have to continue our discussion of the problem.

I shall not say any more about the linguistic aspects, because of course it is not primarily a linguistic problem that Mr Price is concerned with. Nor did I say it was; obviously I understood it for what it was, i.e. in the last analysis a political problem. And as parliamentarians we all know — and I too am well aware — that the Commission cannot interpret itself out of a parliamentary conflict. Neither can Parliament. We cannot solve a real problem by semantics. The Commission is well aware of what lies behind the expression 'calls upon'. We know that the light is at red. We in the Commission know that we must start to think seriously, and Parliament has no need to worry about that. When we get down to the real issues, I think the area of disagreement is very small. At one point in the discussion in the Committee on Budgetary Control I even asked Mr Price to be more specific in his wording and use the phrase 'calls upon' at a few points where he had not originally intended to do so.

Mrs Scrivener did not agree with the Commission on the question of the Joint Declaration. I am familiar with the historical development on this point and I myself do not think that the declaration is worded in the best possible way. I just wanted to warn against getting into a situation in which we have nothing to hold on to, because at a time when the Community is essentially beginning to regain its momentum it is important not to fall back into internal institutional conflicts but to hold on to what is of substance, to

things which mean something to the citizens of the Community — not just things which mean something to us here in a narrower circle. I will not therefore say that the Joint Declaration is the best possible solution, but for the moment it is the only one we have.

Mr Tomlinson laid great emphasis on point 30: information on frauds and irregularities. I agree with Mr Tomlinson that it is desirable for the national authorities to supply information automatically. Generally speaking we need the national authorities to honour their obligations more fully. We cannot get a satisfactory solution to the problem of controls unless the Member States are prepared to supply more information, supply it more promptly and give us better access for scrutiny and verification, allow us a certain access to databanks and other sources of information.

In that connection I would say to Mrs Ewing, who raised the question of anonymity with regard to implication in frauds and abuses, that it is also offensive to me that someone can maintain anonymity even when guilty of extensive frauds. Here again we have a problem with the national authorities — now there is some head-shaking — even so I am afraid we have a problem here, because it raises the whole question of the basis on which the national authorities are disposed to supply information. I do not disagree with Mrs Ewing; I also think that people who divert considerable sums of Community money should be brought to book.

Mr Cornelissen touched upon the important question of the significance of research to the Community. I would mention in this connection that the Commission has proposed a doubling of the Community's contribution over the next five years, a Commission initiative which received support in the conclusions to the European Council meeting in Brussels. I think this is one of the fields in which all the institutions work with the same objective in view. I agree with Mr Cornelissen in his analysis of the political need for such measures.

Mr Vergeer asked whether the Commission might perhaps give an indication of the problems it has met with in connection with food aid. If that arouses interest, the Commission will gladly undertake an analysis and make it available to Parliament, for we have indeed met with a number of concrete problems which we would like to have a discussion about.

Finally I should like to address Mr Price and thank him for his remarks on the staff in the services and the work they do. I think Mr Price has made pertinent comment there, for one of the consequences of the problems of control we have is regrettably a risk that the public appraisal of the Community will very often concentrate on the negative aspects. That is why I warned against overdramatizing the conclusions of the Court of Auditors, for it is dangerous to present to the public a picture of the Community as a large bureaucracy which is not even efficient, but allows fraud and

Christophersen

abuse and at the end of the day does nothing. It is important therefore that, on the one hand, we restrict and eliminate abuse but, on the other hand, we must also show public appreciation of the significant work done in the departments of the Commission, Parliament and the Council alike. We must not neglect to say this in public. I therefore wish to thank Mr Price for the wise point he made at the end of his intervention and moreover, Mr President, to thank everyone for the wide-ranging debate we have had here. I shall be glad to come back to Parliament with a report on what decisions the Commission plans to take on that basis.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

2. *Migrant workers*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

- the report (Doc. A 2-4/85) by Mrs Marinaro, on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on the communication from the Commission to the Council (Doc. C 2-6/85 — COM(85) 48 final) on guidelines for a Community policy on migration together with a draft Council resolution
- the report by Mr Papapietro (Doc. A 2-12/85) on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport on the implementation of Directive 77/486 on the education of the children of migrant workers.

Mr Le Chevallier (DR). — (FR) It is already some months now since we made the distinction between European migrants and those who are not nationals of the European Community, and we hoped that the Commission would find two distinct formulations.

This is why we voted against in the vote taken by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, contrary to what was said yesterday by its chairman. We were alone in voting against, moreover, and we explained the reason for our proposal.

In our view, Mrs Marinaro's report wilfully confuses intra-Community migrant workers and extra-Community immigrants. The rapporteur is seeking by this means to extend the benefit of Community provisions, primarily freedom of movement and establishment, to all migrant workers, irrespective of their nationality or country of origin.

This is a clear case of distortion of the letter and spirit of the Treaty establishing the Community, which most

certainly does not class both the European and non-European populations as 'migrant workers'.

President. — Mr Le Chevallier you are making a speech or do you wish to put forward a proposal?

Mr Le Chevallier (DR). — (FR) Article 48 of the Treaty states very clearly:

'Freedom of movement for workers . . . within the Community' . . .

President. — Mr Le Chevallier, you are making a speech on this particular report. My understanding was that you wanted to put forward a proposal. If you wish to put forward a proposal, please do so.

Mr Le Chevallier (DR). — (FR) Then my proposal is as follows: I move that Mrs Marinaro's report be referred back to Committee and that two separate reports be drawn up, one on European migrants and the other on those who are not European.

President. — You have moved, under Rule 85, that these reports be referred back to committee. Before putting this motion to the vote I shall give the floor to one speaker in favour and one against.

Mr Ducarme (L). — (FR) I shall be brief, and wish to begin by saying that my motive in speaking is not that we share the view taken by the Group of the European Right but that we feel that this matter has been rushed through with unwarranted haste by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. The clearest indication of this is that we now have 160 amendments on the table, and I consider that it would be extremely difficult to make an examination of such a text in plenary sitting. I believe that it would be preferable, without prejudging what will be decided by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, to refer this report back to committee. It would be possible to have a more serious debate after proper discussion in committee. I therefore invite the House to vote in favour of a referral back to committee.

Mrs Dury (S). — (FR) Mr President, I am against a referral back to committee. As a member of the Committee on Social Affairs, I can confirm that all the political groups and all members of the Committee on Social Affairs were given the opportunity to discuss this report, to propose amendments, to express their views and to make their recommendations to Mrs Marinaro as to the line to be adopted in the report. All this was done, and I would stress that the report was adopted all but unanimously.

Dury

I believe that this issue is too important for us to refer it back to the Committee on Social Affairs for further examination.

Now is the time for us to state our views and vote. I do not believe that a referral back to committee would make any difference to the objections to this report. They are not procedural objections, but substantive objections in all but name.

(Applause)

(In successive roll-call votes Parliament rejected the request for referral back to committee of the Marinaro and Papapietro reports)

Mrs Marinaro (COM), rapporteur. — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, today — perhaps as never before, where the question that we are discussing is concerned — it has to be said that the problem is ripe, and it is a burning one — both for itself, taken objectively, and in the awareness of public opinion.

The considerable number of amendments, to the motion for a resolution, presented on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs, shows clearly how great are the obstacles and how negative are the attitudes in certain quarters, where the immigrant question in Europe is concerned, despite the fact that the urgency and need for greater political and cultural receptiveness is becoming increasingly apparent.

The recent sad, dramatic events that have occurred in France are to be blamed on causes that must induce Europe to implement a Community emigration policy that starts from the real needs and requirements of millions of workers, young people and women, whose presence in the European Community is now, I should say, taken for granted, and no longer likely to change very much.

The immigration question is certainly not new. Whilst it is true that for a long time now it has been a subject of discussion in all quarters, with wide formal recognition of the need to improve on the present situation, we have unfortunately once more to note, despite the repeated requests of the European Parliament — the latest of which, in chronological order, were the resolution of November 1983 on the problem of migrant workers, and the resolution of January 1984 on the condition of women in Europe — especially Chapter 5 of that resolution — that words have not been matched by reforming measures and attitudes more appropriate to the calls for effective participation that have again been put forward forcibly, especially by the second and third generations.

Today, with the economic crisis growing more acute, the state of uncertainty and precariousness of the migrant workers — whether they are from within or outside the Community — continues to increase.

Equality of rights is increasingly denied or strongly contested, even in the case of citizens of one of the Member States of the European Community. Very few governments and Member States have made themselves responsible for protecting the rights of immigrant workers and their families, despite the fact that these have been solemnly affirmed in the UNO resolution, in the Helsinki Charter, and in the Treaties of Rome and the recommendations, regulations and directives that have successively been published by the Community. Indeed, as the economic difficulties increase, and with the progressive increase in unemployment, we find examples in quite a few countries of marked discrimination, and alarming xenophobic, racist movements, which have also been confirmed by the Parliamentary committee of inquiry into fascism and racism in Europe. These are facts that are rooted deep in history; we are dealing with a phenomenon that rears its head strongly at every crisis, and that today is nourished by the insidious, insistent propaganda of all of those who, especially on the extreme Right, point to foreigners as being the prime cause of all the ills generated by the deep economic crisis, using a perverse logic that threatens civilized communal life and democracy itself in Europe.

That is why the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment calls for concrete action by the Commission and the Council so as to tackle the new situation created by the economic crisis in the countries of Europe. Denunciations and condemnation are in fact not sufficient to fight the recrudescence of racism and xenophobia. Even though they may be of value, very different instruments — more binding and more incisive ones — are needed. We have to get to the very bottom of the phenomenon, simply because the cause of the present situation does not lie only in the crisis, with all its fatal consequences.

There is everything else: there is the absence of a general political plan for immigration in Europe; there are enormous delays in adopting measures appropriate to the social, economic and cultural changes that the great mobility of manpower within the Community, as well as the stream of immigrants from third countries, have produced in the Community.

Now, in the '80s, we see the results of at least two generations of emigration, and the situation has also been fuelled by certain policies practised by some Member States which, during the boom period, used imported manpower, encouraging the migrants to settle with their families.

It therefore appears clear that the migrant workers, after such a long presence in their countries of residence, are an integrated, indivisible part of European society, and they represent a reality that requires an increasing degree of action, with new, advanced policies.

Special calls for action along these lines come above all from the young, especially those born and educated in

Marinaro

their country of residence, who are seeking their own origins, their own identity.

These are the real circumstances of the life of the migrant workers, who are, of course also subject to all the other problems with which the workers in their country of residence have to deal. It is a situation that, looked at objectively, is unjustifiable but which, unfortunately, exists in virtually the same form in every country in Europe.

It is from this reality, therefore, that we have to start in drawing up a real policy that will enable forms of mobility and integration to be established that will allow the migrant worker to become a citizen of Europe by undisputed right. We have therefore to recognise the need to transform instruments and structures alike, changing in a positive way the concept and strategy that must guide and, as it were, give consistency and meaning to, the construction of a real 'People's Europe' in which the freedom and fundamental rights of people are respected.

We must therefore follow a policy for migration that will promote integration, in the search for a rational solution that will assist, from the bottom upwards, the construction of a real 'People's Europe'.

The real problem has to do with the procedures used in the process of integration, and the results that are possible, and it is at this point, which is decisive as far as the destinies and life of individuals and the community are concerned, that account has to be taken of the irreplaceability of one's own culture, the culture that one brings with one, if integration is not to mean the hopeless cancellation of part of oneself and the subordinate assimilation of other cultures, other ways, other points of identity. Integration, therefore, in the sense of enrichment, a synthesis in becoming that involves languages, cultures, and concepts of different origin which can find, however, in the special quality of situations experienced daily, valuable opportunities for recognition and common, reciprocal development.

We believe, therefore, that in order to tackle the present situation in Europe, the time has come to open a new chapter in which isolation and 'Ghettization' will have no place.

That is why, although on the one hand we approve of the proposals contained in the Commission's communication to the Council, especially as regards the adjustment of Community regulations to suit the present situation — with regard to which we urge the Commission and the Council to commit themselves to employ all the instruments for implementing the proposed actions, in particular in paragraph 44 of the Communication, before the end of 1986 — on the other hand we denounce and deplore the lack of a policy and concrete proposals for integration as an aim and, at the same time, a method that should guide

every initiative in this field for the realization of a true 'People's Europe'.

In fact we consider that proposals by the Commission, regarding the political and civil participation of migrant workers in the countries in which they live and in which they pay taxes, are either not far-reaching enough or non-existent. And such participation is an essential need that is strongly felt and strongly expressed, especially by the second and third generations. There are no proposals or measures regarding equality of access to the employment market, for nationals and immigrants of both sexes, especially in this period of rapid, tumultuous change in production methods, and in one's way of life and the way one is educated and trained. There are no clear, concrete proposals for a real Community policy that would make possible the development of an ethnically and culturally pluralistic society. There are no initiatives designed to guarantee the equality and dignity of immigrant women. There are no measures for improving the situation of migrant women and female workers, in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 5 of the resolution approved by the European Parliament in January 1984.

We consider the draft resolution to be evasive and inadequate as regards the protection of the rights and dignity of workers from third countries, to whom we consider it is essential — and we say this through no spirit of demagogic factiousness, but with their fair legal and humanitarian status within the Community in mind — to extend the rights that are extended to members of the Community, so as to avoid subdivisions, which in these years of crisis can have harmful and even fatal effects on the life together of the different communities, the different peoples. This concern is, moreover, shared by Commissioner Sutherland himself, and was expressed before the annual Congress of the episcopal commission on emigration in Ireland last week. And it is because we are conscious that there are problems specifically concerning immigrants from outside the Community — different realities and different conditions — that we call urgently upon the Council and the Commission to arrange the conciliation of emigration policies with regard to third countries, which was moreover already envisaged in the EEC programme of action for 1974, and was repeated in the Council resolution of February 1976 on which, however, no positive action was ever taken.

We have already referred to the tendency towards stabilization in those countries where there are immigrants. Whilst we recognise the existence of this phenomenon — to deal with which we call, in the motion for a resolution approved by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, for a policy centred on integration, in every respect, with equality of rights and responsibilities vis-à-vis the indigenous population — we would point out that there are no proposals in the Communication from the Commission regarding another aspect of the present situation — that of the

Marinaro

so-called 're-entries', in respect of which we call for coordination, not least at Community level, of the necessary collaboration to be established both with the countries of the Community and also with countries outside the Community, to ensure that it is a prepared 're-entry' and a free choice for the migrant worker returning to his own country.

This is the content of the motion for a resolution that the Committee on Social Affairs is putting before the European Parliament, and for which we ask all those who are sensitive to this question, and who in previous years have committed themselves, to vote in favour, so as to give migrant workers an indispensable instrument in these hard, dramatic times.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR PLASKOVITIS*Vice-President*

Mr Papapietro (COM), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in addition to presenting the report on the implementation of the directive on the education of the children of migrant workers, I have also to explain orally in this Chamber the opinion of the Committee on Youth and Culture on the report by Mrs Marinaro. Shortage of time made it impossible to present that opinion in writing.

It is my view that the European Parliament is starting too late to discuss the problem of migrant workers and their rights — a problem that is bound up with the history of Europe, the history of its development and its crises — a problem that springs from the very heart of the fundamental contradiction in the Europe of the Community, that of the difference in development between its North and its South. The migrant workers who, in the last two decades from 1950 to 1970, have eased the demand for work in their own countries and have responded to the greater availability of work in the more developed countries of the North, have contributed to the growth of this part of Europe: but it was also they that paid the highest human price, and they were the first to suffer the setbacks of the crisis. They have suffered crises of national, family and even individual identity, as well as a linguistic crisis.

These workers have however sunk roots in the host countries. Whereas the first migrants — the fathers and grandfathers — were often workers with few or no skills, their children and grandchildren have very largely studied in the schools of the host countries, they speak the language of the country, and they have won for themselves, through their studies, higher qualifications. Despite that, they are in many cases the victims of discrimination and an unfair obligation, aggra-

vated by the economic crises and the xenophobic attitudes referred to by Mrs Marinaro, to carry on their father's occupations.

The Marinaro report outlines a sort of statu e of rights for these workers, both political and civil rights. Fundamental amongst these is the right to vote, because this is the only way to achieve the integration of the workers in the host country — the type of integration that is necessary for the very construction of the Community of Europe. These rights cannot be denied to those who have contributed for years to the productive and civil life of the host country. Not to recognise their political and civil rights and the fundamental right to choose their own representatives in the democratic institutions is to change the difference in economic development between the country of origin and the host country into a condition of political inferiority and civil minority.

One of these rights, which is certainly not negligible, is the right to education. The Commission has acted very intelligently on this question over the last ten years. It is in fact only from 1974 that the question has received attention — not when the migrant workers were producing on the crest of the economic boom, but when the oil crisis and the difficulties with the economy started to cause a certain conflict of interests in the host countries, with regard to the continuation of migrant working. In other words, not when the usefulness of the migrant workers' contribution was beyond discussion, but when the migrants started to become, to some extent, if not a burden then at least an increased cost — when, furthermore, the stream of migrant workers to the Community from non-member countries — particularly the African countries — was increasing.

The social action programme for the period 1974–1976 contained a variety of measures for integrating the children of migrant workers in the scholastic and social environment of the host country, for keeping open the possibility of their re-entry into the scholastic system of their country of origin, and for improving, in consequence, teaching methods and material and giving the teachers specialized training; there were also measures to eliminate any form of discrimination. The result of this action programme was disappointing, so that in 1976 the Commission launched a programme of pilot projects, and then, in 1977, a real directive. The pilot projects, like the 1977 directive, start from a single principle that is of great interest — that the teaching of the language of the host country and the teaching of the language and culture of the country of origin should be developed together, so as to establish, both in school and outside it, a relationship of reciprocal understanding between pupils who were the children of migrant workers and pupils who were the children of workers from the host country — in other words, reciprocal knowledge and understanding, and a dialogue between the two cultures. The presence of foreign cultures would then no longer

Papapietro

seem a tolerated interference, but a cultural enrichment for both the migrant worker's child and the child of the worker from the host country.

The other important aspect of the pilot projects and the directive is their awareness that this integration and this dialogue between unity and diversity must not take place only at school level, but on an overall social plane involving the families, the authorities, the immigrants' associations, the social services, the trade unions and the employers, who then take charge of the problem of the migrant workers. The problem of the migrant workers becomes a social problem of the host country, and along these lines integration is possible.

Unfortunately the implementation of the 1977 directive was minimal; it differed from one country to the next, but, taken overall, was pitiful. The period allowed for its application was 4 years, and this expired, therefore, in July 1981, almost 4 years ago. And so my report, like the report also of Mrs Marinaro, calls for quick solutions to be worked out by Member States to bring about some progress in the implementation of the directive.

The Council, whose president is currently a fellow-countryman of mine, is thinking of allowing a two-year period, but two years seem to me to be too long, since the implementation of this directive would then have taken ten years. In any event we call on the Commission to institute proceedings at the Court of Justice against any Member State that persists, after eight years, in not applying it.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Piermont (ARC), advisory rapporteur to the Political Affairs Committee. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. Before the Political Affairs Committee, at its meeting of 20-22 March, could express its views on the Marinaro report, the draft of which it had received only a week before during the Strasbourg plenary, the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment had already finally approved the report. The Political Affairs Committee deplores the fact that it was thus given no opportunity of expressing its opinion before the report was approved. It recommends that in future timetables should be set and announced in such a way that the giving of opinions does not become a farce. If they can be given before the report is finally approved, logically they can be taken into account when the competent committee votes on the matter.

To the matter in hand: the Political Affairs Committee approves the basic gist of the amendment and the individual solutions proposed. The four following points should be considered, however:

Firstly, paragraph 3a) calls for a 'determined battle against increasing racism and xenophobia' inter alia by 'coordinating the legislation of the indi-

vidual states'. The Political Affairs Committee considers that racism and xenophobia cannot really be countered by legislation but have to be tackled at their roots. Root causes include increasing unemployment, ignorance of the native population and migrant workers about each other, lack of social integration, the development of ghettos in certain housing areas, and others. The Council is thus called on to give priority to removing these causes.

Secondly, paragraph 3g) calls for 'equal treatment and status of immigrant women'. Unfortunately at this level of abstraction such calls remain only clichés. If they are to be translated into reality for those affected the Political Affairs Committee thinks that an individual right of establishment in particular is needed for the wives of migrant workers, so that if divorced they are not required to leave the country.

Thirdly, the Political Affairs Committee thinks that the policy of 'return migration' outlined in paragraph 3h) carries the possible danger that pressure may be exerted to force a return. This must be avoided at all costs. Experience in the FRG with 'return grants' shows, furthermore, that unless priority is given to ensuring suitable preconditions in the countries of origin, migrants soon find themselves totally without money or prospects, as the 'grant' is hardly ever sufficient to form the basis for a new life.

Fourthly, the Political Affairs Committee fears that the 'fight against illegal immigration' referred to in paragraph 5 might turn into a 'fight against illegal immigrants'. To avoid this it considers that the status of those already in the Community should be legalized and a policy developed which, instead of applying sanctions to the migrants themselves, makes it unprofitable for employers to employ illegal migrants by means of appropriate tax and other measures. Above all, however, the Committee thinks that worker representation bodies in each factory or firm should be given greater supervisory powers and more say over recruitment.

(Applause from various quarters)

Mrs d'Ancona (S). — (NL) I should like to begin by complimenting Mrs Marinaro on her report and motion for a resolution. The Socialist Group fully endorses her analyses of the problems relating to migrant workers and her recommendations for joint action to solve these problems. There is a greater need than ever for action.

The situation of many foreign workers is now more disturbing than ever before, not only because they are the ones who foot the bill for the economic crisis by losing their jobs and seeing their incomes decline, but above all because some people are carrying on a mali-

d'Ancona

cious campaign against them by giving the impression that they are to blame for this crisis. They suffer under a shortage of money, discrimination and mental distress caused by loneliness and contempt. In short, the migrant problem has become acute, but despite this the 1974 action programme has not been fully implemented, and that is what needs to be done now, as the Marinaro report makes abundantly clear.

Action must be taken to prevent racism and xenophobia, in the fields of political and civil rights, employment and vocational training, schooling and cultural education, and specific measures will be needed to help women and young people.

I do not want to discuss all these points at length: you can read about them in the report. I should just like to refer to two aspects to which we must pay special attention and which are particularly important, as I see it, for the position of foreign workers. The first, which is mentioned in the report, is the right of migrants to vote and stand for election at local and regional level. The second, which I believe is extremely important for their emancipation and integration, is financial support for foreigners' own organizations, so that it is not always the people and authorities of the host country, the country in which the migrants work, who decide what is best for them.

I should like to dwell rather longer on the question of the return of migrants to their countries of origin. In this respect, signs of abuse and xenophobia are to be detected. Are we then opposed to their returning? No, provided that the principles laid down in the Marinaro report are observed. A start should be made straight away, in my view, with older migrants who are on their own in the host country. Their situation is hopeless because they have no chance in the labour market. The same qualities that once made them so attractive to employers — their poor education, youth, good health — are now to their disadvantage or no longer apply. Ten to twenty years of hard physical labour have left their mark on these men. As their families live outside the host country, they also have to send home a proportion of their paltry social benefit.

The first step should be to set up a satisfactory repatriation scheme. What point is there in leaving them to grow lonely here? It is a disgrace that it has not yet been possible to introduce a good system that allows them to leave and have their benefits transferred to their countries of origin. This does not mean that we should not establish a general repatriation scheme, but here again we must be extremely careful. A scheme of this kind can only work satisfactorily if the following points are taken into account.

At all events, repatriation must be completely voluntary, and this will only be possible if we offer them substantial financial assistance. How much this assistance amounts to must be determined by reference to age and the time spent in a Member State. Objective

criteria will thus make it possible for each case to be treated on its merits. The financial assistance can take the form of a lumpsum or periodic payments. We must also help with educational programmes in the country of origin for children who have been to school in the Member States, and we must inform the returning worker fully of his rights in the Member State concerned and of the opportunities available to him in his own country.

The Netherlands Government has today published a document on the repatriation of foreigners, which describes a scheme for covering their travel and moving expenses and provides for a modest amount for workers over 55. That is not much, Mr President, but it is a beginning. What the Netherlands Government excludes and what the Marinaro report proposes — and rightly so, in my opinion — is the option of returning to the country of departure. The right to return to the country of departure is only retained for a given period where the migrant worker is disappointed by his country of origin.

Mr Pisoni Ferruccio (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, once again the European Parliament is taking a wide and detailed look — albeit not so wide nor so detailed as it should — at the problems of the migrant workers. By so doing it shows that it is still giving one of the most vital, most pregnant social questions its attention, and is attempting, in the construction of Europe, not to sacrifice or leave at the mercy of their own selves those whom we may call European citizens *ante litteram*.

If our Europe is to be a People's Europe, it must firmly implement the principles of the treaties and the solemn declarations of the Summits and Councils of Ministers as they relate to migrant workers as well. If the aim is to enable these citizens to exercise the fundamental rights of free movement, access to work, education, and the free participation in the political, social and trade union life of the Community, we have to concern ourselves with the concrete instruments for promoting that aim.

Unemployment stands at a dramatic, pathological level; the economic difficulties that are present in many Member States, and the burden borne by the social security bodies, may provide the xenophobic factions with convenient alibis, and may spark off pernicious nationalistic defensive measures and intolerant attitudes. The different rates of increase or decrease in the population create imbalances and tensions, and are sometimes responsible for new emigration and even illegal immigration. The Commission's communication is a timely one for us on these questions. There is nothing to disagree with in its analyses and its statements. It also has the merit of taking a sufficiently far-sighted view; it seems very much more cautious where concrete proposals are concerned, especially those addressed to Member States, perhaps because it

Pisoni Ferruccio

does not believe them capable of an act of courage. Promoting measures to make free movement effective means removing every obstacle in the form, amongst other things, of the application for a resident's permit, the preclusion of access to too many jobs, the application of police regulations that are not consistent with those of the Community, the difficult access to schools of every type and grade for one's own children, and the absence of any real repatriation policy that would make emigration a free choice, and not a compulsory condition.

The new demand that is emerging from the world of emigration — in addition to the fundamental demand for security — is the demand for culture and participation, and therefore it calls for schools, permanent training, cultural stimulus, teaching of the language, aid for emigrants' associations, freedom of association, the vote, and political and trade union freedom. In this part, the draft resolution that the Commission is submitting to the Council is somewhat timid and oversparing when it comes to indicating concrete action. The Marinaro report, which we agree with and support, attempts to give all the good indications and proposals a more concrete character, and makes an effort to propose measures that are incisive and are also possible.

In the Commission's communication to the Council, and in the Marinaro report, it is not always easy to understand whether reference is being made to all the workers in the Community, or to Community members only. If that springs from a desire not to discriminate or create ghettos, we are in complete agreement; if, on the other hand, such a statement is designed to keep everything vague so as to avoid commitments, and the effect is less recognition for Community members, we do not agree at all. We want workers from third countries to be treated like Community members — not Community members to be treated like those of third countries. Being a Community member is a status, and that must be respected to the hilt. People from outside the Community should be offered, as far as is possible, all the rights that are given to Community members. They must in any event be guaranteed equal wages and social security entitlements; they must also be guaranteed the right of reunion with their families, the defence of their own racial culture and an efficient, respectful school for their children. Every process of integration must safeguard the ethnic and cultural identity of every citizen, and this should be the basis for developing the benefits inherent in the various cultures.

We consider the Commission's proposal, to educate those in a position of authority in the sector, so that they can take steps to see that human rights are respected, is an important one. We consider it even more important that everyone should be guaranteed the possibility of free legal aid for the defence of their rights, in all the appropriate courts. We await with interest the instruments for implementing the proposals, and

we are sure that if the Commission and the Council will, as they have said, involve the emigrants' associations that have been accepted at Community level in their consultations, they will draw from them useful and important indications, and the involvement of these associations will benefit operations generally.

(Applause)

Mrs Hoffmann (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, no-one can be indifferent to the discrimination suffered by the 17 million migrant workers in the Community, which has been rightly denounced by my friend Francesca Marinaro. First of all, the deadly canker of racism must be resisted. We must never forget that it was in the name of racism that the most monstrous crimes in history, especially the Nazi holocaust, were committed. Racism and xenophobia can lead to all manner of excess, even the murder of children and young people, as has been seen in France in recent months. We Communists do not accept the contention made in certain quarters that racism is an opinion like any other; it is a crime which deserves to be severely punished by the law. In the campaign against racism and intolerance, every resource must be mobilized to ensure that dialogue and mutual respect prevail.

A stronger role could and should be played by the schools and the media, as the rapporteur suggests. Regrettable though it is, it has to be admitted that there has been a dangerous resurgence in racist campaigns. For instance, there are those who are claiming that expelling immigrant workers and their families could solve the unemployment problem. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Federal Republic of Germany has thrown out about a million foreign workers. Has there been a fall in unemployment in that country as a result? It is also claimed that they are responsible for the erosion of law and order in urban life. That is equally untrue, so the statistics on criminality and delinquency prove. In making immigrants the scapegoats for the crisis, the parties of the right and the extreme right and the bosses are simply attempting to duck their responsibilities. For decades they resorted to massive immigration as a means of recruiting labour which could be exploited at will. Today, they have no compunction in describing this section of the labour force as being responsible for holding back economic development and modernization.

I believe that emigrant workers should be free to choose whether or not to return to their home countries. With regard to freedoms, social and cultural rights, housing, working conditions and training, we stand for complete equality of treatment between nationals and migrant workers from within the Community or beyond.

The fact is that equality is far from having been attained and serious problems subsist. On the matter

Hoffmann

of the right to vote, several questions arise, and I note in passing that none of the Member States has yet managed to find solutions. Apart from the legal and constitutional implications, there is a problem from the viewpoint of the immigrants themselves. They are still citizens of their countries of origin, to which they remain deeply attached. Many hope to be able to return home one day. Large numbers vote in their countries' elections. We therefore consider that nothing should be done along the lines of compulsory integration of these workers.

On behalf of the French Communists and Allies, I wholeheartedly support the constructive proposals made by the rapporteur, especially the proposal that a migrant workers' charter should at long last be drawn up at Community level. These 17 million men and women contribute to the wealth-creating process, and the Community has a duty to uphold their rights to security, respect and dignity.

(Applause from the Communists and Allies Group)

Mr De Gucht (L). — (NL) Mr President, no one can ignore the migrant worker problem any more. Nor do we of the Liberal and Democratic group want to ignore it, because it concerns respect for human dignity, to which we attach particular importance. We know after all that there are no ready solutions to the migrant worker problem that are based on rather than merely paying lip-service to human dignity and are geared to the practical aspects. They will only be found by dint of purposeful political action, backed up by very fundamental considerations. Passions are indeed alight where the question of foreigners is concerned. For some political groupings it has even become a goal, and as others believe the whole problem may blow up at some time, they are attracted to extreme right-wing groups.

It is precisely because we believe these to be real dangers that we do not think the Marinaro report is a good one. It seriously underestimates the problem, it assumes a generosity that is true of only a few people, and it suggests radical solutions in the other direction — in short, the report is so unrealistic because it runs the risk of doing a poor service to a good cause. The naiveté that has guided the authors of the report is not the line we should be adopting in this difficult question. The public are divided over voting rights for migrants, even if they are Community citizens, even if a minimum period of residence is made a requirement, even where migrants from non-Community countries are concerned.

The Marinaro report says that all migrants resident in the host country for five years should have the right to vote in local, regional and European elections. We say that all Community citizens should have the right to vote in such elections. If a Member State feels it can go further, we have no objection. Quite the contrary.

But the right to vote cannot be given to all migrant workers. The general public would not accept that.

I can give other examples. Can it simply be said that migrant workers should be able to take all their social rights with them on their repatriation? The payment of unemployment benefit, for example, is subject to strict controls and legislation, which have been tightened up in all the Member States under the pressure of the changing economic situation. How can such controls be imposed on the migrant who returns to his own country?

To conclude, let us be realistic and take politically courageous decisions which consider the migrant worker's position. Let us not succumb to a flood of hollow words that get us nowhere and are likely to be counterproductive.

Mrs Chouraqui (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my group will not be voting for the Marinaro report unless the amendments that we tabled are adopted, this for the following reasons.

First of all, a general comment is called for: from the very outset, the report creates serious confusion between migrants who are Community nationals and immigrants from countries outside the Community. It should have been in two separate parts, but no distinction is made, and this makes for ambiguity in many areas. Secondly, the general tone, although stemming from a spirit of generosity and humanitarianism, in fact makes it an unrealistic, utopian report which fails to take any account of economic and social conditions in our Member States.

The tone here is not the same as that of the Commission's report on guidelines for a Community policy on migration, nor is it consistent with the tone of the opinion of the Economic and Social Committee published in the Official Journal of the Communities in December 1984.

In seeking to achieve everything for the immigrant population all at once, this report is conducive to the opposite of the effect envisaged and may provoke a backlash involving the worst excesses.

When dealing with a topic as serious and important as the problem of immigration, reasonableness and moderation are essential.

The Marinaro report raises three problems in particular.

First, the problem of granting the right to vote and stand for election to immigrants. Who would be the beneficiaries? People from within the Community or those from outside? There can be no question, in our view, of granting rights to men and women from outside the Community which we Europeans do not yet

Chouraqui

have in our respective countries, despite the fact that they are members of Europe!

Moreover, do Europeans who have been resident for more than five years in non-Community countries have the right to vote and stand for election there? For instance, do French cooperation personnel working in Africa have the vote? Do they stand for election in Africa? Did the many Swedish managers who came to live in our European countries a few years ago have the right to vote in our own countries?

The second problem is equality between the mother tongue and the language of the host country. This in my view is an unrealistic and unjust proposal. There are many African immigrants in my country, and there are 52 African dialects. According to Mrs Marinaro — I put this question to her — would they rank equally with French, English, German, Italian or the other European languages?

If so, it is not Europe that we shall be building, but the Tower of Babel!

(Applause from the right)

This is not the creation of a multicultural society but the destruction of our own cultural identity, I wonder what Mr Léopold Senghor, that great black African poet and member of the French Academy who speaks French so beautifully, would make of this Marinaro report.

On the other hand, we are in favour of launching an open educational and cultural policy which takes account of the diversity of backgrounds and fosters integration making for openness and respect for the various cultural identities but keeps the language of the host country as the priority language.

John-Paul II said on 20 September in Ottawa: 'Every country is enriched by the complementarity of cultures and traditions'. That is true, we approve and agree with those words.

The third problem is the guaranteed right for an immigrant who has returned to his or her country of origin and had difficulty in resettling there to come back to the host country. Now if I understand correctly, this report, while taking absolutely no account of the economic situation in Europe, is setting the scene for an uncontrollable toing and froing of men and women, which could well be against the interests of the people concerned.

These are three examples of the problems which have prompted us to table extensive amendments to the Marinaro report. This does not mean that we do not intend to propose a coherent, balanced, responsible and fair policy for immigrants. Europe has a universal message, a humanist tradition to live up to.

Mr President, I believe that the way for Europe to be true to this message is by combating xenophobia and — I urge the House — proposing a responsible policy on immigration.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mrs Heinrich (ARC). — *(DE)* Ladies and gentlemen. We have not so far followed the custom of this House which is to praise to the skies each and every piece of paper which drops on to our table.

For this report, drawn up by Mrs Marinaro with expertise and heartfelt commitment, we should like to make an exception. Let me make a few comments on it. The reason for the continuing absence of any plan of action for migrant workers is probably that these 17 million people in the EC are not voters and are thus not particularly interesting to the big political parties — not even to those which pay lip service to foreigners having the vote in local elections but do nothing towards actually securing it for them.

The report calls for stricter checks on the implementation of Community regulations and directives. In my view the Community should reserve the right to penalize the Member States, for we are light years away from the demands made in this report. Forty years after the defeat of fascism in our country a continuing latent racism is being revived in restrictive government measures against foreigners to the extent that election campaigns today are fought with slogans such as 'foreigners go home!'.

There are few signs in our country of any fight against racism and xenophobia. This House is perhaps unaware that there are still judges in the Federal Republic who say that a cafe or restaurant owner is legally entitled to put a sign on his door saying 'no Turks'. No attention at all is paid to calls by migrant workers' organizations.

And now membership of the Italian Communist Party is deemed a reason for deportation! I can quote countless instances of foreigners being prosecuted for criticizing the political or economic conditions in their homeland, for example Turkey — such a degree of freedom of expression is prejudicial to the interests of the Federal Republic, claimed the prosecution — or instances where organizations of foreign dissidents were banned for similar reasons.

We deplore the fact that, whilst our Community is abolishing barriers to trade in goods and eliminating bureaucratic obstacles to the movement of capital the very people who produce these goods are, during the time of crisis, finding the barriers more and more immovable and life less and less humane. In the light of this it is all the more imperative that the report

Heinrich

should be approved. We also endorse the call for a migrant workers' charter.

(The sitting was suspended at 1 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)¹

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

Vice-President

3. Action taken on the opinions of Parliament

President. — The next item is the statement by the Commission of the European Communities on the action taken on the opinions and resolutions of the European Parliament.²

Mr Pranchère (COM). — (FR) The Council of Agriculture Ministers failed to reach agreement on prices by 1st April and Mr Pandolfi stated that the Commission's proposals as submitted no longer constituted a valid basis for the resumption of negotiations. That is an opinion with which I in fact entirely agree, and I should therefore like to ask the representative of the Commission the following question: has the Commission decided to submit to the Council the proposals which were voted by this House following adoption of my report during the last part-session? Those proposals were supported not only by a majority of the House but also by Community farmers' organizations, and there is no doubt that taking them into account would be most effective and logical way to break the deadlock and open up fresh prospects for the major debates on the common agricultural policy, since it is announced that consultations are going to be held with the organizations representing the industry and that Parliament is to be consulted. On the subject of farm prices, Parliament has only recently been consulted, when I presented my report, which it adopted. But the Commission is behaving as though this report did not exist; it is persisting in its refusal to recognize a fact, and the situation is deadlocked.

There you have my question, Mr Commissioner.

Mr Ripa di Meana, Member of the Commission. — (IT) The Commission is, naturally, perfectly well aware of the points of view expressed by Parliament.

As far as the outcome of this decision of the Council is concerned, it is not up to the Commission to guess what that will be today, but I confirm that the Commission will maintain its proposal.

Mr Cryer (S). — I wonder whether I could refer to page 5 of the Commission's report which gives a list of the disaster aid supplied since the last part-session? Can I draw the attention of the Commissioner to the fact that at the March part-session they stated that they had supplied 175 000 tonnes of cereals and that the Commissioner said that they were going to see whether improvements could be made. According to the statement made at the current part-session less than half the amount of cereals has in the meantime apparently been supplied. In the case of Ethiopia, for example, whereas at the March part-session it was stated that some 70 000 tonnes of cereals had been supplied, the statement given at this part-session indicates that only 34 000 tonnes have since been supplied. Surely with something like 4 million tonnes of wheat alone — quite apart from other cereals — in storage in the Common Market it is incumbent on the Commission to do something about getting the stores of food to starving people. Is it not a crime against humanity that there is plenty in the Common Market foodstores and nothing in places like Ethiopia?

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (IT) I should like first of all to inform the honourable member that a supplementary text — page 5a — which contains information to complete the picture, has been prepared and will be circulated by the Commission.

With regard to the question itself, the Commission will give an explicit answer to the questions raised at the next meeting of the Committee on Development and Cooperation of the European Parliament.

Mr Maffre-Baugé (COM). — (FR) My question is this: given that the Commission's position effectively creates a freeze in the immediate term, I should like to know how it intends to take account of the reports adopted by Parliament to date and to ask, if it does not take account of them, what purpose is served by this Parliament and what purpose is served by the promises given to our various peoples when we were elected for this term of office? The Commission cannot sidestep the issue. I hope for my part that it will give a detailed reply, especially on farm prices.

I hope to receive a very clear answer. How does the Commission intend to take account of the viewpoint expressed by this House on the problem of farm prices?

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (IT) Commissioner Franz Andriessen, on behalf of the Commission, has replied fully and at length to the question that has just been raised. I will reiterate the information that I have already given to another honourable member, who put a question regarding the behaviour of the Commission on agricultural prices, to the effect that the Commission will maintain its proposal.

¹ Agenda: see Minutes.

² See Annex.

Mr Wurtz (COM). — (*FR*) I have found no mention in the document distributed to us of action taken on the resolution adopted during our last part-session on safety and health in coalmines following the Forbach disaster.

I should therefore like to ask which bodies this matter has been referred to. What work has been done in the meantime? Does the Commission intend to draw up new safety standards? Have funds been made available for this purpose?

I should like a reply, assuming that someone from the Commission has had the courtesy to listen to what I have been saying, otherwise I shall repeat it.

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (*IT*) The report referred to by the honourable member is a report prepared by the Parliament. This is not the time for the Commission to reply to such reports; it does this, as you are aware, at the six-monthly progress reviews.

Mr Collins (S). — I wonder if the Commission can explain the extent of its satisfaction with the decision reached by Council on the twin proposals on lead-free petrol and car exhaust emissions. This was a compromise which was finally agreed and I wonder about the extent to which the Commission is really satisfied by it. Can it now indicate what real beneficial effect this is likely to have on the environment and on air pollution, or does it simply agree with us that the final compromise is far too little far too late?

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (*IT*) This point does not come under the questions that refer to the Commission's report. The question should therefore be put to the competent Commissioner, at the next opportunity.

Mrs Daly (ED). — Mr Cryer mentioned food going to some of the African countries. I would like to ask what action has been taken to actually get medical supplies and tents to them. Regarding long-term developments in those countries, I accept that there is a need for food, but it is not food alone. I would like to know what steps the Commission has taken to get other things to them.

Also on the subject of aid, I would like to know what steps the Commission has taken to ensure that the people of Tigre and Eritrea actually receive the food. What pressure has been put on the Ethiopian Government to ensure that the aid actually gets to the people who need it, rather than the diplomatic niceties which we seem to have had reported to us in the past?

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (*IT*) I should like to point out to the honourable member that the Commission will give an answer to these and other questions at the

meeting of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, when the question now raised will be discussed, presumably on the basis of Vice-President Natali's report.

Mrs Jackson (ED). — I should like to ask a question on the draft regulation concerning the names to be used for milk and dairy products when they are marketed. This is no doubt written in Mr Andriessen's heart. I notice that the Commission sent the Council an amendment to its original proposal and the number of the document is given as COM(85) 122 final.

In a sense this moment, when the Commission reports to Parliament, is one of the most important in our part-sessions. It is a pity that more people do not take it seriously. It is a sign of how little importance it receives that, as far as I know, no Member of the European Parliament has been sent a copy of COM(85) 122 final which my spies tell me is filed in the Commission's office under 'Jackson'. Well, Jackson has not received a copy and it would be very nice if I could have one. Unless I am given the opportunity to follow this up in this way, I can see no possibility at all of Parliament's building on the present powers that it was given in the Treaty. Can the Commission please tell me what COM(85) 122 final means, whether it contains any proposals to downgrade this from a draft regulation to an amendment to the existing food-labelling directive, and if not why not, and if it doesn't, how we can now follow this up with the Council of Ministers?

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (*IT*) The document to which the honourable member refers was sent to the Council and to Parliament. It is at her disposal, and is dated 19 March.

Mr Balfé (S). — On a point of order, Mr President. As you will recall, I always quote the rule on which I speak, and this time it is Rule 60, on access to the Chamber. I am informed that next month it is intended that we shall not only have President Reagan here but also 450 security people, and that will make it extremely difficult to implement Rule 60(3), which concerns the admission of members of the public to the gallery of this House. I should like to ask you three questions under Rule 60 and to ask you to refer them to the Bureau for consideration and to report to this House.

First, what arrangements are there for Members to gain access for interested members of the public under Rule 60(3)?

Secondly, are the security people who will be accompanying the American President to be allowed to carry loaded weapons within this building?

Balfe

Third, under what rules may they fire those weapons?

(Laughter)

I ask that you refer these questions to the Bureau, as I think it is important that this sovereign parliament should be aware of the situation in which these rules might be violated.

President. — Mr Balfe, there is a meeting of the enlarged Bureau due to take place this afternoon, and when I go to that meeting at 5 p.m. I will ensure that before the end of it the points you raise will be taken up.

4. Question Time

President. — The next item is the first part of Question Time (Doc. B 2-104/85).

We begin with questions to the Commission.

Question No 1, by Mr Ford (H-327/84):

Subject: Severn barrage

Further to the Commission's answer to oral question No H-201/84, by Mr Llewellyn Smith¹, will the Commission state what consideration has been given to the possibility of the Community's support for a second Severn crossing by means of a short barrage scheme incorporating a tidal power facility, rather than by means of another bridge?

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — First of all, I am delighted to say that a decision has been taken to grant from the European Regional Development Fund an amount not exceeding £ 1 050 000 to the study currently being undertaken in regard to the Severn crossing. The study's terms of reference include an examination of several forms of bridge or tunnel or barrage. If other studies demonstrate that a combined scheme would be worthwhile, that would be undertaken. Also it can be said that this reflects the maximum amount that the Community could possibly allow under this heading.

Mr Ford (S). — I would ask the Commissioner whether Parliament and the Commission will be taking into account the non-economic benefits that could accrue from several of these schemes when considering which of them it finds most appropriate?

What sort of internal rate of return does the Commission regard as appropriate for alternative renewable

energy schemes at a pilot phase in the Community, because that clearly is going to be a factor in deciding whether the Community will be prepared to put money into the scheme itself once the feasibility study has been undertaken?

What will the comparative costs be? In an answer to Mr Hughes earlier this year figures were given for the comparative cost of nuclear power, coal power and oil power in the 1990s. Would the Commissioner give some comparison for schemes like this so that we can judge them against conventional power schemes?

Finally, is tidal power, as it stands at the moment, something the Commission wants to support? Of the various alternative energy schemes it would appear to offer the most advantages to the Community in scale as well as in relation to the environmental problems?

Mr Sutherland. — Referring in the first instance to the question itself, what we are concerned with here is a major infrastructural project which will influence the economic regeneration of South and West Wales. That is the major issue on which the Commission based its determination that this particular project should be supported. It is therefore recognized that the crossing is a vital element of the M4 and the development of the area in question.

With regard to the various issues that were raised relative to the benefits that might accrue from one type of project as opposed to another, which seems to be entirely different to the approach taken by the questioner, the study itself will determine the feasibility of the crossing. I am answering on an issue relative to the crossing of the Severn River.

Mr Cottrell (ED). — I am grateful for the Commission's very clear answer. I would just like a little further information. The sum of 1 500 000 pounds refers, I take it, to the British Government's announced decision to investigate the feasibility of a second crossing as such, which could take the form, as the Commissioner suggests, of a bridge or a tunnel or a submersible tube. But Mr Sutherland also made specific reference to a barrage. There are at least two proposals to incorporate a barrage in a second crossing. Representing as I do the constituency of Bristol, I think I would be giving away no secrets if I said that people in Bristol are very much in favour of a barrage being incorporated in the second crossing.

Will any of that 1 500 000 pounds reach the area of the second study — which has also been announced — into the feasibility of a power-generating barrage of some kind? Here I make the point to Mr Sutherland — in case he is not already aware of it — that there is a proposal for a ground barrage, which would be the largest civil engineering project ever undertaken in the history of the modern world, and also for a slightly

¹ Verbatim Report of Proceedings, 10 October 1984, p. 142.

Cottrell

smaller one, fortunately, which would be near the existing Severn Bridge.

Mr Sutherland. — The study in question relates to the various possible ways of providing a crossing, including a barrage. First of all, I should correct the questioner, it is 1 050 000, not 1 500 000 pounds. That represents 50% of the total cost of the studies, which in turn represents the maximum amount that can currently be allowed under the regulations for this type of study. Following the conclusion of the study, the Commission will consider the results. If it is then decided to implement a project, an application for assistance from the Regional Fund for eligible construction works can be taken into consideration by the Commission.

Mr Stewart (S). — I am very pleased about the fact that we are getting this finance in the United Kingdom and for the Severn. Nevertheless, in view of the various independent reports and the reports submitted by the Merseyside County Council which have been given to the Commission, I would like to ask the Commissioner if full consideration has been taken of all the relevant factors in deciding whether the Severn barrage should have priority over the possible Mersey barrage?

I have tabled Question No 10 on the barrage across the Mersey and the feasibility study. It is a well-known fact that Merseyside is one of the most depressed areas in the Community and suffers from some of the worst unemployment problems. Have all these factors been considered?

Mr Sutherland. — First of all, I cannot and will not link Questions Nos 1 and 10. In my answer to the question itself, I indicated that the M4 corridor between London and South Wales has been identified as a major economic growth area. It is being dealt with in this question *sui generis* and as a separate issue to any other. Question No 10 on the Mersey barrage is a separate question and should be dealt with as such. The Severn crossing is being dealt with as an integral part of an important motor route and one which is of considerable importance for the growth of an entire region.

Mr Smith (S). — Is the worthy Commission, in deciding whether or not to support a second Severn crossing and barrage in South Wales, ignoring the recent changes in development area status in South Wales? Male unemployment in many communities, including my own, is running at 45%. Is the Commission aware of the extent to which the future of South Wales depends on a second Severn crossing and, indeed, on a barrage?

Mr Sutherland. — As my earlier answer may indicate, the Commission is fully aware of the importance of maintaining and improving road communications between this region and other parts of Britain. That is why the Commission has granted the maximum amount available for the study in question. So, it is a reflection of the Commission's concern that this application to the Regional Development Fund has been successful, as I have been pleased to tell Parliament today.

President. — Question No 2, by Mr Rogalla (H-527/84):

Subject: Abolition of personal checks at the internal frontiers

What is the Commission's assessment of the effects of the resolution adopted by the Council and the Member States on 7 June 1984 at its instigation on the easing of checks on persons on the Community's internal frontiers? Can the Commission indicate any tangible changes for the ordinary traveller, compared with the previous legal or actual situation at the Community's internal frontiers, that have come about following this agreement?

Lord Cockfield, Vice-president of the Commission. — A number of developments have taken place recently to ease border crossings. The following might be mentioned.

First, on 4 January this year the Commission proposed a directive on the easing of controls and formalities applicable to nationals of Member States when crossing intra-Community borders. This draft directive has been referred both to Parliament and to the Council of Ministers, and the opinion of Parliament is awaited.

Secondly, France and Germany signed a bilateral agreement on 13 July 1984 to ease border controls. The Benelux countries held discussions with France and Germany on 27 February to examine whether the five countries could come to a bilateral agreement to ease border formalities for persons and goods crossing their common frontiers. A steering group has been set up to prepare a final agreement by the end of April.

The Council resolution of 7 June 1984 was addressed to the Member States and was not binding. The administrative arrangements for frontier controls are the responsibility of the Member States. The Commission understands, however, that already there have been some small but tangible improvements. For example, I understand that Paris, Frankfurt and London airports now operate spot-checks. Similarly, at some other points of entry systematic controls have been replaced by spot-checks.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) The nub of my question was concerned with the concrete changes affecting the citi-

Rogalla

zen. In the light of the information I received just an hour ago, that checks in the trains between Paris and Brussels have actually increased and intensified, I should like to ask the Vice-President what explanation he can give for this dilatory implementation of a new policy. Is it tradition, fear of redundancy, fear of a real security risk, or is it pure self-interest on the part of the customs and border control officials concerned? Does the Vice-President not agree with me that the slow, steady, progressive introduction of a common customs administration for checking travellers from third countries would be a way of allaying such suspicions?

Lord Cockfield. — The administrative arrangements for frontier controls, which would, of course, include the controls carried out on trains between Paris and Brussels, are the responsibility of the individual Member States. Where unreasonable measures are taken, it is the practice of the Commission to take up the matter with the government concerned. I will, therefore, be very willing to look into the specific case raised by the honourable Member. If the facts so warrant, we will certainly raise the matter with the French Government.

In general, our objective is precisely the same as that of the honourable Member. We wish to see controls between individual Member States reduced to the absolute minimum consistent with the control, for example, of drug traffic, terrorism and public order.

Mr Wijsenbeek (L). — Does the Commissioner, Lord Cockfield, not think that since the Community began there are more rather than less customs officials, and that it is precisely these officials who are trying to prevent the realization of a real Community of the citizen?

Lord Cockfield. — I am afraid that I do not have before me specific figures relating to the number of customs officials employed in 1957 as compared with the present day, but I must say that, in general, I do not find that customs officials are unreasonable or that they exercise their powers in a way deliberately to cause harassment. On the contrary, we do have a very good working relationship with the customs authorities in the individual Member States and where there are difficulties we do endeavour to resolve them.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Would the Commissioner confirm that 'internal frontiers are co-terminous with international frontiers' includes all ports and airports where Community citizens enter another Member State as, for example, the port of Dover and Brussels airport? Would he also take on board the possibility that Community citizens should be separated from those coming to those ports or airports from third

countries as the only way of ensuring that Community citizens enjoy free access?

Lord Cockfield. — I entirely agree that very often internal frontiers are co-terminous with international frontiers and that is particularly so in the case of the maritime states. Where, as I have already indicated, particular problems arise, it is the practice of the Commission to take the matter up with the government of the Member State concerned and we have done so specifically in relation to difficulties which have occurred both at Dover and at Brussels. We have also endeavoured to ensure wherever possible that separate entry channels are provided for Community citizens and the honourable Member will be aware of the fact that such channels do exist at Heathrow, as an example.

Mr Cryer (S). — Since the Commissioner says that customs officers are not unreasonable, why is the Commission pressing for the diminution of customs barriers at a time when he knows that the trafficking in drugs is not decreasing but increasing, when the dependence on hard drugs is increasing, when drug abuse is increasing? Is he satisfied that this pressure from the Commission on Member States to remove customs barriers will in fact enable the United Kingdom to remain rabies-free? Would he not regard it as desirable to control the illegal movement of drugs, to reduce the abuse of drugs and to retain areas free from the dreaded scourge of rabies?

Lord Cockfield. — There is a very clear distinction between the rules which customs officials are obliged to enforce and the manner in which they enforce them. The point that I was making was that, in general, customs officials do not exercise their powers unreasonably. So far as the rules themselves are concerned, the onus rests on the Community as a whole — and here I do not distinguish between the Commission, Parliament and the Council — to simplify those rules and to remove the internal frontiers which at present obstruct the free movement of citizens within the Community. We have, however, always recognized — and this is spelt out in detail in the documents accompanying the draft directive on the facilitation of frontier controls — that special measures need to be taken to deal with the drug trade and that measures may be necessary on the grounds of public health. Rabies, which the honourable Member mentions, is an obvious case in point here.

Mr Gerontopoulos (PPE). — (GR) Once again I would like to raise a matter that is extremely important for us Greeks — not to say one of essential pride. Despite continual protestations to the contrary, it remains true that at London's Heathrow airport there is a separate channel through passport control for Greeks, as opposed to the channel for the citizens of other countries in the Community.

Gerontopoulos

I therefore ask the Commissioner what steps the Commission intends to take, to put an end to this discrimination between equal partners by the authorities at Heathrow airport.

Lord Cockfield. — I understand the point the honourable Member makes. I have in fact myself written to the United Kingdom Government on this point and I await its reply. As soon as I hear from it I will communicate with the honourable Member.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — May I ask the Commissioner whether he has recently travelled in normal cars and with normal citizens? In my experience the customs authorities — exactly contrary to the efforts of the Commission — are currently doing everything to annoy citizens who cross borders. This even applies to the border between France and Germany here in Strasbourg where they are doing something very bad. They are carrying out a thorough examination of cars — my own car was stopped for over half an hour recently on that border. Would it not be a good thing to force the customs officials at least to wear their own name because I asked one of the officials what his name was in order to raise the issue and he refused it to me.

Lord Cockfield. — I am grateful to the honourable Member for the information he has given. I do commonly travel as a private individual. In fact, I went through Heathrow at Easter specifically in that capacity and I can assure him that I am probably just as familiar with the hazards, the difficulties and the problems of travel as he himself is. Indeed, if I may cap his own story, the last time that I returned from the Parliament here to Brussels, my car was stopped by a roving patrol to see if I had aboard quantities of uncustomed liquor which I assured him I did not have. The customs officer concerned behaved with great courtesy and I have no criticism whatever. What I would like to do is to get rid of the need for controls of that sort, and that is what the Commission's proposals and plans are designed to ensure.

Mr Møller (ED). — (DA) I should like to put a supplementary question to the Commissioner for we are dealing here with a question which concerns all citizens in the Community. It is not a small circle of business people who are put to inconvenience by the dividing lines of old Europe, it is virtually all the citizens who are inconvenienced by having to stand in line with their passports or identity papers. That was something we genuinely hoped and expected would disappear when the Community was created. Here we have the heart of the matter: nothing of significance has happened, apart from the provision at one or two places of a special door for the use of EEC nationals, a special passage — and progress through it is just as slow as through the other doors!

At Heathrow and Brussels getting through is a particularly slow process. What will the Commission do if the Member States ignore its representations? Will it bring a case before the Court of Justice, and will the ridiculous checks at Heathrow on passengers leaving Great Britain be stopped? It is one thing to check on who's coming in, emigration controls are quite another. Will these emigration controls be stopped? We don't have any at Kastrup.

Lord Cockfield. — The difficulty I have in answering the honourable Member is that I agree with most of what he says. I can only ask him to be kind enough to await the publication of the Commission's white paper on making a reality of the internal market, which will appear before the summit in June and which will deal with many of the problems with which he is concerned.

President. — Question No 3, by Mrs Chouraqui (H-485/84):

Subject: Effects and consequences of demographic change

Last April Commissioner Richard told the House that demography, the birth rate, the encouragement of population or otherwise within Member States, is essentially a matter for the national policy of individual Member States', but he added that the Council of Social Affairs Ministers had asked the Commission to analyse the effects and consequences of the demographic changes that are now taking place.

Could the Commission make a statement on this very important question?

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — It is true to say that all Member States show an interest in demographic trends but not in all aspects of the subject; and there are differing views as to the approach which should be taken to the problem. Some Member States have indicated only a minor concern with the birth rate issue, some expressed no interest at all. These discrepancies of view make it difficult to envisage Community action in this field. The Commission is, however, initiating a comparative analysis of the family policies of the Member States, as invited to do by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment last June.

The same committee also invited the Commission to study the demographic consequences of the aging of our populations and some work in this area has already been done. The Commission has underlined the problem in its communication of December 1982 on the social security problems of Member States and years previously a specific study examined the likely impact of demographic factors on the different branches of social security during the first decade of the next century. The Commission will continue its

Sutherland

study of these, conditions, but before embarking on a research programme the Commission is examining and reporting on the work which has already been carried out in other organizations, such as the Council of Europe, the OECD or the Economic and Social Committee. This will enable the Commission to avoid unnecessary duplication and to identify the areas where research still needs to be done.

Mrs Chouraqui (RDE). — (FR) I thank the Commission for his reply, but in view of the fact that Mr Delors, the new President of the Commission, announced in his investiture speech that the Commission could not address itself to such an important issue since a comparative study had already been carried out, is the Commission of the Communities now contemplating a more detailed study of the need for harmonization of family policies in Europe? I fully appreciate that some countries are more closely concerned than others but I now believe, in the light of the demographic tables, that sooner or later the whole of Europe will be concerned.

To my mind, therefore, the question is whether you can begin to set up action to harmonize family policies and in any event at least hold a meeting of the ministers responsible for family affairs in the various European countries.

Mr Sutherland. — Before the Commission can commence harmonizing it has first of all to find out what the family policies in the various Member States actually are. As I indicated in the answer to the question — perhaps not clearly enough — the Commission is initiating a programme in accordance with what the President said — and I reiterate it today — to establish what the family policies of the various Member States are. Once that comparative analysis has been conducted, it will then be in a position to analyse what further steps can and should be taken. Once that analysis is complete, in the event of this matter being raised again in the Parliament, I will be in a position to answer clearly the subsequent issue that has arisen and which is referred to in the supplementary question.

Mrs Lehideux (DR). — (FR) Before putting my question, I should like to make the point that the effects and implications of population decline are now well known and that, in the various countries of the Community, all the necessary studies have been carried out and all the statistics have been notified to us. They are obviously disastrous in the Community as a whole and more especially in certain Member States.

Although I do not think that this particular aspect is on today's agenda, the important point is that we must propose remedies.

I should therefore like to ask this question: within the scope of the measures which it is empowered to take,

what aid does the Commission propose to organize — aid to families, tax measures, pay for mothers who stay at home to look after their children? Thus far, we have been told about the declining birthrate and the demographic problem, but nothing about the action that could be taken speedily to remedy the situation.

Mr Sutherland. — On 7 June 1984, the Council of Ministers requested the Commission to carry out a study of problems caused by present demographic trends in Europe. That study is being conducted. Once the demographic trends have been established, the Commission will consider such steps as could or should be considered, but it cannot do so — and I cannot possibly answer the specific issue raised — until the initial inquiry has been conducted. I would merely point out that there are clear differences of opinion between Member States as to whether or not there should be an intervention by the Commission in areas of this kind.

Mr Wijsenbeek (L). — (IT) Does the Commission not take the view that there should not be any family policy whatsoever and that, in fact, it is entirely a matter for the individual?

Mr Sutherland. — As I think I have said twice already, the Commission is carrying out a survey in response to a Council request, and once the survey is completed the Commission will reconsider the matter. It is not indicating that it has or has not a policy at this time in regard to the matters being raised, but is merely indicating that it does believe that this is a matter which should be investigated, that it is following the suggestion of the Council of Ministers of Social Affairs of 7 June 1984 and that when that study has been completed, the matter will be reviewed.

Mrs Lizin (S). — (FR) Demographic policy is a matter of concern to all groups in this House, I would imagine, even though their attitudes differ. We believe that it is necessary to introduce measures aimed at the incomes of young people, especially those taking the decision to set up home and to embark upon the risky venture of creating a future for a family. This calls for a comprehensive social policy, not just a policy on family allowances.

My question is very straightforward: since the Commissioner has said that a number of studies are in progress, I should like to know with whom it is in contact in each country, since I imagine that it would be impossible for the Commission to carry out such work without using contacts in the various countries. To take the example of Belgium, work in this field is done by the King Baudouin Foundation, and I should like to ask him whether or not the Commission is in touch with the Foundation on this subject.

Mr Sutherland. — The competent authorities in each Member State will be contacted, and the verifiable statistical basis which may be available in each Member State will be researched. I cannot be more specific than that. I cannot indicate today what particular authority will be contacted in Belgium.

President. — Question No 4, by Mr Flanagan (H-509/84):

Subject: Cut-backs on Social Fund aid for the handicapped

Will the Commission confirm whether or not it has taken a decision to cut back on the level of Social Fund aid at present being made available to rehabilitation institutes for the handicapped, and if it has, will it state its reasons for doing so?

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — As total priority applications exceeded the Social Fund budget in 1984 by about 50%, it was inevitable that a wide range of applications had to be wholly or partly refused. The requirement of the Council rules now in force to allocate at least 75% of the total Social Fund appropriations to young people under 25 years of age exacerbated the situation for target groups such as the disabled, who are the subject matter of the question and where the majority of the applications, I should say, related to adults. The Commission, therefore, shares the honourable Member's concern for the disabled and has sought to mitigate the impact of the reduction. In its guidelines for the management of the Fund, the Commission does give preference to cases where Community assistance is of particular importance to the carrying out of the operation. Projects with alternative adequate financial resources, therefore, bore the brunt of the reduction, and these included, to some extent, operations for the disabled. This concentration of Fund aid on projects of greatest need is of particular importance in situations of acute financial shortage.

Mr Flanagan (RDE). — I thank the Commissioner for his very clear reply and also for his known concern for the handicapped. In view of the job opportunities, particularly for the young handicapped, that are available under the new technological industries programmes, would he and the Commission support a concerted training programme in this area for the handicapped?

Mr Sutherland. — The issue of support to the handicapped under the Social Fund guidelines is a matter which is currently of concern in the sense that the guidelines are presently being prepared which will operate for the next three years. Those guidelines can only operate, however, within the established rules, which will continue to require the allocation of 75 % of total Fund allocations to young persons rather than

to adults. The application of the Fund to new technologies could well be of particular relevance to the handicapped, having regard to their capacity to deal with certain types of technology which is new and of an advanced kind and which does not require mobility. This matter is of concern to the Commission and is being considered in the context of its proposals.

Mr Hughes (S). — The Commissioner will be aware that Manpower Services schemes in the UK are heavily supported by the European Social Fund. He will also be aware that, irrespective of restrictions on Social Fund aid, many of the least well-off in Britain, including many handicapped people and unemployed women, are being prevented from applying for MSC schemes because of a rule change requiring all applicants to be in receipt of benefit. Has the Commissioner investigated these apparent discrepancies between the Social Fund guidelines and the rules operated by MSC? If not, will he do so when Manpower Services make their next block application for a grant?

Mr Sutherland. — I am not sure that the question directly arises out of the major issue which I am answering. But to try to reply to it as best I can, I would say that the Commission is, of course, conscious of the importance that applications must conform with the regulations and guidelines. An analysis is conducted in regard to each application or block application relative to the applicability of the scheme in question and the parameters which are utilized by the applicant in respect of each scheme. The particular scheme referred to by the questioner I cannot comment on in answer to this question.

Mrs Dury (S). — (FR) In the new definition of the guidelines and in the study undertaken in connection with statistical machinery which could be used to define much more objective methods for Social Fund projects, the prevailing guideline seems to be to concentrate effort on regions which are experiencing difficulties. Now it seems to me that not only handicapped people but also migrant workers and perhaps women who could benefit from projects are not necessarily to be found in regions where incomes are very low or unemployment is very high; they are also to be found in the towns, in urban areas.

This is the point that I should like to raise with the Commissioner; I should like to ask him whether he proposes, in connection with projects for handicapped people and migrant workers, to find a solution to this problem, to find a very effective way of allocating Social Fund resources and supporting this Fund's projects without overlooking these categories.

Mr Sutherland. — The Social Fund and the new guidelines will not overlook the categories referred to. They are specifically enjoined by the regulations not

Sutherland

to do so. Therefore the issue of migrants and handicapped has to be and will form part of the scheme of Social Fund applications and disbursements after the review has taken place. The review, of course, has not been completed nor have the guidelines been finally drafted. So the position is still under review. But I can assure the honourable Member that in accordance with the requirements both the handicapped and migrants will be the subject matter of specific consideration within the guidelines and not specifically related as a suggestion to defined areas.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Will the Commissioner confirm that institutes for the blind such as St. Dunstan's in Worcester, for instance, will stand high on the priority list in the guidelines if they so apply and I believe they have done — for aid in modernizing their equipment to deal with blind people in that part of the world?

Mr Sutherland. — The problems of the handicapped generally and particularly the problems which have been referred to will, of course, be the subject matter of sympathetic consideration in the drafting of the guidelines.

President. — Question No 5 will not be called as the subject is already on the agenda.

Question No 6, by Mr Lalor (H-726/84):

Subject: Imports of Swiss milk

Will the Commission indicate what quantities of Swiss milk are imported into the Community by each Member State, giving the basis of the agreement, if any, which authorizes such imports, and furthermore how does the Commission justify such imports at a time when the Community farmers are being harassed by milk quotas and superlevies?

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) If I am to attempt to answer the question as accurately as possible, I am, of course, compelled to quote a few figures. I apologize for this, but I hope they will explain the situation. The latest figures available cover imports of Swiss milk up to June 1984. Imports of fresh milk into the Community amounted to 0 tonnes from 1976 to 1980, 1 tonne in 1981, 466 tonnes in 1982 and 600 tonnes in 1983. These quantities were distributed among the various Member States as follows: in 1982 Italy imported all 466 tonnes, in 1983 almost all the imports, 598 of the 600 tonnes, went to Italy, the two remaining tonnes going to France, and in 1984 no milk had been imported by June.

So much for the figures. As for agreements, there is no specific arrangement with Switzerland regarding the

import of milk. Although no milk was exported from Switzerland to the Community in 1984, I cannot exclude the possibility of such arrangements existing, particularly with the French frontier region, last year. But in general I would point out that the Community, which is the world's largest exporter of dairy products, pursues and, in my opinion, should pursue an import policy under which quantitative restrictions are avoided. The only protection against cheap imports is the well-known levy which raises the prices of imported products to the level in the Community.

I assume that in the two years to which I have referred imports into Italy were possible because the price of milk in that country is higher than the guide price, there being a shortage of milk in Italy, as you know. May I conclude by pointing out that in 1983 Italy imported 1.6 m tonnes of milk and that, of this, only 600 tonnes came from outside the Community, a negligible quantity, in other words.

Mr Lalor (RDE). — I appreciate the point made by Mr Andriessen and the fact that he went out of his way to spell out the figures. Indeed, I am availing myself of these very figures to frame my supplementary question. Would the Commissioner not concede that it is fundamentally unjustifiable to make arrangements to facilitate an increase between 1981 and 1983 of 600% in the volume and value of milk imported into the Community from Switzerland? At a time when the Commission is crucifying our own Community farmers with levies and restrictive quotas to prevent over-production and at a time when the Commission ...

(The President urged the speaker to put his question)

Does he not think that this is completely unjustifiable at a time when the Commission and the Council cannot agree on a way of conceding to our own unfortunate milk farmers even a minute increase in their production?

Furthermore, the Commissioner has told us that two tonnes of milk was exported from Switzerland to France two years ago. How did some of that filter its way in a shameful way onto the Air France flight which served Swiss milk to European parliamentarians on their way here to a parliamentary part-session in Strasbourg? That same Swiss milk could be replacing our own allegedly over-produced supply in many of our continental restaurants. Can he justify that?

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) Mr President, firstly, the Commission did not relax the import regulations in the period to which the honourable Member referred, 1981 to 1983. The Commission simply applied the regulations that already existed and imposed the normal levy on imported products.

Andriessen

As regards the honourable Member's second point, I feel I must correct his mathematics: 600% of 0 is 0.

(Laughter)

I am sorry, but you said 0 increased by 600% ... ah, now you say 1 tonne. Then you are right. Then 600% is correct. But it is still almost nothing. It was probably sour milk, something like yoghurt, specific products which can be so easily offered to honourable Members.

I should like to say something of a general nature. As the world's largest exporter of dairy products, we cannot insist on arrangements that include specific quantitative restrictions. We have discussed this same question in the past in the context of beef and veal. What I said then applies to milk too. That is an impossibility, and the Commission does not think that this is the course it should follow.

To conclude, I must also correct the figures quoted by the honourable Member. I am told that an increase from 1 to 600 tonnes is not a 600% but a 6 000 or perhaps even a 60 000% rise.

Mr Simmonds (ED). — I am concerned that there is some misunderstanding about the system whereby imports of dairy produce are allowed into the Community. I am attempting a study of imports as a whole. Mr Lalor has merely questioned Swiss imports, but it does seem to me a little unjust that whereas the Community's dairy farmers are restricted, countries other than Community Member States can, provided they are prepared to pay a levy to bring their milk products up to Community prices, have unlimited access to our dairy markets.

Will the Commissioner explain in words of one syllable to Europe's dairy farmers why he cannot envisage some kind of restriction on imports to the Community dairy products?

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* Mr President, I am asked to explain this in words of one syllable. I will do my best. The answer is that milk producers who know that enormous quantities of milk products have to be sold on the world market beware of taking measures to protect the Community market which would undoubtedly make it far more difficult to export to the world market than it already is.

Mr Pasty (RDE). — *(FR)* I should like to put the following question to the Commissioner: how is it that the Commission does not find it strange that Swiss milk, the producer price for which is double that in the Community, is able to compete with French milk and German milk, which are also exported to Italy? Is not dumping going on here?

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* The Commission has received no complaints of this. If it should do so, it will take appropriate action.

Mr Morris (S). — While the Commission is not prepared to impose import quotas on milk, I am sure they must be aware that the banks in Wales — especially the 'listening' bank — are now foreclosing all loans to the small dairy farmers of Dyfed, thereby forcing at least 10% of the people in dairy farming in Wales out of business, and into bankruptcy.

What steps has the Commission taken or will it take to tell the United Kingdom Government that since the Dyfed farmers are in precisely the same position as the dairy farmers in Northern Ireland, there is no reason for not extending to the Dyfed farmers and the Welsh farmers the same extra quota that has been allowed to the people of Northern Ireland?

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* Under the milk quota system that has now been introduced in the Community the Commission has a responsibility to allocate quotas to the Member States, and the governments of the Member States have the major responsibility of sharing the quotas in their respective countries. And I believe we should leave the division of responsibilities as it is. The Commission has done its duty and has taken account of specific national situations here and there when allocating the quotas. Parliament is aware of this. Otherwise, the Commission leaves the policy to the Member States, as befits a good decentralized policy.

President. — Question No 7, by Mr Roux (H-564/84):

Subject: Rhine-Rhône river link

Is the Commission in a position to explain why in its transport infrastructure policy it has not been able to include the Rhine-Rhône river link as a project of Community interest, as common sense would dictate?

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — May I remind the honourable Member that criteria to identify the Community interest of transport infrastructure projects already exist. In the same way, there are also criteria to identify the eligibility of such projects for Community financial support. These criteria are mentioned in various Council acts, and the Commission will of course send the various basic documents to the honourable Member.

As far as the Rhine-Rhône river link is concerned, this has been included in the general framework of the Community's approach to the whole question of the medium-term infrastructure programme for transport which was communicated to the Council on

Davis

14 December. This is developed in Annex 4 of the communication.

Mr Roux (RDE). — (FR) Mr Commissioner, in so far as this project does not appear to be high on the French Government's list of priorities, is it not the Commission's role to identify and promote projects which it itself considers to be priority projects?

No-one can be in any doubt that the Rhine-Rhône link, which fits in perfectly with the concept of a north-south corridor in Europe and which, moreover, should become part of the continuous system of navigable waterways in the Member States, is of interest to the Community as a whole.

In the circumstances, what explanation can there be for the failure to produce detailed estimates, notably in the most recent communication to the Council on guidelines for medium-term policies on transport infrastructures?

Mr Clinton Davis. — The honourable Member is right in saying that successive French governments — he did not use the word 'successive' — have shown little interest in furthering this particular project. The question is, however, whether in fact the project meets the necessary criteria that have been spelt out very clearly by the Commission with the agreement of the Member States; and, no doubt, the honourable Member is familiar with those criteria.

It is for the Member States to advance a particular project. It is then for the Commission to consider whether it meets the Community criteria which are specifically laid down.

Mr Wijzenbeek (L). — (NL) Does the Commission not feel that this is putting the cart before the horse and that it would be better for the Community to establish its priorities first and then to talk to the Member States rather than Member States undertaking these projects in the Community? Where Community infrastructure is concerned, it is in the final analysis the Community that must decide what the priorities are.

Mr Clinton Davis. — The fact remains that the Commission has laid down the priorities in terms of setting out very clearly what the criteria are. I do not think that it is unreasonable for us to do that.

President. — Question No 8, by Mr Alavanos (H-566/84):

Subject: Proceedings against Greece under Article 169

What justification, what factual elements and whose requests have prompted the Commission to

institute against Greece the procedure provided for under Article 169 with reference to Greek regulations and the practice of the Greek authorities in the matter of public contracts relating to State supplies?

Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the Commission. — As the Commission has indicated in the past, notably in reply to Written Question No 688/77, from Mr Wurtz, and to oral questions from Mr Dalziel on 14 March 1978, the Commission does not provide information on proceedings under Article 169 of the Treaty, although information relating to cases in which a reasoned opinion has been adopted is published in the Bulletin. The Commission is, however, willing to inform a parliamentary committee, on request, of the main arguments involved in individual Article 169 proceedings.

I visited Athens last month to discuss these matters personally with ministers of the Greek Government. The discussions were held in a helpful atmosphere and progress is now being made.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) It is difficult for me to put my prepared supplementary question because the Commissioner has referred to answers given to similar questions three or four years before Greece became a member of the EEC.

From this point of view I feel that the Commissioner has failed to answer my question, and I believe that, disregarding a practice going back in fact some seven years, the new Commission should give clear answers to questions of this kind. I would therefore ask the Commissioner for clarification concerning his reference to a meeting in Athens with the Greek Government, and to the mutual understanding that prevailed in relation to this fundamental matter of direct concern to the development of Greece's economy.

Lord Cockfield. — The point of my quoting the replies which were given, as the honourable Members says, some years ago, was to indicate that this was a long-established practice which has been consistently followed over a period of years, which still remains the Commission's practice and which is, in fact, entirely justifiable. At the time the proceedings are first launched, under Article 169, it may very well be that the Member State concerned has a full and adequate answer to the complaint being made. Where that is so the case is closed. But it would be unfair to the Member State concerned for the Commission to publish what in effect was an *ex parte* statement before the other side had had the opportunity of presenting its own case. It is therefore a perfectly reasonable and a perfectly sensible practice and one which I hope he will agree ought to be continued.

So far as my own discussions with the Greek Government are concerned, the position quite simply is that

Lord Cockfield

the Commission understands and appreciates the difficulties faced by the Greek economy, the problems that they have in adapting to the wider area of the Community market as a whole and the fact that they may in some instances need time to make the necessary adjustments. At the same time it is necessary that the Greek Government should accept that the terms of the Treaty must be adhered to, and indeed it is my clear understanding that they do accept this obligation. The purpose of my visit — and I was accompanied by representatives of the Commission's services involved, as well as by members of my own cabinet — was to go through all the media infractions and to see whether we could agree on a programme for ensuring that where things had gone wrong they were now put right. That process is now continuing. It has been helpful and I think that we will, on both sides, be able to make good progress.

President. — Question No 9, by Mr Christodoulou (H-574/84):

Subject: Availability of lead-free petrol in countries which are not Members of the EEC

The recent decision of the Council of Ministers of the Environment on the use of lead-free petrol from 1989 will — owing to the geographical position of Greece — hinder the passage of private vehicles both to and from Greece and have a particularly damaging effect on tourism, unless it is decided to make available lead-free petrol in the transit countries Austria and Yugoslavia as well.

Can the Commission state whether these countries (Austria and Yugoslavia) will have petrol stations to supply tourists with lead-free petrol in 1989? If not, what steps does the Commission intend taking to tackle this problem?

Mr De Clercq, Member of the Commission. — (NL) As regards the supply of lead-free petrol in Austria, the Austrian authorities have decided to import lead-free regular petrol from 1 April 1985 onwards. So this is already being done, provided it was not an April fool's joke, of course. From 1 October 1985 the sale of regular petrol containing lead will be prohibited in Austria. In addition, in accordance with decisions taken by the Austrian Government, all new cars must be fitted with a catalyst by 1 January 1988, and as these cars will then be running on lead-free petrol, a suitable distribution network will clearly have to be installed by that time.

Where Yugoslavia is concerned, I can say that the Commission has made an official approach to the Yugoslav authorities on this problem, emphasizing that it is in Yugoslavia's own interests to provide an adequate number of lead-free petrol outlets for European Community motorists, whether they are travelling to Yugoslavia itself or merely passing through the country.

Mr Christodoulou (PPE). — (GR) I am pleased to hear that the matter has been dealt with so far as Austria is concerned. As for Yugoslavia, since the information available to the tourist services in my country indicates that satisfactory progress has not been made, I should like to ask the Commissioner whether some solution, even if only temporary, should not be established from now, so that when the system of lead-free petrol is implemented in the Community there will be some petrol stations, at least along the major arterial roads in Yugoslavia, where supplies of lead-free petrol can be obtained with Community assistance, so that problems can be avoided. Because if matters continue as at present nothing will have been done when the time comes.

Mr De Clercq. — (NL) So far we have had no official or unofficial reaction from the Yugoslav authorities to the official approach I have just mentioned. I assume they need some time to respond, but if no reply is received in the fairly near future, we will send a reminder. As for taking measures, I feel it is still too early for that.

President. — Question No 10, by Mr Stewart (H-596/84):

Subject: Barrage across the Mersey

Can the Commission give its view on the feasibility of the recent proposal for a tidal barrage across the Mersey from a technical and economic viewpoint and can it also comment on the regional benefits to employment that might accrue during the construction and subsequent operation of such a barrage?

Lord Cockfield, Vice-president of the Commission. — The Commission's services are considering a request for Regional Fund assistance for a study for the purpose of further research work on the technical and economic feasibility of a barrage across the Mersey. I expect the Commission to be in a position to adopt a decision on this request in the near future. When the results of this research work become available, the Commission will be able to take a view on the building of the barrage.

Mr Stewart (S). — I would like to ask the Commissioner, whether in view of the fact that Merseyside is one of the most depressed areas in the United Kingdom, with one of the worst unemployment problems in the Community, factory closures being an everyday occurrence, recognizing the urgent need for an economic revival and regeneration of the City of Liverpool and the Merseyside area, and knowing what a boost such a project to economic survival and the provision of jobs in that area; recognizing the various study reports already submitted to the Commission. I am asking the Commission whether in view of the various

Stewart

study reports that have already been given he would indicate in fact when there could possibly be an answer to the application by the Merseyside County Council for support aid for the rest of the feasibility study.

Lord Cockfield. — I am fully aware of the problems faced by Merseyside. So far as the question and the present requests are concerned, they are for assistance towards meeting the cost of a study. That study follows on an earlier study undertaken by consultants engaged by the Mersey County Council. The result of the Commission's consideration of the requests for funds for the study will be announced very shortly and I can assure the honourable Member that we are giving the matter favourable consideration.

Mr Ford (S). — I did ask a general question on tidal barrage schemes as a supplementary to my own question, which Commissioner Sutherland rather ducked. I should like to put the same points to the Commissioner now.

Could he give us some idea of the Commission's view of the cost comparison between nuclear, oil, coal and alternative energy schemes, including tidal power schemes, similar to that given to Mr Hughes in answer to his question (H-804/84). Can he tell us a little about the consideration that will be given, in appraising whether Merseyside County Council will get the 14 000 they have asked for, which is a very small sum, to the indirect economic benefits that might flow from recreational activities, etc.

Finally, could he tell me what the Commission's internal rate of return is that they look for in these schemes. I have been told unofficially that it is 5%. That seems to me rather high for a pilot scheme which clearly will have implications for the United Kingdom and for Europe for the future, in terms of providing energy that is renewable rather than using fossil fuels or other resources that can be exhausted. Can he assure me that this will not be a criterion that will be rigidly applied to this scheme in particular or to tidal power schemes in general?

Lord Cockfield. — The points raised by the honourable Member are interesting and important, but they are matters to be taken up after the results of the study are available, not in deciding whether or not the studies should be undertaken, and, in particular, whether the Commission should contribute towards the cost of the study. As I have indicated, the Commission is giving favourable consideration to contributing towards that cost.

Mr Smith (S). — Is the Commissioner aware that if one of the suggested schemes for a barrage on the Severn in South Wales were actually implemented, it

would meet over 10% of Britain's electricity consumption? Is he also aware that, using official EEC statistics, South-East Wales is now one of the most deprived areas in the Community and one which would obviously benefit most from such a scheme?

Lord Cockfield. — I think from the honourable Member's question that there is a certain rivalry between South-East Wales and Merseyside. I hope he will forgive me if I do not myself get involved in that rivalry.

President. — Question No 11, by Mr Pasty (H-597/84):

Subject: Increase in suckler herd premiums

Suckler herd premiums were introduced by the Community to offset the inadequacy of specialist meat producers' incomes compared with those of milk producers. Because of the collapse in beef prices, which are now considerably below the guide price, the situation for these farmers is now disastrous and it is aggravated by the effects of the introduction of milk quotas on dairy cow slaughtering. Does the Commission consider that it is fair to make specialist meat producers, who are already penalized by their income levels, suffer the consequences of an imbalance that has arisen in another sector? Does it not consider that under these circumstances it would be fair to propose a substantial increase in suckler herd premiums or any other measures having an equivalent effect in the price review for the next marketing year?

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) The problems facing the beef sector, to which the question rightly refers, are not, of course, confined to specialist meat producers: they affect the whole sector. The Commission therefore felt that in 1985 it should concentrate its efforts on measures that are principally designed to assist and stabilize the sector as a whole, in other words, intervention buying, assistance for private storage and refunds on exported beef. The Commission expects this policy to benefit the whole of the beef sector and thus the specific sector to which the question alludes.

I would point out in this context that the Community has made a great effort in the past to assist the beef sector. Let me quote you some figures: EAGGF Guarantee Section expenditure rose from 1 200 m ECU in 1982 to 2 300 m ECU in 1984 and so almost doubled over two years. In these circumstances, the Commission did not feel it needed to come forward with further supplementary proposals for the beef sector and should not therefore propose an increase in the suckler herd premium. What I would stress in this connection is that in its farm price proposals for 1985/86 the Commission did not call for an extension of other premiums in the beef sector, particularly the variable

Andriessen

slaughtering premium and the calf premium. The retention of the suckler herd premium shows that the Commission wanted to give priority to this aspect.

May I conclude by pointing out that the question we are now considering formed part of the opinion delivered by Parliament at a previous part-session on the farm price proposals and that the Commission let it be known on that occasion that it could not agree to Parliament's proposal in this respect.

Mr Pasty (RDE). — (*FR*) I did not understand a word of Mr Andriessen's reply; this perhaps had something to do with the people drumming on the desks, but I am inclined to think that there is a more substantive problem.

In reply, the Commissioner spoke of support for the beef and veal market whereas, quite obviously, the purpose of this premium, when it was introduced some years ago, was to guide production. I should therefore like to put the following supplementary: the Commission is currently thinking in terms of alternatives which would have to be offered to farmers in certain regions who have been affected by certain production limits, such as the milk quotas. In the light of its deliberations, does it not consider that it would be appropriate to update this premium to give dairy farmers obliged by the quotas to stop producing milk or to limit their production an opportunity to switch into production of meat, since we know that the dairy cow slaughterings will mean that in a few years there will be a reduction in the amount of meat coming onto the market and perhaps a shortage of beef and veal in the Community?

Mr Andriessen. — (*NL*) We consider it unlikely that the last development suggested or assumed by the honourable Member will occur. Let me quote just one more set of figures on the trend in this premium.

In 1980/81 some 4.5 m head of cattle qualified for this premium. By 1983/84 the figure had risen to over 5.1 m, a not insignificant increase in absolute and percentage terms. If we look at the expenditure on this premium, we find that, while 42.5 m ECU was available in 1980, the amount had risen to 91 m by 1983, more than twice the sum paid out in 1980.

If what the honourable Member says was true — that this premium is designed to guide production in a given direction — the obvious conclusion would surely be that it is not a permanent but a temporary premium. As I have already said, the Commission felt that this particular premium should be retained, unlike all the others in the beef sector, and this reflects the priority which the honourable Member believes should be given to this measure.

An allusion was made to the study we are now making of future prospects. I would point out that this study

covers a somewhat wider field than the honourable Member indicated, but it will certainly deal with the prospects for producers in given sectors. I am, of course, quite prepared to consider as part of this study what should be done about this premium. But I cannot exclude the possibility that the conclusion will not be what the honourable Member wants, an increase in the per capita premium. I cannot therefore anticipate the conclusions that will be drawn, but I am quite prepared to ensure that the study covers this question.

Mr Pranchère (COM). — (*FR*) I was paying attention to what the Commissioner said. Since many arguments have been advanced in favour of taking account of the trend in the suckler herd premium, I should like to remind him that this premium has not been increased since 1982. It is being reduced, whereas in 1983 the full amount of funds allocated, some 96 million ECU, was not used.

My question is as follows: does Mr Andriessen intend to take account of the opinion of Parliament which, in paragraph 96 of the report which I presented, indicates that it is necessary to increase the premium, so as to combat overproduction of milk and to secure supplies of good quality meat? At a time when Mr Andriessen is proposing to enter into negotiations with the farmers' organizations and Parliament, does he or does he not intend to take account of the opinion expressed by Parliament on the subject of suckler herds during its last part-session?

Mr Andriessen. — (*NL*) I thought I had answered the first question. At the end of my first answer I said that the Pranchère report called for an increase in this premium. I mentioned that. I have, of course, read paragraph 102 of the report very carefully, Mr President. I referred to it, and I said that during the debate I had announced that the Commission felt it could not comply with the opinion. I therefore repeat that the Commission feels that in 1985-86 at least the suckling herd premium must stay as it has been since 1982 and that, in view of the proposal that other premiums should be abolished, the retention of this premium is an indication of the priority the Commission feels it should enjoy.

Mr Guermeur (RDE). — (*FR*) My colleague Jean-Claude Pasty put a very pertinent question which the Commissioner does not seem to have answered explicitly. My colleague referred, with justification, to the effects of the Community's bungling policy on dairy farming, and he drew attention to the inevitable consequences of the reduction of dairy herds as a result of the compulsory limitation of production. My colleague asked what measures the Commission intended to promote to save beef and veal producers from the catastrophe which would befall them if they were obliged to slaughter some of their herds. Mr Commissioner, have you taken this absolutely vital factor into

Guermeur

consideration, and what action do you have in mind to avoid a disaster in production of beef and veal as a result of the bungling, I repeat, of policy on dairy production?

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) It is, of course, impossible to tell at the moment what the farmers who reduce their milk production or give it up altogether because of the Community's milk policy will do in the future. An investigation into the possibilities forms part of the study of the prospects which has already been mentioned in this debate. That is one point. The Commission is looking into this question, which it certainly cannot answer on its own, nor does it want to.

Secondly, I should like to say that we have approximately doubled expenditure in support of the market for the beef sector — I have quoted the figure — in the space of two years with a view to going some way towards solving the problems which this sector is facing as a result of the present milk policy — an aspect the author of the question also mentioned — and which are in many respects of a cyclical nature. I very much hope, Mr President, that it will not be necessary to continue spending such large amounts on this particular sector in the future in view of the budgetary resources available to the Community.

There is thus a cyclical and a structural aspect. The cyclical aspect will undoubtedly influence the Commission's and Community's policy and budget in 1985. The structural policy will be covered by the study I have mentioned, and I therefore hope that it will provide a more accurate answer to the question that the honourable Member has rightly put.

President. — Question No 12, by Mr Evrigenis (H-740/84)¹

Subject: Protection of confidentiality of legal documents

According to document COM(84) 548 final of 9 October 1984, the Commission has requested the Council's authorization to negotiate the conclusion of agreements between the European Economic Community and third countries with the object of ensuring protection of confidentiality of legal documents in the field of competition. According to the Commission, the conclusion of agreements of this nature is necessary following the publication of the judgment of the European Court of Justice of 18 May 1982 (case 155/79, AM & S Europe Ltd. Commission)² and is designed both to extend the protection of professional secrecy to independent lawyers from third countries and, correspondingly, to strengthen and

make internationally binding the protection granted by third countries to independent lawyers from the Member States. Would the Commission state:

1. Why the proposed negotiations and the international agreements which may result are confined to matters concerning competition under the EEC Treaty and are not broadened to cover competition under the terms of the other treaties or other related fields such as those defined under the anti-dumping rules or Article 213 of the EEC Treaty?
2. Whether it intends to request the opinion of the Court of Justice under Article 228(1), paragraph 2, as to whether the international agreements which are to be negotiated are compatible with the provisions of the Treaty or Treaties?
3. Whether it also intends to amend and supplement Council Regulation 17/62¹ in order to clarify and consolidate the system of protection of lawyers' professional secrecy in accordance with the proposals contained in Parliament's resolution of 13 April 1984.²

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — The judgment of the Court of Justice in the AM and S Case, which is Case No 155 of 1979, only concerns the competition rules of the Treaty. As regards the application of other treaties — treaties other than the EEC Treaty, in particular the ECSC Treaty — it is very rare, except in anti-dumping procedures, for enterprises from third countries to be involved. Therefore, the problem of legal privilege being accorded to the correspondence between such enterprises and non-EEC lawyers, hardly arises. As for giving the Commission powers of information gathering and investigation by way of a Council regulation based on Articles 2 and 3 of the EEC Treaty, it would have to be decided on a case by case basis to what extent such regulations in practice pose the problem of legal privilege.

Finally, with respect to the anti-dumping rules, it should be underlined that the investigations carried out by the Commission consist mainly in seeking actual figures from the enterprises so that the problem regarding the privileged nature of the correspondence between these enterprises and their lawyers arises to a lesser degree.

With reference to the second part of the question, the Commission does not see at this stage what questions should be submitted to the Court of Justice for its opinion on the basis of Article 228, paragraph 1, sub-section 2 of the EEC Treaty.

¹ Former oral question without debate (0-114/84), converted into a question for question time.

² European Court Reports 1982, pp. 1575-1616.

¹ OJ C 13, 21. 2. 1962, p. 104.

² OJ C 127, 14. 5. 1984, p. 131.

Sutherland

Finally, with regard to the third part of the question, the definition or uniformization within the Community of the protection of lawyers' professional secrecy exceeds the framework of the rules relating to the applications of Article 85 and 86. Consequently, a modification of Regulation 17 of 1962 would not, in the Commission's view, constitute an appropriate legal basis to resolve this problem in its entirety. Furthermore, a modification of Regulation 17, 1962 is not envisaged.

Mr Evrigenis (PPE). — (GR). I thank the Commissioner for his answer. However, I have three supplementary questions:

First, the Court's decision in the matter of AM and S actually concerned the application of the EEC Treaty's rules on competition. However, in a more general way it raised the subject of the protection of legal confidentiality. Why are the agreements being negotiated limited to the EEC Treaty's rules on competition, which cover only one segment of a more general review that needs to be considered from the standpoint of legal confidentiality as well?

Secondly, does the Commissioner consider that the negotiation of an international agreement on a matter so vital for the functioning of justice and for the exercise of the legal profession should fall within the exclusive competence of the Community and not that of the Member States? Here indeed is a matter on which the Court's opinion could be sought in accordance with Article 228 of the EEC Treaty.

My third supplementary question in this: in relation to this matter, is the Commission in touch with the consultative committee of the Community's lawyers' association?

Mr Sutherland. — With reference to the first part of the question, relating to the application of Treaties other than the EEC Treaty and to matters other than those pertaining to Articles 85 and 86, it is, as I have pointed out, very rare, except in the case of anti-dumping procedures, for enterprises from third countries to be involved. The issue hardly arises, because under the anti-dumping rules investigations which have been or would be carried out in the future by the Commission consist in seeking actual figures. So, the only issue with which the Commission has been concerned arising out of the AM & S case is competition policy. Therefore, that is the only area in which the Commission is seeking to regularize the position, as the Commission believes that it is now obliged to do, having regard to the difficulties which could arise if agreements of this kind were not entered into.

The Commission believes that, the recommendation which has been put before the Council is something which is within the competence of the Community and

that it is proper that this matter should be dealt with as proposed by the Commission. The problem is that in some third countries rules or precedent on the protection of confidentiality exist which are similar or equivalent to those in Community law and which are also applied to communications with lawyers entitled to practice in a Member State of the Community. In such cases it is to be feared that it could be argued that the system applied in the Community discriminates against those lawyers, as opposed to the position which pertains within the Community itself following the judgment to which I have referred.

In regard to the third aspect of the question, i.e. the consultation which has been carried out, I can only say that the Commission has made the fullest possible investigation before deciding to put forward this recommendation.

I cannot answer specifically the question that was asked in regard to the Lawyers Association. That is something which I will enquire about. I hope to be able to give the honourable Member the information he requires at a later date.

President. — The first part of Question Time is concluded.¹

5. Migrant workers (continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on the reports of Mrs Marinaro (Doc. A 2-4/85) and of Mr Papapietro (Doc. A 2-12/85).

Mr Le Chevallier (DR). — (FR) Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, at the risk of drawing smiles from the Communist and their fellow-travellers, I will say that the members of the Group of the European Right are neither racist nor xenophobic. They merely make the distinction between Europeans and others.

Harmonization of laws on immigrants must therefore take account of the different circumstances of these two groups. This, quite simply, is the opinion of the French Minister for External Affairs, who has said as much in his observations on the Communist Marinaro report. I quote what he has had to say about the Marinaro report:

'It contains various ambiguities, to say the least of it. She (Mrs Marinaro) treats freedom of movement for Community nationals within the territory of Member States and the problems of migration by nationals of other countries as a single issue, whereas separate texts are called for in order to deal with the differences between the populations concerned and to comply with the

¹ See Annex of 17. 4. 85.

Le Chevallier

provisions concerning competence contained in the Treaties.'

This is why we moved a referral back to committee this morning, so that two separate reports could be prepared, to examine what should be done for emigrants from within the Community and for those from elsewhere.

When we were learning the history of France, we were taught that there were remote causes and immediate causes of war.

It is possible that future historians will identify the Communist Marinaro report as a not so very remote cause of civil war in Europe. What exactly is it all about?

Ladies and Gentlemen, what Mrs Marinaro's report is proposing to us is nothing short of a policy for the settlement of Europe by foreign populations, the realization of the hopes of President Boumedienne, who is on record as having declared before the United Nations: 'One day millions of men will leave the poverty-stricken southern regions of the world and surge into the relatively accessible areas of the northern hemisphere, seeking to secure their very survival', and the implication is that it will not necessarily be in a peaceful manner that they do so.

But let me first of all make two points which go some way to explain the drift of this report. First, Mrs Marinaro is a Communist and as such is eager to see the disappearance of the European Community, whose cohesion and authority can only hinder Moscow's plans. What better way to achieve this end than by turning Europe into a vast multicultural, multiracial and multid denominational hotchpotch, so that it would only be a matter of time before it became a soulless, impotent Tower of Babel, powerless to defend itself against bold invaders? On this point, I agree with Mrs Chouraqui, who spoke before me this morning.

Secondly, and this is an extraordinary thing, how is it that the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment entrusted this report to an Italian Communist, when the Communists readily engage in illegal immigration, or even military immigration, as in Afghanistan?

What Mrs Marinaro is offering us is surreptitious immigration, and it is no doubt because she is Italian that she was chosen. We know that Italy is a country of emigration, not immigration, and that Italians have gone to live abroad in large numbers.

Mrs Marinaro is very well aware that the unrealistic and dangerous policies that she is recommending would have no effect on Italy, for the time being at any rate, but would have a massive impact on France, whose laws in this field are the laxest in Europe. Mrs Marinaro has a rather curious conception of European solidarity.

The confusion wilfully created by Mrs Marinaro between intra-Community migrants and extra-Community immigrants is to be denounced in the strongest possible terms. The rapporteur is seeking by this means to extend the benefit of Community provisions, primarily freedom of movement and establishment, to all migrant workers, irrespective of their nationality or country of origin.

This is a clear case of distortion of the letter and spirit of the Treaty establishing the Community, which most certainly does not class both the European and non-European populations as 'migrant workers'.

Article 48 stipulates very clearly that freedom of movement for workers within the Community entails the abolition of all discrimination based on nationality between workers of the Member States.

The Group of the European Right denounces these fraudulent manoeuvres loud and clear, issuing a reminder that the Europe intended by the founding fathers was not a vast free-trade area but a genuine Community protected by a common external tariff and very real frontiers.

How does our Group propose that this challenge to our peoples and our governments should be met?

First of all it is necessary to develop an ambitious policy to increase the birth-rate and promote the family, to people Europe with Europeans, and to repeal the decadent abortion laws which contain the potential for a massive European genocide.

Another priority is to promote development in third countries, especially in Africa, by intensifying the policy on trade timorously set in train under the third Lomé Convention.

It is not by abolishing Community preference and adopting lax immigration laws that the Community will deter illegal immigrants and their families attracted by the 'welfare Community', entering Europe by the back door in increasing numbers.

This deliberate decision to make wholesale improvements in conditions for an uprooted emigrant minority unwilling or unable to integrate in their host countries instead of opting for conventions or bilateral agreements to assist the majority who have stayed in their countries of origin is a grave error of judgment for which certain people will have to answer to history.

It is for themselves that the nations of the Third World want progress, they do not want to look on from afar at the relative success of a few of their sons, and not always the best. If the extra-Community emigrants returned to their countries of origin, Europe would be able to devote more resources to job-creating productive investments, to vocational training, to basic farming and craft industries, and it would also be able to

Le Chevallier

provide more loans and aid in various forms. With this approach, Europe would rediscover its civilizing, humanist role and the Third World its roots and its traditions.

It is unacceptable that immigrants from outside Europe should become full citizens of the Community enjoying all the civil, political, economic, social and educational rights granted to nationals of the Member States, when at the same time they wish neither to be naturalized, for political or religious reasons, nor to be assimilated. Moreover, it is deplorable that some people should be given favourable treatment exempting them from the laws applicable to the population at large, on military service for instance. Enjoyment of the benefits offered by a society must be matched by commitment and acceptance of its rules and customs, and above all its laws. That must be absolutely clear. No-one is obliged to stay in the countries of the Community and anyone refusing to accept these rules, this *modus vivendi*, should be expelled immediately.

Our governments have a duty to stem and then reverse the tide of immigration from outside Europe and they must make their position clear and adopt appropriate legislation to demonstrate to the rest of the world that Europe intends to resume control of its destiny.

Finally, we could follow the example of Switzerland, the oldest democracy in Europe, and give the peoples of Europe an opportunity to express their views on the daunting problem of immigration by way of referendum, giving them the right to decide for themselves.

Until the recent past most immigration was from within Europe. Now it is primarily from Africa and the Indian subcontinent. These immigrants from outside Europe, whose cultural backgrounds, religions and traditions are different from ours, and who are unable or unwilling to integrate in a Community built on other values, represent a danger to Europe which will develop over the years if nothing is done to rectify the situation.

Moreover, there are already threats of destabilization, subversion and infiltration from a number of extremist Moslem countries and they are bound to get worse if we show weakness or merely accept the situation.

A vote for the Communist Marinaro report would be a vote to sacrifice Europe's identity and historical unity to the chimeras of Third-Worldism and the 'prophets' of decadence and plurimania, to deliver up Europe bound hand and foot to Islam and Soviet totalitarianism. It would be a vote to bring fresh causes of civil war into Europe, and we have had enough of that.

I call upon all Members of this House who are concerned for the future of Europe and its children to reflect on the terrible consequences of a failure to display lucidity and courage in this Chamber today.

(Applause from the European Right)

IN THE CHAIR: MR DIDÒ*Vice-President*

Mrs Dury (S). — (FR) Mr President, the study of history should normally assist an understanding of the present. This is manifestly not so in Mr Le Chevallier's case, since he seems to be unaware that the Italian Communist Party is a pro-European party and also seems to be unaware that, whatever he may say, immigration is well and truly at an end in most European countries. To give the example of my own country, immigration has been effectively at an end since 1974. The same is true of France. On the other hand, we face the problem of . . .

(Interruptions from the extreme right)

I think that Mr Le Pen and his friends are letting themselves be blinded by their racism and xenophobia, and I wish that they would listen to the other speakers. We sat through their drivel for nine minutes, and I think that I have the right to speak as well.

(Applause from the left)

The European Parliament has an opportunity today to demonstrate its sense of responsibility, to show that, in dealing with the problem of immigration, it intends to contribute solutions which alleviate tensions rather than heightening them, tensions which drive out foreign nationals and which eventually put weapons in the hands of those who kill little children. I will say that, as Socialists, we are in agreement with Mrs Marinaro's report, which is concerned first and foremost with the rights of Community workers. The Community that we want to see is one where everyone who works within its territory has identical rights — and identical duties.

We are also in favour of Mrs Marinaro's report because it has clearly shown that, although the Commission had made a correct analysis of the immigration problem, the proposals that it made to the Council were, in my opinion, inadequate and mediocre when set against the analysis made.

I should like to say two things: the first is that, whatever may be said or thought, and however much the fact may be regretted, immigration is an irreversible phenomenon. Living in our countries there are migrants who have shared and contributed to our prosperity, and these people are going to stay, whatever repatriation assistance is provided, because their children were born in our countries and want to continue living here.

(Applause from the left)

Dury

I should also like to say, Mr Le Pen, that immigration is first and foremost a social problem and should be treated as such.

(Interruption from the extreme right)

The aim of our Community is to improve conditions for all; I do not think in terms of Europeans and non-Europeans, but of people who have the same right . . .

(Interruptions from the extreme right)

Mr President, perhaps they could be removed from the Chamber . . . In any event, they do not want this debate, they do not want to listen.

You at any rate have already put yourself beyond the pale of the House by your behaviour, Mr Le Pen!

(Interruptions from the benches of the European Right — Applause from the left)

I wish to say this: what we want is a concerted approach at European level. We are very well aware that migrant workers have to put up with intolerance, stupidity and incomprehension. We want the Commission and the responsible ministers of the Member States to join together to produce a real policy. That policy consists in saying: very well, we know that immigration is at an end, but on the other hand the migrants who are living in our countries are entitled to security under the law and the right to vote in local elections.

(Interruptions from the benches of the European Right — Applause from the left)

It is essential for us to have this concerted approach. The future of the Community depends on it. When I hear the arguments against migrants, against human beings, I say that our duty as democrats — and you are no democrat, Mr Le Pen — is to help to find solutions. The Marinaro report, which we now have before us, has provided a number of answers. What we want to ensure is that the Member States are left in no doubt as to the dangers inherent in the proposals made by the group of the extreme right. Today it is the migrant workers that they have in their sights. Next it will be the unemployed, then women, and then — why not? — the handicapped. What we are dealing with is a threat to our democracy.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Le Pen (DR). — (FR) Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the last speaker asserted that I was not a democrat. I would like her to prove . . .

(Interruptions from the left)

Listen, this is a serious matter and I should be allowed to make myself heard.

I am not prepared to allow this insult to pass and I challenge the speaker concerned to produce a shred of evidence to prove her slanderous assertion. I have very often had occasion to bring actions in the French courts against others who have made that accusation against me. And I have to tell the House that on each such occasion French justice has found against the slanderers and libellers.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (NL) Mr President, I welcome the report on immigrants we are now discussing and congratulate the rapporteur, Mrs Marinaro, although I am dependent on neither Moscow or Washington.

I would point out that throughout history immigrants have had a considerable innovative influence on the indigenous population. Without this stimulus various nations and civilizations would have gone under in the past as a result of waste, inbreeding and obsolescence. Is old Europe not in danger of going under unless immigrants breathe new life into it?

Demographically speaking, the population pyramid in Europe is beginning to stand on its head: many elderly people, few young ones and an alarming decline in the birth rate.

Socially speaking, who is going to provide the social services for an older European population? If we give the younger generation of immigrants our support today, they will give us their support in the future.

Socio-culturally speaking, you have to live in immigrant quarters to realize how enormously creative and socially dynamic this section of the population is. I myself have spent my whole life living and working with immigrants, and I can assure you that they have had an enormous influence on me. As in all the other Member States of the Community, the immigrants in my country form one of the most active sections of the population, both politically and culturally.

I should also like to draw your attention, ladies and gentlemen, to the fact that a nation that has immigrants in its midst is a great nation whose culture incorporates a universal value and solidarity. I would refer in this context to the great traditions described in the Bible and to the other great freedom movements in modern history, from the ideals of the French revolution through to the social movements. If we succeed in outlawing all racial discrimination against immigrants, we shall overcome all social discrimination against marginal groups in our own population.

Those who treat immigrants fairly will also treat the peoples of the Third World fairly, because it is from here that many of the new immigrants are coming. If we seek justice in the European Community, we shall avoid any kind of exploitation of the Third World

Ulburghs

countries and help them with their own economic and political development, so that fewer people need to leave their countries for economic and political reasons.

I will conclude, Mr President, with a few practical thoughts. Firstly, if immigrants are to be integrated harmoniously in the European Community, the attempt must always be made to involve them in activities to this end. Secondly, I believe priority should be given to integrated projects in neighbourhoods where immigrants live in large numbers, as is done in the large cities of the United States and as we are trying to do in Belgian Limburg. Thirdly, we consider it important for the right to vote to be given to all immigrants who have lived in one of the Member States for at least five years, beginning with the right to vote in local elections. For years these immigrants have been able to vote in elections to works councils, so why should they not have the right to vote in political elections. Finally, we emphasize that integration applies on both sides and presupposes an exchange of values.

Mrs Peus (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, implementation of the directive on schooling for the children of migrant workers leaves much to be desired in the various Member States. Reception tuition is usually given only at the primary level and not thereafter. Ethnic culture and instruction in the mother tongue are often given in the afternoons, and not at the secondary level; the number of pupils is often too high. Teacher training is optional in many countries, there is no provision for further training jointly for teachers from the guest and host country, and in only two member countries are there joint committees with representatives of guest and host countries which concern themselves not only with the question of teacher allocation but also with didactic and methodological questions.

The Group of the European People's Party thus warmly endorses the Papapietro report which urgently calls on Member States comprehensively to implement the directives and enact necessary legislation and regulations without delay.

The Group of the EPP particularly welcomes the call, made in the explanatory statement to the Papapietro report, for greater involvement of the parents of migrants, foreigners' associations, foreigners' welfare services and local government representatives. The rule applying to education in all the Member States, that schools must be more open to the outside world if they are to prepare children adequately for their subsequent social and vocational role, is even more relevant to the children of migrant workers, whose social and vocational integration is far more problematical. But the EPP members of the Committee on Youth particularly welcome the Papapietro report for its lack of radical or extreme demands of the kind often discussed in the media and already discussed today in this House, both which would almost certainly not be upheld by the majority of our populations.

Allow me to make just three observations on this. There is no denying that it is sensible and necessary in educational terms that migrant children should be absorbed as quickly as possible into standard classes. But anyone who seeks to make even temporary removal from standard classes impossible in any individual case ends up with a situation in which too much may be expected of the migrant children, whilst the children of the host country see their legitimate expectations of advancing in accordance with their knowledge and abilities curtailed.

It goes without saying that considerable educational skill and care is needed to wean migrant children slowly away from their mother tongues and dialects to the official host languages. But anyone who seeks to give mother tongue and host language equal status in education for all children will not get far either; the result, as we have already heard today on several occasions, will be linguistic confusion, a tower of Babel, instead of greater understanding.

Lastly, there is no denying that the host countries have a duty to ensure that migrant children do not lose their cultural identity. This is also true, however, of the children of the host country. The mature adult may adapt easily to a multicultural society. The child needs first to become part of his own culture and system of values in order to challenge them and thus enrich himself.

Mr Barzanti (COM). — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are in the fullest possible agreement with the resolutions that have been put forward. They are particularly important as regards the question of civil and political rights. Allowing the migrant workers to exercise the right to vote and to be elected in local government elections is essential in order to promote their full participation in the government and management of their own community, the community of which they are in fact members. For the election of this Parliament, also, it is necessary to act along these lines — that is to say, basing both active and passive electoral rights, the right to elect and to be elected, no longer on nationality but on effective residence.

But the problem of the effective integration of groups and persons with different backgrounds and their own identities cannot be solved purely and simply by the granting of rights. Promoting and supporting the communal life of those who have often been obliged to leave their own country in search of work means acting with the awareness that in the age of the 'electronic village' it is more than ever essential to practice pluralism. Hence the importance, therefore, of what has been said regarding the delays, hesitation and inertia with which, apart from a very few exceptions, the 1977 directive has been applied. There is no question — as has been claimed here, in order to make the problem appear ridiculous — of creating a new 'Babel'. It is rather a question of instituting policies for

Barzanti

the prompt, effective creation of educational structures that will allow the migrants to learn the language of the country of residence but will not neglect to teach the mother tongue, which is and must be a permanent means of keeping alive the unforgettable roots in one's own mother country, with its heritage of ideas, sentiments and images. It is therefore not a policy of ghettos and non-communicating islands that we have to pursue, but a policy of integration, a policy of fruitful enrichment for everyone.

On this occasion we should like furthermore to ask the Council and the Commission once again to prepare a Community Statute for the migrant worker which, based on the Convention concluded in Strasbourg on 24 October 1977, which came into force in 1983, would standardize and clarify the application of principles and regulations that now enjoy wide support.

During the course of the debate emphasis has frequently been given to the need to make a clear distinction between migrant workers who are members of the Community and workers who come from countries outside the Community. Well, we think that in the case of workers from the Community, who are all citizens of one Europe, the questions seen from a strictly legal standpoint — have specific connotations that is unquestionable. But it is one thing to emphasize the specific nature or the necessarily gradual character of the process of harmonization of rights and treatment, and another thing to set up an insurmountable, hateful barrier between one group and the other, which is a form of discrimination that is inhuman, quite apart from its being unjust.

The road to full equality for all migrant workers will be long and difficult, as we know, but the direction in which we have to move — a direction that is indicated in the resolution of the competent committee and the resolutions of the Committees on Social Affairs and Culture — is one that commands full support; and these indications should be seen as practical, immediate and urgent indications of complex, longer term objectives. The task facing Parliament is to control the flow of migrants on the basis of sure and certain principles, and to respond to the difficult challenge that faces us by reviving, against any resurgence of racism or xenophobia, the most noble European traditions of democracy, tolerance and egalitarianism. The resolutions are in line with this task.

This is undoubtedly the road that we have to take, because, as Bernard Stasi wrote in a fine book on this subject — *'L'immigration, une chance pour la France'* — the great challenge to man today, and in the next century, will be whether he is able to live out his faith in humanity or divinity on a universal scale.

(Applause from the Communist Group)

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC). — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by

congratulating the two rapporteurs on their sound and clearly structured reports. I believe that the problems have been correctly stated and that, with a few minor exceptions, the solutions are balanced. But I think I said the same some eighteen months ago, when this subject was being discussed in Parliament.

It does not, of course, help to say that a policy on migrants ought really to have been introduced twenty years ago, but it does help when it comes to analysing the two reports. What they have to say was just as applicable twenty years ago. We all know the problems: vocational training, reception, schooling, culture, social security and services — the same problems as existed then. The migrants who came to our countries at that time probably got by because they came at what was in fact an economically good time, and many managed to settle down to a more or less comfortable existence. Furthermore, their ties to their own countries were still very strong because this first generation had been brought up in the country of origin. But the situation is far worse and different for their children and grandchildren, the second and, shortly, the third generation.

Although I am able to endorse the many suggestions made in the Marinaro and Papapietro reports, they fail to do something that I consider essential: they fail to place the emphasis on the way in which we are going to give the tens of thousands of second-generation young people their place in our Community. A great deal has been written about this, as many Members will probably know. There are many accounts of lost roots, lost culture, of falling between two stools, disappointments in the labour market, failure at school, the hopeless feeling of 'nobody wants me'. The absence of any kind of policy on migrants has resulted in a generation being lost, and clearly no one knows how this loss is to be made good. If this deplorable situation is not to have even greater ramifications, it must be accepted that the education and training of these growing young people is an extremely important task. Their particular situation must also be taken into account, and the attempt must be made to avoid repeating past mistakes. Specifically, this means that these young people must speak their own language, that they must gradually learn the language in which they are taught, that they must be systematically and progressively integrated into the indigenous population. At present nothing at all, apart from a few experiments, is being done in this respect.

Look at Brussels, known as the capital of Europe. You do not need to go far from Belliard Street to find several schools where almost all the pupils are migrant children. One in three of the children born in Brussels is the child of migrants, and in some parts of Brussels the figure is as high as one in two. They are put in classes of at least 35, without any preparation or adjustment. Few understand the language in which they are taught. The teachers are becoming desperate.

Vandemeulebroucke

It is not unusual for migrant children to stay down three or four times.

Mr Papapietro recently said that the second generation has reached a higher level of development. I think he is being optimistic. Many are still illiterate. That is why top priority must now be given to special education for migrant children because that will prepare them for the future. We have already lost one generation, and all we can offer these people now is various palliatives: adult education, vocational retraining, reculturalization. But programmes are not enough. There must be a change of attitude. Northern European society can only plead guilty and try to make good the mistakes of the past. Which brings us automatically to the problem of the international division of labour, which I believe is the crux of the matter.

Ladies and gentlemen, I will conclude by wishing the Commissioner responsible every success. I am afraid that the new plan of action bears too much similarity to the one adopted in 1976. I feel that too little attention has been paid to the second and third generations, that too little thought has been given to the future. Nonetheless, this is a good step forward, and I hope the Commissioner will continue in this direction.

Mr Hindley (S). — Mr President, our sensibilities in this Chamber have been assuaged by words of racists, but we must not forget that outside, in the real world, migrants are being physically attacked by racists. In that connection, I am pleased to see Members of this Assembly wearing the French badge which says, 'Keep your hands off my mate!'. These reports that we have before us are to be welcomed for the reason that they focus attention on one of the most, if not the most, exploited and abused sections of our Community. We should remind ourselves that migrant workers have come here to improve their own conditions and the conditions of their families, often to escape hopeless and repressive domestic situations. These are the self-same reasons why millions of European ordinary working people have left our continent and sought asylum and a new life on other continents in history. We should have some sympathy with these people.

Migrants also come here because in times of so-called labour shortage our governments and their agencies have actively recruited abroad. In my own country, London Transport recruited directly in the West Indies. In my own area, the local health authorities have recruited directly in Italy and Spain. On coming to our countries, they have often taken jobs whose skill level is far below that which their own skills and qualifications entitle them to. That is also true of their children.

Migrant labour continues to do the dirty work for all of us in Western Europe. There is considerable irony when people still use the term 'guest workers' (*Gastarbeiter*). Guest implies hospitality, not only treating

people as your equal but giving them extra concern and consideration because they are guests. In fact, the very opposite of that is true. Migrant workers are at best met with indifference to their concerns and their culture and at worst, and increasingly, met with hostility.

Migrants suffer higher unemployment rates, worse living conditions and worse health. As the crisis in the capitalist system deepens, they are increasingly used as scapegoats for all our ills. The fact that there were racist attacks in 1980 and that parties can win seats in this Assembly using migrants as scapegoats is a telling indictment on all of us as hosts to these people. The EEC countries say many fine words and pass wonderful resolutions about racial harmony. However, our institutions remain closed to migrants.

My own country's immigration and nationality laws are racist in intent and practice. I welcome particularly the call to facilitate the reunification of families. On the one hand, the United Kingdom Government deliberately impedes the reunification of black families, while on the other hand they speed through in a matter of days nationality procedures to allow a white South African girl to run in the Olympics for Britain.

In striving for acceptance and recognition, migrant workers have often been forced to renounce important aspects of their own culture and, therefore, I welcome very much the calls in these reports to encourage the preservation of migrant culture. By preserving their culture, we enrich our own.

We are in a situation of continuing debt to migrant workers. They contribute enormously to our wealth and our welfare. In the United Kingdom particularly, we have a considerable historical and moral debt to these people, because our wealth has been based on the savage and ruthless exploitation of our colonies. If the positive discrimination proposed in both these reports is accepted to some degree, then I hope that at long last we can begin to repay some of that debt.

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti (PPE). — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of the European People's Party has for a long time urged the implementation of the programme of action for migrant workers.

In our motion for a resolution of 21 November 1984 we also asked that emigration problems be given priority for action by this Parliament during the present legislature.

The Commission's new Communication, and the report by Mrs Marinaro, repeat many of our requests, especially our request for the policy on emigration to be updated to suit the present situation which is characterised, amongst other things, by the resurgence of alarming racist and xenophobic tendencies, that

Cassanmagnago Cerretti

require a massive information commitment, but also more precise legal intervention to fight them.

We cannot ignore the problems of the second generation of emigrants, who are faced with serious difficulties of cultural identity and integration. In this connection, action by the Commission is more than ever necessary to ensure the application in full of the directive on education and schooling for the children of migrant workers. On that subject, I would refer members to the Papapietro report.

Out of 12 million migrant workers, with their families, citizens of the Member States account for 3.5 million today, which will become 5 million tomorrow, after the accession of Spain and Portugal.

Where the citizens of Member States are concerned, the very concept of migrant workers has no longer any reason to exist, since they are citizens with freedom of movement throughout the EEC to whom all civil and political rights must be guaranteed — the electoral right to vote and to be elected, at least at local level; the right to vote in European elections; the right to application of the European regulations on the subject of social security and limitation of access to public functions — in accordance with the case law of the Court of Justice, which is now clear.

The situation of workers from outside the Community is more complex, but we have to accept greater responsibility for them, not least at times of economic crisis, in accordance with fundamental principles of solidarity.

It is these principles that lead us to reject the idea of any kind of wage discrimination or discrimination in regard to social security benefits, where migrant workers resident legally with their families in Community countries are concerned.

But it is this same sense of responsibility that must oblige the countries of Europe to exercise closer control over the new influx of migrants, providing a clear picture — through special immigration offices — of what jobs are really available for potential immigrants.

We have constantly emphasized, in committee as well, the family aspect of the question of migrant workers, and the right of such workers to be united with their families.

Immigration policies in relation to third countries, including repatriation programmes for those who want them, should be the subject of agreement between Member States, as part of a coordinated Community programme.

A determined fight must be waged against clandestine immigration, and against those who promote this for their own financial gain.

In conclusion, Mr President, conscious of the sensitivity already shown by the Italian Presidency where the problems of migrant workers are concerned, we very sincerely hope that the Council of Ministers will finally adopt the proposals put forward by this Parliament.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) Mr President, today there are more than 17 million migrants in the Community's Member States. The countries that have received them, that have squeezed them dry for decades by the savage exploitation of cheap labour for heavy, underrated, manual work, have condemned them to live at the fringes of society as second-class citizens. Without exaggeration, migrant workers are today's serfs who have paid dearly for the consequences of the EEC's crisis. The notice hung by a West German landlord outside a building he owned is quite typical: 'To let: suitable as a stable, or dwelling for a migrant worker'.

Among these 17 million outcasts from the EEC society there are about 350 000 Greek workers and their families, most of whom, around 300 000, are in the Federal Republic of Germany. Time does not permit me to describe their conditions in detail. Just the fact that the average per capita income in their families is only DM 520, and that there are almost 30 000 unemployed, shows the wretchedness of their way of life.

Mr President, I would now like to say something about the problem of education, which is one of the basic prerequisites if Greeks, and generally all migrants are to escape from the ghettos where they have lived for years. The problem concerns 116 000 young Greeks below the age of 25 years. Of these, 78 500 aged 15 years and under were born in West Germany, while the remaining 37 500 have lived there for an average of 15 years. How is the problem of their education tackled? Thanks to the policies of the German authorities, but also to the silly, unfounded and demagogic chauvinism of all Greek Governments — unfortunately including today's — thousands of young Greeks, the children of migrants, have no proper language but speak half-Greek and half-German. They have remained uneducated and without integrated and up-to-date knowledge. Thus, with no professional specialization and training they are destined to swell the ranks of the unskilled proletariat and to live on the fringes of society. Instead of studying in the schools of their host countries from kindergarten and primary level up to secondary level, high school and university where the appropriate educational and technical facilities are available, so that they can develop and perfect their abilities, they have been and still are studying in separate Greek schools with vast objective deficiencies, and consequently remain uneducated and unspecialized.

As for the so-called danger of losing their Greek national identity, this exists only in the minds of those

Adamou

who wish to ignore reality. The mother-tongue and national cultural influences could be taught compulsorily by Greek teachers in foreign schools, and could be cultivated and developed in cultural centres, migrant organizations and the families of the migrants, with the full support and backing of the host country.

The analogous positive experience of thousands of young Greeks who lived for 35 years in Socialist countries as political refugees completely confirms this view. Thus, alongside national identity, the human dignity of the migrants would be ensured since they could take part as equal members of the societies in which they live and work.

The Marinaro and Papapietro reports contain many positive proposals, which we support. Yet, we do not believe that the Community's policy towards migrants is likely to change. The interests of employers, who exploit migrants and make excessive profits from their work, will always define the framework of that policy.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Avgerinos (S). — (GR) Mr President, the migrant problem is not just a social and humanitarian problem that concerns an import and numerous category of working people in the Community. It also particularly involves the Community's obligation to abide by one of its founding principles, namely freedom of movement for working people.

However, on the basis of our experience so far, how long can we persist with present policies regarding migrants? Have these policies resulted in gains and costs, and if so for whom? Lastly, have we proved the existence of a Europe capable of preserving and safeguarding the rights of working people within its legal and geographical framework, or is it evident that Europe cannot abide by its principles when the national economic expediencies that contributed to its creation have in the course of time ceased to pertain?

I would like to try and answer these questions by referring to the experiences of a country, my own, a very large proportion of whose working population was forced after the war to migrate for economic and social reasons.

I believe that our experiences so far constitute a practical refutation of theories that claimed mutual economic benefit for the countries of origin and the host countries of migrant workers. Migrants contributed a great deal to building up and renewing the productive potential of the North. Today however, in different economic circumstances, the countries in the North not only fail to contribute to relieving the pressure of unemployment in less well developed parts of the Community, but on the contrary, favour and support the return of migrants to their countries of origin.

The second group of problems that must be highlighted relate to the migrants themselves as citizens, as working people, and as the subjects of personal and social rights. First of all we must express our grave reservations and concern about the extent to which migrant workers have been able to retain their identity. Migrants have been obliged to integrate, often under great pressure, into foreign societies and cultures without any means of preserving their own national and cultural heritage.

Nowadays, however, while second and third generations face more and more acute problems of national and cultural identity, they are coming under attack not only from extreme right-wing racist organizations, but even from official government policies which see in migrants the easiest way to deal with employment pressures in their country.

I would first like to express my agreement with the proposed resolution, especially in stressing the need to work out specific positions that will constitute our future lines of action.

It is a moral imperative for the host countries to develop educational programmes in collaboration with the countries of origin, to make it possible for the children of migrants to preserve and cultivate their mother-tongue and the culture of their country.

The Community should support bipartite agreements between the host country and the country of origin, and for its part, examine the possibility of founding enterprises in peripheral areas that will employ over 50% of the manpower represented by repatriated workers.

So far as immigrant workers from third countries are concerned, we agree completely with the principle of gradually extending to them the principles of the common policy on migrants, presupposing of course that in each case the specific conditions pertaining to the country in question would be examined.

Finally, I should like to stress the importance we place on the need for the Community, but also the governments of Member States, to collaborate with migrants' organizations in the various countries. It is unacceptable that not only should there be no collaboration, but not even recognition by the official German authorities of the federation of Greek communities in Germany, representing as they do at least 80% of the migrants. Collaboration between the Community, the national governments and the migrants' organizations is a prerequisite if we are to progress towards the solution of a problem which is both very old and very current for the Community, and which truly provides a yardstick of our ability to advance towards a Europe whose citizens enjoy fair treatment and freedom.

Mrs Lenz (PPE), Chairman of the Committee on Women's Rights. — (DE) Mr President, allow me to

Lenz

touch just briefly on one aspect: a variety of allusions have already been made to the disadvantages facing women as female migrant workers or wives of migrant male workers.

For the sole reason that time was too short the Committee on Women's Rights was not able to forward its amendments to the responsible committee in time, and as Chairman of this Committee I should now like to draw your attention to amendments 89, 94 and 93 which I have submitted in my own name and that of a colleague from my Group, but which express the wishes of the Committee on Women's Rights.

In the two resolutions by earlier committees we made specific proposals as to what could be done here, for example by introducing specific training programmes tailored to the special needs of female migrant workers or instructing a group of experts to study the special problems and disadvantages facing women immigrants. We simply wish to draw attention to these questions here so that account is taken of them.

Mr Filinis (COM). — (GR) Mr President, the Commission's documents and the excellent reports by Mr Marinaro and Mr Papapietro, which we are debating today, show how right Parliament was in trying for so many years to persuade the Commission and Council that urgent measures on behalf of the 17 million migrants are essential. To serve various political and economic expediencies in their own country, but also in the host countries, these people were encouraged and often pressed to abandon their countries and their families. But despite having contributed very directly to the economic recovery of post-war Europe, migrants are now regarded by those same countries as bothersome and intrusive foreigners, whom they would like to get rid of cheaply, while at the same time manifestations of racism and hostility directed against the migrants are becoming disquietingly more frequent.

It is unacceptable that even the second-generation children, born and bred in the host country, should be destined only for low-grade work. Migrants have lived in Europe as foreigners and outcasts for as long as twenty to thirty years, and have to change their nationality to become entitled to an opinion even on public issues in the towns where they live. For many years now they have had no recognition of the right of public association, which would enable them to express their news or protest against some special national problem of theirs without fear and without being branded as terrorists. Yet, instead of granting them these urban and political rights, the host countries are more interested in integrating them to the point where they lose any trace of special affinity with their country of origin. Besides, there are no effective special programmes for repatriation.

Mr President, while we regard the Commission's proposals as positive, there is unfortunately a lack of spe-

cific measures and we fear that the proposals will share the fate of the Commission's 1974 programme of action, which achieved very little. That is precisely why there must be a popular mobilization, particularly of the migrants themselves, with practical support from all working people and other social forces.

On the major issue of education for the children of migrants, Mr Papapietro's excellent report stresses that little has been achieved so far, and that much more must be done to ensure free and proper education for the children of migrants, and to teach them their language.

Mr President, I end with a call to all the Community's bodies and Member States to condemn the injustice of racial activities, to bring to an end the outrageous situation, for civilized countries, in which we witness even murderous acts against migrants. I want to stress how unacceptable it is that even here in Strasbourg we should read pre-election posters of the party headed by the leader of the Group of the European Right, bearing the racist slogan '3 000 000 migrants = 3 000 000 more jobs for Frenchmen'.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Sakellariou (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. Twenty five years after the start of the greatest and most intensive worker migrations within Europe this House is again obliged to consider the question of migrant workers, because with a very few exceptions the governments of Member States have done nothing to enable these citizens to lead a humane and dignified life in their host countries.

Today there are 17 million migrant workers living in the EC, more than the population of each of the six Member States Belgium, Denmark, Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg or the Netherlands. Seventeen million citizens of the Community have no civic rights. In some cases, as for example recently in the Federal Republic of Germany, basic human rights of migrant workers such as the right of parents and children to live together are being disputed.

How are these Community citizens represented? Who speaks for them in this House? We know very well who it is who agitates against them, who very recently and also at the time of the European elections stirred up pogrom feelings against the migrant workers. Because they carry no political weight otherwise, yesterday's fascists and racists are trying to use yesterday's slogans to justify racist policy for the Europe of tomorrow. One of the worthiest tasks of this Parliament would be to throttle such trends at birth. And so I am convinced that a broad majority of the House will endorse the Marinaro and Papapietro reports put before us today.

Any efforts to solve the problem of migrant workers must centre on a process of integration aimed at creat-

Sakellariou

ing a multicultural society, in which migrant worker minorities can find a secure political, economic, social and cultural place without having to give up their cultural identity as the price of assimilation into the host country.

A process of this kind, which gives a chance to both parties, host country and migrants, presupposes that migrant workers and their families are given a chance to plan their lives for the long term. Perhaps the most important factor here is schooling for the children of migrant workers. The Socialist Group fully supports the demands expressed in the Papapietro report and the opinion which I have drafted on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. I shall not repeat them here but shall pick out the three main ones and stress them once again.

We want equal rights for the children of all migrant workers, whether or not they are EC nationals, because we wish to integrate all migrants workers and not cause further divisions and discords among them.

We want equal rights and status for the mother tongue with the official language of the host country in order to give Kurds, for example, hundreds and thousands of whom live and work in the EC, the chance to speak their own mother tongue and practise their own culture as free citizens in the Community. For 'crimes' such as these the military courts of the Turkish 'civilian' Government hand down sentences of several years' imprisonment.

We are clearly and unequivocally opposed to any attempts to take foreign children out of the standard classes of the host country's schools and, on the pretext of giving them special assistance, isolate them in mother tongue 'ghetto classes'. No one who, on whatever grounds, pursues a policy of linguistic and cultural apartheid can expect this House to approve.

In the past the free and democratic states of the European Community have done serious injustices to the first generation of migrant workers, in order to satisfy the need of economic forces and capital for labour. Today we have the chance of making good the damage by helping the second and third generation, i.e. the children of those migrant workers. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, let us all take this chance.

Mr Brok (PPE). — (DE) The writer Max Frisch once said we thought we were getting a labour force and did not realize we were getting people. Regrettably, in the case of attitudes towards migrant workers, I think this is often true. And at a time of economic and employment difficulty we ought not to create problems for those who were urgently needed in the industrialized countries of central and northern Europe during the boom years. For this reason we should meet our social and legal obligations. Anyone who fishes in troubled waters, like the Le Pen group in France, for

example, and uses cheap-emotions to catch votes, must be given the cold shoulder by this House. But some of those looking virtuous should also remember that during the French local election campaign in the early eighties it was the communists who stirred things up against the foreign workers. They should be honest enough to admit it today!

Concerning the Papapietro report, we should see to it that in school and pre-school education the second and third generation of migrant workers receive real educational opportunities, so that they subsequently have job opportunities too, for at present they are often badly off as regards the labour market because they are less qualified. Here, I think, improvements are needed of the kind clearly formulated in the Papapietro report.

In reply to Mr Sakellariou I would say, though, that we must see to it that in preserving a migrant worker's culture, his own language must be recognized as a foreign language so that he does not have to learn another one. But the question of equal status with the language of the host country for all languages spoken by immigrants in the European Community ought, I think, to be discussed again elsewhere. We should ensure, and I refer back to the Marinaro report here, that those who work and pay taxes and social insurance contributions in the Community can derive the same benefits from it as all the others.

We should remember, though, that citizens of third countries face particular problems when they leave the Community. Bilateral, mutual treaties are needed here to ensure socially acceptable circumstances.

The franchise, we should remember, is conditional in our constitutions on nationality. But we should also remember that it varies enormously in our Member States at the local and regional level. We should thus ensure that it is made easier for migrant workers from third countries to obtain the nationality of the host country.

But let me make a distinction here. In anticipation of a subsidiary nationality within the meaning of European union, we ought to introduce the franchise in local elections for migrant workers from EC countries, to be enjoyed after a specified period of time and subject to specific terms and limitations. In this way we could, I think, take an important step towards the integration of the citizens of our Community.

Mrs Giannakou-Koutsikou (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the European People's Party firmly believes in a common policy on migrants, at the European level, and agrees with the Commission that this is an essential ingredient of the movement for a citizens' Europe. The acuteness of the problem of mainly extracommunity immigrants is due not only to difficulties of social and cultural integra-

Giannakou-Koutsikou

tion, but nowadays much more to the accelerating pace of unemployment and to economic stagnation.

The position of the European People's Party in this connection is based on a rational combination of the fundamental democratic principles that inspire its political philosophy, with a realistic view of the conditions that prevail in the Community today. I shall state briefly the general principles of our group on the matter.

Firstly, the European People's Party steadfastly adheres to the application of the spirit of the Treaty of Rome on the free movement of workers within the Community.

Secondly, it agrees with the effort to create a common policy on migrants, which will facilitate the more rational distribution of workers and favour the continual exchange of information between the Member States and the migrants themselves. Furthermore, it considers that it would be useful to set up a common coordinating body, whose purpose would be to disseminate information and to coordinate matters relating to the state of the labour market, the workforce, conditions of work, remuneration, social security, and the conditions prevailing in Member States, and which would benefit potential migrants by informing them on matters of concern to them.

Thirdly, it favours efforts to create conditions of social integration for migrants in their host countries, and to ensure their social and economic security. At the same time it insists that measures should be taken by the host countries, in collaboration with the countries of origin, to enable migrants to cultivate the language and culture of their homeland.

Fourthly, it agrees with equal treatment for Community migrants in aid and social security. This includes the transfer of rights relating to pensions and social assistance.

Fifthly, it confirms its insistence on guarantees of equal treatment for both sexes.

Sixthly, it condemns the black labour market, wherever it exists, since this exacerbates the already acute problem of unemployment and introduces methods unacceptable in well-governed democratic countries.

Seventh, it supports the signing of bipartite agreements for cooperation between the countries in the Community, in connection with the formulation of programmes for repatriation based on the free choice of the migrants.

Eighth, as for immigrants from third countries, it believes that the most rational approach to this, for the time being, is that bipartite agreements should exist between the countries of origin and the host countries,

which cover all matters relating to social security, assistance and political rights in general.

As for the amendments, Mr President, the European People's Party reserves the right to examine them one by one in the light of the views I have just defined, and to make its position clear during the vote.

Mr Ducarme (L). — (FR) Mr President, I would begin by saying that whatever is excessive is insignificant and very often has no chance of ever being applied. I am sorry that Mrs Marinaro should have adopted the line she has taken in her report. What she is proposing is in fact a report calling for another in reply. I am afraid that she has missed the main point, which was to consider the Commission's document and, in the light of that document, determine our Parliament's guidelines for a coherent policy on immigration.

Granted, the Commission does not go far enough, but what purpose is served by complaining without bringing forward concrete proposals? Where are our proposals for a family policy to meet the needs of the situation? For a housing policy to prevent the development of ghettos? For an education policy to safeguard cultural diversity but at the same time ensure the necessary degree of integration? We believe that a correct policy on immigration must be founded on a balance between rights and duties, and your report fails to show any appreciation of this essential requirement. The amendments which I have tabled on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group are aimed at making good this weakness in the report as presented, and I hope that the House will adopt them.

I should nevertheless like to make a political observation for the benefit of all the groups on the left of this Parliament.

Mrs Marinaro, whether wittingly or unwittingly, you have been taking part in a greyhound race, with you as the hare and the extreme right as the greyhounds. The adoption of extreme positions on either side cannot do the migrants any good. We were expecting a fair and realistic parliamentary report, one whose content could be translated into legislation and above all would not offer certain extremists an opportunity for giving free rein to their xenophobia.

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — I should commence by saying, Mr President, that I recognize the time factor. Equally, while I shall try to be concise, it will be appreciated that this has been a long debate on an important issue.

First of all, I would like to clarify a couple of points that have been raised during the course of the debate. The report on the Commission's communication does not constitute and is not intended to be taken as an

Sutherland

action programme. It is the recommencement of a debate on the issue of migrants. This relaunching of the debate is considered necessary in view of the changed circumstances which now exist within the Community.

I should say that it has been a most important and interesting debate in which the honourable Members have expressed their individual concern in the main with tolerance, rationality and moderation. It does not, of course, help when we have to listen to hyperbole and exaggeration — which we have on occasion heard — on an issue of this kind; an issue which excites sensitivities throughout the Community. In particular, I should say that the comments which were made on the invasion of the Community by migrants, claims that this is going to be conducted in a manner which is not necessarily peaceful or that the problems of the Community are going to be greatly exacerbated by migration, are not factually correct. In fact we have, as one speaker pointed out, peaked on the issue of migration and the position is more or less static.

I am not the first Commissioner to have replied to a debate on this subject. In an important sense the Commission's communication to the Council on migration policy is a response to the debate and resolution on Mrs Nielsen's report, which was so wideranging in its scope and valuable and stimulating in highlighting the seriousness of the problems.

Most of the honourable Members who participated in the debate have been in general in favour of the approach which has been taken by the Commission. There are those who said that the Commission might have gone further. I suggest, however, that a careful reading of the communication will show that these more explicit or radical positions, for example on voting rights or family reunification, are not excluded or rejected in advance, but are considered to be part of the continuing dialogue which should emanate from the communication which is being submitted to the Council. Room has therefore been left for consideration of various solutions, usually following consultation with those concerned in applying them.

Mrs Marinaro claimed that the rational solution is integration. The Commission totally agrees and approves. Marginalization is unacceptable. Pluralism is required in dealing with the migrants within the Community.

We are, as Mr Sakellariou has said, a multicultural society and must recognize that to be the case. A close identification of the positions of the Commission and Parliament must give us all a certain moral comfort. That identification, I think, is evident in the debate which has taken place today.

The Commission has to deal with political realities. In view of the past history of the Commission's efforts on such matters as illegal immigration and consultation

on migrant policy *vis-à-vis* third countries, there might appear to be justification for concern. It is political realism that has brought us to a position where this communication can be considered by Parliament.

We should, however, try to recognize the dilemma which exists. There is indeed a dilemma regarding the conflicting demands and pressures on national governments in regard to the issue of migrant interests. Questions of rights of access to national territory, about civil and political rights, about the right to decide who is, or who is not, to be part of a national community are questions which reach right into the most sensitive area of national sovereignty.

It is for this reason that the Commission has placed so much emphasis on instituting effective consultation and information procedures. It is not suggested that national governments should abandon all traditional protocol, but it is suggested that there should be a consultation procedure which will develop a coherence in regard to dealing with migration and policy in regard to migrants.

The honourable Members may be aware of the current proposal before the Council of Ministers authorizing the Commission to participate, on behalf of the Community, in the drafting in the United Nations of an international convention on the protection of the rights of all migrant workers and their families.

There are also practical aspects of good neighbour relations between adjoining Member States. We must avoid in the future the disruptive effects of a situation where one Member State takes unilateral action without informing its neighbours who will be immediately affected by it. It simply is not consistent with the proper coherence of Community policy that that should take place. If national frontiers are already quite porous in practice, how much more so will this be when we have achieved the objective of a people's Europe.

I have spoken in this Assembly on another occasion on the rise of xenophobia and racial prejudice and the need to stand by our standards and principles. The Commission recognizes the reality of this problem. It opposes unambiguously the rise of this type of thinking within Europe. We must, and do, resist it and we are trying in this communication to take positive measures to address it. The object of our proposals, as generally accepted by Parliament, is to assist migrants and to assist in the coherence of policy in regard to them.

In conclusion, I would like to deal very briefly with the issues raised in the Papapietro report. I share the views of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport concerning the development of the school population and the social and economic importance of making an energetic effort to improve the education of immigrants' children.

Sutherland

Whether the children of workers from other Member States or non-member countries or whether nationals of Member States forming part of ethnic groups, there is very little real difference in their problems of social and educational integration. There are over 3 million children of migrants. The education systems are faced with a vast and inescapable problem, but a problem which must be addressed.

In the context of some of the comments which have been made, it is the case that the 1977 directive has not been properly applied. It is not the case that the matter has been disregarded by the Commission; it is being pursued by the Commission and there are indications that Member States are seeking to comply with the 1977 directive and what it requires. I do not believe the time has come to revise the directive. It defines the basic principles the subjective right of migrants' children to reception tuition, the obligation to promote the teaching of the mother tongue and culture of origin.

Since these three major guidelines have now been definitely adopted, the task is to put them firmly into practice. The Commission report has shown that this is not always the case. The Commission is currently corresponding with those states where the implementation of the directive appears to be incomplete or doubtful.

I have a number of others points which I would have hoped to have raised, but I think that in the present atmosphere it might be better to conclude. I may return to them at a time subsequent to the voting.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote on the Papapietro report will be taken at the next voting time.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

Mr Welsh (ED), Chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. — Mr President, before we leave the subject of Mrs Marinaro's report, I would just like to make a request to you. It appears that over 150 amendments have been submitted to this report and as you will know, Mr President, the discussion has been an extremely difficult one. Of those amendments, no less than 70 were not submitted to the committee and therefore I would invite you to use your discretion under Rule 54a of our Rules to refer those amendments for examination by the committee and take the substantive vote at the next part-session. I do this, Mr

President, with the support, I believe, of the rapporteur and the majority of groups in the Parliament.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — Mr Welsh proposes that under Rule 54 (1) (a) the amendments in question should be referred back to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

Mr Welsh's request is therefore approved.

Mr Bachy (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, we agree with this proposal from Mr Welsh. I think that it meets with a certain consensus among the various groups and am given to understand that the rapporteur, Mrs Marinaro, also agrees.

I nevertheless feel that I must point out that the reason given on this occasion in connection with the report on migrant workers is the same as the reason that we in the Socialist Group gave during the last part-session on the subject of discussion of the report by Mr Tuckman. We were in exactly the same position, since a very large number of amendments — 98 in all — had not been referred to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, in view of which we also asked for the amendments to be referred back to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment for re-examination.

Consequently, while we appreciate and approve Mr Welsh's suggestion, we are surprised that a similar suggestion made in connection with the Tuckman report during the last part-session was not accepted by other groups.

I propose to the Chair that we follow the same procedure for the Tuckman report, which comes before us today with 98 amendments which have not been examined by the competent committee.

President. — We shall deal with that when we come to the Tuckman report.

Mr Maher (L). — Mr President, I do not want to be involved in a discussion about whether or not this report should be sent back. I simply wished to draw the attention of the vice-president who was in the Chair just before you took over, to the fact that the Commissioner was scarcely able to finish his report to the House because there was so much talk going on — it was like the Tower of Babel. I think any member of the Commission is entitled to be received with courtesy by the House and if the House does not want to listen to him then at least Members should carry on their conversations elsewhere.

(Applause)

Maher

I think it was a discourtesy to the Commissioner that he could not finish his report. I think we owe him an apology.

(Cries of 'Hear, hear!')

President. — I also regret what has happened, Mr Maher.

Mr Elliott (S). — Mr President, I have no objection to the proposal that has been made by Mr Welsh but I wonder if he has considered the way in which we should take Mr Papapietro's report. There has been a joint debate on the reports by Mrs Marinaro and Mr Papapietro. They concern somewhat different but related aspects of the same subject. Is it the intention that if we refer back to committee and vote in May on the Marinaro report, we should do the same with the Papapietro report or do we vote separately on that and if so when? I would like to have this clarified because at the moment I do not understand how we are going to vote separately on resolutions which were part of a joint debate.

President. — I should like to point out that Mr Welsh proposed that the amendments be sent back but not that the vote should be postponed.

Mr Marinaro (COM), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, thank you for clarifying for me a matter which, as rapporteur, I was anxious to know. I agree with the proposal to refer back to committee for discussion the amendments but not the report.

Mr Le Chevallier (DR). — (FR) Mr President, I am delighted at the proposal made by the Chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, but do not see how it is possible to refer the amendments only back to the committee, without referring the report back as well. It stands to reason that the whole document should be referred back, as we proposed this morning.

President. — Mr Le Chevallier, Rule 54(1)(a) permits amendments to be referred back to committee. If, as is here the case, more than 20 amendments in addition to those already submitted to the committee responsible, are tabled after the deadline, the President may refer them back to committee. The amendments can, therefore, be referred to the committee responsible who examines them and communicates the result of this examination in a supplementary report.

I would point out moreover that, under this same provision of the Rules of Procedure it is for me to fix

the deadline for this procedure during the May part-session. The vote on the motion for a resolution in Mrs Marinaro's report will therefore be taken during the May part-session after the oral presentation of a supplementary report which will not be followed by a debate. This is exactly the situation which is in line with Rule 54(1)(a).

Mr Le Chevallier (DR). — (FR) Thank you, Mr President.

6. Topical and urgent debate (announcement)

President. — Pursuant to Rule 48(2) of the Rules of procedure, the list of subjects for the topical and urgent debate which will be held on Thursday, 18 April 1985 from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. has been drawn up.

(The President read the list of subjects)¹

Under the second subparagraph of Rule 48(2) of the Rules of Procedure any objections to this list, which must be supported by at least 21 Members or a political group and submitted in writing, setting out the reasons, must be forwarded before 3 p.m. tomorrow. The vote on the objections will be taken, without debate, tomorrow at 3 p.m.

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — (GR) Mr President, since I was unable to follow you when you were reading out the list of matters to be included on the agenda for topical and urgent debate, I ask for your assurance that the list does not include the resolution concerning the election of the new President of the Republic of Greece. If this is so, then that is a positive solution which means that the presidency has not been influenced by an attempt to intervene in Greece's internal affairs, an attempt which would expose the European Parliament to ridicule if it wanted to assume the role of a highest electoral court for every country in Europe and a highest constitutional court, and would create a precedent that would put both the presidency and Parliament in a difficult position since similar matters would perpetually arise.

I repeat that if this matter is not on the list, then that is a positive solution for which we express our satisfaction to the presidency, and our pleasure that a highly suspect effort by those who submitted the proposed resolution has failed.

President. — Mr Ephremidis, the proposal you refer to has not been adopted. However, a different propo-

¹ See Minutes.

President

sal on human rights in Turkey which you tabled has been adopted.

7. July 1985 part-session

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, I must inform the House that the July part-session cannot be held in this chamber since work has to be carried out to enable it to receive the Spanish and Portuguese Members.

For technical and financial reasons the enlarged Bureau has decided that the July part-session will be held in Luxembourg.

8. Votes

Report (Doc. A 2-10/85) by Mr Price, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the decision granting a discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Communities for the 1983 financial year

*Motion for a resolution**Before paragraph 1 — Amendment No 3*

Mr Price (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, this amendment would weaken the affirmation of Parliament's powers because it says that the Commission is required to act by virtue of its responsibility for the budgetary and financial activities of the Community. The reason why the Commission must act is that it is bound to do so under the Treaty and the financial regulation. We must not weaken our powers and therefore the committee was against this amendment.

Paragraph 53 — Amendment No 13

Mr Price (ED), rapporteur. — The committee voted on two previous occasions against the general lines of this amendment, but today voted by 9 votes to 8 in favour. So the committee's opinion is in favour of this amendment.

Mr Pitt (S). — Mr President, can we be quite clear that you yourself once asked the rapporteur to confine his remarks to simply stating whether the committee is for or against? And could you see that the rapporteur does not abuse his position in the way he just did. The committee voted in favour of this amendment. We do not need to discuss numbers nor any previous votes.

(Applause from the left)

President. — Mr Pitt, I do not feel that the rapporteur has made us waste a lot of time by those few words of explanation. However, I think it is better when we have a lot of votes if the rapporteur simply states whether he is for or against. We trust the rapporteur; he is clearly expressing his committee's view.

Explanations of vote

Mr Guermeur (RDE). — (FR) Mr Price's report is a remarkable effort of analysis based on the Court of Auditors report and was the result of very long and attentive examination in committee.

This report contains proposals which are entirely pertinent where it remains within the bounds of the competence accorded to our Committee on Budgetary Control, in other words where it confines itself to the matter of proper, strict management of expenditure authorized by the budgetary authority.

On the other hand, Mr President, we cannot go along with the majority of the Committee on Budgetary Control where the report exceeds the terms of reference and raises criticisms of Community policies themselves, as it does in the section, beginning with paragraph 38 of the motion for a resolution, in which Mr Price discusses the common agricultural policy.

We cannot approve such a departure from procedure. Moreover, we have a substantive objection to Mr Price's report, in that it contains criticism of the common agricultural policy.

Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I invite you to judge for yourselves, in the light of paragraph 38, which has been adopted by this House...

President. — Please conclude, Mr Guermeur.

Mr Guermeur (RDE). — (FR) What is meant by an 'increasing lack of coherence in the common agricultural policy'? Is this incoherence of the common agricultural policy attributed to the demands of the various Member States, to their abuse of the veto in the Council, and in part to the changes seen over recent years in the patterns of supply and consumption? This is not a criticism of the Commission's management in terms of rigorous stewardship of Community funds, but a substantive criticism of a policy purposely chosen by the Community, and one of its most important policies at that.

I also invite you to judge paragraph 46, where it is said that we should recommend the Commission to conduct cost-benefit analyses and review policy relating to the following matters: private storage; limitation of sales into intervention to the end of the marketing year; enforcement of Community quality requirements

Guermeur

for fruit and vegetables; distillation of alcohol from grapes and other fruit etc.

Mr President, this is a clear case of exceeding competence, venturing into areas which involve substantive policy options, not merely procedural options.

Consequently, Mr President, our group — and this is my conclusion — will of course be granting the discharge but cannot, in the circumstances to which I have referred, vote for Mr Price's motion for a resolution, which we regret because, I repeat, it was an excellent piece of work carried out with a great deal of care and attention.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Price (ED), rapporteur. — People often ask: what power has the European Parliament? In most fields the answer is that this Parliament has influence rather than power. However, under the Treaty we have both advisory and supervisory roles. Today, in exercising our power of discharge, we are in our supervisory role. In granting discharge we have the unique power to make comments which bind both the Commission and the Council. Power carries with it responsibility. This resolution, which contains these binding comments, plays a constructive role. It contains over 80 specific ideas for improving the implementation of Community policy through the budget. As such, it represents probably the largest overhaul of the Community's financial machinery ever undertaken by the European Parliament.

This morning I thanked the sub-rapporteurs and draftsmen of opinions for their help. This evening I want to thank the other members of the team who helped me, namely, the staff of the Committee on Budgetary Control. We have worked to a very tight timetable. All the drafting has been done by me, but the timetable would have been unattainable without a massive amount of research and other back-up given to me even seven days a week for several weeks by the secretariat. I want to thank all of them.

Finally, I want to ask Parliament to make all this work worthwhile by voting for this resolution.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-8/85) by Mr Price, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the deferral of

the decisions on the grant of discharge to the Commission in respect of a second, third, fourth and fifth European Development Funds for the 1983 financial year: adopted.

*
* *

Report (Doc. 2-1802/84) by Mr Härlin, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the proposal for a decision granting a discharge to the Commission of the European Communities in respect of the ECSC accounts for the 1983 financial year: adopted.¹

*
* *

Report (Doc 2-1800/84) by Mr Schön, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the discharge to be granted to the Management Board of the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training and to the Administrative Board of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions in respect of the implementation of the budgets for the 1983 financial year: adopted.

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-103/85) by Mr Didò and others, on the special Community job creation scheme for unemployed young people.

Explanations of vote

Mr Filinis (COM). — (GR) Mr President, the problem of unemployment, particularly youth unemployment in the Community's Member States, has assumed dramatic dimensions with incalculable consequences, both for the unemployed themselves and for economic and social life in the Member States. The oral questions put by our colleagues, which we have been debating, very rightly indicate that we must adopt a dynamic policy to care for the young people who are the main victims of economic stagnation. It is now urgently necessary for the EEC's economic and social studies to orient themselves towards the development of an economic environment more favourable to the creation of jobs.

The Commission and Council must go beyond good intentions and see the problem from the standpoint not of hesitant and experimental social measures, but of the need for drastic steps such as an employment policy that will go hand in hand with technological development, the creation of jobs via the public sector

¹ The rapporteur spoke:
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1, 6, 7, 9 to 11, 13 to 17 (1st part);
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 2 to 5, 8, 12, 17 (2nd part), 18 to 20.

¹ The rapporteur spoke:
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendment No 2
— AGAINST Amendment No 1.

Filinis

and with assistance from the European Social Fund, the reduction and restructuring of working time without any corresponding reduction in the purchasing power of the wages involved and without intensification of the work, flexibility in the granting of pensions, and continual professional training. Costly measures to be sure; but whose cost we must simply accept.

Mr President, unemployment, particularly youth unemployment, which is nowadays a continual source of disquiet, is a problem that concerns us all. In struggling for a Europe of the working people, we support the excellent questions put by our colleagues and will vote in favour of the resolution by Mr Didò and others.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS PERY*Vice-President*

Mr Bonaccini (COM). — *(IT)* The Italian Communists will vote in favour of both this resolution, of which I am also one of the co-signatories, and the resolution proposed by Mr Ciancaglini, particularly since the two resolutions are the fruits of a joint initiative taken by the European Trade Unions Confederation, whose action and initiative we support.

The seriousness and complexity of the problem tell us that no short cuts are possible, but that initiatives are certainly essential; and the initiatives are indicated clearly and precisely in our motion for a resolution signed by Mr Didò and other friends. It is really deplorable that, during the debate, there should have been a sort of race to be first, where this question is concerned. This is just the sort of case where the first are in danger of becoming the last. In reality, we need unity and availability between all political groups, if we are to exercise that pressure of which Mr De Michelis spoke.

I do not know whether the call for some kind of a new 'Marshall Plan' is the correct formula, since it seems to me to bear little relation to the things that we are discussing. What is needed is a joint effort, using the resources and implementing the initiatives envisaged in the programme that was approved in April 1984. Our action should be conducted so that we have a definite programme that will lead to the changes that are essential, both worldwide and at European level, to promote the recovery of the economy and the revival of employment.

It is in this spirit that we shall be voting for the two resolutions.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-106/85 by Mrs Larive-Groenendaal, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group on youth unemployment: adopted.

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-107/85/corr.) by Mrs Chouraqui and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the creation of jobs in the Community.

Explanation of vote

Mrs Lemass (RDE). — I would just like to say a few words in favour of this resolution on the creation of jobs in the Community. Unemployment is the central problem to be resolved within the European Economic Community. The Commission has stated that it recognizes that the worst-affected groups are young people and women, and in the group referred to as young people the highest percentage unemployed are young women.

The President of the Commission in his first address to this Parliament indicated his resolve to do away with massive unemployment. I hope he will succeed and I hope it will be soon. The introduction of new technologies, which in the long term must be welcomed, will initially create job-losses in certain sectors. Those sectors particularly affect women workers. This, I hope, will be redressed by ensuring that the social welfare funds are made available to train as many young women as possible in those new technologies. This is a new area, and there is a great opportunity to ensure that equality in the training of young men and women is brought about. We must introduce new policies in the field of technology, including biotechnology, information technology, robotics, research and development, transport, the construction industry, the services sector, and small and medium-sized enterprises.

I am quite confident that we will now undertake the abolition of as much unemployment as possible and create jobs for our young people, and I hope that this problem will be resolved in the very near future.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-108/85) by Mr Ciancaglini, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on a European plan for employment.

Explanation of vote

Mr Christensen (ARC), in writing. — (DA) Between 1975 and 1985 unemployment in the EEC rose from 4.2% to 11.5%, almost a threefold increase. Over the same period unemployment in the EFTA countries rose from 2.8% to 5.5% — almost double. Whereas unemployment in the EEC was 50% higher than in the EFTA countries in 1975, it is now more than twice as high. Today there is only 1% unemployment in Iceland and Switzerland, only 3% in Sweden and Norway, only 4.5% in Austria and only 5.5% in Finland.

How in the world can the Council of Ministers, the Commission and the great majority in the European Parliament come to the conclusion that it is appropriate to escalate the common EEC policy which has led to such deplorable results?

These unemployment figures show that small countries which are free to determine their own economic policy and adjust flexibly to the effects to which they are exposed from outside have much better scope for pursuing a sound and effective employment policy.

I had the pleasure recently of taking part in the delegation meeting with EFTA parliamentarians. They reported on an investigation of the causes of unemployment, particularly youth unemployment. I think we should take up this debate with EFTA and listen to their experiences. The Community does not seem to be able to teach them anything — on the contrary it should be a salutary lesson to them!

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-109/85) by Mr Tuckman and others, on unemployment: adopted.

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-12/85) by Mr Papapietro, on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture Education, Information and Sport, on the implementation of Directive 77/486/EEC on the education of the children of migrant workers.

Explanations of vote

Ms Tongue (S). — I welcome the Papapietro report and I and my group will be voting for it.

I hope that all EEC governments and particularly the United Kingdom Minister for Education, Sir Keith Joseph, will read this report, take note and, what is more important, take action to provide adequate education for our ethnic minority children. Paragraph 6 of the resolution states unequivocally that the directive

should cover all children of residents of all ethnic minority groups, irrespective of whether they have citizenship in the country in which they are living. And yet my government is still, after eight years, failing to implement two of the three basic objectives of the directive. First, it is failing to provide sufficient training for teachers of our 350 000 ethnic minority children, and only 45% of UK teachers questioned recently felt equipped to teach children of different cultures and origins. Secondly, the United Kingdom Government, among others, is still failing to promote adequately the teaching of the mother tongue. Only 12% of our ethnic minority children receive this teaching, and this is no thanks to our government, which tries to pass the buck to local authorities and then starves them of the funds to provide this teaching, as in the case of two boroughs I represent — Redbridge and Newham. The recent Swan report in my country indicts our society for failing to accord equality in education for our ethnic minority children. Eight years of debate is quite long enough. We need action now, and I hope the Commission will pursue Member States up to the Court of Justice if necessary to ensure implementation of this directive.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Elliott (S). — I want to pursue the same theme as my colleague on this matter. I trust that this report will be fully implemented and that Parliament will vote for it today. I put forward in committee an amendment to the resolution and this was included. The intention of that amendment was to ensure that the ideas contained in the directive should be applied to the children of all ethnic minority groups whether they were permanent or temporary residents in the countries concerned and whether or not they had citizenship in those countries.

As you have already heard, the position in a number of Member States with regard to implementing this directive is very unsatisfactory. The original directive of 1977 called for its implementation by Member States within four years. Eight years have elapsed, and implementation is very poor in a great many countries. If I may just refer to the position in my own country — Great Britain — one particular point which I think has not yet been mentioned is that Article 3 of the directive talks about Member States promoting the provision of mother-tongue teaching. It seems that the British Government interprets 'promoting' as setting up research projects. That is not how most people would interpret it. In point of fact, as again you have already heard, in many parts of the United Kingdom, the children of ethnic minority residents have difficulty obtaining mother-tongue teaching other than through the initiative of their own communities, which in many of those cases lack the necessary funds to provide that mother-tongue teaching. It is high time that the ideas of this directive were extended and were properly implemented throughout the countries of the Com-

Elliott

munity, and I hope the passing of this resolution will assist in that objective.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Report (Doc. 2-1753/84) by Mr Tuckman, on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on the new Commission's priorities in the field of social affairs and employment.

Mrs Salisch (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, my honourable friend Mr Bachy has just referred to the vote on the report. It raises the same problem as the one we faced at the last part-session. I agree with Mr Welsh, whose deputy I am, that the work of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment should be organized as efficiently as possible, and so it is not a good thing if we get back a report which has already been discussed on several occasions.

On the other hand it is not good either that we have to vote on such a long list of amendments. As in the case of the Marinaro report we ought here to invoke Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure. The way we are proceeding is senseless and I am surprised that some fellow members of our Committee, at a time when they would really have a chance to have amendments voted on, are raising matters at the plenary which have already been dealt with. I do not think this is a good way of doing things. It makes heavy weather of our work.

(Applause)

I thus move that the amendments be referred back to committee. I hope this will meet with the understanding of the House. I trust it will then influence those colleagues who are using the plenary in a manner I consider unjustified.

(Applause)

Mr Brok (PPE). — *(DE)* On behalf of my Group I oppose this request. I would point out that we have already held over the Tuckmann report once at the last part-session. And so the position is quite different from that surrounding the previous report. We should vote on the Tuckman report today once and for all.

President. — Mr Brok, ladies and gentlemen, Rule 54 does in fact apply to this debate and normally it is for the President to decide. I admit that I am not familiar with each and every one of these amendments. I propose therefore that the chairman of the committee concerned and the rapporteur should be asked for their view after which I will give you my opinion. Mr

Welsh, could you give me your opinion on this question?

Mr Welsh (ED), Chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. — Madam President, I hesitate to dissent from my distinguished vice-chairman, Mrs Salisch, but I do think the circumstances are a little different. In the first place, as Mr Brok pointed out, these amendments have in fact been extant ever since the last part-session and there is nothing new about them. What is more important, when I made my proposition to you before, I did so with the approval of the rapporteur and a large majority of the groups in the House. I have consulted the groups in the House and I understand that at least four of the major groups do not assent to this particular proposal; therefore I think it would be an abuse of your discretion — which, of course, I respect absolutely — if you were to exercise it in this case.

Mr Tuckman (ED), rapporteur. — Madam President, my points are similar but not exactly the same. As you know from experience, Mrs Salisch, the distribution of powers in the plenary is different from that in committee. Consequently, it is understandable that the same topics were brought up again. This material has been well discussed since last September, whereas the other report was a very new one and quite a lot of the amendments had never been seen before. There are many fewer amendments and I know that some are to be withdrawn. I have also looked at the situation under Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure and it is my opinion that there would not be a substantial reduction in what this House has to vote on. We have been postponed twice and that is very bad for the nerves. I would like to see it go through today.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, I feel that the House is very divided. I realize that I have the right to decide...

Mrs Salisch (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, I have heard the opinion of the House. Of course other interests can sometimes predominate, I will not claim otherwise, but this leads to endless juggling with the Rules of Procedure, and this cannot be their intention.

If I may perhaps try to change your mind: the groups organized meetings to discuss the amendments. When there are so many of them they just run away with us, and I find it regrettable that the vote is changed arbitrarily because there are so many amendments, which simply gets our work into a mess. I thus beg you, Madam President, to bear this in mind and instil a degree of discipline into us.

(Parliament rejects Mrs Salisch's request)

Mr Adam (S). — Madam President, I wish to point out that you have not followed the procedure laid down in Rule 54 (3). One of the faults of this Parliament is that the presidency does not exercise its powers properly. We have had a lot of referrals back to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions because of this. I urge you to operate the rules as they are set down. When it says the President shall decide, let the President decide.

President. — Mr Adam, I have done my duty. You are quite entitled to your opinion. I have given mine. In all conscience it is difficult for me to go against the majority of the House even if it is not in line with my own personal opinion.

Explanations of vote

Mr Bonaccini (COM), in writing. — (IT) My party will vote against the resolution on the priority of social action as a whole. We are doing this not out of any preconceived notions. In the Committee for Social Affairs and Employment, our Members worked with those of other groups for a positive outcome. However, during the discussion of many amendments a majority of the centre right systematically imposed a choice which detracts from the original text thereby upsetting the original balance to which we contributed.

Mr Fitzgerald (RDE), in writing. — On my own behalf and on behalf of a number of my Irish colleagues who abstained on paragraph 19 and Amendments Nos 21 and 52 of the Tuckman report, I wish to explain that the reason for this action was that we could not support the inclusion of reference to homosexuals in disadvantaged groups and yet we could not oppose the inclusion of migrant workers, the unemployed, women, the handicapped and the elderly.

Mr Colocotronis (S), in writing. — (GR) I wish to make the following comments, to clarify the intention of my vote. According to the facts that have emerged from the debate, unemployment in the Community's countries is increasing at an alarming rate. We used to speak of 11 million unemployed, then 12 million, and now at the beginning of 1985 we speak of 13.7 million. And bearing in mind that this year is the year of youth, we note that young people make up 41% of the Community's unemployed, which means that they number about 5.4 million. I also note that the proportion of unemployed young people below the age of 25 is increasing rapidly.

The problem of unemployment is world-wide, and certainly embraces the Community as a whole from our own standpoint. I remind you that irrespective of

whether the figures I have quoted include the unemployed in Greece or not, in my country unemployment has become an acute problem that is assuming disquieting dimensions. This fact is especially significant if we take into account that Greece faces difficult structural problems as well. In general I think unemployment is the problem ranking next in importance to that of the nuclear threat.

I agree that a correct study of the local conditions in each of the EEC's countries should afford possibilities for dealing with, and containing the problem. For example, in industrially less well developed countries like Greece, new investments that can be seen objectively to be essential may provide some solutions.

However, I believe that the unemployment problem is mainly a matter of our society's general attitude, related to the kind of life we wish to build.

So far as the proposed measures are concerned, I will continue to press for what I think is the most important, namely reduction of the working time for working people. One of the dilemmas of our age is modern man's working time. In these days are we to accept a situation in which fewer and fewer people work the present time schedules while legions of young people remain unproductive and unemployed with incalculable and unforeseen consequences for our society, or should as many people as possible be involved in the productive process even though this would mean reducing the working time?

I believe that reducing the working time is the essential solution that we shall have to adopt, in whatever form it takes.

In summary, I stress that dealing with the problem of unemployment by reducing the working time does not conflict in any way with the policy of introducing new production technologies, or with increasing productivity. I agree that the whole subject requires study in depth, and I know that small firms, by their very nature, can only create very few new jobs. In my opinion the sectors to which attention must be devoted in any study of the matter are these:

1. The working year
2. Flexibility in the granting of pensions
3. Overtime
4. Part-time work
5. The combination of work and educational programmes.

Going beyond resolutions and reports, we must proceed directly with a programme that will cover the Community as a whole. The 5% set aside by the European Fund must be put to use, and increased if neces-

Colocotronis

sary, to create new jobs, and greater care, in the form of special aid, must be devoted to regions or countries with structural problems, such as Greece.

The solutions we work out must not operate to the disadvantage of working people. The way we deal with the crisis we are facing must be fair and humanitarian.

I mention all this in the conviction — as I said earlier on — that the problem is a political one. New horizons must be opened up to man's potential for action. This of course is related to the nature of production, which is everywhere largely of military orientation. The final solution will be a policy of peace which will orient modern man's infinite resources towards production dedicated to man himself.

For these reasons I am voting against the resolution in its final form.

Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L), in writing. — (NL) If the Socialist Group had shown as much common sense in dealing with the Tuckman report in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment as they have today

in — among other things — their Diddò resolution to wind up the debate on youth unemployment, there would have been nothing to bother about. We could have avoided today's long stream of amendments. The text, as it stood originally, was pitiful: an abject submission to the new technologies and a general lamentation over the plight of the workers.

Happily, Parliament has today acted in an intelligent way by adopting a large number of positive amendments. If I might take just one: our amendment which points out that Europe is faced with the stark choice of adapting to the technological revolution or losing its competitiveness and economic vitality, which would only lead to further unemployment. My group will therefore unanimously vote with pleasure for the Tuckman resolution as now amended.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

President — After this vote and in view of the lateness of the hour we shall adjourn.²

(The sitting was closed at 7.55 p.m.)

¹ The rapporteur spoke:

— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 3, 12 to 14, 20, 21, 26, 29/rev., 30, 37, 39, 40, 43, 45, 52, 57, 58, 69, 75, 79, 84, 91, 92, 97;

— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 18, 22 to 25, 32 to 35, 42, 53 to 56, 59 to 65, 67, 68, 71, 74, 94.

² *Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.*

ANNEX

Commission action on European Parliament opinions on Commission proposals delivered at the February and March 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 February and March part-sessions in the framework of Parliamentary consultation, and of disaster aid granted.

Reports adopted by the House in February and dealt with in last month's account are not referred to in this one unless there have been fresh developments meantime.

I. Commission proposals to which Parliament proposed amendments that have been accepted by the Commission in full

Report by Mr Ferruccio Pisoni, adopted 15 March (PE 2-1783/84), on proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (COM(84) 682 final) for

- (i) a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) 729/70 as regards the amount allotted to the Guidance Section of the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF);
- (ii) a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) 355/77 in respect of a common measure to improve the conditions under which agricultural and fishery products are processed and marketed.

While not actually submitting an amended proposal, the Commission gave its backing at the Council to Parliament's amendment concerning the proposal for amending Regulation 355/77; on 25 March the Council adopted a text which met Parliament's main desideratum, that the total amount should not be broken down by years.¹

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 14. 3. 85, pp. 233-235.

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 15. 3. 85, pp. 10-11.

II. Commission proposals to which Parliament proposed amendments that have been accepted by the Commission in part

Second report by Mr Gatti, adopted 14 February (PE 2-1575/84) on

- (a) the Commission proposals to the Council (COM(84) 515 final) for
 - (i) a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) 337/79 on the common organization of the market in wine,
 - (ii) a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) 338/79 laying down special provisions relating to quality wines produced in specified regions,
 - (iii) a regulation derogating from the arrangements established by Regulation (EEC) 456/80 on the granting of temporary and permanent abandonment premiums in respect of certain areas under vines and of premiums for the renunciation of replanting,
 - (iv) a regulation concerning the granting of permanent abandonment premiums in respect of certain areas under vines for the winegrowing years 1985/86 to 1989/90;
- (b) the amendment of the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(84) 539 final) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) 337/79 on the common organization of the market in wine (COM(84) 515 final);

¹ Regulations 870/85 and 871/85, OJ L 95, 2. 4. 85.

- (c) the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(84) 714 final) for
 - (i) the amendment of the proposal for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) 337/79 on the common organization of the market in wine (COM(84) 515 final and COM(84) 539 final),
 - (ii) the amendment of the proposal for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) 338/79 laying down special provisions relating to quality wines produced in specified regions;
- (d) the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(84) 775 final) for a third amendment of the proposal for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) 337/79 on the common organization of the market in wine.

Further particulars

A Council/Parliament/Commission conciliation meeting was held on 25 March to work out some general guidelines consonant with Parliament's desiderata.

The Council on 26 March¹ formally adopted the proposals it had agreed on in principle on 26 February, and also on 1 April² adopted the regulation on a common measure to improve the structures of the winegrowing sector in Greece on which Parliament delivered its opinion on 15 March.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 14. 2. 85, pp. 251-253.

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 14. 2. 85, pp. 54-70.

- Report by Mr Cassidy, adopted 15 February (PE 2-1568/84) on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation amending Regulations (EEC) 918/83 and 950/68 with regard to the tariff treatment of goods contained in travellers' personal luggage or sent in small consignments to private individuals (COM(84) 626 final)

Further particulars

The Commission has finalized an amendment to its original proposal which is expected to be adopted on 16 April (COM(85) 169). The ceilings on allowances and the standard rate are:

travellers

over 15, 100 ECU (instead of 60)

under 15, 50 ECU (instead of 30)

standard rate, 200 Ecus (instead of 150)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 15. 2. 85, p. 303.

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 15. 2. 85, p. 42.

- Report by Mrs Jackson, adopted 15 February (PE 2-1563/84) on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (COM(84) 5 final) for a regulation concerning the names to be used for milk and dairy products when they are marketed

Further particulars

The Commission sent the Council an amendment to its original proposal (COM(85) 122 final) on 22 March.

¹ OJ L 88, 28. 3. 85.

² OJ L 97, 4. 4. 85.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 14. 2. 85, pp. 275-276.

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 15. 2. 85, pp. 9-12.

- Report by Mr Van der Lek, adopted 15 March (PE 2-1778/84) on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (COM(84) 438 final) 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

The Commission will be confirming at its Council discussions that it accepts Parliament's amendments.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 14. 3. 84, pp. 242-243.

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 15. 3. 85, pp. II 16-19.

- Report by Mr Visser, adopted 12 March (PE 2-1763/84) on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (COM(83) 764 final) 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;
 - (ii) a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) 1107/70 on the granting of aids for transport by rail, road and inland waterway

The Commission will amend its original proposal in accordance with its promises to Parliament.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 11. 3. 85, pp. 30-31.

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 12. 3. 85, pp. II 6-11.

III. *Commission proposals to which Parliament proposed amendments that the Commission has not felt able to accept*

Report by Mr Pranchère, adopted 14 March (PE 2-1770/84) on proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (COM(85) 50 final) for regulations on the fixing of prices for certain agricultural products and certain related measures, 1985/86

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 13. 3. 85, pp. 167-173.

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 14. 3. 85, pp. II 18-41.

IV. *Disaster aid supplied since last part-session*

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>
Chile	300 000 ECU	earthquake	Caritas	7. 3. 85
Comoros	100 000 ECU	cyclones	EEC delegation	12. 3. 85
Mayotte	100 000 ECU	cyclones	EEC delegation	12. 3. 85

Food aid

<i>Country</i>	<i>Tonnage/ product</i>	<i>Distributed by</i>	<i>Date of decision</i>
Sudan (Ethiopian refugees)	12 483 tonnes cereals	UNHCR	12. 3. 85
Sudan (Ethiopian refugees)	21 617 tonnes cereals	UNHCR	12. 3. 85
Mozambique	10 000 tonnes cereals 2 000 tonnes legumes	UNHCR	12. 3. 85
Thailand	570 tonnes legumes 570 tonnes dried fish	UNBRO/WFP	22. 3. 85
Lebanon	5 000 tonnes cereals 1 000 tonnes legumes 500 tonnes sugar	national authorities	27. 3. 85

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 17 APRIL 1985

Contents

1. Minutes: <i>Mr Welsh; Mr Cryer</i>	102	• Question No 84, by Mr Hoon: Operation 'Flood': <i>Mr Andreotti; Mr Hoon; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Andreotti</i>	150
2. Social security — Report (Doc. A 2-2/85) by <i>Mrs Banotti</i> : <i>Mrs Banotti; Mrs Rabbethge; Mrs Daly; Mr Verbeek; Mr Bersani; Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mr Sutherland (Commission)</i> . . .	102	• Question No 85, by Mr Lalor: Dumping of soft fruit: <i>Mr Andreotti; Mr Lalor; Mr Andreotti</i> .	151
3. European Union — Reports (Doc. A 2-17/85) by <i>Mr Croux</i> and (Doc. A 2-16/85) by <i>Mr Seeler</i> : <i>Mr Croux; Mr Seeler; Mr Ripa di Meana (Commission); Mr Falconer; Mr Sutra de Germa; Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti; Mr Ford; Mr P. Beazley; Sir Jack Stewart-Clark; Mr Fanti; Mr Nord; Mr Lalor; Mr Van der Lek; Mr Le Pen; Mr Van der Waal; Mr Megahy; Mr Zarges; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Ephremidis; Mr De Gucht; Mr Musso; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Christiansen; Mr Penders; Mr Toksvig; Mr Croux; Mr Spinelli; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Giavazzi; Mr Sutra de Germa; Mr Cryer; Mr Pannella</i>	107	• Question No 86, by Mrs Lemass: Confiscation of assets of drug 'barons': <i>Mr Andreotti; Mrs Lemass; Mr Andreotti; Miss Tongue; Mr Andreotti</i> .	152
4. European Council in Brussels — Statements by the Council and the Commission: <i>Mr Craxi (Council); Mr Delors (Commission)</i>	128	• Question No 88, by Mr Hutton: Council action on a people's Europe: <i>Mr Andreotti; Mr Hutton; Mr Andreotti; Mrs Ewing; Mr Andreotti</i> .	152
5. Approval of the minutes: <i>Mr Cryer; Mr Boserup; Mr Falconer; Mr Smith</i>	137	• Question No 89, by Mr Fitzgerald: ESB charges: <i>Mr Andreotti; Mr Fitzgerald; Mr Andreotti; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Andreotti</i> .	153
6. European Council in Brussels (continuation): <i>Mr Arndt; Mr Formigoni; Sir Henry Plumb; Mr Cervetti; Mr Romeo; Mr Musso; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Romualdi; Mr Pannella; Mr Alavanos; Mr Lalor; Mr Ulburghs; Mrs Heinrich; Mr Craxi (Council)</i>	137	• Question No 90, by Mr Selva: Aid for the campaign against world hunger: <i>Mr Andreotti; Mr Selva; Mr Andreotti; Mr Mizzau; Mr Andreotti; Mrs Ewing; Mr Andreotti; Mr Pisoni Ferruccio; Mr Andreotti</i>	154
7. Question Time (Doc. B 2-104/85) (continuation):		• Question No 91, by Mr Balfe: Human and civil rights within the Community: <i>Mr Andreotti; Mr Balfe; Mr Andreotti</i> .	156
• Questions to the Council:		• Questions to the Foreign Ministers:	
• Question No 83, by Mr Wijsenbeek: A European surcharge on VAT: <i>Mr Andreotti (Council); Mr Wijsenbeek; Mr Andreotti</i>	149	• Question No 115, by Mr Chambeiron: Action by the Ten to reestablish human rights in Turkey: <i>Mr Andreotti (Foreign Ministers); Mr Wurtz; Mr Andreotti; Mr Lomas; Mr Andreotti</i>	157
		• Question No 116, by Mr Adamou: Community abstention in UN vote: <i>Mr Andreotti; Mr Adamou; Mr Andreotti; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Andreotti; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Andreotti</i>	158
		• Question No 117, by Mr Ephremidis: Visit of the President of Israel to the European Parliament: <i>Mr Andreotti; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Andreotti</i>	159

- Question No 118, by Mrs Hammerich:
Secretariat in Copenhagen:
Mr Andreotti; Mrs Hammerich; Mr
Andreotti; Mr Møller; Mr Andreotti . . . 160
 - Question No 119; by Mr Tzounis:
United Nations report on Afghanistan:
Mr Andreotti; Mr Tzounis; Mr
Andreotti; Mr Alavanos; Mr Andreotti . . . 160
8. Votes:
Mrs Banotti; Mr Clinton Davis (Commis-
sion; Mrs Banotti; Mr Kuijpers; Mrs Pery;
Mr Megahy; Mr Clinton; Mr Herman; Mr
Plaskovitis; Mr Prag; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr
Christensen; Mr P. Beazley; Mr Cryer; Mr
Alavanos; Mrs Piermont; Mr Sutra de
Germa; Mr Staes; Lord Bethell; Mr Verbeek;
Mr C. Beazley; Mr Columbu; Mr Estgen; Mr
Evrigenis; Mr Filinis; Mr Gawronski; Mr
Giavazzi; Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr Mar-
shall; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Normanton;
Mr O'Donnell; Mr Prout; Mr Ryan; Mr Van
der Waal; Mr Welsh; Mr Poettering; Mr
Arndt; Mr Cryer; Mrs Heinrich; Mr Iversen;
Mr Staes; Mr Chanterie; Mr Lalor 161

IN THE CHAIR: MR NORD

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)

1. Minutes

President. — While the Minutes of the previous sitting have been distributed, they are not yet available in all languages. The Greek version has not yet been distributed. I have been informed that it may take about another hour before it is ready. I would propose to the House therefore that we defer the approval of the Minutes until they are available in all languages.

Mr Welsh (ED). — Mr President, in the Minutes that we have not yet adopted there will be reference to a remark by Mr Maher last night when he referred to the rather difficult situation which arose when the distinguished Commissioner for Social Affairs was winding up the debate on the Marinaro report. Because it was close to a voting time, with Members coming into the Chamber in large numbers, it became quite impossible to hear what Commissioner Sutherland was saying. Might I ask you, Mr President, first of all to suggest to the Bureau that they might apologize to the Commissioner on our behalf because he was not able to conclude his remarks, and, secondly, might I ask you specifically to discuss with your colleagues in the Bureau whether it would not be possible to call Commissioners, who are allowed to speak at any time in a debate, at least 30 minutes before a voting time so that they will have a reasonable chance of concluding their remarks in silence and when people are attentive?

(Applause)

President. — I will pass on your remarks, Mr Welsh, to my colleagues in the Bureau.

Mr Cryer (S). — On a point of order, Mr President, may I suggest that as the approval of the Minutes is going to be taken at an unusual time, it should be announced on the television screens that the Minutes are to be taken at a particular time, so that Members can come back if they so choose to raise questions on them?

President. — That will be done, Mr Cryer.

2. Social security

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-2/85) by Mrs Banotti, on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-1377/84 - COM(84) 710 final) for a draft recommendation on social security for voluntary development workers.

Mrs Banotti (PPE), rapporteur. — Mr President, it is a great pleasure for me to present my first report to Parliament. I had begun to feel in the past two days somewhat like a famous character in an old music hall song who took her harp to the party but nobody asked her to play. So I am delighted that we have finally reached this item which has been on the agenda since Monday.

I am also particularly happy to be presenting my report before Commissioner Sutherland, the Commissioner from my own country.

I broadly support the content of the Commission proposals on providing social security for returned volun-

Banotti

teer development workers. The proposals themselves were drafted with the cooperation and active involvement of the non-governmental organizations representing these returned development workers.

In 1981 Parliament's Committee on Development and Cooperation called for action on social security for the protection of these returned development workers. The need for the action at that stage was evident; the need now — four years later — is vital. We are speaking now about social security for some 10 000 Community volunteers who have returned. It is worth mentioning that every returned professional volunteer — or every volunteer who goes out to work in the Third World — represents, amongst other things, one less pressure point, as stated in the Commission document, on the labour market in Europe — apart from the extremely valuable and important work that they are also doing out there.

The lack of a cohesive social security system for these volunteers is proving to be a major disincentive to those wishing to serve in Third World countries. We are losing vital contributions in this area because this legislation does not exist at the moment. These volunteers, I need hardly say, are proving a very important part of the implementation of Community development policy in the Third World.

Volunteer development service has come a long way since the 1960s when this form of service first began to increase. When I went to Africa as a volunteer in the mid-1960s, there were only a small handful of brave, well-meaning but often inappropriate professional workers serving in these countries. However — and I will explain later why I mention this — there were vast numbers of young, eager, untrained peace-corps volunteers from America. In many cases the local communities who were the recipients of this volunteer help were frankly bewildered and very often quite disturbed by the kind of help they were being given. I mention this because there is a certain amount of disquiet amongst myself and my colleagues about proposals to send largely untrained volunteers from the Community to serve in Third World countries — volunteers who, we understand, will not have any particular professional skills to offer and will be gaining more personal experience than actually producing concrete and effective help for the Third World countries.

As I say, voluntary service has come a long way since the 1960s. Since then more realistic and appropriate aid programmes have been formulated and now all the Member States are vigorously participating in a wide variety of useful projects.

The average age of these volunteers at the moment is from 30 years upwards, reflecting a mature and experienced population. All of them have already established social security records in their own countries by the time they have volunteered for service in the Third

World. However, in the past, by the time they have returned to their own countries, they have frequently been excluded from unemployment and health benefits. Some of them returned to their former employment, but many of them returned home, often ill, but precluded from social and health benefits because they had ceased or been unable to pay their contributions whilst working abroad.

Parliament, by putting its full support behind a directive, will redress this injustice and give practical acknowledgement to the valuable work being done by these volunteers.

Briefly, what we envisage is that each Member State will ensure that volunteer development workers will be granted all the social security and health benefits available to employed people in their own country. We do not feel at the moment that it is practical to produce a pan-European blueprint for this social security; we rely on the arrangements in each Member State to ensure that each volunteer is not discriminated against for having given this service in the Third World.

We also anticipate, as does the Commission, that the Member State sending out the volunteers will produce the finance to pay for these social security contributions and will bear the costs generally for this. The medical costs incurred by volunteers will also be refunded, and we hope and anticipate that part of the programme in the Member States will be that the medical costs will be refunded to these volunteers within very short time-limits should they incur medical expenses while serving abroad.

We also, in common with the Commission, welcome the proposal that these health benefits will continue for a period of time after they return from the Third World. Having myself contracted an infectious disease whilst in Africa which did not, in fact, show up until several years after I returned, I think it is extremely important that the nature of tropical diseases to which these volunteers are exposed should be well understood and well covered by any legislation which may be passed in the various Member States.

We also hope, as does the Commission, that the health care and social security benefits will be available to volunteers for the period of time in which they are being trained prior to leaving for Third World countries.

As I have already mentioned, many of the volunteers return to their previous professions when they come back from service. However, some of them do not and these people should be entitled to unemployment benefits while seeking employment when they return from these countries.

Finally, just another word about tropical diseases. We hope, and indeed in my own country this has already happened, that tropical diseases contracted while serv-

Banotti

ing abroad will become part of any long-term illness programme within the Member States.

We also mention, by amendment, that we hope that these volunteers will be granted reasonable diplomatic protection while serving in Third World countries. I need not stress the very real dangers faced by volunteers whilst working there.

While approving the general thrust of the Commission document, I have made several amendments with the purpose of tightening up the text. Thus our proposed directive refers specifically to volunteers who are professionally skilled and experienced; it is not intended at this stage to be a charter for other projects which may be under discussion in some Member States following the Fontainebleau Declaration in June 1984.

We feel it would be unhelpful to treat mature, qualified, experienced volunteers on the same level as young unemployed people who may be sent to Third World countries to give them personal work experience which is not available to them in the Member States.

Finally, Mr President, owing to an unfortunate misunderstanding, the amendments from the Committee on Development and Cooperation were not included in my report. I do hope you will not feel there are any sinister connotations in this. I have discussed with the draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Development and Cooperation their amendments and I am perfectly happy to incorporate all of them in my report and will support them.

We hope that this matter will be given the urgent attention of the Council of Ministers in June and that the legislation will become immediately operative. We look forward at the end of two years to the Commission returning to us with their assessment of the practical implications of the report and with any further additions which they may feel are helpful.

(Applause)

Mrs Rabbethge (PPE), draftsman of an opinion for the Committee on Development and Cooperation. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, to put it kindly, the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment did not have an opportunity to take cognizance of the opinion of our Committee on Development and Cooperation before adopting its report. I therefore earnestly ask you on behalf of my committee to adopt our amendments. Mrs Banotti, the rapporteur, has declared herself prepared to support them. If the Bureau of our Parliament had originally instructed the Committee on Development and Cooperation to draw up this report as the committee responsible, as a large majority of our Parliament had proposed, we would not today find ourselves in the complicated situation that will emerge during the vote.

But since there is no point in crying over spilt milk, I would like to speak briefly to the subject in hand. It concerns directing the social and humanitarian commitment of young Europeans — which does, thank God, exist — into the right channels. Mrs Banotti has just referred to this — when she mentioned the Fontainebleau Summit, where this object was not expressed quite fully.

The Committee on Development and Cooperation therefore believes that only young people who have completed their vocational training, who have occupational experience and linguistic knowledge, may be sent abroad. We cannot simply allow unemployed young people with no vocational training in the true sense of the word to be sent off into the desert. Development aid cannot mean transporting young unemployed Europeans to the Third World countries.

The Committee on Development and Cooperation also feels that the EEC Member States' social security laws governing development workers during their stay and after their return must be harmonized. This protection must be equivalent to that of comparable workers at home.

A further important point, on which Mrs Banotti has already touched, is tropical diseases. They should be recognized as occupational diseases. We have also emphasized the need for development aid workers and their families to be granted the appropriate diplomatic protection. The Commission should also examine, as we ask in our amendments, whether a European volunteer service might be set up and organized at Community level. The Committee on Development and Cooperation decided unanimously that a directive would be the most reliable way to settle these questions, and would prefer that to a non-binding recommendation.

We all know that it takes a long time to issue a directive. That is why our committee suggests that the Member States should be prevailed upon at an early date to act upon the present Commission recommendation until a directive is issued. As the Commission informed the committee, the European Council is not prepared to issue a directive for legal reasons. That is one point of view.

The Committee on Development and Cooperation takes the view that it is our duty to point the way to the future and to go beyond the *status quo*. If we fulfil our task under the Treaty of Rome, under Articles 48, 117 and 118, to harmonize the standard of living in the EEC, this must include the promotion of social and legal equality in all fields — in this case for the volunteer development workers who so urgently need our support in their great task in view of the disastrous situation in the Third World countries.

That is why I earnestly request you, ladies and gentlemen, to support the Committee on Development and

Rabbethge

Cooperation's amendments to the report of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

(Applause from the centre and right)

Mrs Daly (ED). — Mr President, my group supports Mrs Banotti's excellent report, also the opinion of the Committee on Development and Cooperation. We have submitted a couple of amendments which I feel sure will be acceptable to Mrs Banotti.

Our major concern is to ensure that volunteers should be entitled to receive unemployment benefit during the preparatory period of training and on their return. The lack of adequate social security provision is a major disincentive to volunteer workers of any kind going to the Third World. We believe that standardizing of social security benefits across Europe at a minimum basic level would not only increase the number of volunteers, but also increase the numbers of Europeans able to serve in the programmes of each other's countries.

At Fontainebleau the Council encouraged Member States to call in young people to take part in Community development activities outside the Community. Having taken on this responsibility, it must ensure that the interests of development workers are protected. There is no doubt that the demands for manpower assistance in the Third World are for qualified, experienced, skilled people with a high level of personal qualities.

NGOs play a very important role in posting workers to Third World countries. Hopefully we can look at ways of helping them expand their work in these areas. They have at any time 10 000 workers disadvantaged by the present social security rules. Potential development workers will therefore think twice before making themselves available to NGOs.

It is very important, we believe, Mr President, that all those people who choose to serve as development volunteers be given support by the Council to alleviate the disadvantage they now suffer in relation to those who stay at home. We support the view that the Commission should convert its proposal for a recommendation into a proposal for a directive. We wish to press the Italian Presidency to ensure that this subject is dealt with as a matter of urgency at the next meeting.

Mr Verbeek (ARC). — *(NL)* Mr President, this will greatly improve matters for volunteers, provided that the amendments proposed by Parliament are actually made. But I am afraid that this enthusiasm in the Community about volunteers may conceal something that is not so favourable. The impression is that volunteers should try to repair the damage being done by industrial, trade and armaments interests in the Third World. This is the old style of charity, in which well-

meaning individuals do their best to patch up what the people behind such interests are destroying. There is a growing feeling among the NGOs themselves and their volunteers that they are possibly being exploited in this respect. Be that as it may, if volunteer workers are to go out into the world, they should have proper social security.

I have another two brief, but important, comments to make. I agree with Mrs Rabbethge and the Committee on Development and Cooperation, of course, that the Community should not dump the unemployed in the Third World, just as it should not try to dump chemical and nuclear waste, drugs, food surpluses and armaments in the developing countries. That is why it is such a good thing that we should place the emphasis on this aspect by inserting the words 'provided they have the necessary motivation, skills and experience'.

A final warning: the media have reported — and Mrs Viehoff has put questions to the Council and Commission on this subject — that military or paramilitary people have been sent to Third World countries by Community and other countries ostensibly as volunteers. French and German officers have even been assigned to these countries and have begun training programmes there. I am sure that they are highly skilled and experienced people who have offered their services as volunteers, but they certainly have nothing to do with development.

Mr Bersani (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of the European People's Party is particularly pleased to have today's debate on a proposal from the Commission to the Council to which it has long looked forward and for the preparation of which it feels it has worked hard over the years, particularly when this matter was frequently opposed even in this House.

At a time, when many values appear to be called in question, it is significant that the EEC should commit itself to a gesture which is not only inspired by sacrosanct requirements of social security but is connected also by a clear link with the ideals of a disinterested, frequently deeply felt and in any case peaceful and friendly cooperation with the most needy sections of international society.

As the Committee on Development has stressed, we have today attained results of great importance. This has been the wish, we must emphasize, first and foremost of the young people themselves in each of our countries, although serious social deficiencies have been revealed which we as a Community are committed to eliminate.

The Conventions themselves, particularly that of Lomé, have certainly contributed to creating favourable conditions for the expansion of this voluntary service, always better prepared, always better informed

Bersani

and more closely related to specific emergency and development programmes.

In spite of the deficiencies already referred to, there are by now ten thousand young European volunteers, as the report from Mrs Banotti points out, who are working for development in circumstances which we all know well or can easily imagine. This is an example for many young Europeans and for the world.

It is significant that, despite the many initial negative attitudes, there should have been held at Lomé on 8 December, on the occasion of the signature of the third Convention, the first meeting of non-governmental organizations on the African continent. This was as a result of a decision freely taken by the non-governmental organizations themselves, which wished thus to stress the participation of young people in this landmark in cooperation.

In this enthusiastic phase of expansion of the voluntary service, it would, in the opinion of my group, be contradictory and absurd to regard the voluntary service as an answer to unemployment or, worse still, as a bureaucratic or directly militarized instrument for actions from above and from outside having no connection with a genuine policy of voluntary cooperation for development.

We are however fully in agreement with the thrust of the report by Mrs Banotti, to whom we express our cordial thanks, and with the amendments tabled by Mrs Rabbethge on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation.

Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC). — (FR) Mr President, Mrs Banotti, whom I would like to congratulate on the presentation of her first report to the House, has rightly emphasized, from her own experience, that there are undoubtedly injustices where social security for development workers is concerned and that these must be rectified. It is self-evident. Full social security protection must be given, particularly to those people who return to their own countries after months, and very often years, of voluntary work in the countries of the South.

Nevertheless, let us not forget, as our rapporteur said, that ten thousand people are involved, many of whom also accept salary conditions which are local conditions. I think it important to emphasize this, because some people would like to give voluntary development workers a kind of superstatus from the point of view of salary. I think this is entirely contrary to the idea of development cooperation, and in fact account must be taken of the commitment shown in this context by non-governmental organizations and their members.

I think that there is one other point which some of my colleagues have already mentioned and which also has to be emphasized: President Mitterrand and Mr Kohl

would like to be able to recruit a number of volunteers and send them to the countries of the Third World, without their necessarily being trained or competent, and they would then achieve a certain competence during their stay in the countries of the South. I think that the European Parliament's reply to Mr Kohl and Mr Mitterrand was a very felicitous one — the shepherd's reply to the shepherdess — that it considered it important for people who go to the countries of the Third World to be competent and well-trained. This, Mr President, is in fact the essential point in this debate.

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I should like first of all to thank the rapporteur, Mrs Banotti, for her very excellent report which is based on personal commitment and experience and which has been unanimously applauded by this Parliament. I am also grateful for the opinion of the Committee on Development and Cooperation.

The fact that volunteer workers who leave their country to work on projects in developing countries run the risk of losing their social security rights or having them restricted during their time abroad or on returning to their country of origin is unacceptable. By volunteer development workers I mean, of course, persons sent to developing countries through the intermediary of NGOs. The aim of this recommendation, which is universally supported by Parliament, is to remedy this situation so that volunteer development workers are not disadvantaged in relation to other workers.

The recommendation, therefore, requests Member States to take the appropriate steps to develop social cover for development workers. The first part of the recommendation defines the principles on which national legislation should be based — protection by the sending country, risks to be insured against full insurance cover, financing by the Member State, equal treatment between nationals, etc.

The second part of the recommendation specifies the technical procedures for applying these principles. I know that certain Members of this Parliament regret the choice of legal instrument. It is the view of the Commission, however, that a directive would have created serious problems of legal jurisdiction in view of the fact that volunteer development workers pursue their activities outside the Community territory. These problems were liable to halt all progress and thus to jeopardize the speedy implementation of a necessary reform. As the Commission is anxious for immediate action, as indeed Parliament has indicated that it is, we were anxious to proceed by way of the proposal which is now before Parliament.

I should like to add in conclusion that our sole concern was to further the interests of development workers and that we worked on our proposals in close con-

Sutherland

sultation with the NGOs concerned. Thank you again for your support for these proposals.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

3. *European Union*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

- the report (Doc. A 2-17/84) by Mr Croux, on behalf of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, on the European Parliament's position on the deliberations of the European Council on European Union.
- the report (Doc. A 2-16/85) by Mr Seeler, on behalf of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, on the progress of deliberations in the national parliaments on the draft Treaty establishing the European Union.

Before I call the first rapporteur, Mr Croux, I am very happy to be able to tell the House that various members of the Dooge Committee who are not or are no longer Members of our Parliament are coming to Strasbourg specially to follow our debate.

At the moment I note that we have with us Mr Dooge, chairman of the committee, and Mr Van Eekelen, Minister of State in the Government of the Netherlands. I extend to them a very hearty welcome. Various other members of the committee are on their way and will be arriving in Strasbourg shortly. I feel that it is a good omen that the members of this prestigious committee should attach so much importance to our debate today.

(*Applause*)

Mr Croux (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on 14 February 1984 Parliament approved by a large majority its draft Treaty establishing the European Union. At the same time, it adopted a resolution which said that we were now going to take action in two areas: first, we would turn our attention to the national parliaments — this is the subject of Mr Seeler's report — and second, we would also turn our attention to the Council and the governments. And this second point is the subject of my report, which concerns, as the title says, 'the European Parliament's position on the deliberations of the European Council on the European Union'.

The deliberations of the Dooge Committee were to some extent prompted by the action Parliament had taken. It is therefore logical that I should begin my

presentation with a brief assessment, on behalf of Parliament's Committee on Institutional Affairs, of the Dooge Committee's report. It is extremely important that this report was drawn up in a relatively short time. It is also important that the Council has made it the main item on the agenda for the Milan meeting, as it promised it would do in Dublin. I fully endorse the gratitude and praise which you, Mr President, have expressed to the members of the Dooge Committee and particularly to those who are present here today.

As our report says, the Dooge Committee's report is consistent in a remarkable number of respects with Parliament's draft and particularly with the objectives, powers and institutions to which it refers. But there are also differences, which is only to be expected. The Dooge Committee's report is primarily a political document. Parliament compiled a draft *Treaty* in precise legal terms, and it is therefore more complete and more balanced in some ways. Nor does the Dooge report cover certain aspects, such as Parliament's role, which, though assumed, is not elaborated on. This elaboration is to be found in Parliament's document. On the other hand, the Dooge report does cover various new elements, such as security — with all due respect for Ireland's specific position — and the idea that unanimity should in future be confined to a short list of subject areas. The Dooge Committee's report is an important document in every respect, and if we compare its contents with the solemn declaration of Stuttgart, for example, we see that the Council itself has already made considerable progress towards the Union.

Preparations are now being made for the Milan summit meeting. Yesterday the Committee on Institutional Affairs adopted a compromise amendment to paragraph 4 on a proposal from its rapporteur. This reads: 'Considers that the intergovernmental conference should be based on the report of the Dooge Committee, the *acquis communautaire* and Parliament's document'. As regards the spirit and working methods, the Dooge report proposes that the intergovernmental conference should be guided by the spirit and working methods of the European Parliament's draft. What does 'the spirit' mean here? We often talk about the spirit and the letter of the law. The spirit of our document is evident from the preamble and from all the principles, objectives, institutions, actions, resources and procedures outlined in it. These are the practical elements which determine the spirit of Parliament's draft and by which the conference should allow itself to be inspired. Parliament's working methods must also be respected by the intergovernmental conference. And what in fact do 'working methods' mean in western usage? They mean the structure, the division of the whole into chapters and provisions. We propose that the intergovernmental conference should base its deliberations on the legal document that has been drawn up by the European Parliament. The conference should examine this document and propose modifications where it considers them necessary,

Croux

involving Parliament in this process, as indeed the Dooge Committee proposes. Furthermore, all this should be done without undue delay.

Another point regarding the Milan Summit and the intergovernmental conference is the amendment tabled jointly by Sir Fred Catherwood and Mr Spinelli, which resulted in a new text that was adopted almost unanimously by the Committee on Institutional Affairs. In this text we express the hope that all the Member States will find it possible to accede to the new Treaty establishing the European Union. But if some Member States consider it impossible to ratify a new Union Treaty within the space of time deemed necessary and reasonable for its entry into force, a Treaty should nonetheless be concluded with due regard for two provisions:

(a) the States which do not accede immediately should retain the right to become members of the Union without new negotiations being necessary;

(b) the Union and the States which cannot accede straight away should consult and make interim arrangements for maintaining the closest possible relations. This text has already been approved by the Committee on Institutional Affairs by a very large majority, almost unanimously.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we hope the decision to hold the intergovernmental conference will be taken in Milan. I should like to say to the Italian Presidency that we expect a great deal of this summit meeting. The Italian Presidency has been very successful with regard to the accession of Spain and Portugal and in other respects. We set great store by the success of the Milan Summit and activities in the coming months. We believe that political convergence between Parliament, the Council, the various governments, the Member States, the national parliaments and the public, most of whom still want a unified Europe, can be achieved. The public may not be satisfied with the way the Community functions now, but that is all the more reason for us to improve it and make progress. We have the means to make this possible.

To colleagues from Member States that are hesitant I should like to say: we appreciate the differences of view and in historical and geographical circumstances. But let us remember that, despite all the historical differences, we must think first and foremost of the future and remember that there can be no future without a really soundly structured Europe that embraces us all. We all know that there are major geographical differences between North and South, between Europe's northern flank and its southern regions, of which there are now so many, but let us also consider that we together form little more than a headland of the enormous Eurasian continent, whose importance is constantly changing.

The committee, whose rapporteur I have the honour to be, hopes that we can very soon say to the Council

with the backing of a large majority: this is the position of the European Parliament, directly elected by the people of all the Member States. It is an opinion democratically delivered after a thorough study, consultations and wideranging contacts. Take this opinion into account, and let us work together so that it may be decided in Milan that the intergovernmental conference will be held in the form described by the Dooge Committee and by this Parliament.

(Applause)

Mr Seeler (S), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report on European Union that I am presenting on behalf of the Committee on Institutional Affairs is an interim report. When it was drawn up, the delegation of the Committee on Institutional Affairs had not yet visited Bonn, London and Copenhagen. The numerous talks held with government representatives and Members of Parliament in the Member States made it clear, that much can already be said, that all the Member States are studying the draft treaty more or less intensively.

In most of the states parliamentary committees are considering the treaty and preparing the definitive opinions for their national parliaments. I see that as one notable success that our Parliament has achieved with its decision of 14 February. For the national parliaments and governments are finding themselves obliged for the first time to take a look at the situation of the European Community and discuss more practical reform proposals.

And more than that: I am convinced that without this draft treaty the European Council in Fontainebleau would not have created a Dooge Committee and would not therefore have submitted that committee's practical proposals to the Heads of Government for their meeting in Milan. Grand speeches, reports on necessary reforms, voluntary declarations, and finally the Genscher-Colombo Act of Stuttgart — we have seen many of those. But now, I think, the political authorities in the Member States are being confronted for the first time with concrete and well-thought out proposals. It will no longer be possible to take verbal evasive action, at least not without political loss of face.

Let me say a few words about the section dealing with the competences of the European Community. There is wide agreement in the Member States that many tasks would be better tackled and dealt with jointly, rather than separately by each state. They include measures to combat unemployment, measures to improve environmental protection, transport policy, the further development of economic cooperation, the development of the internal market, media policy and many others. A common security policy is another one. Of course our Irish friends must keep their neutrality, but even a neutral country must protect its

Seeler

security politically, and to the utmost. That can be achieved more successfully in a European Community than in isolation.

The Danish Folketing, which has often been criticized for its allegedly anti-European attitude, stated expressly and very early on that the Danish Government and the Danish Parliament would actively promote and develop a European Community policy to combat unemployment, to develop a common industrial and research policy and to improve environmental protection.

The problem in Denmark is not anti-Europeanism but questions of constitutional law, since every treaty amendment and every new treaty must be endorsed by the Danish Folketing by a five-sixths majority or by popular referendum. But that is not feasible at present.

There has been some criticism of the draft treaty provisions on conflicting powers. This concept is still unclear for many Member States and it is up to us to propose more precise provisions, perhaps taking the form of an exhaustive list of Community competences.

There has also been some critical response to the proposals for a new financial constitution, especially in the Federal Republic of Germany. The critics mainly fear that majority decisions by Parliament and the Council will cost Germany its financial rights, and the same applies to other countries which bear the financial brunt of the Community. There is also some concern about the Community having autonomous rights over Member States' finances without much say on the states' own part. I think these concerns must be taken seriously and allayed by better provisions.

We must realise that in the Federal Republic of Germany the *Bund* and the *Länder* share the revenue from VAT. If the European Community wants a share of this cake as the third partner, the problems will become greater and not smaller. That is why the idea was put forward of allocating the Community a different tax, solely to finance its expenditure, in place of VAT. This could be a consumer tax, such as a tax on mineral oils, tobacco or alcohol. We should consider these matters very seriously.

Reservations have been expressed about other proposals regarding the financial constitution. I will not go into the details now, but may I state quite clearly that Parliament is not prepared to abandon its demands for a say on the budget and the financial constitution, which are among the basic rights of every democratically elected Parliament. In my view, that means that the Community's credit financing must also be included in the budget. We regard that as an inalienable right.

A word now about the institutions. Our demand was that the Council should be made able to take decisions again and that Parliament be given the rights proper to

a directly elected people's representation. Those are the two key points we must focus on. Some smaller Member States wanted the Council to retain its right of veto, believing that only thus could they protect their rights *vis à vis* the larger Member States. Other countries think we could return to the majority decisions of the Treaty of Rome. Some countries are prepared to go even further.

In my view, the key to reform lies in the restoration, if not creation, of the Council's decision-making ability. A community of states with its own sovereign rights must be able to exercise these rights. It is not admissible for hundreds of proposals for decisions by the Commission, some of which Parliament endorsed more than fifteen years ago, simply not to be decided, not even to be considered. All the professions of the need for community in Europe are empty words if the Community is not able to implement the powers transferred to it.

Even more disparate are the Member States' reactions to the proposals concerning Parliament. I will spare you the details, we do not have enough time. Most of the Member States are beginning to understand that direct elections have changed the status of the European Parliament. Our rights now derive directly from democratic sovereign power. The measure of say the European Parliament has in policy formation and legislation, in political control, is now equivalent to the measure of democracy in the European Community. Anyone who voted in favour of direct elections must now also vote in favour of the democratic consequences of these direct elections.

Many national parliaments — as shown by our talks — fear a loss of power and are surprised to hear that it is a question of transferring the parliamentary rights taken from them years ago and given to the European Community back to a parliament again. As long as the Council remains both the legislative and the executive organ, we will have an infringement — and I use that term deliberately — of the basic principles of a democratic legal state, namely, the sharing of powers.

People often argue that while they are prepared to do their utmost for the European Community and also to give it rights, first of course the EEC must develop into a kind of federative community. Only then could one discuss giving it further rights. It is especially clear in those Member States in which the administration and the ministerial bureaucracies have examined the draft treaty that people are afraid of losing influence and competences. They are beginning to realise that they can no longer hide behind the veil of grand European speeches.

However, the draft treaty, and also the Dooge report, now require definite decisions to be taken. The future of Europe is a question of power. Without a shift of power there would be no European Community nor will there be any further progress in the Community.

Seeler

This shift of power requires political and not administrative decisions on the part of the Heads of Government.

If in the 1950s we had left it to the administrations to create the European Economic Community or the European Coal and Steel Community, we would not have a European Community today. The political resolve of Schuman, of De Gasperi, of Paul-Henri Spaak and of Adenauer shaped the history of Europe at that time, and we need and expect that same political resolve today of those who hold political responsibility in our Member States.

(Applause)

Mr Ripa di Meana, Member of the Commission. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, very few months have gone by since the beginning of 1985 and the Commission has already had the opportunity to give its views on these matters in this House. The first time it did so was in its declaration setting out its guidelines in January last. The second occasion was in March during the presentation of the work programme for 1985. Now we have come to a fresh juncture of great importance.

The *ad hoc* Committee on Institutional Affairs recently presented its final report to the European Council in Brussels. In the meantime the debate on the consequences of the report — that is, on the mandate to be given to the intergovernmental conference — has become more intensive. I should therefore like to dwell on these two points for a moment.

The report presented by the Committee on Institutional Affairs to the European Council in Brussels produces significant results from three points of view: the objectives set for the European Union, the improvement of decision-making machinery and the procedure to be followed to attain the Union.

As regards the objectives, apart from detailing Community action in various sectors such as technology and social policy, reaffirming at the same time the principle of own resources, the report comes out in favour of strengthening the European Monetary System. It also points to new fields of activity: for example, in the matter of cultural policy. It also envisages the development of political cooperation from the point of view of a common foreign policy and finally proposes measures regarding security and defence.

As regards the institutions, the report envisages the effective participation of Parliament in legislative power — with a field of action to be more specifically defined — in the form of a joint power of decision with the Council. As regards the Council, the majority vote is envisaged as a general rule, whilst it is provided that unanimity shall remain confined to exceptional cases, decidedly less numerous than under the present

Treaties. Last but not least, it recommends a strengthening of the powers of the Commission, to which wider executive powers will have to be given in the sphere of Community policy, and the procedure for the appointment of which will have to be changed.

As regards the method of attaining the European Union, the report has formally proposed convening in the near future the intergovernmental conference whose task it will be to negotiate a draft Treaty of European Union based on:

the Community patrimony, the report of the *ad hoc* Committee for Institutional Affairs and the Solemn Declaration of the European Union adopted in Stuttgart and guided by the spirit and the method underlying the draft Treaty adopted by the European Parliament.

If we compare these results objectively with the careful terms of the conclusions of the European Council of Fontainebleau, we may conclude that the progress made has been substantial although limited and falling short of our ambitions. Moreover, as has already been noted by your rapporteur, the results lead in the same direction as the European Parliament's draft Treaty. The passage on joint decision-making seems to me to be of particular significance. Then again the position could not be otherwise, since the committee had secured the support of the former chairman of the Committee on Institutional Affairs of the European Parliament who presided over the drawing up of the draft Treaty, Mr Mauro Ferri, and of an eminent Member of the present Parliament, Mr Fernand Herman.

It is true that the report is not unanimous. The great majority of the members of the committee subscribed to all the reforms proposed. However, certain members expressed doubts, which indicates that there are still reservations and even misgivings. I would add that the doubts are much more serious than those caused by the provisional report, and this is directly related to the fact that the text has become more detailed. I think we all agree in regretting this situation. But a failure to achieve complete unanimity on a courageous text is preferable to complete and blissful unanimity on a content which has little of interest to show. Experience of the so-called 'Solemn Declaration' of Stuttgart is a case in point that might give us food for thought.

Second point: the convening of the intergovernmental conference which, we hope, is to ensure from the European Council of Milan.

In this connection I should like to be extremely clear. For the Commission certain fundamental conditions must be met and spelt out in a clear and unequivocal mandate:

— first and foremost the task of the conference is to go beyond the existing Treaties;

Ripa di Meana

- in the second place the mandate must at the same time lay down the powers of the Union and the institutional instruments appropriate for exercising them. It must amongst other things provide for the extension of the Community method, which will involve more consistent and binding rules, and regulate certain areas not covered by the present Treaties. I am thinking, for example, of political and cultural cooperation but also of joint activities in the matter of security in which a certain receptiveness has recently emerged;
- Finally, the conference must not degenerate into interminable diplomatic discussions, as has happened too frequently in the past. It must therefore be given tight deadlines.

The Dooge report is not a legal text; it is political. On the other hand, Parliament's text is a draft Treaty in legal form. It is clear that, if the European Council were to agree to define a mandate in the terms I have just described, Parliament's draft would be at the centre of the negotiations without, however, restricting the right of the various participants to put forward proposals. I should therefore like to stress the importance of a correct definition of the mandate.

The Dooge report provides, in the chapter on method: that Parliament is to be closely involved in the work of the conference and that the conference's findings should be submitted to the European Parliament.

This idea was not the subject of any reservations in the report. For the Commission this is a very important point. We insist that in Milan it be embodied in appropriate procedural provisions.

But, over and above legal formulae, what is important is that Parliament should be able to influence the conference during the whole of its work. As regards the final result, it seems to me virtually inconceivable that we could ask the national parliaments to ratify a Treaty on European Union on which the agreement of the European Parliament had not already been obtained.

A further point. The Dooge report did not meet with unanimity. In the present state of affairs it cannot be stated that all the Member States of the Community are ready to commit themselves to the drafting of a Treaty of European Union.

No-one — neither the Member States nor Parliament, and certainly not the Commission — wishes to divide the Community.

On the other hand, one of the aspects which has most encouraged me during participation in the work of the Dooge committee has been the sincere wish demonstrated by all, even those who were not in agreement with the majority positions, to allow the Community to develop. It is therefore essential that the next few

weeks should witness a collective commitment to define objectives, overcome misgivings and conquer reservations.

I should like to believe that, faced with a genuine determination to make further progress, no-one will take on the responsibility of dividing the Community.

And it is to this common objective of far-sightedness and steadfastness that the Commission at the present time feels itself more than ever committed, together with Parliament and in alliance with Parliament.

Certainly many people would have expected a more positive message from the European Council in Brussels. But perhaps the method pursued is the correct one, since it leaves a large margin of manoeuvre for the Presidency and for other means of creating awareness, beginning with the debate which is under way today in this House. I do not doubt that the Presidency will continue to show the dynamism which it has demonstrated up to now.

I conclude with a reflection regarding the times in which these actions are set. As has been said by the chairman of your Committee on Institutional Affairs, Mr Altiero Spinelli, we are truly faced with an opportunity unique in history, which we must grasp without delay. Recently President François Mitterrand said: *Pour la deuxième fois depuis la fin de la dernière guerre, l'Europe doit forcer le destin.* The Community has stitched together — even if the scars have not entirely healed — the wounds which have opened up during the present phase of integration and has decided to welcome two new members. All are today in agreement in asserting — and the Commission has been repeating it for years; one has only to think of the proposals of 1978 and 1983 — that the Community will be able to operate and play its own part with twelve members only if it transforms itself. If it does not do so, we would certainly be heading for a paralysis in decision-making which would speedily produce new disagreements, thus making impossible, even in the long term, the development of the Community. The political opportunity which is offered to us today is genuine but it is also of short duration. It is therefore imperative that a result be reached. I trust that each of the parties in question and each one of us is aware of the position.

(Applause)

Mr Falconer (S). — On a point of order, Mr President. I apologize for interrupting this important debate. I realize that certain people in this Chamber are very concerned about European Union, even if that Union is confined to the EEC only.

However, I wish to refer you, Mr President, to the minutes of yesterday's meeting. My colleague, Mr Balfe, spoke...

President. — We decided at the beginning of this sitting not to deal with the minutes yet because they were not available in every language.

Mr Falconer (S). — Mr President, please, if you will allow me to pursue my point of order.

In today's *Glasgow Herald* there is a report that 12 members of Parliament's security staff are being trained by the special police in France in order to deal with what the newspaper story, written by a certain Mr Fraser, terms 'possible unruly British Labour Members'.

President. — This is not a point of order.

Mr Falconer (S). — This, Mr President, is our Chamber. We are the democratically elected representatives of our people and you, Mr President, have a responsibility to ensure that democratic rights are protected. Mr President, you cannot allow — at least someone has allowed it — our security staff to be trained by the Special Branch police in France.

This, Mr President, is a point of order, and I seek positive assurances from yourself and from the Bureau in general that there will be no restriction on entrance into this Chamber, which is our Chamber and not President Reagan's.

(Protest from various quarters)

President. — Mr Falconer, again I say that this is not a point of order. Your information will be passed on to the President and to the Bureau and will be examined and discussed.

Mr Sutra de Germa (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should first like to welcome the Commissioner with responsibility for institutional and cultural affairs. I see in this dual choice of responsibilities a sign, and I shall draw certain conclusions from this presently. I believe, in fact, that these things are linked.

Important things are happening in Europe at the present time. There is a movement in favour of a stronger Europe, more confident, more fair. The great majority of the European Socialist Group support this advance by our Community, and an even larger majority in the Union of European Socialist Parties, which met in Madrid last week, has reaffirmed its desire to give birth to a Europe of the people at last.

Yes, a fairer Europe, more balanced, more democratic, and not just necessary but possible as well. The Committee on Institutional Affairs recently sent delegations to all the European capitals. I personally took

part in several of these meetings. And I can say that everywhere — it is with good reason that I say everywhere — we found the desire to do something.

Let me say that everyone told me, as a Frenchman, about the hopes which François Mitterrand had aroused here in this Assembly of the European Parliament and at Fontainebleau.

The will is everywhere. Sometimes diffused, sometimes mixed with apprehension. But what to do and how to do it, that is what today's debate is about, and our group supports wholeheartedly the reports of our eminent colleague, Mr Croux, and our comrade, Hans-Joachim Seeler. They are pointing the way and providing several means of attaining our objectives.

For too long this Parliament, and the entire European school of thought which favours Community integration, has been locked in an erroneous debate, an unproductive debate which leads nowhere: I am speaking of the dispute, which to my mind is both artificial and also virtually obsolete, between 'functionalists' and 'institutionalists'. If that were the debate, if we had to choose between what Jacques Delors calls everyday Europe — currency, the internal market, new Community policies — on the one hand and, on the other, some marvellous treaty which would ostensibly resolve all the problems, if, by pushing the button in front of me, I could choose between having tomorrow morning the ECU, a European currency, or a Treaty, we should have no hesitation in choosing what we call the concrete. But there we have it, it is the decision-making process which is in deadlock. Is the law still a light to the world, a professor of law asked me recently? As long as the law does not impede progress.

What happens every year when the European budget is adopted? Well, the old rule of thumb is: accepted, voted, written. The Council applies this rule and in that way overcomes its paralysis.

If Council unanimity were required every year in order to have a budget, there would be no budget at all, and Europe would exist no longer, the Community would not function!

Therefore, as the Congress of the Union of Socialist Parties declared in its resolution last week, 'we consider the institutions to be a means of attaining the objectives set out in the Treaties'.

Let me for one moment take the example of the European currency and the ECU, for many people the symbols of the everyday Europe which they want to oppose to the institutional advance. Not a day passes without the Press giving out good news of what is happening to the ECU in the world. One day it is the American market, the next it is the Soviet Union which is accepting payments in ECU. The same week, China and Japan. We are getting good news all the

Sutra de Germa

time. One might think the ECU is going to be recognized by the whole world, with the exception perhaps of the Europeans, the Community, which is incapable of taking any decision!

I turn to the Council and the Commission: do not expect Parliament to congratulate you on Palermo, where virtually half of what has since become reality was ratified. Let us go further. Palermo is an advance, of course, and it will make it possible to go further. However, to fight against unemployment, for European social issues, for new policies, there is a need for that qualitative leap which François Mitterrand proposed to our Assembly recently! A leap towards a new situation, a new Treaty, which could not, of course, replace the existing Treaties but would extend them into areas which they do not cover. That is the case with political Europe, he said, but let us add technology, the conquest of space, transport, communications and security. Yes, security! The taboo is broken at last, and let me say that that taboo, the ban on the words 'security' and 'defence' in Europe, has been broken since my friend Françoise Mitterrand was elected to the presidency of the French Republic!

United we can take up the challenge, and I should also like to quote the most recent statement from the European Confederation of Trade Unions in December 1984: 'The ECTU considers that the draft Treaty establishing the European Union, adopted by the European Parliament, is moving in the right direction. Even if this draft does not yet provide adequate answers to all the problems, it does nevertheless indicate the path to follow'.

This qualitative leap, which is essential in view of the present deadlocks, will be even more so in a Community which is to increase from ten to twelve members. We, European Socialists, French Socialists, for our part firmly believe that the agreement reached is a good agreement which will show the inveterate pessimists how wrong they are. Yes, it is a good agreement which balances wishes and policies in the South. But the Spain of Felipe Gonzales and the Portugal of Mario Soares want to bring us more. They are countries which are passionately resolved to play the game. I should like to quote — and this is news of a truly political event — some phrases from the closing speech given by Felipe Gonzales at the Congress of the Union of European Socialist Parties, which was held in Madrid exactly one week ago. 'It has often been said that a Europe of twelve cannot function with the same internal machinery that was designed for a Community of six members. I agree'. A little further on, '*El futuro de Europa será un futuro de unidad o de decadencia* — the future of Europe will be union or decline', and a little further on, 'We hope that this work will result in an intergovernmental conference and we are manifesting our will to participate actively in that process'. Finally, he concluded with these words, 'We have a firm desire to move forward with those who want to do so'. Words which have not been uttered by

enough European Heads of State, but which François Mitterrand himself spoke in this Chamber.

And now we are going to go to Milan. Maurice Faure's report embodies the inspiration and the spirit of the draft Union of the European Parliament. We have full confidence in the ability of the Italian Presidency, which has been successful in difficult negotiations so far, and of Prime Minister Bettino Craxi to bring success to this major advance. At Milan Europe will have a meeting with history, and if the intergovernmental conference is not to get lost in the sands of the good intentions of a new Genscher-Colombo draft, it must have a precise mandate for strong, clear action, and that precise mandate must include a precise time-table.

I should like to conclude, Mr President, by mentioning a concept on which there is normally silence and which, to judge from the whispered confidences and innuendoes, runs like a thread through the appraisal which I am trying to make of the meetings in seven capitals of the European Community with the delegations of the Committee on Institutional Affairs: the concept of identity. In some reluctant States it is said, 'Yes, but such-and-such a State, which is racing ahead, has great problems with its lost identity or is having trouble in rediscovering it. Such-and-such a State has never been a nation, only a province'. Well, here I am, a representative of a country which has a very strong selfawareness, which does not feel any serious break with its past. Like Great Britain or Spain tomorrow, France is a State with a thousand years of history. Our identity is indeed so strong that we have nothing to fear from adding a European identity to it. We see it as a strengthening of ourselves, an injection of spirit and strength!

That is the main thing at stake. Yes, it was at Fontainebleau that the march towards a more powerful Europe and a stronger European identity got underway.

Let those who do not love Europe, those who do not want it, who fear it, who hate it, those who may dream of destroying it and dare not admit it, let all these, and a few others besides, despair, for they will prevent nothing. Great things are afoot. We are here in the process of devising our own Parliament, our own institutions, we are giving new birth to our own continent, we are in the process of giving Europe to the citizens of Europe!

(Applause)

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti (PPE). — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I thank Mr Croux, the rapporteur, for his excellent report and I think the time has come for the European Parliament to 'come into the open' and address a serious energetic call to the people on behalf of its plan for European Union,

Cassanmagnago Cerretti

the 'Treaty establishing the Union'. The time is favourable. Numerous parliaments and governments — above all those of the six founder Members of the EEC, the true propulsive nucleus of all integration — have expressed themselves in favour of the political qualitative leap proposed by the Treaty.

The European Council, that is the summit of Heads of State and Government which is to meet in Milan at the Castello Sforzesco on 28 and 29 June, is to be devoted principally to that subject. With that summit meeting the Italian Government will bring to an end its six months' presidency of the EEC; it therefore has in its hands an extraordinary opportunity and behind it it has a political movement which is completely — majority and opposition — in support of the Treaty of Union. Mr Mitterrand is pressing for the process to be speeded up and is raising straight away the suggestion of a popular referendum in France on the European Union.

But there is a risk that the project will come to nothing and it is a serious one. Behind the scenes the few but seasoned enemies of Europe are engaged in their manoeuvres. The Dooge Committee itself, that is the committee of the personal representatives of the Heads of Government charged by the Fontainebleau Summit to work out proposals on the European Union, notwithstanding the clear and steadfast action of the Italian Member Mauro Ferri and the Belgian Member Mr Herman and others, has, all things considered, 'lowered its sights' as compared with the European Parliament's draft, by presenting compromise proposals which represent without doubt a step backwards.

Now, to use the same figure of speech, it is necessary to 'raise the sights again', to return, that is, to the European Parliament's draft, which does not represent an excessively bold or futuristic proposal, but sets out the 'institutional minimum' so that Europe may face with appropriate democratic instruments the new historical situations, the economic and social problems which are afflicting it, its responsibilities at world level for the building of a less precarious peace and a more just world order.

For this to happen it is necessary to guarantee two conditions. First: at the Milan Summit it must be clearly decided that the negotiations on the European Union — that is the proposed and now almost certain intergovernmental conference for a new Treaty of Union — shall have as its basis the Treaty worked out by the European Parliament and that any amendment to that Treaty shall not impair its innovative aspects: legislative power exercised jointly by the Parliament and the Council and executive power conferred on the European Commission (which might as well at that point be referred to as the European Government).

Secondly: the European Parliament must be associated with the negotiations, that is, with any amendments to its draft, and the final text of the Treaty must have the

approval of the European Parliament before being signed by the governments and ratified by the national parliaments or peoples.

Elementary requirements of respect for democracy and for the sovereignty of the people, apart from guaranteeing the political value of the draft, require that these two conditions should be considered even obvious and settled: but they are not.

No government has openly declared itself in this sense. But one thing is certain: if these two conditions are not accepted, it will be clear that there is an intention to deprive the draft of its innovative substance. And public opinion ought to be aware of this. That is why the Parliament at this point must make an appeal to the people.

The federalists moreover have already thought of this and are busy involving parties, trade unions, professional organizations, local administrations, church and secular associations in a campaign of popular mobilization in favour of the Treaty of Union, a campaign which will have its climax in a great popular demonstration in Milan on 29 June, simultaneously with that European summit which may be decisive. Since all the organizations invited have replied positively, often with real enthusiasm, to the call of the European Federal Movement, it is now certain that the demonstration in Milan will be one of complete unity, such as has not been since the far-off times after the war and will be international in character and of imposing dimensions.

A popular mobilization of this kind may truly encourage the favourable forces to give their support, spur on the hesitant and overcome uncertainties. But it is important also for another reason: because it establishes a new relationship between the European people and their Parliament and a new presence for the populace, for public opinion in the construction of Europe, a construction which still has before it various phases in order to attain the objective of the federal State, the great European democracy. This is why the European Parliament must associate itself with the federalists in this struggle, which is its own struggle, and appeal to the people.

(Applause)

Mr Ford (S). — Mr President, I am sorry to have to rise on a point of order, but I have just been to my pigeon-hole and found that people have been abusing the access to pigeon-holes by distributing racist propaganda. I would like to ask you to ask individuals to refrain from circulating material in the pigeon holes, which, at least in the United Kingdom, would be actionable. I would like to ask you to refer to the Bureau the distribution of unsigned material in the pigeon-holes — I am certainly in favour of free access to pigeon-holes, but we have a situation now where

Ford

people are putting in this vile propaganda with no signature on the bottom, which I find personally very distasteful and very disturbing. I hope a number of other Members will feel the same. It is certainly not something that has been distributed to just myself — a number of other Members have complained to me about the same matter.

President. — Thank you for your information, Mr Ford. I shall pass it on to the Bureau.

Mr P. Beazley (ED). — Mr President, could I ask that we might continue with the debate and that this very important subject should not be interrupted by extraneous matters. I think that we have every opportunity of raising these matters at other times. Could I ask you as President to let us hear the debate and then later deal with extraneous matter? It does seem to me to be breaking up the whole of the sense of what we are discussing.

President. — Mr Beazley, I am pleased to hear from a British Member of Parliament that you consider, as we do, that points of order do not mean that you can raise any subject under the sun in order to interrupt a debate. I am glad to hear it. From a practical point of view I would rather have a few seconds of what seems to me a rather strange point of order than spend ten minutes arguing with the House on whether or not it is a point of order.

Sir Jack Stewart-Clark (ED). — Mr President, may I first of all say how delighted I am to see my old friend and colleague, now a Commissioner, Carlo Ripa di Meana, with us today. I would like to compliment Mr Croux and Mr Seeler on their clear and concise reports. No one would doubt that reducing unemployment and increasing wealth lie at the heart of the ambitions of the Community and of each Member State. Success depends on our ability to compete against the United States, Japan and increasingly the newly industrialized countries. In Western Europe we are falling behind because we do not operate together; because for too long we have lacked the political will to create a market which works. National interests have continued to predominate and the use of the veto or the reluctance to vote in Council have caused delay and compromise in creating what the founders envisioned — a strong united Europe. In turn the Commission has been hamstrung and Parliament, despite its new, directly-elected status, has remained not only distant from decision-making but essentially divorced from influence except in budgetary affairs.

Further, democratic power has moved steadily from the national parliaments in matters concerning Europe, not to this European Parliament but to the Council. Is this the practice of advancing democracy? But now we seem to have a fresh wind. To the great

credit of the European Parliament, and especially Mr Spinelli, the need for constitutional change was recognized as far back as 1981. A new Treaty emerged. Many of us do not agree with every item of it, but it points the way forward and will lead to more efficient decision-taking. We welcome too the initiative taken by the European Council at Fontainebleau to set up an *ad hoc* committee under Senator Dooge to draw up Parliament's draft treaty and to recommend the way forward. We praise the final report which has been submitted, for it faces up not only to what needs to be done in the economic, political — including security — and cultural spheres to create a newly-motivated and effective Community but also to the methods by which this should be achieved. But it is in the matter of method that we have the greatest doubts, concerning the progress that will or will not be made.

We recall the recommendations of the report of the 'three wise men' commissioned by the Community Heads of State in 1978 and submitted in 1979, long before Greece joined, which then were effectively, for convenience, swept under the carpet. Is the same thing to happen again? I pray not. This is surely our final chance before Spain and Portugal join the Community to establish the mechanism for efficient decision-making and the proper democratic functioning of the Community through this Parliament. The Dooge report asks for a strengthened Commission with increased powers and having greater delegation of responsibility. It stresses that Parliament cannot continue to be restricted to a consultative role and recommends specific measures for increasing our own responsibilities, including far better follow-up of our recommendations by the Commission. It asks for easier decision-making in Council, particularly by decisions being taken by a qualified or simple majority, bar exceptional cases, and for more use of voting.

We urge and entreat the Heads of State at the forthcoming summit in Milan to find the common will to implement this report in full and to take full account of the draft treaty. We ask them to convene an inter-governmental conference. We support the request that both Commission and this Parliament should be involved. We caution against too much compromise or the digging in of heels of a minority of States including my own. The one will mean we continue to lose the competitive race and relegate ourselves to becoming the museum of the Western world, the other will lead to a divided Community. On the other hand, we ask those Heads of State who want to proceed immediately at top speed to European union to recognize the inbuilt cultural and historical characteristics of some countries, including my own, where caution is being asked for. We, in Britain, want a united Europe but one where achievements and advance can be made steadily and on the basis of practicality. This can be achieved if common sense prevails and goodwill can be maintained.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PLASKOVITIS

Vice-President

Mr Fanti (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, at one year's distance from the approval of the draft Treaty the European Parliament is summoned by the Croux and Seeler reports to a fresh and important moment of intervention in the process of construction of the European Union.

Some perhaps were under the illusion or had hoped that our draft too would undergo the fate which in previous years has befallen the numerous attempts made to undertake the renewal of the institutions of the Community: to find its way, that is, into the capacious drawers of the Community archives.

Anyone who was under these illusions undervalued or did not take into account the fact that this time the proposal under discussion is the result not of some wise man, of some enlightened brain, but is the fruit of a collection of political forces, different, it is true, in their viewpoints and nationalities, but entrusted with the responsibility by the vote of dozens and dozens of millions of electors and gathered together in this directly-elected Parliament which thus, in this manner, has insisted on asserting its rôle and the fact that it is irreplaceable.

We have not concealed and we do not conceal from ourselves the difficulties involved in this procedure. Today we mark a stage. The Dooge Committee, set up at the Fontainebleau Summit on the basis of a mandate which was, to say the least, ambiguous, has concluded its work in a way which even we, the Italian Communists, regard as positive, above all — and this must be said in their praise — through the merits of men such as Mauro Ferri, Maurice Faure and Fernand Herman.

It is true that reservations, dissensions and compromises arise from the work of the Dooge Committee but in substance arrangements such as lead in the right direction, as was emphasized by Commissioner Ripa di Meana, and such as are in harmony with the essential content of our draft, are entrusted to the governments, and above all the go-ahead is given to the convening of that intergovernmental conference which the Milan Summit in June is to summon and which we, in the Croux resolution, ask should proceed according to clearly defined rules.

This is now the decisive point for us, convinced as we are that 1985 is the year in which the chance to move forward the process of the construction of the new Community on to a firm foundation of achievement is truly at stake.

This is made all the more urgent by the positive conclusion of the lengthy negotiations for the extension of the Community to Spain and Portugal. A Community of twelve under the present arrangements or, rather, in the present disorder and institutional paralysis, can certainly not survive. It is necessary therefore in these three months which separate us from the Milan Summit to bring to bear the maximum amount of political pressure by continuing and amplifying the helpful relationship brought about by the Committee on Institutional Affairs with the national parliaments, as suggested by the Seeler report.

Nor will our commitment, as Italian Communists, be found lacking in this phase. It goes back to that expressed here many times in our Parliament in the name of the whole of our party by Enrico Berlinguer and I should like to repeat it in the same words as used by him in the last speech delivered at European level at the Congress of the Federalist Movement only a few weeks before his death: 'We reaffirm this commitment, proud — allow me to say — of having allowed the European Parliament, by our votes, to avail itself of the zeal and intelligence of Altiero Spinelli. This union between Spinelli and the workers' and people's forces, which are to be seen in the policy, the ideals, the autonomy and the proposals of the Italian Communists, is in fact proof of the maturity of the Italian workers' movement, the proof of its conviction that the European sphere is henceforth the necessary sphere in which are to be conducted — together with the campaigns that each one carries on his own country — the campaigns for work, for a new quality of development and life, for a new international order founded on peace, on an end to the arms race, beginning with missiles and nuclear weapons, on cooperation, on a new relationship between North and South and between East and West'.

And it is with these views that we express our agreement with the reports presented by Mr Croux and Mr Seeler.

(Applause)

Mr Nord (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, my group will vote for the reports by Mr Croux and Mr Seeler, and I should like to express my thanks to both rapporteurs for the excellent work they have done. We shall also vote for a number of important compromise amendments announced by Mr Croux, which improve the text and will also greatly increase the majority in this Parliament able to support the report. We are grateful for this.

We have recently heard rather more harmonious sounds coming out of Europe than we have been used to for many years. Spain and Portugal have acceded, and the decision to increase own resources has at last been taken. But if these harmonious sounds already form a symphony, it is an unfinished one: if it is be

Nord

completed, the institutional conclusions must be drawn from what is happening at the moment. If this is not done, we shall have not a symphony but a cacophony. All our fine intentions will remain just that — intentions — and we can already see the signs of the fresh crises that will make for a further period of stagnation in the Community and speed up the deterioration and declining of our part of the world. That is why it is so important for the institutional reforms and the improvement of the decision-making process to be taken in hand now. It is also why the reports by Mr Croux and Mr Seeler are particularly opportune: they come at just the right moment. The aim must now be to make the preparations for the European Council's meeting in Milan that will assure it of success.

We know that in this respect the views of the Italian Presidency and this Parliament do not differ greatly. We can therefore surely say that we expect something of the Italian Presidency. I want to ask the Presidency very precisely and specifically to ensure that the Italian Government, which holds the Presidency, sees to it that terms of reference for the intergovernmental conference are adopted at the European Council's meeting in Milan.

Deciding to hold the intergovernmental conference while leaving its terms of reference vague will in effect mean that this conference will achieve nothing. In our opinion, it is for the Italian Presidency to submit a draft on this to the European Council when it meets in Milan.

Mr President, this morning we have all been able to see that spring has arrived. Or perhaps I should say that it has broken out. After a dreadful, long, grim, cold and wet winter we have had to wait a long, long time for this spring, but it has come today. Let this be seen as a symbol for our debates today and for European activities in the coming months. May it herald a spring and then a summer which give the Community the fresh stimulus it so badly needs and Europe the means of leading a continent that has so often been written off to new prosperity and fresh glory.

Mr Lalor (RDE). — Mr President, my Irish colleagues and I would welcome genuinely positive initiatives towards European Union. I agree that we must move forward and improve the institutional balance and decision-making in our Community. I am also most anxious that we fix our sights on European Union as the ultimate goal of all our efforts.

I would, however, like to make it abundantly clear that, as far as we are concerned, there can be no real union until such time as there is total integration and harmonization of the economic policies of the Member States. The paralysis from which the Community suffers at present stems from factors which cannot be resolved by window-dressing initiatives or by tinkering with the existing institutional structures.

Further integration can only follow economic and social development. The primary motivation for integration is the further development of the Community through the Treaty framework. This means, firstly, that the complex of internal problems facing the Community must be resolved in the immediate future. Secondly, it means the development of an even closer community of interest through the adoption of concrete and visible measures designed to face up to the economic and social problems of the Community, notably and principally unemployment, and to further the aim of convergence of the economies of the Member States. This means the provision of the necessary financial resources for the Community to maintain existing policies and to develop new ones designed to achieve the aims already mentioned. A European union based on 1.4 or 1.6% VAT contribution is, therefore, at present nonsensical and very Utopian.

I fully agree with Senator Dooge in his refusal to subscribe to the inclusion of the text on security and defence in his committee's report. On behalf of the Fianna Fáil members of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, let me make it perfectly clear to all that Ireland's neutrality is not negotiable. We will strongly reject any attempt to embroil our country in any military alliance. Our positive neutrality is aimed at the promotion of peace, as has been clearly established already by Ireland's traditional attitude to decolonization, disarmament and peace-keeping issues in the United Nations.

It is being suggested that European political cooperation should be extended to military affairs. We are totally opposed to this idea. While individual Member States may discuss certain foreign policy questions touching on political aspects of security, we are opposed to any involvement in either military or defence matters by the Community institutions as such. This opposition is rooted in our status as a Member State which does not belong to any military alliance. If Ireland were to adopt any other position, inevitably we would find ourselves subjected to pressures to promote nuclear facilities in our country. The political party that I am proud to represent here in Europe — Fianna Fáil — is resolved to preserve the whole of Ireland, North and South, as a nuclear-free zone. We see clearly that this is possible only on the basis of maintaining our military neutrality. As I said at the outset, Ireland's neutrality is not negotiable.

When my country signed the Act of Accession to the EEC, there was no reference to any military or defence obligations, Protocol 30, which was annexed to that Act, recommended that the Community institutions implement all the means and procedures laid down by the EEC Treaty, particularly by making adequate use of the Community resources to reduce the economic differences between Ireland and the rest of the Community. We are still a long way from having this commitment honoured.

Lalor

This brings me to the phasing out of the veto, which could cause serious problems for my country. Of course there are issues which can and must be decided by a majority vote. Nevertheless, as long as excessive economic imbalances between the regions persist and until such time as they are eliminated, there must be provision to allow smaller and economically weaker nations like Ireland to invoke, when necessary and justified, their vital national interest and exercise the right of veto.

Finally, may I say that it is extremely difficult to visualize the ideal European Union from the view base of a divided Ireland.

Mr Van der Lek (ARC). — (NL) Mr President, the explanatory statement in Mr Croux's report contains a remarkable sentence. Referring to the Spinelli draft Treaty, it says: 'The draft was adopted by an overwhelming majority and is therefore an acceptable model for all shades of opinion.' This might be regarded as a small mistake, a slip of the pen, but I am afraid it is rather typical of what minorities can expect if the plans for a European Union are actually implemented.

I am speaking on behalf of part of this minority, which actually exists and is utterly opposed to the forced tempo of development towards unification that is welcomed so enthusiastically here. I am also convinced that if the citizens of the Western European countries really knew what developments were involved, how they were being given stones for bread with this European Union, most of them would be against it. The developments proposed here will not solve the problems the people in Europe face. On the contrary, they will simply aggravate some of these problems because the causes lie in the economic, social and political course which the institutions of the European Community have always followed and continue to follow.

What do people want, Mr President? More competition with the United States and Japan? That is more likely to destroy jobs than create them. More economic growth? That is more likely to destroy the environment that preserve it. Do they want more nuclear power stations, the production of yet more weapons, the continuation of the arms race, the deployment of missiles, an increase in defence spending or even participation in the Star Wars project, as the Commission seems very prematurely to assume? No, Mr President, that is not what they want, and yet these are things that are constantly referred to in the documents, things which are actually happening and for which the draft Treaty seeks to create an even stronger basis.

Mr President, we naturally agree with Mr Seeler, Mr Croux and the Committee on Institutional Affairs that wherever powers are withdrawn from the national parliaments, equivalent powers should be vested in the European Parliament. A powerless parliament is worse

than no parliament. But this should not necessarily entail the centralization of powers. What is more, we do not believe that intentions are anything like as clear as is now being suggested.

The report of the *ad hoc* working party, which, despite all its footnotes, does not on the whole have any solution to offer to the problem of the veto in the Council, shows how bizarre the procedures are and how much more bizarre they will become if the plan is to develop Western Europe, come what may, into a new super-state.

Mr President, we believe it is fundamentally wrong to think that bigger is always better. It is also wrong to think that the problems of the world and of Western Europe in particular are the outcome of insufficient integration. They are the outcome of an incorrect policy. It is appalling that both the Dooge report and the other documents still assume that a higher rate of economic growth can restore employment, that these documents should say that we will be stronger in the struggle against the United States and Japan, in international competition in other words, if we act together and that we will ensure peace if we speak to the other superpowers with one voice. What good is speaking with one voice if what it says is wrong? And do we need a European Community to say the right things, to take initiatives which promote peace, to further disarmament and a reduction of tension? Of course not. Mr President, we are in favour of international cooperation, but cooperation worldwide. That alone will be truly beneficial to peace and the well-being of everyone in the world.

Mr President, I should like to go on with this analysis a great deal longer, but I will sum up. A poor policy does not improve with more integration. As we see it, the draft Treaty is centralist. There is no reference to regional autonomy, the decentralization of decision-making or the participation of the public. The principles — the striving after economic growth, competition, an increase in scale — lack any understanding of the real causes of the destruction of the environment. We reject an international policy based on the threat of the use of arms, and we are opposed to the militarization of the European Community. We want the democratization of Europe from the bottom up, and we are therefore very sceptical about all these plans for integration.

Mr Le Pen (DE). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in our view the only legitimate purpose of building a political Europe is defence and the advancement of the nations and peoples of which it is composed, to the maximum benefit of progress and peace in the world.

There is a European area of European peoples which have their own characteristics, but they also have a European identity and culture. The basic objectives of

Le Pen

these institutions must be the defence of its own interests. In a world where the iron law of international economic competition reigns, the prosperity of Europe is threatened, a Europe so grievously lacking in sources of energy and raw materials. But its security, its existence even, are also threatened by the formidable military and subversive organization of Communism, and, more insidiously, by infiltration from foreign immigrants as a result of both Europe's own falling birth-rate and the population explosion in the Third World.

The survival of our continent, already half-occupied by the totalitarian forces of the Soviet Union, depends on the acumen and courage of its spiritual, economic, social and political elites. It was the dramatic decline in power after the Second World War which led most of the nations of Europe through resignation to attempt to unite in order to survive.

In this Assembly, which is too often prey to the phantasies and ravings of humanitarianism, we often lose sight of the fact that our countries are living dangerously, under the threat of invasion and sudden death. In the so sadly neglected area of military and civil defence of Europe, which should be the prime, principal, obsessive, preoccupation of our Assembly, it is imperative that the eyes of those who out of prejudice refuse to see, at least be opened. First of all we have to admit that for forty years our freedom has been assured thanks to the links between Europe and the United States, through and in the Atlantic Alliance. In the confrontation with the USSR's hegemonic ambitions the balance of strategic nuclear terror has been the instrument of peace. But we are entering a period where in Europe that balance is dangerously disturbed, to the advantage of the Soviet Union, particularly in the area of conventional forces — air, land and sea — which the USSR has gone on strengthening for over forty years, with obvious aggressive intent.

At present the disadvantage is 1 to 3 and may be as high as 1 to 6 in particular areas of stress. For example, in Central Europe, the Warsaw Pact has drawn up 160 divisions, half of which are capable of going into action at any time, backed up by several thousand aircraft, an air defence system, radar cover and a significant array of ECM measures, while ultramodern surface and submarine fleets would attack vital maritime links. For eighteen months those forces have been equipped with front and superfront general staff which in the Soviet plan are general staff in time of war. These forces are deployed in accordance with the doctrine of the ultimate offensive, which aims to destroy the NATO forces as quickly as possible and to occupy Western Europe before it can be reinforced by American forces. These manoeuvres would take place under the threat of small-scale nuclear weapons: 250 triple-warhead SS-20s, not to mention the biological and chemical weapons, of which there is a 400,000 tonne stockpile. On the logistical side the offensive nature of all this is demonstrated by the enormous dumps of

river-crossing equipment and the 12,000 kilometres of oil pipeline stockpiled close to the West German frontier, which the Soviet military oil terminals have now reached.

This agonizing situation ought to make Europe assess the danger, look it in the face and rethink the problem of its defence as soon as possible. We have therefore first to admit, and to get other people to admit, that the defence of Europe is the prime responsibility of all Europeans and cannot be confined to any one national frontier of one country. But each government must retain control of its armed forces, with the possibility of their being used on national duties, a European nuclear strategy must be organized — as Helmut Schmidt proposed in November 1984 — around France, and possibly Great Britain, following a positive increase in financial resources by all European countries, which would apply to all the frontiers in Western Europe. There would be an automatic nuclear response to any offensive penetration of Europe's territory or to an attack with nuclear, biological or chemical weapons. We should also reduce Europe's dramatic weakness in terms of conventional weapons, build up a civil defence system, like that of Switzerland, worthy of the name, and, finally, set up an integrated European force to combat all forms of subversion.

A global response to a global threat. Europe is threatened, Europe's first duty is to defend itself. How could the Assembly evade its responsibilities in this field? Let us therefore begin, like all parliaments, by setting up a full-scale committee with responsibility for problems of defence.

My time is very closely limited and I cannot go into detail of the proposed defence policy. Enough to say that it means the will to think clearly, determination, sacrifice. The war waged against us is likely to be military and subversive, by land, sea, air and space, and with nuclear, chemical, biological and conventional weapons.

Security, colleagues, is the first duty of a State and the prime freedom of men, it requires material resources and financial outlay, but it is unrealistic if it is not backed up by the readiness of men to make the supreme sacrifice if necessary in order to defend their families, their country and their freedom.

(Protest from the Rainbow Group benches)

IN THE CHAIR: MR SEEFELD

Vice-President

Mr Van der Waal (NI). — (NL) Mr President, the reports by Mr Croux and Mr Seeler are a logical

Van der Waal

extension of the European Parliament's approval on 14 February 1984 of the draft Treaty establishing the European Union.

We do not endorse the draft Treaty, and we do not therefore support the tenor of the two reports and the motions for resolutions they contain. I have tried to express our feelings in the amendments I have tabled to the motions. To put it in a nutshell, the European Communities today lack a strong decision-making mechanism and effective democratic control of the decisions taken. This is resulting in stagnation in important areas of the European Communities. For example, an internal market has still not been established, and there is still no common transport policy. There is also a need for closer cooperation in various areas, high technology being but one example.

For all these reasons the working methods of the European institutions need improving, but we do not believe radical institutional reforms are necessary or desirable to achieve this. Firstly, the present Treaties and what has followed them are perfectly adequate both for a reform of the decision-making procedure and for the achievement of the goal of closer economic cooperation.

Secondly, if we build on what has already been done, we shall perpetuate the situation that arose when the Community grew from six to ten Member States. When this enlargement took place, we knew that the views of some of the new Member States on European cooperation differed from those of the Community of the Six. It would not therefore be wise to force these Member States into a corner with a new Treaty and a supranational increase in momentum, with the added risk of producing a Community of Member States proceeding at different speeds.

As regards the reforms, we believe that there must be more majority decisions but that it should still be possible for a Member State to claim vital national interests. In these respects, we feel the Dooge Committee's recommendations provide valuable pointers.

On the other hand, we cannot support Parliament's draft Treaty and the way in which the reports by Mr Croux and Mr Seeler follow on from it, not only because of the proposed abrupt change to the institutional structure, which we see as a threat to the unity of the present Communities, but above all because the draft Treaty advocates the wholesale transfer of powers to supranational bodies. Partly as result of the eventual elimination of the right of veto, this would lead to large-scale centralization of powers, a trend that would encroach heavily upon the sovereignty of the Member States and also run counter to the movement towards decentralization which we are now witnessing at national level. Hence, Mr President, our call for the present Treaties to be enforced in every respect. We believe this to be the most practical and effective approach.

Mr Megahy (S). — Mr President, in the course of his speech earlier, Sir Jack Stewart-Clark made the remark that the British people wanted a united Europe. That is completely untrue. A previous speaker talked about the coming of spring. His own Prime Minister looks on that as synonymous with the coming of cuckoos. British Members will understand the reference.

British Labour Members will be voting against both the Croux and the Seeler reports, which embody the latest attempts by this Assembly to further the cause of European union. This is in line with our previous opposition to the draft European union treaty and other associated moves trying to propel us along the way to a European superstate. The call in these reports for an intergovernmental conference as early as June this year to prepare the way for such a union, if necessary without the agreement of all Member States, is a highly dangerous one.

If successful, it would take decision-making in more and more spheres further away from the people and centralize them in remote bureaucratic European union bases in Brussels, Luxembourg, Strasbourg or wherever it finally decided to settle. I personally do not think the grandiose plans will be accepted, but I do not think anyone opposed to such plans should ignore the comparative speed with which they have become a serious issue on the European Council's agenda. Certainly, if accepted, they would make it virtually impossible for member governments, particularly socialist governments, to carry out essential economic and social reforms within their own countries.

The major implication of the Dooge and other reports is that a grand design for institutional reform will provide a universal panacea for the failure of the Community over the years. Mr President, this is totally misguided, because it ignores the fact that the major failings of the EEC have been those of political will, not constitutional structures, although the structures, if anything, have made things worse.

Moreover, there is no common European identity to sustain any imposition of a quasi-federal structure of government over 12 countries. It is surely ironical that a great deal of the pressure behind the Croux report comes from the belief that the accession of Spain and Portugal will create a state of paralysis inside the EEC unless we further strengthen the Community institutions. This, of course, ignores the fact that there is a contradiction in the preamble to the present Treaties between the desire for a political United States of Europe and the express wish to offer membership to more and more European nations. Left to themselves, the original Six might well have developed into something like a monolithic Europe — although it certainly would not have been Europe; once the process of enlargement started, however, that prospect disappeared.

Megahy

The conflict between dream and reality is becoming more and more apparent. There is greater diversity, less convergence and less identity of interest. To accept proposals for a European union in these circumstances would be to turn that original dream into a nightmare.

Logically, the sensible thing to do in this situation would be to question whether the highly-centralized, tightly-structured EEC envisaged in 1957 is still appropriate. That opinion has never been explored. The present system has failed miserably, but what is on offer is the same, only more so: the remedy is to be greater centralization and standardization, not less.

When the Croux report calls for an intergovernmental conference, it specifies that this must have terms of reference along the lines of the European Parliament draft treaty. But, Mr President, there are no grounds for believing that the problems which the existing institutions have failed to deal with will be any more satisfactorily dealt with by European union. This is pure integrationist posturing. The Dooge report echoes, even goes further than, the European Parliament's draft treaty in calling for an end to the veto in the Council of Ministers. The reality is that every country stands ready to use it when its interests are at stake.

We have seen many examples of this recently. Indeed, the right to exercise this veto was one of the promises given to the British people by those who urged support for our continued membership of the EEC in the referendum. Labour is completely opposed to its removal. I wonder, however, what answer members of the Committee on Institutional Affairs will get in London when they visit there, because, make no mistake, there is a complete split between the Tories here and the Tories at Westminster. In this place we have Tory Members who are dedicated federalists, determined to take more and more powers away from the British Government and hand them over to the European institutions, in which, of course, they see themselves as exercising a leading role.

I find it remarkable that Tory Members in the Committee on Institutional Affairs were actually urging Mr Spinelli to adopt the Dooge formula on the veto because it was stronger than the European Parliament's draft. Not for the first time, Mr President, we find Tory MEPs completely out of touch with the British people and, I suspect, with their own government. Indeed, I have no doubt that a short sharp shock will be administered by their national leader, especially in her new belligerent mood displayed in South-East Asia.

There are other aspects, of course, of the Dooge views which we are similarly opposed to: the extension of this Parliament's powers and the notion that the Community should develop a defence and security role. I must admit that after having heard the speech by Mr

Le Pen, one began to have nightmares about what kind of defence role this Community should have. Surely what we ought to be aiming for is the dismantling of existing defence organizations, not creating new ones.

Of course, the saving grace of the Dooge report lies in the footnotes and the reservations which litter its pages. When the European Council comes to consider it in June, I hope it will pay attention to them. I hope it will put an end once and for all to all this federal posturing. There should be no intergovernmental conference along the lines proposed. There should be no end to the veto. There should be no defence rôle for the EEC. The summit should dispense with reports and turn to action. We should produce joint economic plans to generate the wealth which will put people back to work and assist the conquest of hunger in the world. It is not the lack of institutions that is stopping this, it is only the lack of political will and effective policies.

Mr Zarges (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, unlike the preceding Socialist speaker, the Group of the European People's Party agrees *in toto* with the reports of Mr Croux and Mr Seeler. The course so far of the debate in the Member States on our draft treaty has brought two important insights:

Firstly, by its vision of the future of Europe, the European Parliament has forced the Member States to concern themselves with this subject, and they have accepted that task.

Secondly: the continuous dialogue between Members of the European Parliament and members of the national parliaments, which was seriously disrupted by the effective disappearance of the dual mandate, is being placed on a new basis.

On the first point, I would like to point out that our draft treaty naturally does not lose sight of the final objective of creating a United States of Europe in the form of a European federal state. At present some people, and not only in the United Kingdom, may regard that objective as utopian; but without a degree of utopianism we will not gain a future of freedom.

In the medium term we see European Union the subject of our draft treaty, as a decisive step along that road. We want it to free the European Community from its agony and make it fully able to take political action again. To do so we must apply two principles, efficiency and democracy, in order to reform the Community in such a way as to make its organs workable again, but also to ensure that the Community of governments becomes a Community of nations.

On the second point, we may note that a wide-ranging dialogue has at last begun with the members of the

Zarges

national parliaments, something which is more necessary than ever. Our talks in the Member States have shown that the national bureaucracies are exceedingly well informed about all the important elements of the draft treaty. But the same cannot be said of the members of the national parliaments. Many of them regard Europe as a remote and tiresome business that disturbs them in their national peace and day-to-day work.

We must jointly attempt to change this attitude. It is hardly surprising for national officials, educated in national inertia, to fight to preserve their national power if the politicians do not give them any European impetus.

In our view, the further discussions in the Member States must concentrate on five areas in which we must make progress for survival's sake.

Firstly, the European Parliament, as an organ with the same status and rights as the Council, must have a say in legislation, the budget and political control of the Community.

Secondly, the Council must at last become able to act again and made fully capable of political action by a return to the majority rule. The unanimity rule may no longer apply as a matter of principle.

Thirdly, the Commission must act as the political motive force of the Community, as the representative of the common interest, and be equipped with wide-ranging executive powers; and it must, as Mr Ripa di Meana of the Commission said, look upon the European Parliament as its most important ally.

Fourthly, the European Community must become financially autonomous by being allocated specific taxes by the Member States, in order to be able to fulfil the tasks already transferred to it and its new tasks, and it must create a complete internal market as soon as possible, by measures ranging from the dismantling of border controls on passengers and goods to the removal of all barriers to trade, and even to accepting a European currency, the ECU.

Fifthly, the Community must take on responsibility for a new range of tasks, whether in the field of common external and security policy, in the field of research or in the field of environmental protection. Our national governments must work towards that objective.

In view of the Milan Summit, we call for a government conference with a clear mandate, in order to convert the most important elements of our draft treaty and the Dooge report into a new treaty by a specific deadline, so that it can be submitted to the citizens of the Community this year. A government conference similar in kind to the usual conferences of experts, which take years to produce results, cannot help Europe. The decision must be taken this year. 1985 is the year of destiny for European integration, given that most of

the member governments are not burdened by parliamentary elections and are thus free for Europe.

As Chancellor Helmut Kohl has repeatedly declared, we must now decide on irrevocable steps towards European Union. We call on Chancellor Kohl and President Mitterand to convert their words and promises into deeds and not to wait in case some Member States do not want to join in, for we cannot allow the delayers and opponents of European Union to determine the pace and direction of the convoy! Like Joan of Arc to her king, we must say: 'You must bear the burden that is for you to carry. Either you are king or you remain a beggar!'

In the fight for a united Europe, let us jointly be the king of the royal idea of our century, as Konrad Adenauer once put it, so that we achieve success this year on the road to the United States of Europe.

(Applause)

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — Mr President, I am astounded to find Comrade Megahy sheltering behind the skirts of Mrs Thatcher — or what he thinks are the skirts of Mrs Thatcher! It just shows how bankrupt the Labour Group are of ideas of their own that they should be driven to that!

I do not know myself of any vital national interest in my country which has been protected by the veto. I do know of vital national interests which are now frustrated by a thousand vetoes used to protect a thousand narrow sectional interests which prevent our Community from meeting the needs of all our nations. It is a vital interest of the Community and a vital national interest in all our countries to get our unemployed back to work. We in this Parliament have given that priority. The Commission in its statements has given it priority and has put forward practical proposals. The Council's Dooge Committee has given it priority, but Vice-President Cockfield and President Delors have made it clear that the Commission plan to get 13 million people back to work cannot be carried out while the Council still operates a veto. The majority of the Dooge Committee, representing a majority of Heads of Government, agree with them.

It is inconceivable that a Community of Twelve can work if any country, large or small, can veto anything for any length of time. That is why I believe that the majority of Heads of State, including my own, will agree in Milan at least to return to the existing Treaty with its much more precise safeguards for genuine vital national interests. I do believe that that will allow us to create a frontier-free Europe and that that dynamic boost to trade and investment will be quite enough to get our unemployed back to work. I defy those in the British Labour Group who think, as Mr Megahy has said, that this can be done by separate sectional, national proposals to produce the proposals

Catherwood

which they think can match the collective impact of the European Community's proposals. They have no document, no backup and no research that shows anything to substantiate their claims, but we have. We know it is the best researched proposal that we have ever had.

I also support the other two major proposals of the Dooge Committee. The world will be a better place for the coordinated foreign policy to support American democracy where it is right and to modify it where it is wrong. And the world will be a safer place if our collective security policy is brought under more democratic control and not left to the military and to the one dominant unitary State in NATO.

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — (GR) Mr President, we who represent the Greek Communist Party in this House do not agree with the resolutions embodied in the Croux and Seeler reports, and we will vote against them because, each in its own way, they both promote the draft European Union treaty that Parliament has voted for, and also the draft prepared by the *ad hoc* committee. In our view all these resolutions and drafts are fraudulent. They appear to aim at a united Europe, democratic and devoted to dealing with the problems that beset its peoples, while their actual purpose is different. They aim to strengthen international institutions, granting them excess powers to the cost of the national institutions and arming them with the weapon of majority decision-making so that they can act all the more effectively in the interests of state-monopolistic conglomerates and to the disadvantage of working people and their rights by loading the burdens of the crisis onto their shoulders. These drafts and resolutions also aim to impose the will of the Community's large and well-developed countries on its smaller and less well-developed ones. Furthermore, they aim to allow state-monopolistic conglomerates to hold their own in competition with American and Japanese capital on the one hand, and on the other hand to collaborate with it, within the framework of an Atlantic cold war, to present a common front against the Socialist and the developing countries.

For these reasons we shall vote against the resolutions. However, Mr President, please let me say that so far as Greece is concerned, the Greek government and the Greek Parliament have no right to participate in the intergovernmental conference that will approve the final text of the modified Treaty, because the latter will restrict and limit popular national sovereignty. There are consequently constitutional obstacles and opposition by the Greek people, as expressed in the mandate it gave its Government. Under no circumstances will it be possible for this new treaty to be ratified. If that happens, there will be an uproar in my country because that would infringe the fundamental principles of our constitution.

Mr De Gucht (L). — (NL) Mr President, if we compare the Haagerup report on a European security

policy, the Spinelli report in its successive phases and the report of the Dooge Committee, we detect a clear evolution, a growing interest in peace and security. The facts have emerged more clearly than certain protagonists would have liked to see. The need for a European security policy is indeed becoming increasingly apparent. The polemics that have erupted over President Reagan's Star Wars programme reveal the very grave doubts about this initiative felt in various Member States, and not without reason. How should a European react to this, that is the big question, and one to which there is clearly only one answer: European, together and not in open battle order.

The SDI calls for a review of the present balance. It means a fundamental change in the position of the European countries in particular and, to say the least, it is not without risks. We must react by establishing within NATO as a matter of urgency an integrated European security policy that takes account of the European continent's own security interests. It is not by impairing European security, by yielding to the pressure of Russian rhetoric because it goes down well with the electorate — in my country Karel van Miert epitomizes this attitude — but by joining hands that we will maintain peace for our countries. The Milan Summit can take a major step in this direction. If it does, it will be a historic meeting.

Mr Musso (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have before us two reports: one tabled by Mr Croux, the other by Mr Seeler. These two reports have been laid before us on behalf of the Institutional Committee and the request of the Institutional Committee.

What is at issue? The first report — Mr Croux's — sets out the European Parliament's position on the work done under the leadership of Mr Dooge and points out that Parliament last year adopted a draft treaty, which has gone unheeded, and that the conclusions in Mr Dooge's work should not forget that treaty. In fact, the only difference is to be found in the second indent of paragraph 4 of the motion for a resolution, which states that the European Union must be in the form of a genuine legal, concrete and specific draft and wants the conference to be given a mandate to prepare the Union in this legal form. That is the only difference. As for the rest, both Mr Croux and Mr Seeler have pointed out that there had been other initiatives before this draft treaty. Notably the Genscher-Colombo document. There were also other initiatives which have gone unheeded. Parliament, after adopting last year's draft treaty, has today realized that it is still unheeded and would now like to press on further.

As far as the idea of European Union is concerned, we are in favour of it. I shall vote for the two reports, but there is something that worries me in Mr Croux's report. I should like to repeat here what I said in the

Musso

Institutional Committee yesterday. How is it possible at one and the same time to want to establish a European Union and to say — laudable as it is — that the door will be left open to any States which may not be ready yet, and at the same time tell them — this is written down in paragraph 6 of the resolution — that if they do not join, they will retain the right to become members of the Union without new negotiations being necessary. To my mind it is an encouragement to the ones which are dragging their feet and which, in the past, have shown us that they did not expect — after having tried to torpedo the Community — to do anything else in order to join. It is an encouragement to those which did not exist in the past and which today think they can place obstacles in the way of this grand concept of Europe about which various Members have spoken just now. I do not think this a good way of bringing about the European Union of which everyone seems to dream, but which one must have doubts about when one then sees the statements made by the different governments and — I use this word, I hope you will excuse me, but I cannot find any other suitable word — the cowardice of the Council and the European Council, which make great declarations but do not want to make any progress. I think that we too are now showing signs of weakness by saying to people: of you do not join now, it does not matter because you will retain your rights, you will not have to renegotiate, we shall offer you a seat, even if you did try and stop us.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (NL) Mr President, the grandeur of Europe, built on the dream of its becoming a new economic superpower, is a thing of the past. It is not relentless competition but the moral greatness of Europe, based on solidarity internally and externally, that will make it a shining example.

Firstly, internal solidarity. I am sorry that the report refers to the abolition of all measures that conflict with the law of free competition in the Community. This would mean, for example, the closure of the Limburg coal mines on the grounds that social criteria must take second place to economic criteria. I am sorry that the report calls for greater transparency in the case of nationalized industries while multinational undertakings are to have greater freedom and be subject to less control. What happened to the Vredeling directive and its call for information and control? I am sorry that the report says the universities must gear their activities more closely to the commercial sector than to cultural values.

Secondly, external solidarity. Europe must speak with one voice. All right, but it must do so chiefly in UNCTAD and the UN to the benefit of the North-South dialogue, to the benefit of the developing countries. As regards defence policy, Europe must develop an economy for peace and consolidate its economic, military and cultural autonomy, and this also means handing back nuclear missiles. In this the historic efforts being

made by Mr Van Miert and others in Belgium have my support.

The European Parliament must also awaken the interests of the European public in the development of a strong Europe from the bottom up, not to the disadvantage of those without power but to their advantage.

Mr Christiansen (S). — (DA) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I know that a majority in this assembly regard Denmark as a reluctant partner in cooperation and as a block to the introduction of a supranational European political union. The latter view is correct, the former absolutely wrong.

My own party, the Social Democratic Party, has always had a strong and sincere will to participate in close and binding international cooperation. Our party — which for many years has been the largest party in Denmark — was instrumental, for example, in the creation of the Nordic Council and in bringing about Danish membership of NATO and the European Community. We have always felt that the problems can only be solved jointly and have therefore, since we have been in the Community, always backed attempts to devise collective solutions for the Community as a whole, which would be effective in achieving the goals set and would be seen as forward-looking by the citizens of Europe.

We take the same constructive attitude in the institutional debate. We do not accept that any one institution can be of value by dint of its mere existence. Like everything else, it must have a political aim and be judged according to its acts. These are the results which count, not formalism, pen-pushing and paper mountains. It is true that the Community institutions do not operate efficiently enough at present, that they lack coordination and a common approach to the objectives. Not enough is done to solve the real problems in our society. This is also the conclusion our colleagues Croux and Seeler have reached, but their response is to demand that more powers be given to the institutions of the Community. In my view this will not solve the problems. The cause does not lie there. It is to be found elsewhere: the political will of the national parliaments, the governments and even the European Parliament is not strong enough.

Let me give just one example: it is a manifestation of dual morality when those countries which are the strongest advocates of institutional supranationality are the very ones which most often violate Community law. In Denmark we observe the Community's directives and regulations. But take a look at two of the big countries: France and Italy. In 1983 proceedings had to be taken against France for violations in 55 cases and against Italy in all of 69 cases.

Thus the assertion of the two rapporteurs that the lack of a coordinated policy is due to the misuse of the

Christiansen

right of veto must be emphatically rejected. The fact is that the proposed restrictions on the right of veto will not reduce violations of Community law by the Member States. A limitation of the right of veto will only hit the small countries because the big countries in practice have always been able and always will be able to exercise a form of veto, irrespective of the voting system applied: majority decisions, unanimity etc. Yes, indeed, I think that — to quote a proverb — they should put their own house in order before they turn their attention to those of others.

I should also like to say a few brief words on Mr Seeler's criticism of the decision-making procedure of the Danish Folketing with regard to Community matters. It is claimed that the parliamentary control applied by Denmark when our ministers are given their negotiating briefs goes beyond the intentions of the right of veto and hence has an inhibitory effect on the Community's decision-making capacity. This view is incorrect. The normal practice is to confer wide powers, but it is nevertheless a sound element in the decision-making procedure, since it ensures that we in Denmark, unlike certain other countries, do not repeatedly violate Community law. The system under which the market committee of the Folketing works contributes to the securing of parliamentary and political will for the implementation of the decisions which are taken under Community auspices. After all, it is not the decisions themselves which matter but their practical implementation. It is loyal action which will, institutional changes are unnecessary. If on the other hand the political will is not present, institutional changes will serve no purpose in any case.

The Danish Social Democrats here in Parliament therefore recommend voting against both reports, and it should also be noted that the Danish Folketing has adopted the views I have presented here, so that they are also the views of the Danish government. It should and certainly will be seen from the vote therefore that 16 Danish Members have voted against these two reports, and we shall be able to verify this if an electronic vote is taken on the two reports, which I hereby request.

Mr Penders (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, the report of the Dooge Committee is out. I should like to say, 'Bravo, this is a good report,' but the Dooge Committee has been disbanded, and that is something I do not welcome. There is now in fact a vacuum between two European Council meetings. I think that is a pity and, what is more, dangerous.

Mr Tindemans pointed out in Brussels that we would be having three nerve-racking months, and I am afraid he was right. Will the institutional *élan* not be lost in the coming months? Is the Dooge report not being nibbled at? And another question is whether this Parliament should back Spinelli or Dooge. I believe this question should not be asked.

Let us be honest: the European Council will consider the institutions only once. The deed must be done in Milan. I feel the European Parliament should support its own draft Treaty with all its mights. But we must above all realize that without our Treaty the Dooge Committee would not even have existed.

What must come out of the Milan Summit? What is the minimum necessary? An intergovernmental conference that makes progress towards a new Treaty. And what must this Treaty at least produce? (a) A stronger European Parliament and (b) better decision-making in the Council.

As regards the first point, Mr President, diplomacy and democracy always have difficulty with one another. That has always been the case. The European diplomats and more specifically our permanent representatives in the Community have recently been very successful: accession, enlargement, own resources, the British problem. We owe them our gratitude and we also owe them our congratulations. But what is completely disastrous is their tendency to build Europe at closed Council and Coreper meetings with national bureaucracies looking over their shoulders. The national parliaments have lost the scent, and the European Parliament is being thrown off it. But how can we ever hope to retain, let alone inspire, the European citizen's interest in the European adventure without democracy? Hence the need for a say in the legislative process and in deciding our incomes, the time-honoured purse strings.

A tribute, Mr President, to the majority of the Dooge Committee, provided the list of subjects requiring unanimous decisions in the Council is kept short. The pivot on which this all turns is London: see the British footnotes in the Dooge report. I believe that in future a crucial role will be played by the Dutch Government, which has in the past, particularly under previous cabinets, been suspected of always looking to the United Kingdom with at least one eye. I believe we must now press on and persevere, not threaten London, but hold up the mirror so that it can see itself. After all, London wants an effective democratic Community, and London wants to strengthen Europe's role and contribution.

Mr Toksvig (ED). — (DA) Mr President, as a member of the Committee on Institutional Affairs I have repeatedly drawn attention to the fact that I personally see Parliament's draft treaty as a particularly exciting and worthwhile piece of work. But I am not convinced — and neither is my party — that the draft constitutes the only possible solution.

It is therefore difficult to give wholehearted support to Mr Croux's motion for a resolution. That Mr Spinelli and the other rapporteurs responsible for the draft treaty have produced an outstanding piece of work is beyond any doubt. But to sanctify the proposal — and

Toksvig

that is what the Croux report does — as the only true doctrine is going rather too far.

The important thing is to repeat that the Danish government and the main opposition party have made it clear that we shall take part in the conference of governments envisaged in both the report of the Dooge Committee and the Croux and Seeler reports. Obviously there is no-one in this Chamber who would willingly cut his country off from participation in mapping out the Community's future and setting the course for its further development. My Danish Conservative colleagues and I have therefore tabled a number of amendments to the Croux report in the hope that the final document will show that we are more immediately concerned to see the discussion at the intergovernmental conference pursued in an unbiased and impartial manner, without any prior obligation on the Heads of Government to discuss only one text. We think that all possible options should remain open.

Mr Hovgård Christiansen mentioned our European disposition. I do not want to leave any doubt as to that. It is my view that a Europe with two speed settings would be a disaster the consequences of which it is hardly possible at present to gauge. For that reason we propose that paragraph 6 in the Croux report should be deleted. Paragraph 6 is an open door — an all too tempting open door. It provides almost explicitly that countries which have doubts about their electorate should be free to refrain from participation in the new development without incurring any sanctions. We think that is dangerous and would like to see this point removed. If that cannot be done, we would support Sir Fred Catherwood's new wording.

With regard to the Seeler report, which calls for continued cooperation with the national parliaments, all there is to say is that we can support it as it stands.

A little while ago we were given by my Danish colleague an outline of the political and parliamentary situation in our home country. I would remind you of the present position in which the country is being ruled by a coalition with a variable mandate and a very uncertain majority. I remind you of it because the European Parliament will later be discussing the Bocklet report on a uniform election system, and I would draw your attention to the risk of fixing the proportion of the vote entitling a party to a seat in the legislature at too low a level.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, we have to interrupt this debate at 12 noon, at which time the Council will be making its statement.

I still have several Members listed to speak. I would estimate that the debate should finish in about 40 minutes. We can have one or two more speakers now, but then the debate must be adjourned. This means, how-

ever, that the vote on the reports we are debating can no longer be taken today but must wait until tomorrow.

Mr Croux (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, Mr Spinelli will probably be asking the same question as I after hearing what you have just said. It is very important that we should take the vote at 6 p.m. today. I should therefore like to ask Members if they could make their speeches or statements in the form of explanations of vote, perhaps even in writing, this evening so that we can vote at 6 p.m.

(Applause)

Mr Spinelli (COM), chairman of the Committee on Institutional Affairs. — (IT) Mr President, I should like to point out that it had already been agreed with the President, Mr Pflimlin, that this should be the most important debate of this part-session and that the vote would be taken on the resolution at a time when we had all the Members here and not when half of them had already left. Come what may, we must vote this evening. For my own part I am prepared to waive my right to speak if that would prevent the vote from being held this evening.

President. — I could ask each speaker on my list if he would be prepared to waive his right to speak. If that does not work, then I shall be obliged, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, to continue the debate this evening.

I shall now ask Mr Chambeiron. Do you wish to speak in the debate, Mr Chambeiron, or do you waive your right to do so?

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — (FR) Mr President, I do wish to speak. When we raised for the first time these proposals for an institutional revival, I indicated that in our opinion Europe was suffering not from a lack of institutions but from a lack of political will: non-existent social policies, a permanent weakness as regards American demands. I am thinking particularly of the role of small firms and the field of commercial policy. These problems cannot be resolved by any new institutional creation in the continued absence of the political will to attack the crisis.

Having said that, I pointed out at the same time that the various projects — the Spinelli and the Faure — could have important constitutional effects by jeopardizing certain national or regional institutions, as both the French Assemblée Nationale and the German Bundesrat have also pointed out. But today, after the Brussels Summit, after reading Mr Faure's report, one realises that the main innovation of the various current projects is not so much the political revival, which

Chambeiron

does not have the agreement of all the Member States, but rather the disturbing revival of a military Europe.

It is not by chance that at the time when the Commission — in the document which it laid before Parliament in February — is proposing joint coproduction of armaments, its President wonders whether the Community as such should not participate in the American strategic defence initiative, in other words, Star Wars. The idea of a European space shuttle, with military and strategic objectives, which has been put forward in France, would coincide with all the projects I have just mentioned. What independent role could one imagine Europe playing in that case? What kind of spectacle would one present to the young people of our countries who are demonstrating for peace and want the Europe of Ten to seize every opportunity of moving towards disarmament? I am disquieted to find that with exception of the Irish Opposition and the Greek deputies, no government has opposed the formulations of Mr Maurice Faure's report: concertation of strategic doctrines, coproduction of high-technology equipment designed to increase Europe's military capability, a formal undertaking by the Member States that they will participate in these measures. All this, as the report points out, 'within the framework of the common interests of the members of the Atlantic Alliance'. This trend unfortunately confirms that our fears are justified. Behind enlargement, which some people were already using as an opportunity to make a link between membership of the Community and membership of the NATO, the institutional revival was discernible. But behind those two projects it is in fact the formation of a military and strategic Europe which appears today to be the true aim of the governments of the Community.

Mr Giavazzi (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party and in accordance with Rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure, I request that the debate be closed even though the list of speakers has not been exhausted.

President. — Pursuant to Rule 86 of our Rules of Procedure, the closure of a debate must be requested by a political group or at least 10 Members. You have made this request on behalf of your group. It will be put to the vote immediately. First, however, we can have one speaker for and one against.

Mr Sutra de Germa. — *(FR)* Mr President, we can support the proposal which has just been made, because the only speaker from our group who is still down to speak in the debate, Mr Zagari, has agreed to step down. We know how important this decision is. If it had not been taken, we should not be able to vote on this report today. We support the proposal.

(Applause)

Mr Cryer (S). — Mr President, I do not think this debate should be curtailed because the spokesmen for the political groups have already used up their full allocation of speaking-time. I have not heard anybody up to now sacrifice a few of their minutes, and the people who have spoken are now saying, by and large, that the debate should be curtailed. In my view, the debate should be extended. My friend, Tom Megahy, has not yet contributed to the debate.

(Cries of 'He has!' from the European Democratic benches)

Well, if he has, there are other contributions yet to come which I am sure will be full of interest and range over a wide number of issues. In fact, Tom Megahy is not the only one who would raise critical issues, and, therefore, it seems to me that this debate should continue.

(Parliament agreed to the request for closure of the debate)

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

Mr Pannella (NI). — *(FR)* I speak on a point of order, Mr President.

The situation at present is this. The agenda calls for statements from the Council and the Commission between 12 noon and 1 p.m. We have just enough time to listen to the President of the Council and the President of the Commission. Then the agenda says that the groups have 90 minutes for the debate on the statements. In addition the President of Council has undertaken to reply to the debate. But the 'scatty' agenda which has been voted only shows 90 minutes, between 3 p.m. and 4.30 p.m. But at 3 p.m. we are going to vote on the objections concerning the urgencies.

Mr President, if we want to keep to the agenda, we shall have a minimal debate. I therefore appeal to you in your wisdom to reject the proposal which has been made, as Rule 56 (2) of the Rules of Procedure provides: 'Once adopted, the agenda shall not be amended, except on a proposal from the President'.

I should then like to ask you, Mr President, not to allow the development committee to meet at 3 p.m. or 3.30 p.m., whether informally or otherwise, during the debate under the Council presidency. Because there

Pannella

are more than sixty meetings fixed or possible this afternoon. Do we or do we not want Parliament to debate? I want to have the right not to go to a committee meeting, even if I have been summoned to it.

President. — Mr Pannella, you are very concerned about the amount of time we have available to us. The best way to ensure that the agenda can be covered is not to waste the time of the House with unnecessary speeches.

There is no question of amending the agenda.

(Applause)

4. *European Council in Brussels*

President. — The next item is the statements by the Council and the Commission on the outcome of the European Council meeting in Brussels on 29 and 30 March 1985.¹

I extend a respectful and hearty welcome to Mr Bettino Craxi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy and President-in-Office of the European Council.

(Applause)

I should also like to extend a sincere and cordial welcome to Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers.

(Applause)

Mr Craxi, President-in-Office of the European Council. — *(IT)* Mr President, Honourable Members of the European Parliament, ladies and gentlemen, I regard it as a great privilege to address this Assembly, which is the voice of the peoples of our countries representing as they do both great reality and great hope: for a European Community growing and intent on growing still further in its search for greater sense of identity and greater cohesion.

This meeting of the European Parliament takes place shortly after the Brussels European Council whose proceedings marked the very important and constructive conclusion of a particular situation in the life of the Community, when the Community's dynamism appeared to have burned out in a morass of petty interests and internecine quarrels.

Finally, at the Fontainebleau Council, agreement was reached on a package of measures, adoption of which

would enable solid foundations to be laid for the future construction of the Community.

These measures have in turn been translated into concrete decisions and Minister Andreotti and I are pleased to be able to inform you in the name of the Council that, with your support and encouragement, the ground is now cleared of the many obstacles hindering progress towards the great and real objectives of Europe.

When I had the pleasure of being host to President Pflimlin last December in Rome I told him in substance that, in its programme, the Italian Presidency intended to ensure continuity with the work already accomplished, to make it fully effective to take initiatives to enable the favourable conditions and premisses to hand to come to fruition.

Among the objectives to be achieved, I mentioned as priorities the signing of the Treaties of Accession, progress with new policies and an improvement in the functioning of the Institutions; as regards action to be taken, I expressed the hope that during the period of the Italian Presidency an overall strategy could be launched to combat unemployment, and the preparatory phase for commencing negotiations on the European Union might be completed.

Spain and Portugal are now about to cross the threshold of the Community: they will do so, we hope, on 1 January 1986. Protracted negotiations lasting eight years have finally been concluded. With the accession of the two Iberian countries, Europe will be given fresh impetus to play the active role on the world political stage which history, but not history alone, ascribes to it. Spain and Portugal will be able to make a major contribution since they are countries with ancient traditions and a great commitment to democracy, linked with overseas regions by bonds of history and a common language and culture.

The Europe of Twelve will require even greater efforts of mediation to avoid increasing the disparities and divisions within the Community. The Mediterranean dimension will grow stronger but that should be understood as an extension of the presence and the role of Europe in the world; such extension will eventually be to the advantage of all since it seems to me that the objectives of a Community of 320 million people, representative of the oldest and most prolific of the world's cultures, bringing together peoples among the most advanced in regard to civilization, science and prosperity cannot but be major objectives, of world significance, which we will be able to pursue with increasing hope of success the more we succeed in making the wider Community area cohesive, balanced and united.

The approval of the IMPs, on which this Parliament rightly laid emphasis, is a highly significant example of the gesture of solidarity necessary to reduce North-

¹ Also included in the debate were the oral questions with debate (Docs. B 2/127/85 and B 2/128/85) by Mr Formigoni, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, to the Foreign Ministers and to the Council.

Craxi

South imbalances. Without a more equal distribution of burdens and advantages, it is difficult to imagine the development of the Community venture. A redistribution of financial resources, based on criteria of solidarity, is very often nothing other than a measure to compensate for the extent to which the member countries derive benefit from the integration of the market.

We must work to ensure that all the Member States feel they are participating in the same political objective, that they are involved in the same project. No major objective is possible without the conviction that its realization is, in concrete terms, in the common interest. It is incumbent on us to seek and identify the true basis for the balanced participation of all the forces in European society so that the process of unification can be advanced.

In Brussels we discussed at length the economic and social situation in the Community, a feature of which is still the unacceptably high level of unemployment at over 10% which is in sharp contrast with the prosperity of our nations and undermines the credibility of our system in the eyes of all the other countries of the world. We have defined guidelines with a view to economic growth such as may create new jobs. I should like to make a few remarks on this subject.

In the first place, Europe can and must do more to sustain its own growth process, to make it less vulnerable to external influences and more stable in time.

The completion of the internal market is undoubtedly a vital instrument if the multiplying role of national efforts is to be achieved. The Community must exploit the potential of its enormous market and it will have to set about it with diligence if it is to be achieved by 1992 as suggested by the Parliament and by the President of the Commission, Mr Delors.

Another basic instrument will be the intensification of the technological base. The Community falls behind the other major industrial democracies in the technological field, and yet the Ten Countries of the European Community spend in total 20% of world expenditure on scientific research, a percentage which is half-way between the United States (27% of the total) and Japan (17%).

Unfortunately, the research in the Ten is greatly fragmented leading inevitably to duplication and overlapping of programmes, double investment, a lack of coordination and a consequent waste of manpower and capital. The level of resources spent either directly or indirectly by the Community as such is paltry: 1.5% of the European total.

Technological change is one of the main factors for giving impetus to progress in advanced economies and societies. In the present phase of major economic changes it is impossible to forego programmes to bring production up to date, since such programmes make

the recovery of productivity and competitiveness possible in the international markets. But nor is it possible to accept a deterioration in the employment situation always as the other side of the coin of new technology. This then is an important task for the Community: how to reconcile industrial innovation with the protection of employment. It is something we must tackle as a matter of urgency.

For we have evidence that in other countries e.g. in the United States and Japan technological changes and the creation of jobs are not incompatible objectives. It is true that high-technology industries do not create much employment but the impact of innovation can be measured above all in the maintenance of the level of competitiveness of what we may call the established industries. And this is made possible thanks precisely to the processes of modernization and adaptation.

However, it is difficult to accept the thesis that, to resolve the problem, it is enough to assimilate the prescriptions which succeeded in other countries. We welcome advice when it is wise and reasonable and we also know how to draw useful lessons from the experiences of others.

The industrialized democracies share the same principles with regard to economic pluralism and the free market, but each of our countries has its own socio-economic reality, rooted in its own culture and historical traditions. Our endeavours must be to seek to harmonize these realities by accentuating the European identity, but we must not imagine that we can choose one type of reality and impose it on all the others.

For reasons to do with the values of social and human solidarity which it expresses and protects we cannot relinquish the European development model. We must improve the way it operates, make the labour market, for example, more flexible and better able to adjust to the constant evolution of the productive process and the changing international context.

We will have to find within the Community the means and resources if we are to succeed in combating unemployment. We will have to work out within the Community specific additional measures to reinforce the impact of the strategy for economic development and the expansion of the productive base. At the European Council in Brussels, we instructed the Commission to submit proposals as soon as possible aimed at adapting working conditions to the new phase of technological and economic development and to prepare an analysis of the possibilities of using the Social Fund to promote innovative model schemes which can be used and promoted in the employment area, and to offer a valid response to the employment problems of certain disadvantaged social categories.

But action on a vaster scale should, I think, be launched within the year to achieve substantial and decisive progress in the creation of a European Social

Craxi

Area. The work programme of the President of the Commission, Mr Delors, sets out interesting proposals and I am confident that the Council will be able to translate these into guidelines and directives. I am thinking in particular of the adaption of working time and vocational training and mobility in connection with the introduction of new technology, industrial and productive redevelopment, and the completion of the programme for equal treatment between men and women — with the three Directives already being examined by the Council and which will hopefully be adopted before next June.

I think that — in this International Youth Year — I should express full approval for the Commission's presentation of a communication for an integrated policy for those young people who are hardest hit by the problem of unemployment.

President Delors did well, at the beginning of his term of office, to encourage the relaunching of the social dialogue which must now be given the opportunity for tangible action. The European Parliament in Strasbourg did well to devote in the last few days a wide-ranging debate to the youth unemployment problem, from which emerged interesting information and proposals which should be examined carefully and in detail by the relevant Community authorities.

But if the protection and promotion of levels of employment are to be effective and durable, it is vital that the general economic situation be improved. Since the recovery which is to hand needs to be strengthened and sustained. Other elements of uncertainty and instability remain, some extraneous to the Community system, which can only be countered by means of closer internal Community cohesion.

Over the last two years significant, positive results have been achieved in the European Community along the road to economic convergence. Rates of inflation have been reduced and the balance of payments situation has improved for all the EEC countries.

This has not happened to the same extent in the various member countries. Some countries have achieved remarkable levels of stability and consequently have a greater margin for manoeuvre in supporting demand. While they have achieved considerable success in streamlining in economy other countries have still to follow a more prudent course to preclude a recurrence of the phenomenon of inflation. This is why, in the face of disparate economic trends, we are among those who favour a comprehensive recovery programme based on differentiated policies: more expansive policies for countries with a high level of stability, more prudent ones for countries where the balance of payments deficit is relatively high and where levels of inflation are somewhat higher. I believe that controlled acceleration of the real growth rate would be in the common interest to restore the dynamism to production and trade from which all the member countries

will derive equal benefit. Each of them will have to take its fair share of the responsibility for setting guidelines which are consistent and compatible with the general objectives.

There is also need for greater co-operation in the monetary sector. The wide fluctuations which are a present feature of the dollar, resulting in instability in the exchange markets, make more pressing the need for consolidation of the European Monetary System and the controlled extension of both the official and private role of the ECU. Hitherto the EMS has performed a steadying function in exchange relations and has facilitated the development of international trade. Concrete measures to strengthen the 'ECU' have now been defined and will be formally approved within the next few weeks. It is our hope that new steps to strengthen the EMS can be adopted between now and June at the Ecofin Council.

The objective should be to improve measures to defend European currencies by stemming the negative influences deriving from external factors.

A structure of European interest rates unaffected by the tendency in the United States to rising interest rates would represent a highly important factor in creating more autonomous development in the economies of the Community. 'More autonomous development' is certainly not the same thing as 'self-sufficient or independent development'. There is no question therefore of arriving at separation of the various international markets, especially at a moment such as this when the bonds of interdependence are increasingly stronger and more necessary. Nor can we be indifferent to the persistence of external factors which have a negative influence on the prospects for economic growth in Europe.

The best way forward is along the lines, therefore, of greater and more effective co-operation, particularly between the most highly industrialized countries with the aim of ensuring the conditions for the most general and durable global economic development possible.

In this context I believe, therefore, that we should welcome the suggestion for a monetary conference of industrialized countries. It is a suggestion which takes account of a move advocated time and again by the European countries and by the Community in particular. We should now define together the main lines of such a meeting and in close co-operation to devote attention to preparing for it since from it will emerge clear and effective replies to a need which we increasingly perceive, namely that of ensuring greater stability in currency markets without neglecting the need for a greater degree of order in the international financial system.

Following the significant progress achieved by the March Council in combating air pollution caused by

Craxi

exhaust gases from motor vehicles, we can look forward with renewed confidence to implementing a genuine overall and balanced environmental protection policy, which itself can contribute to the creation of new employment. To underline the importance, and rightly in my opinion, attaching to such an objective, the European Council decided that 1987 will be designated 'European Environment Year'.

A more united Europe should resist the temptation to look only to its own advantage; it should widen its frontiers of action and be prepared to honour the principles of solidarity enshrined in the Treaties.

We must know how to reply to the expectations of those who are looking to us: not only the citizens of Europe with their ever-new wishes but also those peoples who are defending the most elementary of rights, the right to life; people now oppressed by underdevelopment, hunger and malnutrition which turn their gaze towards Europe for greater assurances on their future.

Efforts have been made in the past to combat the scourge of hunger and malnutrition. We have had occasion to discuss it many times, taking account of the urgency and the serious concern expressed by the European Parliament at its March part-session which was brought to my notice personally by President Pflimlin. We noted with satisfaction the gratifying response to the European appeal. The contributions from many friendly countries, primarily the United States of America, enabled us to attain the objectives we had set ourselves to cope with the immediate requirements in Africa where the problem of hunger was most acute on account of the famine and drought.

With regard to aid, there is a problem of particular relevance — which did not pass unnoticed by this Parliament or by the European Council in Strasbourg. It concerns access to emergency aid and the system for distributing such aid.

Thought will have to be given to developing new strata-gems and innovatory mechanisms capable of utilizing the transport and distribution structures so that the aid with the necessary guarantees to the recipient countries, reaches its legitimate destination, the people afflicted, in the form, way and manner and at the time dictated by their needs and not by the convenience of the donors.

We are hoping that Mr Natali's fact-finding mission will provide a picture of the real situation throughout the sub-Sahara countries, and in particular those where infrastructure is lacking, so as to have the necessary information to improve further the effectiveness of the Community's action, and to come to an agreement on the distinction between provisions and other emergency goods. On the basis of the results of the mission, the Commission will submit a report to the European Council in Milan which will enable the

necessary guidelines to be set down for supplementing short-term aid and creating the most logical relationship between aid and structural measures for assistance aimed at improving the degree of self-sufficiency in food.

Because of its structure and its economy, Europe can only prosper in a climate of free trade and safety in international relations. Europe seeks peace and dialogue and offers its genuine collaboration in promoting development in the world.

The conclusion of the third Lomé Convention, which binds the Community in close relationship with 65 States of Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific; the useful understandings with the ASEAN countries and India, the new agreement which the Ten are about to conclude with China in May, the new Mediterranean policy which should lead to a qualitative change in the direction of more active collaboration with the countries in this area, are among the most outstanding of the measures for peace and friendship which the Community has developed and intends to continue developing in order to construct a better world. Part of this plan must be the strengthening of relations between the EEC and the countries of Latin America which share the values of our civilisation and which are now committed to making a relentless thrust towards the democratization of the entire sub-continent.

It was my pleasure to attend the great popular festival with which Uruguay celebrated its return to freedom. Before Uruguay it had been the turn of Argentina, and after Uruguay, Brazil. Powerful forces are working in those countries to extend and complete the democratization process. In Chile, a civilized people, with ancient democratic traditions, is clamouring for a return to a state of law and free elections. It is an aspiration which is worthy of the support of all democratic forces and to which we cannot remain insensitive.

(Applause)

We will also have to pay similar attention to those countries where the democratic system, restored at last, needs to be consolidated. We must ward off the risk of worsening economic difficulties eroding the social consensus on which the renewed democratic institutions are based, thus reopening the return of the troubled chapters of authoritarian rule.

In Central America too Europe must also make its own political and economic contribution to the process of peace by supporting the mediation efforts of the Contadora Group, and assisting in the socio-economic development of the entire area. Following the gratifying success of the San José Conference, the political dialogue between European and Central American countries should be made more formal and negotiating directives should be passed without delay for cooperation agreements which would testify to our support for measures to overcome all unacceptable

Craxi

forms of inequality which are the real focal points of crisis and instability.

(Applause)

The European Community has always sought to keep open all channels of East-West dialogue and has never ceased to urge constructive negotiations for balanced and verifiable disarmament measures and for a stable organization of peace through security. Now that the negotiations have resumed we know that the work done was not futile: but we also know that it is not finished. We shall continue therefore to follow with the greatest attention developments in the various phases of the negotiations to encourage their ultimate objective, a substantial reduction in strategic and intermediate nuclear weapons and the prevention of a new arms race in other sectors including space.

(Applause)

The success of the Geneva talks will depend to a large extent on our ability to establish increased understanding and trust between East and West. In the past we have made overtures to the East, and we have also tried to offer concrete evidence of our resolve to reinforce our exchanges between us so as to bring out the points which, despite the diversity of our socio-political systems, define and qualify where our interests converge. Now there is a new leadership in the Soviet Union and I think I can detect in the SUCP General Secretary, Michael Gorbachev, an openness to maintaining and stimulating a more constructive dialogue. I hope I am not mistaken, but for the time being I would not undervalue or disregard such openness which should rather be encouraged by balanced attitudes.

The Europe of the Ten is prepared for its part to strengthen the cooperation agreements with the Eastern European countries on the basis of joint advantage and reciprocal respect and to look for new forms of dialogue capable of improving stability and restoring a genuine process of détente.

There is one region, the Middle East, which, more than any other, is torn by tensions and conflicts and where the need for peaceful initiatives is therefore more pressing. At the European Council in Brussels we examined with concern the development of events in this region. The will emerged that every effort should be made to support any negotiating move towards a process of peace.

As regards the Arab-Israeli crisis, I have, on the explicit instructions of the Heads of State or of Government of the European Community, declared Europe's support for the movement under way to seek a negotiated and peaceful settlement to this long-standing conflict. I expressed appreciation for the Jordano-Palestinian agreement signed on 11 March in

Amman which introduces new elements into the negotiating process.

I voiced Europe's desire to assist and encourage all those who are progressing towards an equitable settlement based on mutual respect for the rights of all the parties involved, frequently reiterated by the Ten and first stated in the Venice declaration. Firstly, the right of all States to existence and security and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, with the concomitant principle, also so often repeated, of involving the PLO in the peace negotiations.

Without deluding ourselves about the difficulties, and in some cases, the contradictions which remain, it would be well to point to the satisfactory direction taken by new elements including the ideas put forward by President Mubarak — as well as to the hopes they raise for openings towards a broader dialogue, which should involve all the interested parties and which the Ten support and encourage in the hope of being able to facilitate a reconciliation of the various positions.

Other situations of conflict in the world cause great concern and require our attention. I refer to the sterile and bloody conflict in the Gulf. This is a tragedy which has been going on for years and pages of intolerable violence are still being written. The Ten have addressed constant, pressing appeals to induce the parties to come to a complete cessation of hostilities and with the launching of negotiations for a definitive political settlement of the conflict in accordance with international law and the United Nations' resolutions.

Our thoughts still turn towards Lebanon, a country tormented by cruel internal struggles which preclude that major national reconciliation which the international community would be prepared to support with a plan for the rebuilding of the country.

We also discussed in Brussels the growing tension in South Africa which is a cause for concern. The position of the Ten has been consistently firm in condemning the violence which the system of racial segregation has fanned, and in pressing urgently for an overall dialogue aimed at making substantial reforms designed to achieve equality for all citizens.

Only from greater unity and a higher degree of cohesion will Europe be able to derive the authority to discharge its role as a political force active on the international stage, and as a factor for development, progress and stability. The new Europe cannot be simply the result of an institutional engineering operation. European Union is certainly a political design which meets a profound aspiration of the peoples and nations of our continent, but at the same time it must be able to perform the great task of mediation — mediation between present and future interests, between expectations and needs. From the real problems, from the replies to the requests from the member countries there is no escape. The existing Treaties offer great

Craxi

scope for action to this end which we have been able to turn to good account but which we have not yet been able to complete. We should now do so, pursuing all the guidelines aimed at a more far-reaching integration of our economies and markets. Our task is to design still further the convergence of economic results, to create new areas of action particularly where the future of the Community is at stake — strengthening the competitiveness of European industry by giving it a genuine and broad technological basis — and to encourage the development of initiatives already launched. Other spheres of activity should be expanded and developed, and here I am thinking of cooperation in the field of law and legislation and above all of the cultural component, on which our manner of acting and sense of identification as Europeans is based.

The attempt to increase European political cooperation, the efforts to harmonize the positions of the Ten, and soon of the Twelve, can be summed up in one specific objective, the search for an external identity which is not to compromise the traditional roles of the Member States but should, on the contrary, give them increased credibility and greater incisiveness as parts of a more harmonious and united whole.

This was the reason why at Fontainebleau we adverted to the need to associate in the construction of Europe the greatest possible number of the active forces in European society, proposing new and more ambitious objectives to improve the understanding and significance of the European idea and its image with the citizens by means of acts which are symbolic of the values of unity of Europe. The two committees set up at Fontainebleau have fulfilled these needs.

The first, on institutional questions, has been exploring an approach towards a gradual transformation of the Community into a genuine political entity with its own institutional order, its own financial autonomy and a greater range of powers. An entity therefore which assumes the shape of a more united European Union, stronger in its own values and actions.

The second, on a People's Europe, has been striving and is continuing to strive for the abolition of border controls, and for other important initiatives connected with the special rights of citizens, education, culture, information and law.

As regards the unification process, the European Parliament must be credited in the first place with having drawn the attention of the national governments and parliaments to the need to renew the Community institutions.

The Dooge Committee report is essentially a political synthesis of the draft Treaty adopted on 14 February 1984 by this Parliament by a large majority. This is a further demonstration of the balance, the wisdom, and, may I say, the far-sightedness of the important

document produced by the Strasbourg Parliament. But I believe that if we want to express proper appreciation of the European Parliament's initiative then we have to agree that its special merit was to restore impetus and vigour to an examination which until then had been marked by uncertainty, reticence and certain misgivings.

Now we can note with satisfaction that the process of reflection has been set in train, that a logical, coherent and committed discussion is taking place in the various Community institutions, a discussion which even today has been given a new impetus on the basis of the report prepared by the Committee on Institutional Affairs. The guidelines set out in the report were considered with interest and the proposals will be examined in greater detail in the coming months in a series of bilateral contacts at the highest political level.

There are a number of important questions to which we have to respond. The objective of institutional reform is not proposed as an alternative to the completion of the Treaties. We believe these are two complementary objectives which can be pursued simultaneously since they correspond to different objectives and requirements. The Treaties of Rome and Paris provided fertile ground for action. They constitute the institutional foundation and framework for achieving unprecedented progress towards gradual integration and economic convergence.

However, we are living today in a different historical context from that in which the founding fathers of Europe traced the plan for the Community edifice. From a Community of Six we have moved in succession to a Community of Nine, then of Ten and now to a Community of Twelve. New areas were revealed as essential to strengthen the cohesion of the Community and to broaden its solidarity. We have paid increasing attention to these areas and we think the time has now come to include them in the Community method, to make them, in other words, integral and essential parts of our common action.

Europe is now required to meet difficult challenges, has an increasing obligation to safeguard and reinforce its role in the world. The European Community must provide itself with adequate means and above all with effective Institutions, which are both functional and highly representative, and capable of giving voice to the widest possible involvement of the active forces in European society. Furthermore, we cannot fail to note how our experience in recent times has revealed gaps and deficiencies which have been mirrored in the overall operation of the Community. The decision-making process has become more cumbersome, causing delays and impeding the process of Community integration.

That is why we must strive for efficient Institutions which are more able to respond to the demands of a Community of Twelve, to the specific requirements related thereto, to the new priority objectives of the

Craxi

unification process. Thought must be given to the various Institutions: the role of the European Council and the strategic role it should assume and its task of political direction; the Council of the EEC, with particular reference to its decision-making powers which must be strengthened; the Commission, to ensure that it has the authority and independence which its duties require.

But effectiveness can never be separated from the increasing democratization of the entire European system which we are in the process of building. And who better than the European Parliament, elected by universal suffrage and therefore the mouthpiece of the sovereign will of the people, can ensure such democratization? It would be quite unacceptable that in a movement towards European unity, in which national parliaments would lose part of their political control and related powers, no thought was given to the machinery which would ensure a simultaneous transfer of duties and powers to the European Parliament.

(Applause)

We must be aware to this, we must bear it in mind when we think of the proper institutional balance which should govern the implementation of the complex task which confronts us: a Europe united and free, democratic and strong.

Mr President, Honourable Members, Europe has made much progress and will make more. If one were to attempt to appraise, stage by stage, the enormous work that has been done, and the major objectives that we are still setting ourselves today, that we may all achieve greater prosperity and equality, enjoy a vaster education and better civic sense, and indeed that we communicate these values to the world, one would have to enquire what lofty ideal, what extraordinary motive has moved this great power for progress and civilisation, has made possible these goals in so few years, so very few years when compared with the millennia in our countries' histories, histories so diverse and often indeed so contrasted.

I believe that his powerful impetus for the idea of a united Europe is the consent which the plan for European construction receives from our peoples. You are the direct representatives of those peoples, freely chosen in free elections. This consent must be paid back to our nations in concrete achievements. Let us not disappoint their expectations. We know that the most lofty ideals require daily, patient and persistent work if they are to survive and flourish, and, from time to time, to transform utopian dreams into reality. You are the link between the consent of the people and the authorities of Europe. Take pride in your role and deploy the power which you derive from the mandate entrusted to you, and Europe is bound to attain her most ambitious goals.

(Loud and sustained applause)

President. — I thank the President-in-Office of the European Council for having given us such a clear and comprehensive statement of his hopes and ideas.

At this point I should like to pay tribute to the Italian Presidency for the sterling efforts it has made so far and particularly for the way in which it has forged stronger bonds of cooperation between itself and the European Parliament. Let us hope that the Milan Summit will go down in the history of Europe as the launching pad for the great recovery of which we are so sorely in need.

(Loud applause)

Mr Delors, President of the Commission. — *(FR)* Mr President, President of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen of the Parliament, let me first of all, on behalf of the Commission, express our admiration for the way in which the Italian Presidency has conducted the business of Europe during the last three months, and for the results it has obtained.

President Craxi has given an exhaustive and detailed account of European problems, aspects of them and the solutions found. Therefore, as I do not wish to encroach on the ninety minutes available for the debate, for my part I shall confine my remarks to answering two questions from the point of view of the Commission's terms of reference. Firstly, are the present Community institutions functioning as well as they did some time ago? Secondly, what will our main concerns be in the coming months?

If I ask about the functioning of the institutions, it is because, as you will undoubtedly remember, during what people call the investiture speech I said that if we wanted to play a part along the way to European Union, we thought it necessary to demonstrate first that the present institutions could function more efficiently. From this point of view I have to confirm, first of all, that the European Parliament has exercised even greater influence over the events of the last few months than it might believe itself, that the European Council has acquired a more precise understanding of its role, and finally that the Commission has exercised its right of initiative whenever it thought it advisable.

The European Council has in effect returned to its original starting point. It has examined the state of the Union and it has provided considerable momentum for the future. Certainly it has had to settle some of the thorny problems of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, but that, if I may say so, was part of the dispute which had already been tackled at the Fontainebleau Summit. For the rest, the European Council has given us clear guidelines as regards the realisation of the great market by approving our timetable up to 1992 where the environment and the fight against world hunger are concerned.

Delors

As for the Commission, as I promised you, it has exercised its right of initiative whenever it has thought it advisable. Thus it proposed to the Italian Presidency a global package for the negotiations with Spain and Portugal, and I am weak enough to think that it did at least have the merit of precipitating a happy outcome to the negotiations. It made a proposal on the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, which owed a great deal to the debates which have taken place in the European Parliament and in the Regional Committee and, believe me, it was because we took with us the support which you lent to the project, and your demands for solidarity between the different member countries and the different regions, that our task of persuading the various parties was greatly eased during the discussions in the European Council. I should, in passing, like to thank you.

The Commission used its right of initiative on environmental matters and the programme to speed up technology in Europe.

I now come to the second question. What will our main concerns be in the future? In broad outline, there are three areas in which we have made progress, three in which there have been beginnings, which still have to be confirmed, and three areas which give us serious cause for concern.

The areas in which we have made progress are enlargement and the internal cohesion of the Community as shown by the adoption of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, which I must say has operational significance in addition to their political and psychological significance. This is a new way of tackling problems, less sectoral and more integrated. It will be an important experiment, which will no doubt enable us to improve the operation of the structural Funds afterwards.

And finally, although this has not been dealt with directly in the European Council, substantial progress has been made towards strengthening the European Monetary System. For our part, we made a discreet contribution, as the psychological difficulty was so great, as I told you in January.

But in that little package, there is the promise of greater progress for the European Monetary System in future. For example it is material that as soon as the decision is taken the central banks of countries which are not members of the Community will be able to hold ECUs. This is something more than just a technical measure. But more than that, at the informal meeting of the Councils of Ministers for Finance and Economic Affairs it was possible to set in motion the work of reflection, which shows that we are not yet satisfied with the point reached and that we must go further.

There will be consideration of the following questions: what were the objectives of the European Monetary

System when it was created? To what extent have these objectives been achieved so far? Are the objectives still relevant? The follow-up to the development of the private ECU, and what are the responsibilities of those who set up the European Monetary System in the light of this development of the private ECU? And finally, is it possible that the official ECU will one day become a reserve currency which would make its contribution towards an improved balance in the operation of exchange systems?

I should like to emphasize this point, which has perhaps not really been noticed, but which shows that Europe is moving in every field.

In addition there are three fields in which the start still has to be confirmed.

First of all there is the large market, for which the Commission is to present to the Council of Ministers in Milan a timetable which has to receive political approval by the Heads of State and of Government so that afterwards...

(Applause)

... the Commission will have the political strength to transcend the difficulties created by either administrative opposition or through the interaction of interests which have nothing in common with the objective in view. This continuing realization of the great market, I must point out, is also in accord with the proposals made initially by the Committee for a Citizens' Europe under the chairmanship of Mr Adonnino.

Then there is technology, a field in which the European Council has not had the time needed to take decisions. President Craxi spoke about our handicaps, the dispersion of our efforts, even duplication. We made clear, simple proposals. I hope that we shall be able to follow them up and that at Milan, in one way or another, we shall take a decisive step so that by keeping up with the times and utilizing the new technologies fully we shall make a decisive contribution to the fight against unemployment, to the search for renewed growth and also to our power and independence in the world.

Finally, the third beginning, the institutional questions, the march towards European Union. President Craxi dwelt on this point for a long time.

I should like to end by underlining three subjects of concern, which if they are not taken head-on could check the momentum which has begun to be felt, thanks to everyone and, I repeat, thanks to the support of your Parliament.

The first is the adaptation of the common agricultural policy and the positive outlook for the future which we can give to our farmers. When we launched this exercise, we did not have any ulterior motives. I repeat

Delors

that here. We are very receptive, both intellectually and politically. What we want to do is this: how are we to give back hope to the farmers who for so long have been the mainstays of the European structure? What place will agriculture occupy in the Europe of tomorrow, what will its economic, its social, role be in the protection of the environment?

(Applause)

The question has to be asked, but it must not obscure today's dictates, which are that we have other things to do than finance surpluses which we do not know how to use and that, in order to defend our commercial position outside, we must be able to demonstrate that we are making an effort to prevent such surpluses. How much weight will our word carry with the United States if we carry on being lax when they are willing to make an effort? How could we discuss, defend the interests of Europe and agricultural Europe if we do not set out along the way of improved rationalization of our financial resources and a better definition of the common agricultural policy?

(Applause)

The second great cause for concern is budgetary policy. We are officially going to adopt at governmental level an increase in own resources. President Thorn in his time said that it was insufficient, that is clear. If we wanted at one stroke to realize what we have in mind in the way of new policies, to maintain the growth in the structural Funds and to resolve by means of more money the present disagreements between the Ministers for Agriculture, we should exceed 1.4% of own resources from next year. That is not possible, ladies and gentlemen. Consequently therefore, in association with what I have said about the common agricultural policy, we have to exercise great intellectual discipline in order to allocate resources better, and also great political discipline. And I think, for my part, that it is only if we, you and us, can give evidence of that discipline, that we shall then be able to turn to the States and ask them for fresh resources to increase Europe's role.

Finally, the third subject for concern is Europe's ability in this concentrated period of international meetings to speak with one voice and to act with one voice. How can it do that, as President Craxi pointed out, if it does not strengthen its internal cohesion? How can it do it, if every country is myopic and will not look beyond its own frontiers? It is not possible and, from that point of view, there are three broad lines which I should like to indicate when a Conference is held in Washington, to which — for the first time — the Commission has not been admitted, and when there are other important discussions such as the summit of industrialized nations, the meeting of the Group of Ten, or the beginning of the negotiations prior to the new trade 'Round'.

First idea: the developing countries must play a full part in the world economy, which means that they have a sense of responsibility, but means also that we cannot content ourselves with giving them the crumbs from the feast. That is why a fair way has to be found, between the two extremes of those who say that the developing countries have only to apply proper market formulae and proper liberal formulae — an idea which is wholly unrealistic when one realises the actual conditions under which these countries have to act — and of those who plead only for moratoria or financing facilities. That is what the Community is trying to do in an exemplary manner through the Lomé Convention, but also by having opened up room for a European negotiating presence in Central America and Latin America, as in the Mediterranean. Yes, we want the developing countries to play a full part and, if I can leave the economic and financial sector for a moment, I believe that that will be an important factor towards the consolidation of peace and towards preventing the great powers from waging war through the intermediary of poor nations.

(Applause)

Second line, it is not for tactical reasons that the Community claims that a lasting improvement in the economy lies in applying solutions simultaneously to monetary problems, financial problems and commercial problems. It is because we know, we more than others, that the erratic pattern of exchange movements is an obstacle to the improvement of world trade and an encouragement to protectionism. It is because we know that at present the greatest economic power in the world is a drain on saving, which is desperately lacking in Europe and in the developing countries. I hope that in the discussion or negotiations which are to come Europe will be able to speak with one voice and make unique proposals. If it were to fail to do so this year, it would be missing an opportunity: when the United States is becoming aware of the limits of the new American model, Europe would be missing an opportunity to influence world affairs.

Finally, the third point, when the Americans say to Europe, 'We have made our contribution to the recovery in world trade' — and that is true — by sometimes dubious means —, 'What are you going to do now to take over from us?' Ladies and gentlemen, that is a good question, to which we must give a reply. We must, through increased growth, contribute to the increase in world trade, and thereby the world economy, and give to the developing countries the most precious of all aid, that is, buy more from them. Europe therefore has to be capable of increased growth. By doing that we shall help the developing countries, we shall be acting more responsibly, we shall be able to play a part in world affairs, but we shall be helping ourselves. Because if it were possible for us, through improved internal cohesion and through greater understanding of our solidarity, to have increased growth from 1986, then we should

Delors

derive from it direct benefits, and also indirect benefits through our exports, and thus provide an initial solution to the problem of unemployment. I have said that all the great projects for Europe will be credible only if we succeed in reversing the unemployment curve within two years. There is here a direct correlation between the fact of assuming our international responsibilities correctly and deriving benefit from it, so that our Europe will be more credible to young people and to the present populations.

I hope that on these three points, in the weeks to come, Europe will not disappoint us.

(Loud applause)

(The sitting was suspended at 1.15 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

5. *Approval of the Minutes*

President. — The Minutes of yesterday's sitting have been distributed. Are there any objections?

Mr Cryer (S). — Madam President, on page 13, paragraph 7, of the minutes it says that the statement on the action taken by the Commission on Parliament's opinions had been distributed. The Commissioner said that an addition to the statement was to be distributed. I think that ought to be reported in the minutes. He said that there was an additional page 5A which was not available to the Assembly. I think that we ought to include that in the minutes to make the Commissioner accountable to this Assembly. Quite clearly it is a matter of regret that, when the very point and object is to present a statement to the Assembly, the Commission should suddenly, when presented with a question that it cannot answer, say that there is another part of the statement which it is going to distribute at some stage in the future. I hope that that amendment can be made.

President. — My Cryer, it will all go into the record, as you have requested.

Mrs Boserup (COM). — *(DA)* Madam President, I would draw your attention to an error in the minutes where the discharge resolution is reproduced in the form it took after the vote: a point which was adopted under an amendment has been inserted in the wrong

place. A point which does not deal with the European Schools has been included as point 91, as if it were concerned with the European Schools. That is incorrect. The point should have been numbered 89a.

President. — Mrs Boserup, the corrections that you have asked for will be made.

Mr Falconer (S). — Madam President, I referred this morning to the minutes and was advised by the President in the chair that yesterday's minutes had not been approved. I drew the attention of the President this morning to the report in the *Glasgow Herald* which stated that some 12 security persons had been trained and ordered to eject British Labour Members during the visit of President Reagan. This appears not as a result...

President. — You already had a reply to that this morning. We are now dealing with the minutes of yesterday's sitting.

Mr Falconer (S). — Madam President, I understand...

(Cries of 'shut up' by the British members of the European Democratic Group)

No, I will not shut up, and that is what is wrong with Conservatives: they cannot understand that the people will be listened to.

Mr Smith (S). — Madam President, I have been informed that the next training session in unarmed combat for the ushers will take place next week. Because of the urgency of this matter, is it possible to discuss...

President. — Mr Smith, you will have to raise this matter with the Bureau.

I would remind you, however, that there is to be a meeting of the security group at 4.30 p.m. tomorrow.

(Parliament approved the minutes)¹

6. *European Council in Brussels (continuation)*

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, Mr Presidents, only a few weeks before the fortieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War and the return to democracy in Europe, the Community has shown that

¹ *Topical and urgent debate (objections):* See Minutes.

Arndt

it can be more than merely an instrument to make Europe more competitive. In the view of the Social Democrats and Socialists, the European Community is a democratic alliance of freedom, social justice and peace in Europe and the world. This alliance would be incomplete without the democrats in Spain and Portugal. The Socialist Group therefore welcomes the successful conclusion of the accession negotiations with great satisfaction. Europe needs the historic strength of Spain and the contribution of Portugal.

These two countries never regarded accession as a purely economic enterprise but saw it as a step to consolidate democracy and freedom. Last week when the Spanish President Felipe Gonzales said in Madrid that this country would support any steps to advance the political integration of Europe, this made it clear that we Socialists were right to take the resolute stand we took in constantly fighting for the accession of these countries. Now we must ensure that 1 January 1986 remains the definitive date of accession. The Social Democrats and Socialists committed themselves to that date at their joint meeting in Madrid last week, regardless of whether they were government or opposition parties. We expect the same of the other political forces. At that meeting in Madrid we also decided expressly that representatives of the Socialist parties in Spain and Portugal will take part as from now in the activities of the Socialist Group in the European Parliament.

The Socialist Group is assuming that the Council will honour the commitment it made in the Solemn Declaration of Stuttgart to consult the European Parliament on accession treaties. We will do all in our power to ensure that this Parliament delivers its opinion in good time before the treaties are signed. We regard this consultation, which is to take place in May, as an appropriate moment to evaluate the content of the accession treaties in depth.

Today, however, my group would already like to thank the President-in-Office of the Council, Bettino Craxi, and his Foreign Minister, Giulio Andreotti. Many thanks for your endeavours in these European Council negotiations.

(Applause)

Your personal endeavours have enabled the negotiations to produce positive results. We would also express gratitude for the willingness to compromise shown by Greek prime minister Papandreu on the question of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes.

My group has always taken a clear stand on this, for solidarity is not a foreign concept for us Socialists but a spur to action. We regard it as the basis of our concept of development in the Third World countries, but also for the internal development process of the Community. That is why my group sees the Integrated

Mediterranean Programmes not purely as a relief action for southern Europe but as a necessary contribution to the overall development of the Community.

May I express one criticism in this context, however. The Council's conclusions do not make it clear by what procedures the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes are to be financed, especially as regards the Community's structural funds. The Commission's rectifying letter to the 1985 budget contains no reference to this. We are about the return to the 1985 budgetary procedure and want the structural financing to be settled now and not postponed to 1986. Important rights of the European Parliament are at stake here and we therefore want clarification, both from the Council and from the Commission.

The enlargement southwards of the Community may not necessarily mean a shift of emphasis within the EEC to the Mediterranean area, but it certainly means a shift of the Community's system of coordinates as regards guidelines and perspectives. We Socialists see enlargement southwards not just as a question of financial distribution but as a cultural challenge, a challenge to think in new dimensions, to see the Mediterranean area as a unit, as the meeting point of three worlds, the Christian, the Islamic and the Jewish. Throughout our history, this Mediterranean area always displayed its dynamism at times of intensive exchanges between these disparate yet complementary civilisations and worlds. So the European Parliament is the proper place to put the right questions in the framework of these new perspectives: for example, the question of the development of a basis of complementary action between the two Mediterranean coasts, the question of the possible demilitarization of the Mediterranean area and the question of the ecological preservation of the Mediterranean.

We Socialists can therefore only regard the declaration by the Council and by President Craxi on the enlarged Community's Mediterranean policy as the beginning of a thought process, a first step in that direction. We are convinced that the new Member State of Spain and Portugal will play a particularly valuable role in the process of growing cooperation with the Arab world, and similarly we regard the historical ties between Spain and Portugal and the Latin American countries as enriching the foreign policy profile of this European Community in terms of strengthening our relations with Latin America.

Since 1978, when the European Monetary System was born at the Copenhagen meeting of Heads of State and Government, this Brussels Summit has been the first one to bring the European Community forward again. For the first time, after a long series of summits at which mercenary considerations and national short-sightedness prevailed, it has proved possible to clear away the detritus of unresolved problems and free the way for a reform of the Community.

Arndt

Mr President, you said: the clouds have cleared. I would like to add: Europe can breathe again. At last, forces have been released again which Europe needs more than ever today. We can now devote all our energies to the priority tasks of Europe, to the development of our future technologies, the renewal of our industrial potential and the realization of solidarity with the Third World.

The Community of Twelve contains 320 million people, that is to say, more than either of the two superpowers, who have so much say in Europe. The enlarged Community is the largest market in the Western world and by far the greatest trading power in the world. In future, more than 30% of the GNP of all Western industrial countries will be produced in the European Community. We must continue to develop the Community, so we must prepare the road now, this year. As was made clear here by both the President of the Commission and the President of the Council, we must consolidate and further develop the internal market in the interest of the European citizens and achieve closer industrial cooperation, especially in the fields of research and development of key technologies, to preserve jobs and create new jobs.

Nearly 14 million people in the Community are out of work. My group, the Social Democrats and Socialists of Europe, therefore regards and will continue to regard the reduction of unemployment as the most important task for the Community. That is why we regret that the measures proposed at the Brussels Summit remain quite inadequate. Only if the European states finally muster the strength to adopt a common economic strategy and pursue it consistently on the basis of a spirit of trust and cooperation between the two sides of industry at both national and Community level will we ensure that every man and every woman who wants to work will be able to find a job which can be performed under conditions and with a pay that are compatible with human dignity.

We cannot accept the constant discrimination against workers under the pretext of crisis. We reject the dismantling of social benefits and want measures to be taken to create a genuine European social area at once.

A society, a community is strong only to the extent that that society or community is able to help its own weaker members. The necessary economic recovery in Europe must not, therefore, be at the price of social injustice. The European road must be a road of continuous reconciliation between economic freedom and social justice. Our European road must therefore differ from the road taken by the United States, Japan or the Soviet Union.

We Socialists welcome the fact that the European Council has stated clearly for the first time that a common environmental policy can lead to greater economic growth and the creation of jobs and that environ-

mental protection must be a major component of the Community's and the Member States' economic, industrial, agricultural and social policy. We regard that as a good start for reconciling economy and ecology on a European scale. For if the industrialized world does not manage to restore peace with nature, in the end not nature at large but we little humans alone will be the losers.

We also welcome the fact that in their final declaration on environmental policy the Heads of State and Government rejected separate national measures. Europe will only develop an identity of its own if it regains its ability to act and to decide. Europe must strengthen its democratic structures. Most of my group believes this reform package must contain two inalienable minimum requirements.

The unanimity rule in the Council's decision-making procedure must become the exception and not the rule from now on. The institutional status of the European Parliament must be upgraded.

A week ago in Madrid the Socialists asked the forthcoming European Summit in Milan to decide immediately to convene a conference of governments to negotiate a new contractual basis for the Community and for this conference to begin its activities at once. This Parliament's draft treaty has already proposed guidelines. They must be taken into account in the activities of the governmental conference, on the basis of the Dooge Committee's report. We expect the outcome of the institutional reform process to be an equal co-decision-making power on the part of the European Parliament in legislative and budgetary procedures, greater foreign policy competences and closer ties between the Commission and Parliament.

We are convinced that the discussion on reform must not focus only on the question of improving the institutional machinery. We never regard institutions as an end in themselves but merely as the necessary instruments for achieving political objectives laid down in the treaties. That is why we Socialists constantly ask ourselves the essential questions: what kind of Europe do we want and how far do we want to go jointly? We expect the Member States' governments to answer these questions too. The Europe we are aiming at must not be purely economic. Nor can it be a purely ecological or social Europe; instead it must serve as a model of how states with different social systems can find bridges between East and West in this Europe that was divided by the last World War, so that we learn to live together again in Europe and peace is assured on the basis of an exemplary reconciliation between East and West. Europe needs its own external and security policy identity. Only a Europe that speaks with one voice can assert itself *vis à vis* the two superpowers and determine its own future. Europe must turn from an object into a subject capable of action.

The European Parliament has referred to this issue on various occasions and the Dooge Committee report to

Arndt

the European Council proposes more wide-ranging and intensive consultation on security measures and political cooperation. But what has really happened in the past few weeks? When various European countries, in particular France, proposed forming a European consortium to strengthen Europe's negotiating positions *vis à vis* the American space initiative, Mr Abrahamsen, the American General responsible, said that this affair, referring to the European attempt to adopt a common position, concerned the United States and that was why the USA encouraged its allies to reply to the proposals on an individual basis. So, no common answer on the part of the Europeans.

Even before Defence Minister Weinberger sent the now familiar Note to his European counterparts requesting them to respond to the American programme within a period of sixty days, Richard Burt, the expert on European affairs in the American Foreign Ministry, already warned the seven member states of the Western European Union by letter to work out a common position on the questions of arms control outside the Nato structures.

We are not concerned here with the American Star Wars programme. We submitted a motion for a resolution on it last month and warned against the illusion that more arms produce more security. The history of humanity proves the contrary.

What does concern me and my group, however, and I am addressing those who keep calling for European Union, is the need for an honest commitment to a common European security policy, since we have the same security policy interests. Anyone interested in a united Europe must also want Europe to speak with one voice on arms control questions.

We Socialists want a strong Europe as a counterpoise to the two superpowers. All those who want a real European Union and not just some artifice must immediately declare themselves in the reality of everyday Europe, and do so to our friends in the Alliance too.

Europe is standing at a crossroads, as it has so often. The alternatives are degeneration to the status of an intergovernmental free trade zone or further development. We Socialists measure the value of the Community mainly by what it does to create jobs and provide social security. We know that Europe is in a serious crisis of economic and social adjustment. That crisis cannot be overcome by applying Conservative recipes, which usually regard man only as a factor of production. Man must once again become the focal point of political activity. That is what concerns us. It is up to the European Council to discuss the Community's major future tasks and prospects. Brussels offered some hope. We wish the Italian Presidency success along this road.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR DIDÒ

Vice-President

Mr Formigoni (PPE), *chairman of the Political Affairs Committee*. — (IT) Mr President, in the name of the Group of the European People's Party, I should like first of all to express our sincere thanks to the Italian Presidency, to President Craxi and to Mr Andreotti for the brilliant conclusion of the accession negotiations.

After eight years' waiting Europe is finally open to two countries of great traditions. The enlargement of the Community from ten to twelve represents a step forward and a relaunching of Europe, the need for which was clearly felt. Hence this must be the occasion for a consideration of the rôle of Europe. The occasion to take full cognizance of the task which still awaits us and fresh impetus and vigour to realize it.

The construction of European unity does not end here. Europe must become more mature; it must take on ever more its own identity. And it must do so either on the basis of the pursuit of its own interests — for today we are an important part of Europe but not yet all Europe — or above all on the basis of an intensification of our cultural and ideal identity, of the complete acquisition of our historic memory, of the development of the dialogue between the various cultures, of the mutual regard of the populations which compose Europe, in their understanding and integration.

The road towards European unity was begun many years ago as regards the economy; then the first political structures were created. Today it is necessary to consolidate the political links and to work together for a Europe of science, of culture, of the arts, of religions and of humanism; in the knowledge that without *that* Europe the other Europe would risk being a robot without spirit and without heart.

Europe must be an area of liberty and of justice, of realization of the whole dignity of man, a place where the tragedy of a single people or even of a single individual will always find an echo and support.

Europe then must be the place where the Treaty of Helsinki is applied in its entirety, and the European Community must put forward the maximum effort every day so that this may take place on both sides of the demarcation line which still divides our continent in two.

Then there is the relationship between North and South which has still not been resolved either within our continent or, sad to say, over the planet. On this point our activity must be unremitting and our energies and our resources must not be measured by the

Formigoni

balance-sheet of the calculating cynic but expended with the courage of one who wishes to write a page in history.

And finally Europe must be in the forefront, without yielding, in the common struggle against terrorism and every form of violence and in determined opposition to all forms of racism and discrimination between members of the human race.

Along the way towards the attainment of these objectives, Mr President, I think certain instruments are required.

First: a strengthening of political cooperation between the Member States. I trust that the Italian Presidency will be willing to play a decisive rôle in this sector so that Europe may truly present to the world a single, clear, loud, strong voice in support of the cause of peace and justice in the various regions of the planet.

Second: the realization of a 'People's Europe' by means of every action which may produce a complete awareness of a common European identity and hence the rapid progressive elimination of all frontiers, the unification of standards and symbols, a European passport in the immediate future.

Third: the last in the order in which I mention it but not in order of importance: a decisive acceleration of the progress towards European Union.

Mr President, I trust that there will truly be convened at Milan, by the month of June, an intergovernmental conference with a mandate to examine the European Parliament's draft Treaty of 14 February 1984 and to initiate the steps which it envisages.

I should be grateful if you would let me have confirmation of this intention on the part of the Italian Presidency and would confirm the undertaking to prepare for the Council of Milan by bilateral contacts amongst the governments.

And finally, Mr President, in the name of the Political Affairs Committee of the European Parliament, of which I have the honour to be chairman, I should like to remind you of the question which is on the record and which I referred to the Council, regarding the procedure by which Spain and Portugal will appoint their own representatives to the European Parliament.

I am sorry to have to express my regret that the Council has allowed the Governments of Spain and Portugal the opportunity to choose between a partial election and the appointment of Members of the European Parliament by national parliaments. I trust that the Council will ask the Governments of Spain and Portugal to give due weight to the resolution of the European Parliament of 14 February 1985 and will take account of the report which the Political Affairs Committee prepared on this subject and which is to be dis-

cussed here in May. I should be grateful, Mr President, for confirmation of this point too.

In fact it is essential that all the peoples of Europe should be represented within this Parliament by Members elected according to a uniform electoral procedure. This is necessary for the dignity of Parliament and of the European Community and for the complete respect which is due to the people of Spain and Portugal as well as to the people of all the other countries of Europe.

(Applause)

Sir Henry Plumb (ED). — Mr President, first of all, on behalf of my group, I would like to thank Mr Craxi for his very statesmanlike speech, and I would equally like to thank Mr Delors for his very practical and very positive response to it.

Time is short and therefore I shall concentrate, if I may, on only two questions raised in Mr Craxi's speech. Both are, as I see it, of overwhelming importance for the future of our Community and both give grounds for hope and optimism.

The Italian Presidency may rightly congratulate itself on securing the accession of Spain and Portugal to our Community. The road, of course, has been long and it has been hard, and it was difficult always to retain our faith that Spain and Portugal would become part of the democratic jigsaw of the European Community. But we in this House must extend the warmest possible welcome to our Spanish and Portuguese friends who will be joining us next year.

Spain and Portugal are two of the historic nations of Europe and we shall be enriched by their genius and their material resources. They in turn will look to us to help them improve their standard of living, and European democracy will be strengthened. In this context, Mr President, I must remind Mr Craxi of the oft expressed view of the European Parliament that Spain and Portugal should hold direct elections to the European Parliament as soon as may be.

We are disappointed that the Council of Ministers, without consulting this Parliament, made in its negotiations with Spain and Portugal a less satisfactory agreement than was made with Greece. Within a year of Greek accession there were directly elected Greek Members in this House in accordance with the Treaty of Accession. So, it is for the Council to do what it still can to ensure that the Spanish and Portuguese colleagues who join us next year will enjoy, as soon as possible, the direct democratic mandate which all of us in this House are privileged to enjoy. I very much hope that this matter will not be allowed to cast a cloud over our excitement and our joy at greeting Spain and Portugal within the European Community.

Plumb

Before the end of the Italian Presidency the European Council will have occasion to consider the so-called Dooge report. It is to this report that I now wish to turn. It is an impressive document and in the name of my group I welcome it. We see it as an important and historic contribution to the development of the Community. I cannot agree with every word of it, but it will serve as the indispensable basis for serious discussion of institutional questions over the coming years.

The report begins with a firm commitment to the ideal of a genuine internal market. There is no European cause more important than that. I cannot put it better than the committee itself when it says this would mean more jobs, more prosperity and faster growth and would thus make the Community a reality for its citizens. Dooge has hit the nail on the head. Economic prosperity and the ability of the Community's citizens to identify with the European Community go hand in hand.

In general, there are many who fail to recognize the immense *political* significance of the internal market. My Group sees in the realized internal market not merely an engine for economic growth but an important spur to political integration. Nothing could sound simpler than to be able to sell your goods and services as easily in Scotland as in Sicily, as easily in Biarritz as in Bochum, but in fact it requires an enormous effort of political will and convergence in economic policies for the internal market to be a reality. When we have a genuine internal market, we will have made a gigantic stride towards the European Union to which this House rightly attaches so much importance.

So the Dooge Committee stressed the importance of competitiveness in the European economy and a strengthening of the European Monetary System. Mr President, I have said before, and I repeat it today, that the United Kingdom should participate more fully in the EMS.

(Applause)

Sterling should join in the Exchange Rate Mechanism, and those who say the time is not yet ripe should remember that there are always good reasons for doing nothing and there is only one good reason for doing anything — and that is that it is the right thing to do.

(Applause)

Some of the most telling pages in that report are those concerned with European Political Cooperation. The administrative recommendations for an EPC secretariat, and possibly common representation of Community countries at international institutions, deserve sympathetic study. The report brings out, in a way which this House can only commend, the indissoluble link between European Political Cooperation and security.

There is no greater political topic for Western Europe than its security and it is right for it to be discussed in the forum of EPC.

I come now to those two areas where I believe that the Dooge Committee's report needs refining. I refer here to decision-making in the Council of Ministers and the powers of the European Parliament. Senator Dooge's Committee is right to say that the European Council has distorted the decision-making of the Community. The number of its meetings should be reduced and decisions taken by a competent Council of Ministers. These Councils should normally take their decisions by majority vote.

It is on the question of majority voting that the Dooge Committee provides a majority and a minority view. Now, Mr President, I am not convinced that the gap between the two is unbridgeable, although it will surprise no one to learn that my Group is nearer to the minority than the majority position. There have been abuses of the so-called Luxembourg Compromise. Merely because there have been abuses, one should not necessarily abandon the principle if the principle is sound.

What is unacceptable is that a country, for shortterm internal political reasons, should seek to obstruct the functioning of the Community by postponing a decision.

The Council of Agriculture Ministers should consider proceeding now to a majority vote on agricultural prices in accordance with the Treaty. This has happened before, notably in 1982, and perhaps it should happen again.

But I do not think that it is right to abandon entirely the possibility for Member States of invoking vital national interests to defer decision-making. The minority report of the Dooge Committee envisages a more restrictive use of this procedure, and I think that the procedure should be even more restrictive than that envisaged by the minority report.

There should be a specific and limited number of issues on which countries could plead vital national interest. I am happy for the bounds to be set as restrictively as possible. So, short of a fully federated Europe (and we are far from such a state of affairs now), I do not believe that the withdrawal from all Member States of their right of national veto is either workable or desirable.

Senator Dooge's Committee has wise words on the predicament of the European Parliament. Because our powers are circumscribed, we are sometimes given to 'oblivion or over-statement'. Part of the remedy lies in working out a more coherent and a more sensible constitutional role for Parliament. But we have to beware of over-ambition. And we do not, as I see it, Mr President, always make the best use of the powers that we

Plumb

have. Those we can make more use of are those powers that in fact are conferred upon us now.

Co-decision making for Parliament, as set out in the Dooge Report, might, in my view, now be premature. Short of that, my Group views the Dooge Committee's recommendations on European Parliament powers with considerable sympathy.

I know that you, Mr President, will ensure that the preparatory work done by the Dooge Committee finds its proper culmination at the next European Council. If that Council convenes an intergovernmental conference on institutional questions, I hope all Member States will participate fully and constructively in the conference.

(Applause)

Mr Cervetti (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the present moment is important and indeed crucial for Europe. Let us be clear, Mr President of the Council, nothing justifies any form of Euro-optimism, neither the unemployment figures nor the conditions of research, of technology, of finance and the actual status of the currency nor the absence of an effective rôle for Europe on the decisive question of disarmament nor what has hitherto been the position in the institutional field.

Obviously all is not difficulties and crises. There is a compelling, serious and increasingly acknowledged necessity for European unity and above all there are forces available for commitment in the struggle to overcome the crisis, the relaunching of the work of unification and the solution of the serious problems which face us.

Certain recent events have made the European commitment even more urgent. The extension to Spain and Portugal is not only a success, it is a fresh challenge. The resumption of the dialogue between the two major powers with the prospect of the summit proposed by the United States and with the actions of the Soviet Union recently announced by Gorbachev represent for Europe an opportunity to act and at the same time a risk of not knowing how to act. The conclusion of the labours of the Dooge Committee accepting the substance of the Parliament's draft is an indication, although with restrictions and contradictions, of the way to European Union. This combination of crisis, of available forces, of opportunities to be grasped and challenges to be taken up makes this juncture an important one for various crucial reasons. Enthusiasm and determination are required. We, the forces of European unity, of democratization and progress in the European Parliament, are expressly committed in the battle. There are intact forces of resistance which must not be underestimated.

To the Council we say that in taking note of its declarations, Mr President of the Council, and on certain

points, with the best of intentions we shall be able to judge only on the basis of facts. And it is on the facts that we shall judge also the European Council of Milan.

In the meantime we ask for precise commitments from the Italian Presidency. The first consists in the convening at the Milan Council of the intergovernmental conference on the decisive institutional theme. But that is not enough; the conference must be convened on the basis of a precise mandate and of a platform which, as has been said this morning, can only be that of Parliament.

To deal with the problems of unemployment an emergency plan is necessary: the EMS and the ECU cannot remain in their present condition or even at the stage indicated in Palermo. It is necessary to go much further. In the matter of agriculture, reform of the CAP, the budget, there are becoming quite clear instances of corporativism, special interests, national vetoes which must be fought and overcome.

Then there is international politics. Amongst the negative attitudes which we observe we must count the positions, perhaps still hesitant, of certain governments, including the Italian government, for example on Middle Eastern questions. But Europe cannot place its trust today in that. It must express a common opinion on all the great world questions. Meanwhile the great powers must speak with a strong, unanimous voice at the next summit in Bonn. Next it is essential to be true to commitments undertaken, such as that for the convening of a second San José Conference in Costa Rica to measure up to the expectations of the peoples of Latin America and in particular of Central America. Present relationships with the countries in the south of the world must be considerably expanded. A new policy towards the Mediterranean is necessitated by the very enlargement of the Community.

Finally on the decisive question of disarmament a clear 'no' must be given to any prospect of star wars. Instead we must ensure the association of Europe with the Geneva negotiations in forms which appear appropriate and properly adapted. This is what we ask; let it not be said that realism is required! We are realists. That is why we see resistance, contradictions, timidity, which will not allow us to rest and which make us critical, whilst at the same time we see the need and the opportunity for a real change. We need everybody's enthusiasm and commitment to the work of structural, institutional and economic reform and redistribution of powers. The unity and autonomy of Europe are values in which we firmly believe and for which it is worth fighting with all our might.

(Applause)

Mr Romeo (L). — *(IT)* Mr President, in the name of the Liberal and Democratic Group I should like to

Romeo

associate myself with the congratulations already offered to the Italian Presidency on the great success which they have achieved with the entry of Spain and Portugal into the Community. These are negotiations which, it is true, were not recently initiated, but the Italian Presidency has the merit of having overcome — with the personal support of President Craxi and Mr Andreotti — the great difficulties which still stood in the way of achieving this great objective.

A great objective because above all with the entry of Spain into Europe there enters amongst us a country which for centuries has been at the political and cultural head of a component of European civilization which was opposed to that other civilization — the one of Nordic Protestant Europe. For centuries Spain and Northern Europe have represented two poles of different civilizations.

It is difficult to express a judgement on the significance which each of these two components has had on the history of civilization, but it is clear that Europe would not be what it is if it were limited to one only of these components. Today for the first time it may be said that what at one time was referred to as the Europe of the Romano-Germanic peoples is approaching genuine unity. Some of these peoples are not yet part of that Europe, but for the first time we now have a European Community which contains within itself the most ancient, the largest and most creative nucleus that European civilization has produced in the thousand years of its history.

It is for this reason that our Group has approved the entry of Spain and Portugal notwithstanding the fact that it has taken place in circumstances not always corresponding to requirements which we put forward. The requests made on various occasions to the Commission to provide forecasts of the cost of enlargement have always had vague and imprecise answers, probably because of the difficulty of giving an answer.

I must also say that the approval of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes itself took place in a manner which does not altogether eliminate the doubts which we had mentioned more than once regarding the actual supplementary nature of these programmes, at least as far as the Italian and French regions are concerned. It is clear that all the fresh budget heading will go to Greece. As regards the other funds, there is a strong suspicion that to a large extent they will amount to old money with a new name. But we shall not oppose such a great result for reasons which at bottom involve a few hundred of millions of ECU. The result is noteworthy, and for this very reason Community logic must prevail and does prevail even in the eyes of those of us who represent regions which nevertheless will receive directly the first impact of enlargement.

Enlargement is a great positive fact and yet in Mr President Craxi's speech there is already a reference to

future difficulties. He said that enlargement would require an effort of mediation even more intense than in the past. Which means that enlargement may nevertheless signify a diminution of the cohesion which previously existed. It may also signify a weakening. That is why it seems still more important that the Community should provide itself with institutions capable of regulating such a complicated reality. I must say — and President Craxi will pardon me who in comparison with him is a novice in politics — that basically his speech was an enumeration of problems which, to tell the truth, we have not just heard for the first time. The problems which he has listed have already been recorded at least three times this year: twice in the two speeches by President Delors, once in the speech by Mr Andreotti. It is an almost classical list of knotty problems which the Community states it wishes to resolve. They are enormous problems ranging from unemployment in the European social area to new technologies, to the environment, to mediation between East and West, to Latin America, to the Middle East and to South Africa. All things which, when they are compared with means at the disposal of a Community in which the budget is equivalent to less than half of the budget deficit of the State which Mr Craxi has to administer, may appear unrealistic objectives.

In reality we know that the Community's means, if used with a Community spirit and at the proper time and in the right direction, may then mobilize other resources. Hence the policy of the Community must not be measured only in terms of adding up budget figures. It is essential to follow a political line and to do so it is precisely necessary to improve decision-making machinery. It is for that reason that we federalists, who are frequently accused of not being realists or not paying attention to specific problems, attach so much importance to the institutional problem.

The speech by Commissioner Ripa di Meana this morning seemed to me to be centred wholly and with great effect on this question, and I believe and hope that it reflects what will be the policy of the Commission.

I realize that the words of the President of the Council had to be more careful. I do not believe I even caught in his speech the words 'intergovernmental conference' and I realize that the sensitivity of this phase of negotiations with the other States necessitates the maximum prudence. But if this is the correct rôle for the President, it is not the correct rôle for Parliament. Parliament must instead demand and encourage. So we remind President Craxi that he must go forward in this direction, taking account of the fact that in reality it is very easy to secure in this House and outside it unanimity or a very large majority when speaking in general terms of Europe. If instead the intention is actually to construct Europe and we are not speaking of it in general terms, then it will be seen that this unanimity does not exist. Then it will be a question of

Romeo

choosing between the positions of those who truly desire Europe and those who really do not want Europe.

I have the greatest respect for those who stress the importance of the right of veto on the part of individual States, but I think that this right must not go so far as to prohibit other States from going forward with the pursuit of objectives of external policy which they regard as fundamental.

(Applause)

Mr Musso (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, President of the Council, President of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen, the European Council of 29 and 30 March dealt in a concrete way with only two files: the file on enlargement, where they were content to ratify the decisions taken a little while before by the Council, and the one on the IMP. For the rest there are either declarations of intent, without concrete resources, as in the case of new technologies, or questions have been deferred till the European Council in June, as in the case of citizens' Europe, or referred to the *ad hoc* Committee on Institutional Affairs. We shall hold a debate on enlargement in May; that is why I do not wish to speak on it. I should like to mention the IMPs.

But before that, I should like to draw to your attention a telegram which has just arrived, sent to Mr Guermeur, chairman of the fisheries sub-committee, from some fishermen. I ask the Commission to hear me, because the telegram is disquieting. It reads, '... request immediate protective measures for inshore vessels operating 30 miles southwest of Permin. Spanish 'long-liners' from Andorra continually attacked inshore vessels from Lesconie on 16 April 1985 throwing pebbles and other objects'. The fishermen also request that protective measures be taken and that a strict watch be kept. I should simply like to draw to your attention the fact that at the point where we are opening our doors and enlarging our Communities, it would be a bad omen if we were to allow relations between the old members and the new ones to start with stone-throwing and acts of aggression. I therefore request that measures be taken to protect the fishermen and that there be a watch.

Having said that, let me return to the IMPs. I heard the President of the Council say this morning on the subject of the IMPs — I speak from memory and hope he will forgive me if I do not use his precise words — that the redistribution of financial resources is a fair means of compensating for the fact that Member States benefit from the integrated market in varying degrees. But, President of the Council, it is not our impression at all that it is a fair means of compensation and neither do we have the impression that it is a redistribution.

In fact, where have we got to with these IMPs? I should like to remind you that it was accepted that the

Mediterranean regions were among the poorest and least favoured in the Community, and that enlargement to include Spain and Portugal would only enhance this discrepancy. That is why, within the framework of its mandate of 30 May 1980, the Commission made provision for the famous IMPs. I need not remind you of the 6 billion, 600 million ECU, in six years and all the other measures; we have spoken about them many times.

Then, recently, the Commission came and told us it was no longer possible. Therefore I make other proposals and ask you not to make me retract them. President Delors said this morning that Parliament had been courageous, that it had been forceful and that nevertheless it had been left with its opinions. President Delors' proposals were for 2 billion ECU in seven years, no longer six years. That was making structural funds available to the Mediterranean regions. And there was the possibility of receiving loans from the European Investment Bank at special rates. What did the European Council do?

It obviously paid no further attention to the first proposals, they were forgotten, there is no longer talk any mention of them. Neither did it take account of the precise content of President Delors' proposals, it reduced them. They went down to 1.6 billion ECU. There was talk of up to 2.5 billion ECU of structural funds, and finally there was mention of the possibility of borrowings from the European Investment Bank, i.e. the New Community Instrument, but there was no longer mention of measures at special rates.

Under these conditions the IMPs have simply melted away. One thing has been substituted for another. That means that, without even going back to the original figures, structural funds are now being used. I hope that it is not simply a way of testing a new way of operating the structural funds, as I heard said this morning.

I should simply like to say that all the measures proposed should be re-examined by Parliament, because they ought to be given concrete form in a Regulation, and Parliament would have to give an opinion for that Regulation to be adopted. After the preceding sessions I doubt whether the Commission, or the Council, or the European Council wants to accept the new guidelines which are being laid before us, which I would now describe as virtually outdated.

Mrs Hammerich (ARC). — (DA) At the summit meeting dealt with by Mr Craxi, the ten Prime Ministers expressed satisfaction with the guidelines set out in the Dooge report. Thus there are some who welcome the prospect of a centralized EEC union, but not very many. Indeed there has never been any popular demand for European Union, there has never been a major demonstration *in favour of* a United States of Europe, there has never been a genuine popular movement *in favour of* concentrating power in Brussels.

Hammerich

Mr Spinelli has said that the Dooge report goes further than his own union plan with regard to security, defence and military matters. He is happy with that. But who else is happy with militarization? Apparently only a handful of arms manufacturers, top politicians and bureaucrats. Ordinary people in Europe have never expressed a wish to build up a new military superpower.

Few people can see the logic of working for peace by increasing armament in Europe under Community auspices. For that is what we are talking about. I quote: 'jointly to undertake the development and production of advanced weapons'. It also emerged clearly from Mr Delors' recommendation that the Community is to participate in Reagan's Star Wars research.

Arming the Community means heavy expenditure and will not get popular support at a time when we have too many weapons, when we live under the serious threat of war and in an economic crisis. People would rather spend their money on social development than on military equipment. Thus the advocates of union, who meet in closed sessions unfettered by public scrutiny, will find themselves in an isolated unreality with their demands for the Community to be given new power and military forces. They cannot expect support from the broad mass of the Danish population. We are not interested in being a small part of an armed superpower. Even the Danish Government has its reservations.

And how do they feel in Ireland? All those who want to preserve Irish neutrality must be shocked. The Irish peace movement has said no. The peace movements throughout Europe will greet the plans with protest.

Since there is a lack of popular support for this dangerous project, the project-makers should take the consequences: scrap the project and leave it to the people themselves to decide what kind of future they want for Europe.

Mr Romualdi (DR). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, if we of the European Right were not also to recognize that the conclusion of the long and difficult agreements for the entry of Spain and Portugal into the Community is a positive fact for Europe and a credit to the Italian Presidency, we should be lacking in good taste and objectivity.

But it would be worse if, at the very moment at which we take note of the good work which has been done, we were to abandon ourselves to the exaggeration — in the same way as the Italian Christian-Democratic and Socialist circles — of what President Craxi said this morning. If we did not realize, that is, the enormous difficulties which still have to be overcome in this field in order to reach the conclusion effectively and without damage. Because, too, anxious to make

the announcement, after obtaining the 'yes' of Papan-dreou's Greece — a yes to the agreement acquired with the concession in its favour of a large part of the money of the IMPs — that is, of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes — the Italian Presidency did not refer to all the writing that still has to be done so that the contracting parties may sign and thirteen parliaments including ours discuss and ratify it. A way a little longer than that warmly envisaged by the enthusiastic President Craxi, who is only now a strict and tenacious supporter of Europe after the conversion of Mitterrand and the advent of the Socialists to government in Spain and Portugal.

But enlargement is not everything; there were other tasks for the Brussels Summit. What were the results? Sad to say, more or less negative in every sphere. Mr Craxi's optimism did not prevent Mr Delors this morning from giving us to understand that in the matter of the budget we have remained at rock bottom, particularly as regards own resources and agricultural expenditure, which, at this point, must be directly covered — we do not understand how — by national contributions still to come.

We are at rock bottom too in the battle against unemployment, unfortunately without any result. Unemployment during the Italian Presidency has increased further, and to say that that is unacceptable is not enough.

And nothing serious has been done for monetary stability or the struggle against inflation. 'We must use the ECU as a pivot', it was said at Brussels. All right. We were among the first to put this problem in specific terms: let us make contracts in ECU, carry on financing in ECU, issue bonds or other securities in ECU at rates competitive with those quoted for the dollar in the United States, in an attempt to divert towards us the flow of international deposits. We even proposed a stock exchange guaranteed by the 'basket' of our currencies. No doubt it is a good thing that it should be discussed at the summit, but it would be better to decide something positive and specific.

The same may be said about the other arguments on which discussion took place: technology, the environment, the struggle against terrorism, against drugs. No serious measure even in the sensitive and altogether scandalous sphere of extradition or on that of the common legal area. Mr Craxi, this is the true balance-sheet!

And I do not speak — I have not time — of international relations on which you dwelt so long in your lengthy speech in a way destined not to strengthen but to weaken our presence in a world tragically upset by wars and terrorism for which those most responsible are often the privileged persons with whom you carry on discussions.

This morning mention was made too of European Union. We have been in favour of that for a very long

Romualdi

time past. The Dooge Report may be a good way, but all the preparations still have to be made for the Milan conference and the obstacles are not few. To avoid the road to union becoming a snare but to ensure that it should instead become the right way to unity and that unity should be a genuine defence of our great interests, of our liberty and independence, what is needed, Mr Craxi, is intelligent and specific measures. This is what we have been waiting for for a long time, not so much from the summits as from the political forces which are in control of our governments and which until the present have always and constantly failed.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Pannella (NI). — *(IT)* Mr President, Mr President of the Council, Mr President of the Commission, I think that the speech of the President of the Council this morning did not express in the most felicitous manner the reality or the truth of the policy of the Italian Presidency. I am entitled to say that, probably because I am also a member of the Italian Parliament. I state, very frankly, that the speech this morning was much less incisive and precise than that with which the Italian Presidency of the Council presented itself to our Parliament in January, but I think that this probably results from an error of exposition in which the intention naturally was to go back to the habits of other presidencies which have always offered all the components of the 'hot air' of which an empty speech of the president of a non-existent European Union is made up.

The problem of the Italian Presidency, it seems to me, was precisely understood and gave a spur in the right direction to the Commission which, in my opinion, was motivated in the inaugural speech, with some hesitation and some mistakes perhaps, by pessimistic expectation.

That being said, Mr President, the problem nevertheless remains one and one alone: the intergovernmental conference. It was a mistake not to speak of it. The draft of a European constitution worked out by Parliament must be the basis and the actual reason for the intergovernmental conference, and then the Council, as representative of the States, and we, as representatives of the people, have to ratify that constitution. The rest — I repeat — is hot air.

I thank Mr Romeo, on behalf of everyone, and thus do not need to stress the argument. His analysis is reasonable for a Federalist without any extremism, motivated only by the reasonable requirement of seeking to attack political illusions. We have a needle's eye through which we must pass, and the Italian Presidency has moved, it seems to me, sufficiently well in that direction. Let us go forward bearing in mind that in the weeks to come all this risks becoming to some extent frayed at the edges; let us recognize that the policy of our country at this moment is in reality

redeeming or interpreting what the European peoples have demanded by a great majority through the intermediary of this Parliament with the help and comfort of the work of the Commission set out by the President of the Commission and corroborated today by the speech of Commissioner Ripa di Meana. I think that this is a moment which must be grasped without compromise and, I would say too, according to the essential style by which we introduced ourselves in January within the Community with the Italian Presidency.

Mr President, I have kept in reserve a few seconds to stress my concern as regards the political administration which is crumbling all at once in our Parliament. Today, with the President of the Council, with the Minister for External Affairs, with the President of the Commission, you have authorized 62 formal and informal meetings emptying this hemicycle, as it is doing right now. You have arranged a time for debate which in absolute terms has been the shortest since 1979. Thus, with the Pertini affair, with the lack of clarity in this question of Reagan, I should like to know whether it is true that the President of Parliament is not going to Luxembourg for parochial and secondary reasons.

I conclude by saying that if we have the duty to demand that other institutions shall operate with clarity and precision we must begin with ourselves, because I do not know what is happening, but it seems to me that for the past three months here we have been doing very badly.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, since the spokesmen for all the political groups have already spoken, I should like, pursuant to Rule 86, to close the debate after the two replies from the President-in-Office of the Council and from the Commission, so that we can begin with Question Time at 5 p.m. I would formally propose to the House therefore that we take a vote on the closure of the debate.

(Parliament agreed to this proposal)

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, I wish to protest about this decision of yours, and about the way in which you put the matter to the vote without even giving Members an opportunity to express their opinion, and finally also because this decision was adopted in the presence of only 55 Members, which I do not think reflects honour on our Parliament.

There are rights that apply to Members in contradistinction to the groups. The views of some groups may express the overall view of their members, while those of others reflect the views of only a part of their membership. I believe that many Members and national political parties would have wished to raise certain very important matters before the presidency of the

Alavanos

European Council but were deprived of an opportunity to do so.

I am therefore protesting, and I ask that, if at all possible, we should follow normal procedure and use up the one-and-a-half hours allowed on today's agenda for the European Council debate, since up to now we have only debated for one hour. We used up the other half hour in voting on the urgent topics.

Mr Lalor (RDE). — Mr President, may the Members who were not allowed to speak submit their speeches in writing for the record?

President. — I am sorry, but only explanations of vote may be submitted in writing when the vote is being taken on motions for resolutions.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (NL) Mr President, I would point out that this will be chiefly to the disadvantage of the smaller groups and the marginals. Why were they made promises that could not be kept? Could this situation not have been foreseen, or has the President failed to conduct the proceedings correctly?

Mrs Heinrich (ARC). — (DE) If I am not going to be permitted to speak, I should at least like to ask the Commission a question. What is the position with regard to the communication sent by the Commission to the World Economic Summit at the beginning of May, in which it was agreed that the Community's research budget would be doubled by 1989 from 3% to 6%, and that with a view to the strategic defence initiative, in other words, the Star Wars programme? I know that attempts are being made to play down this whole matter. The Rainbow Group asked the Commission for a look at this paper, but we were told that it was too 'hot'.

Mr Craxi, President-in-Office of the European Council. — (IT) Mr President, I shall snatch only a minute or so for some very brief reflections, as I do not wish to cause an argument on questions of time.

First of all I should like to thank all those who have spoken and who have been kind enough to stress the importance of the work which has been done to attain the completion of the negotiations for the accession of Spain and Portugal.

I do not wish to deal with a series of polemical questions which I have heard, which I had heard before and which I know I shall have to hear again in Italy. I prefer this type of 'hot air' to be 'heated up' in Italy. I should prefer instead to reply to some of the specific questions which have been put and to the requests for clarification.

It was difficult to do anything other than what has been done as far as concerns the method of election of the Members of Parliament for Spain and Portugal in the sense that account was taken, so to speak, in the process of accession, of transitional phases for all the economic and commercial cycles and also for political cycles. There has not been a breach of any principles, in the sense that a mandate received from a freely-elected Parliament is nevertheless always a representative, democratic mandate. Thus things will have to go through a transitional period, and subsequently there will be direct election at the same time as the elections for the next European Parliament.

Hence I do not think it is possible to revert to this argument as an afterthought in the negotiations which will still have to be conducted on questions which are, let us say, not essential or matters for definition in the agreements which have already been concluded. I trust that all this may be concluded by the month of May so that we may have the necessary time for ratification by the national parliaments and hence manage to keep to the date of 1 January.

I agree straight away that one of the questions — as Mr Arndt was reminding us — on which attention will be concentrated in the discussions in progress on the problems of reform of the institutions concerns the rule of unanimity, a rule which historically has been the cause of the disintegration of States and institutions and which, as is well known, is of lesser antiquity than the principle of the majority, which goes back even to the times of barbarous peoples, who took formal decisions — not as sophisticated as ours it is true — by the principle of the majority.

I believe therefore that unanimity will have to be the exception and that the majoritarian principle will have to become established to an ever-increasing extent as a constituent element of the decision-making process. I think that this is the major path to be followed and it is in this direction that work will proceed.

But the question which more or less everybody has raised is a different one, that is, whether or not this intergovernmental conference of which we have spoken will take place. I restricted myself to reporting the decisions of the Brussels Council; and this was not one of the decisions adopted at the Brussels Council. The suggestion, as you know, has been made, the idea is in the air, strongly supported by a large part of the States; we are at a stage at which we must finally manage to clarify everyone's position, that is, to determine what is the degree of consensus and convergence which it is possible to attain regarding this project. I trust that, at the conclusion of the consultation which is to be held during the next few weeks and months and in the course of the work of the Milan Council, this decision may finally be adopted in such a way as to avoid these problems too becoming bogged down in Byzantine arguments which prevent and would continue to prevent the European institutions from recov-

Craxi

ering their efficiency, their ability to be representative, their ability to act with authority and their capacity to adopt in time the decisions which are needed.

Let us not forget that the Community is becoming a Community of Twelve, that is, a Community which will be more representative, probably more influential but also more complicated. Hence the institutional need is certainly one of great importance and urgency.

At Milan, Mrs Hammerich, at the Council of Milan there will not be adopted decisions concerning the rearmament of Europe or the militarization of Europe. We shall certainly not be discussing that. All our countries are working actively, as far as I know, with particular care and intensity to extend this process which is under way, the resumption of this dialogue and this process of negotiation with the fundamental aim of succeeding in reaching agreements on the lowest possible levels of armaments; agreements which do not freeze situations of disequilibrium but which in the framework of an equilibrium accepted and recognized by all may at the same time make it possible to say that we have worked for peace in security and simultaneously have advanced the cause of the reduction of nuclear armaments.

I have not much to add or anything else to explain in connection with the requests which have been put forward. I should just like to refer to the words spoken by Mr Formigoni — I recall them — who spoke of a Europe which must also be a Europe of science, of art, of culture and of the many humanisms in which Europe is rich. And yet in the great work which we have carried out over the last few years European culture — even in European budgets — has always been a Cinderella.

Regard being had to our traditions and our energy availability, very frequently it is easier to organize a great cultural institution than a great industrial complex or colossal investments in other fields and — I repeat — in all these years European culture, the European cultural institutions, have remained the Cinderella of the Communities. This truth is inscribed in the budgets of the Community and everybody may read it there. In this sense I conclude, not with a 'hot air' appeal, but with an appeal aimed at ensuring that this cultural sustenance too, made up of values and ideas, of knowledge and of human communication, may itself become one of the cements with which the Europe of tomorrow is built.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR FANTI

Vice-President

President. — The debate is closed.

I thank Mr Craxi for his kindness in devoting this entire day to the European Parliament. I feel that the proceedings of this day will have been a source of support to him in the vital and arduous labours that await him as President-in-Office of the Council during the last three months of the Italian Presidency in preparing for the Milan Summit. I hope that this Summit will be a resounding success, and I know that that is also the wish of the European Parliament.

(Applause)

7. Question Time

President. — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. B 2-104/85), to which Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council, will be replying. I should like to extend to him the heartfelt greetings of the European Parliament and to express our appreciation of his recent unsparing labours in the Council of Ministers which have led to the conclusion of the lengthy negotiations on enlargement with Spain and Portugal.

(Applause)

We begin with the questions to the Council.

As the author is not present, Question No 82 will be answered in writing.¹

Question no 83, by Mr Wijsenbeek, (-721/84):

Subject: A European surcharge on VAT

The Netherlands State Secretary for Foreign Affairs with responsibility for European cooperation, Dr W. F. van Eekelen, has put forward the idea that a European surcharge be put on VAT to provide the national contribution towards the shortfalls in the Community budget and in this way to make the costs of Europe more readily apparent to its citizens. What does the Council as an institution think of this idea put forward by one of its members?

Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(IT)* The Council has held discussions on the subject of the future financing of the Community on the basis of a communication from the Commission, which put forward various solutions to increase the Community's own resources. Finally the Council shared the opinion of the Commission to the effect that the increase in the maximum of own resources arising from VAT constitutes the simplest and most appropriate means of endowing the Community with new own resources.

¹ See Annex of 17. 4. 1985.

Andreotti

The Council adopted a position on a proposal from the Commission essentially intended to increase from 1 to 1.4% the maximum of own VAT resources and will discuss it with the Council at the end of this month (April).

Mr Wijsenbeek (L). — (NL) I have listened with interest to the answer given by the President of the Council, a former Member of this Parliament. What I have to ask him is not only a supplementary question but my original question, because I am not interested in a proposal for an increase in own resources by a few percentage points. What I am interested in is the proposal made by a member of the Council for an increase in VAT by a few points to make it clear that it is a direct tax on the European citizen. I therefore ask the President of the Council once again: what does he think of the proposal put forward by a member of the Council that it should be made clear to the European citizen that he too must make a given contribution to Europe, and how is this proposal to be reconciled with the own resources proposal?

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) I think that what I said earlier, namely that the method which is the simplest, because, too, it has already been tried, that is, to increase the rate without changing the system, has been adopted precisely because otherwise we should probably come up against certain difficulties of a practical nature, even though from a psychological or political point of view it might be significant if the taxpayer were to know directly the amount of tax going to the Community.

The matter is of such difficulty in view of the fact that for this increase, which is already insufficient — the Commission itself has said so — enormous efforts have been needed to reach agreement within the Council.

Thus I should like to ask the Honourable Member who has raised the question to await better times for changing the method. Moreover I think that when we have — I trust not in the distant future — a specific draft for the Union, we should return to discuss financing because, too, I think it will be necessary to introduce a system which then, perhaps with the guarantee of unanimity within the Council of Ministers, will not require, each time subsequent amendments have to be made, the obligation of ratification by the national parliaments.

It may therefore be at the time at which amendments are made to the Treaty for the purpose of advancing on the way to the Union that Mr Wijsenbeek may be able to bring his idea forward again more appropriately.

President. — Question No 84, by Mr Hoon (H-746/84):

Subject: Operation Flood

Given that 'Operation Flood' is regarded by the European Commission as a prime example of how food aid can be used to promote long-term rural development, and that it provides help to 10 million families in India through the provision of Community skimmed milk powder and butteroil, does the Council intend to continue with this valuable programme on the same scale?

Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council. — (IT) As regards aid, as is well known, we work here too through the intermediary of the proposals of the Commission. I may say that from 1970 the Community has developed a programme of aids to India which has been renewed eight years later at the request of the competent authorities and in collaboration with those authorities.

However, there has been a series of programmes of food aid in milk and milk products which, for duration and importance from year to year, has represented the first multiennial programme of food aid in the Community with results which we think may be regarded as noteworthy. The relative decisions are for the Commission to take on the basis of the relevant provisions and I believe that the Commission will continue that type of action in 1985 to the extent to which funds for food aid in milk and milk products will permit, extending them to other regions or other countries. The example of Flood 2 shows in fact that food aid, apart from the most urgent cases, in which it is vital, constitutes, if it is used intelligently, an appropriate instrument for development aid.

Finally, I would remark that India has asked that the aid in question should be continued until 1986 with the inclusion of other products in addition to milk and milk products.

Mr Hoon (S). — I would like first of all to ask the President-in-Office to expand upon the extent to which Operation Flood has fulfilled its stated objectives of establishing a modern and efficient dairy industry in India, improving the living conditions of the 10 million families of milk producers and creating a distribution network extending over a considerable number of towns in India.

It was originally intended that the operation should be stepped up over a number of years. Has that been achieved? Indeed, are there figures available to support that contention?

What I would like the Minister to do, if he would, is unequivocally guarantee that once the present scheme reaches its conclusion, then the level of funding in real terms will be maintained, in particular to take account of inflation in India.

Hoon

Finally, I would like him to specify the period of time over which the Council is prepared to guarantee this level of funding, bearing in mind that I understand that the Commission will bring forward proposals to repeat this operation after the present scheme expires.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (NL) Development groups like *Frères du Monde* have rightly denounced the fact that long-term food aid in the form of skimmed milk powder and butteroil often disrupts local markets and so discourages local farmers. What does the Council intend to do about this, particularly in the longer term?

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) As I said before, this programme has not been established by the Commission on its own initiative but is agreed by the competent Indian authorities. Therefore we must above all recognize that there is a positive assessment made by the Indian authorities themselves as regards what has occurred hitherto, and hence it is for them to make to us proposals so that the Commission may discuss them.

There is a commitment to continue this programme, as I have said. How it may subsequently be improved and extended will depend not only upon the requests made but also upon our opportunities.

Naturally, even though we recognize certain limits, we have greater quantities of a certain type of product available and everybody knows that in certain products the Commission's stocks are enormous and, apart from anything else, very expensive. Hence, in a manner of speaking, in providing this aid we are certainly not endangering the finances or the economy of the Community.

From a more general point of view, if food aid were to disturb the market, first of all it would be necessary to see whether the market is supplied only by national production, that is to say, if there is self-sufficiency in foodstuffs. If so, it would be possible to say also that there is to some extent a case to be made against it; but if this self-sufficiency is not present and if it is a question on the contrary of replacing by aid the expensive imports of a country which is certainly not rich, I do not think that comments of a critical nature can be made.

In any case the question concerns not only the case in point, that is, the case of India, but a line of the Community's general aid policy. On this I can say that the most consistent aid which we can supply — let us think for example of northern Africa — is that of improving and increasing local agricultural production, diversifying it so as to provide not only emergency aid but to give true aid which may be defined as 'for development'.

President. — Question No 85, by Mr Lalor (H-758/84):

Subject: Dumping of soft fruit

Will the President-in-Office of the Council give an assurance that the Council will undertake to adopt, as a matter of urgency, measures to ensure that the dumping of strawberries and raspberries on the EEC market, from State-trading countries outside the Community, is discontinued immediately in the interest of the fruit industry in County Wexford, Ireland?

Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council. — (IT) Any anti-dumping procedure originates with the Commission which, according to the basic regulation, receives the complaints of the industries concerned, carries out the necessary inquiries and decides whether or not to institute a provisional anti-dumping duty.

The Council intervenes only in a subsequent phase when it is essentially a matter of taking a decision on a proposal from the Commission to extend a provisional anti-dumping duty or to make it definitive. Hitherto the Council has not received any proposal from the Commission as regards the importation of strawberries and raspberries from State-trading countries. It appears that the Commission's officers are engaged in considering this file.

Mr Lalor (RDE). — I am rather disturbed to find that the Council are not taking a more active interest in the problem. Can the President-in-Office assure my County Wexford strawberry producers that they will not continue to be forced to compete at a disadvantage in the market place with substitute inferior products, heavily subsidized, to a degree that fair market competition no longer exists? This matter has been taken up with the Commission, but they are dragging their feet and acting too slowly on it.

Does not the President-in-Office agree that some positive and constructive protective action should be undertaken and that he should not come here as President-in-Office of the Council and simply pass the buck to the Commission?

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) Certainly the problem of strawberries and raspberries is a very important one and we have not underestimated it, even though the Italian Presidency has had to give consideration in these three months to some problems of a slightly greater complexity.

However, the Community industries concerned, which are the ones which ought to put forward their complaints, have not raised any objections. I have asked for the opening of an anti-dumping procedure; you might perhaps therefore ask the industries con-

Andreotti

cerned in your country to set this procedure in motion.

President. — Question No 86, by Mrs Lemass (H-765/84):

Subject: Confiscation of assets of drug 'Barons'

Does the Council support the view that the introduction of legislation in the Member States aimed at confiscating the assets of illegal drug traffickers would make a positive contribution to the Community's efforts to combat the drug menace that is rampant in Dublin and the other capitals of Europe, and, if so, what action would the Council be prepared to take a decision on?

Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council. — (IT) The Presidency takes note of the concern expressed by the Honourable Member and is in a position to confirm that the competent ministers of the Member States are aware of the essential importance of the drug problem. The Ministers of Health discussed the problem at their meeting on 29 November 1984 in Brussels and will continue the discussion at the next meeting, fixed for 3 and 4 May 1985.

Moreover, the Presidency has the intention of convening in the near future, where appropriate, the Ministers of Justice and of the Interior to discuss this drug problem jointly.

Various aspects of the campaign against drugs may be raised at that meeting, including the one which is the subject of this question.

Mrs Lemass (RDE). — The President-in-Office said that this matter was discussed at the Health Ministers' meeting on 29 November in Brussels. Would he give us a little bit of information as to what actually did happen at that particular meeting? Does he not agree with me that it is a total injustice to the thousands of young people whose lives are destroyed by drugs that these people who traffic illegally in drugs make vast fortunes, can buy large houses and cars and lots of property and yet nothing really happens to them? I would ask him to do his utmost to have something really concrete and effective done to try to solve this very great problem in all our countries.

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) I can confirm that the precise intention to further the quest for common measures exists and is strongly encouraged by the Presidency. Moreover we ourselves had asked the preceding Irish Presidency to make drugs a priority theme at Community level. The difficulty which emerged in the meeting of Ministers of Health in November 1984 was as follows: there are certain countries which prefer to have purely national measures, largely inherent in their internal systems; others on the other hand accept the idea of having the same measures in various countries

with a major impact of a political and perhaps a practical nature. I can however give an assurance that the Presidency and the Council will give this subject the maximum attention in the next few weeks.

Miss Tongue (S). — What proposals has the Italian presidency for encouraging, for example, collaboration among customs officers in preventing drugs actually arriving within Community boundaries? Does the President-in-Office not agree that they would surely be better employed doing this than stopping EEC citizens legitimately crossing Community borders?

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) I can say that this matter is taken so seriously that in the development of one of the proposals of the Adonnino Committee to make crossing frontiers easier and quicker, consideration has been given to the way in which these checks may be liberalized, whilst preserving nevertheless the possibility of effective control as regards this very traffic in drugs. It would in fact be truly absurd if a victory of a Community nature such as that of bringing about a single external frontier to the Community should turn out to be to the advantage of the hordes of criminals engaged in drug trafficking. It is precisely in connection with these new rules which the Adonnino Committee has suggested to us that we are attempting to find a guarantee that we shall have available an additional instrument, or rather not have available an instrument less, for controlling drugs traffic.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 87 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 88, by Mr Hutton (H-370/84):

Subject: Council action on a people's Europe

The European Council of Fontainebleau asked the Council and the Member States to study urgently methods of introducing by June 1985 a single document for the movement of goods, the abolition of all police and customs formalities for people crossing intra-Community frontiers, and equivalence of university diplomas.

What progress has the Council made with these measures and will they in fact be in operation by June 1985?

Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council. — (IT) The *ad hoc* committee for a People's Europe, about which I was speaking a short while ago — which is chaired by Mr Adonnino and which was set up at Fontainebleau — has, as the House is aware, submitted a first report to the last European Council in Brussels. This morning the President of the Council

¹ See Annex of 17. 4. 1985.

Andreotti

summed up here the conclusions of the Brussels meeting regarding the proposals of the Adonnino Committee.

I can say that these proposals fall into two parts: certain ones are of a character which may be carried out at once and — just to show that we look to the substance and not to the form, that we are in earnest — we laid it down that at the Milan Council at the end of June we must have a check on what has really been achieved in the period between the European Council in Brussels and that in Milan as regards rules on the part of the individual States. There is another part, the one which figures in the proposals already received or of which the chapter headings have been approved, which is to be presented at the Milan Council. With these objectives, some of which may perhaps be long-term, whilst others are shorter-term projects, we think we shall be able, during the current six months, to give a noteworthy impetus to what has been defined as the People's Europe.

Mr Hutton (ED). — My question referred first to the single document for the movement of goods. How are the people that we represent to understand that they are living in a people's Europe when this document is not due to come into effect until the beginning of 1988? Would the President-in-Office say if he will speed up the introduction of that document to make this people's Europe a good deal more real to the people we represent?

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) As a rule a transitional period is required because it is a question of amending not only a whole series of internal rules in each State, a series of forms, a bureaucratic organization, but also of altering people's mentality, something which occasionally requires more time than amendments to a decree or to a system of issuing printed matter and forms. However, since in the Adonnino Committee this matter of free movement and thus of the speeding up which must be achieved was strongly emphasized, I shall have examination made as to whether this transitional period, which is indeed rather long, may be accelerated.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — If these recommendations from the Adonnino Committee do require legislation, could that legislation be enacted quickly? Indeed, the Adonnino Committee has acted with speed and all its rapporteurs have been very speedy in coming before all the committees of this Parliament to put forward proposals. What would the time-scale be, for example, on legislation affecting youth exchanges, increase of budget for these matters, recognition of mutual diplomas? Surely there is no reason why, if it worked with a will, the Council could not match the speed with which the Adonnino Committee has worked. Otherwise we are going to face another European election five years from 1984 and the disillusionment and the

impatience of the citizen will still be as great as it was before.

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) I agree with the request for greater speed, but the period which has elapsed since the presentation of the proposals of the Adonnino Committee until today is one which is measured in days, so I do not think that we can be accused of failure to act, all the more so as, for the part which we regard as being capable of being put into force at once by the individual States, no rules of a Community nature are needed. As I said before, we are committed to carrying out a check at the Milan Summit and we shall also have a prior written inquiry to see whether these first commitments have been carried out and to show our intention of contributing to spreading the Community idea and thus to bringing this Europe ever closer to the people.

On the other hand the actual matters mentioned by you are very varied, since you mentioned the technical modifications in customs procedures apart from the question of youth exchanges, the problem of degrees, harmonization in school matters and so on: each of these problems requires a special procedure and special consideration. I can say, however, that I share your conviction that these things must be carried out within the time strictly necessary, without dragging them out too long.

President. — Question No 89, by Mr Fitzgerald (H-500/84):

Subject: ESB charges

A 6.83% increase in electricity charges came into effect this month (November) in Ireland in an effort to reduce the ESB's (Electricity Supply Board) projected deficit at year end of over £ 77 million to £ 58 million.

In view of the fact that electricity prices in Ireland are already higher than in other EEC countries and in view of the fact that thousands of jobs could have been saved and factory closures avoided if electricity costs were lower, will the Council take immediate action to urge the Irish Government to seek alternative ways of securing the financial situation of the ESB, particularly since the Community has contributed substantial EIB loans to the ESB?

Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council. — (IT) The Council lays down the broad lines of a common energy policy, but hitherto we have not had the power to work out special measures such as that quoted in this question, which come within the powers of the national authorities of every State. I think that from the general point of view of guidance and harmonization which is proper to the Council, it may be said that a realistic price structure for energy consti-

Andreotti

tutes the key element of this common energy policy as long as such price structure ensures above all the efficiency and economy of energy, next decisions on the optimal choice and allocation of fuels and finally security of the energy supply.

In the Council for some years past Community principles relating to the formation of prices have been confirmed and there is also a report by the officers of the Commission on the application of such principles in the Member States, in particular in the sector of electrical energy and gas. Supplementary work is envisaged as regards other sectors of energy, but apart from these lines of guidance it is a matter of national policies which as such cannot, in the present state of our powers and duties, be settled on a Community basis.

Mr Fitzgerald (RDE). — I am sure that the President-in-Office of the Council will agree with me that high fuel costs for lighting and heating have a serious impact on many sections of the Community. I do not intend to go into these in detail — the old, the unemployed, etc. — but surely the President-in-Office would agree with me that the most important aspect of energy policy is its bearing on jobs and employment? I do not recollect him referring to that in his reply.

While he did say that the Council considered it realistic that energy costs should be at a particular level, I think a little more is required of him and his Council if they are serious in their utterances regarding unemployment. Presidents-in-Office of the Council go in and out of office like cuckoo clocks, and they tell us that employment is their main priority. If they are serious, surely there is no better way in which the Council can help to create and maintain jobs than by ensuring that Member States do their utmost to keep their energy costs low. Would the President-in-Office not agree with this?

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) I think it is difficult not to agree with the statement that low energy costs are needed, apart from low prices. If I were to speak not as a minister but as the father of a family, I would say that for us too electrical tariffs are very high. However, as a minister I know that since the balance-sheets of the electricity distribution authorities are not very healthy, if they made us pay still less they would end up with a still bigger deficit.

In any case the problem which you raise is an important one since, as regards employment, there are sectors in which energy is a raw material. Let us think of an aluminium factory, to take a specific example. Here it is a question of seeing whether and how differentiated tariffs may be provided. This is, however, a differentiation which certain countries accept and other countries on the other hand think will create a whole series of privileges. Perhaps an excessive differentia-

tion in the tariffs would in the final analysis create forms, perhaps surreptitious forms, of aid which, even from a Community point of view, might be open to criticism.

I think therefore that, apart from a common conviction, which we must foster, every country must resolve its own problems because we know well that in the question of sources of energy the position of the ten countries — tomorrow the twelve countries of the Community — is very different, since some are high producers of energy and energy resources whilst others are almost exclusively dependent on importation from abroad of raw materials or indeed even of energy already produced.

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Would the President-in-Office accept my thanks for the first part of his answer in which he said that this was not the responsibility of the Council but of Member States? Will he accept that if he ever goes any further than that answer, he will be answering all sorts of questions about the denial of health care and educational opportunity in the United Kingdom? I do not want him to get embroiled in that because that is the responsibility of our citizens to deal with in their national elections. So will he accept my congratulation on refusing to get drawn into these issues of national concern?

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) I am grateful for that observation and I would ask the Honourable Member who made it to help me on every occasion on which, on the other hand, I am reproached for not having replied to arguments which I regard as not concerning the Community.

President. — Question No 90, by Mr Selva (H-592/84):

Subject: Aid for the campaign against world hunger

In his New Year message on 31 December 1984 the President of the Italian Republic, Sandro Pertini, asked, speaking of the problem of famine in the world: 'Where is the aid going? Is it really reaching those who are dying of hunger?'

Taking up these questions, I would ask for detailed information on the destination of the aid provided by the countries of the European Economic Community, particularly that going to Ethiopia in recent months?

Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council. — (IT) The Council and the European Council have followed and continue to follow attentively the work of the Community and the individual States belonging to the Community so as to give help to the populations

Andreotti

suffering from hunger, particularly in Africa, in the recent past.

I can give an assurance that the Council is making remarkable efforts so that such help will be consistent and brought to the populations effectively and at the right time. There is also a logistic coordination with which attempts have been made to deal with a series of difficulties, because to arrive at airports — in this case — is not difficult, but the internal distribution is very difficult.

One concern has been under consideration by the Council and that is that at the present time internal obstacles are arising as a result not of difficulties of a technical nature but of considering the various populations differently, not according to their need, but according to assessments of a political nature. This is what has been the subject of discussion together with checks on how these distributions of aid are proceeding, simultaneously with the visit to Ethiopia of the Vice-President of the Commission, Mr Natali. However, the Commission, in agreement with us and in close touch with other organizations such as the FAO, has done its best to avail itself of the experience which they have gained, not to run into the difficulties in which they have become involved and to plan together deliveries both by sea and by air.

Then there are under way important programmes by non-government organisations and we feel that a part of the distribution of the aid which may be provided should be entrusted by us to these non-government organizations. If it is of interest, and I think that it will interest both the Honourable Member Mr Selva and the Parliament in general, I may say in general terms that the aid which the Community and the Member States are furnishing in cereal equivalents to the whole of the eight African countries most affected had at the end of February reached these figures: Ethiopia 304 000 tonnes, in round figures; Mali 82 000 tonnes; Mauritania 62 000 tonnes; Niger 84 000; Chad 73 000; Sudan 199 000; Mozambique 114 000; Angola 38 000. Further, there are in reserve 310 000 tonnes, or rather there were at the end of February. We are therefore speaking of total aid of 1 272 000 tonnes.

I quote these figures because in Dublin in December the European Council committed itself to a supply of aid in the sum of 1 200 000 tonnes: hence we have complied with this commitment and have exceeded it.

As far as concerns the problem as a whole, I think that Mr Vice-President Natali will be able subject to the permissible procedures to supply the Parliament with all other details.

Mr Selva (PPE). — (IT) I thank Mr President Andreotti for the detailed reply which he has been kind enough to give to my question, in which I note both commitment and good will. My Honourable

Friend, Mr Andreotti, as an expert Parliamentarian, knows that in the legitimate ritual of Question Time we cannot declare ourselves either satisfied or dissatisfied. I declare myself satisfied in fact and I should like to put a supplementary question: can the Council of Ministers undertake to give an account periodically of the use to which the aid furnished by the Community is put? From the political point of view — and of this I gave a hint also in the wording of my question — there is a suspicion, over and above the technical hesitation mentioned by Mr Minister Andreotti, that some part of this aid is going by unorthodox channels. The suspicion is serious from the essentially moral point of view, since we are pledging the European peoples to be generous, as they should be.

I should be glad if Mr Minister Andreotti, in addition to the figures, for which I thank him, and the obligation which he has laid upon Mr Vice-President Natali, will let us have a few words also on this subject so as to dispel doubts on the matter.

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) It is for the Commission to give an account of what amounts to an executive activity affecting aid. For myself, apart from asking the Commission to do what in any case it is doing, I can undertake to ask my colleagues to make every effort so that the initiatives of the individual States, which are supplementary to Community initiatives, should always be notified promptly and that the individual States should notify the way in which these distributions are being made, so that if there are difficulties they may be faced and overcome as a result of one another's experience.

As regards possible cases of misappropriation, certainly we must do whatever is possible and Mr Vice-President Natali's inspection on the spot had not only what I might call a confirmatory value, since arrangements could have been made for that to be done by an official; it had for the country in question the value of a summons to adopt the very serious approach required. In each of these programmes we must make the machinery ever more refined so as to avoid the occurrence of these cases of misappropriation. It is not necessary, however, and I think the Honourable Member Mr Selva will agree with me, because of the fact that sometimes there has been or may be misappropriation, to arrive at the conclusion which certain people adopt, that is, to say: then it is better not to provide this aid. It would really be as if — the example is only partially valid — for fear that there might be somebody who would ask assistance from you but did not deserve it, you would give no further aid to anyone. In a certain sense it is better to show an excess of generosity: this, however, is when private matters are in question. When public means are at stake we must be very strict and I think that checks and vigilance are not only right and proper but also informative.

Mr Mizzau (PPE). — (IT) Mr President of the Council, we are certain that aid in foodstuffs to the

Mizzau

people suffering hunger reaches those who are in need when it goes through the missions.

Do not the Council and the Commission think that they should share out the funds by increasing those for the missions in comparison with those for the governments since it appears, to judge by the Ethiopian Government, that they show greater interest in guns than in butter?

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) I have already said that a part — I have not indicated percentages here for practical reasons — is distributed by means of non-government organizations in which certainly the missions are included.

I must cite a case which dates precisely from recent times: the appalling earthquake which affected a huge part of Chile. In view of the fact that there is not a great desire for relations with the government of Chile, many countries and the Community itself will be inclined to have recourse to the Chilean *Caritas* for sending the help in question which in other countries can be provided by other non-government organizations.

Thus in spite of our great esteem, which is moreover historically supremely well founded, for the disinterested activity of the missions, this cannot be *a priori* a good argument for excluding the governments as such. Basically I do not think that such an unlimited mistrust of governments can be shared by the Parliament; at most I myself might share it, speaking in the name of the Council of Ministers.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — Can I congratulate the Council on its conclusion that it is better to send the aid despite mishaps. But could I also draw to its attention the fact that there was a three-MEP delegation from three groups of the Parliament which went to Eritrea via the Sudan, including Mr Andrews of my group, who brought back clear film evidence — which I am sure could be readily made available as it has been shown here — that EEC sacks were being distributed on the black market between Sudan and Eritrea. On questioning it was alleged that these had been sold to Sudanese black-marketeers by Ethiopian soldiers. If the Council accepts that evidence — which is, as I say, on film — would it not be time for the Council to take this up with the Ethiopian Government and perhaps give more credence to the last questioner's suggestion that in that particular government's case we should look more at other methods of distribution?

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) I think that the reason for which, as distinct from other analogous cases, the Commission thought it should send the Vice-President to the spot is precisely that cases of this kind, in this case documented by our colleagues, cannot fail to require our full attention. Naturally to be objective it

is necessary in the first place to wait for a detailed report which Mr Vice-President Natali may present to us and in the second place to avoid, according to a saying by Leonardo, making a general rule of a single case.

I trust that it is a question really of a partial deviation of our aid from its destination. However, to avoid any repetition, I think that our monitoring systems should be improved.

Mr Pisoni Ferruccio (PPE). — (IT) We have heard with great satisfaction the figures showing the practical commitment to provide for basic necessities.

I should like to ask Mr President Andreotti whether, apart from this distribution of cereals, there is also a specific commitment so that this should not be simply an immediate programme but that it should instead induce these peoples to feed themselves. It frequently happens that too long drawn-out assistance discourages diligence and hence the people's cultivation of their own land, thus leading to the abandonment of those few resources which it is possible to obtain on the spot. Hence: a programme of aid especially where the drought has had serious effect; of aid when other immediate measures are not possible, but at the same time help for the development of these people's own resources and capacity. It is impossible indeed to think of giving them help for ever; above all it would amount to an anti-educative programme and in the last resort even an inhuman one.

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) I share the view that food aid is only a part of the development aid programme, a part which, at certain times, as a result of drought or insufficient crops or even the complete destruction of crops, must be accentuated but must not exceed a fair proportion.

On the other hand I may say that even as compared with this tragic situation which has struck Ethiopia and the neighbouring countries, a part of the programmes of individual States, apart from food aid, is intended to provide funds, even though only small in amount, without expecting great plans of reclamation, of transformation, so as to activate local resources and improve and stabilize the agricultural situation.

One of the great tasks which we shall have to pursue in Africa, which has in total a quantity of water not less than the world average, is that of conservation of the water itself and this must be done in the form of aid programmes. It is said that someone who is hungry should not be given fish but a hook; however, if someone is dying it is useless to give even the hook.

President. — Question No 91, by Mr Balfe (H-701/84):

President

Subject: Human and civil rights within the Community

In his speech of 16 January 1985 Italy's Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr G. Andreotti, said, with regard to relations with countries outside the Community: 'Secondly, we shall continue our activities to promote human and civil rights'. In view of his concern as regards countries outside the Community, why do ministers continually refuse, either in Council or when meeting in political cooperation, to discuss human and civil rights within the Community?

Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council. — (IT) The Council recalls the joint declaration of the Council, the Commission and the Parliament of April 1977 on respect for fundamental rights, in which the institutions stress the decisive importance which they attach to respect for human rights, resulting in particular from the constitution of the Member States and from the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. In the exercise of their powers and in pursuit of the objectives of the European Communities the said institutions respect and will continue to respect human rights.

The Heads of Government of the Member States, meeting in the European Council of April 1978, confirmed their intention — Declaration of Copenhagen on the European identity — to guarantee respect for the legal, political and moral values to which they are attached and to safeguard the principles of representative democracy, of law, of social justice and of respect for human rights.

In the Community legal order the case-law of the Court of Justice offers effective legal protection to fundamental rights. The Court has several times stated that fundamental rights form an integral part of the general principles of law, the observance of which it guarantees, and that in providing for the protection of such rights it is required to conform to the constitutional traditions common to the Member States so that measures incompatible with the fundamental rights recognized by the constitutions of the said States are not permissible in the Community. The international instruments regarding the protection of human rights in which the Member States have co-operated or to which they have acceded may moreover provide information of which account must be taken in the sphere of Community law.

Mr Balfe (S). — Can I begin by thanking the Minister for that answer, which is far more comprehensive than any that has been given in this House for the last six years. Can I ask him whether he will consider in the Council whether it is not possible to bring forward some of the proposals of the Copenhagen Declaration to make a more realistic assessment of human rights

within the Community possible. We often find, for instance, that such subjects as the black population, women, not to mention the use of plastic bullets in Northern Ireland and the Prevention of Terrorism Act, which have been the subject of resolutions within this House, are not then admissible. And when we ask the Minister for comment on what is being done about this Parliament's resolutions with respect to human rights, we are told that nothing can be done because they have not been discussed. This makes it very difficult when, as the rapporteur on human rights in Turkey and having just come from a meeting with a delegation of Turkish parliamentarians, it is rightly pointed out to me that in Istanbul today there is a woman called Mrs Halil, deported from the United Kingdom, and that the Council is not apparently able or willing to discuss human rights within its own Community but does wish to discuss them in countries that are not part of the Community.

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) I think that an opportunity to monitor the situation and to correct any provisions in the legislation of the individual nations which do not appear appropriate — that opportunity may be given within the context of the events consequent upon the conference of Helsinki and Madrid, regard being had to the fact that an *ad hoc* meeting in Canada will be expressly devoted to human rights. In preparing ourselves for this meeting and in seeking to adopt the most balanced attitude possible amongst the Member States of the European Community we shall be able, I think, to deal seriously with this subject in accordance with the wishes of the Honourable Member Mr Balfe.

President. — We now turn to questions to the Foreign Ministers.

Question No 115, by Mr Chambeiron, for whom Mr Wurtz is deputizing (H-777/84):

Subject: Action by the Ten to re-establish human rights in Turkey

During Question Time on 13 February 1985, the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Forte, undertook to inform the Turkish Government of the critical view taken by the Ten of the grave situation with regard to human rights prevailing in Turkey.

Can the Ministers say what action has been taken on this undertaking by Mr Forte?

Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (IT) I can assure the Honourable Member of Parliament that in accordance with the declaration at the seat of the European Parliament on 13 February last the Ten are continuing to follow closely developments in the situation regarding human rights in Turkey. I myself have been in contact with the Foreign Minister, and at least two Community Foreign Minis-

Andreotti

ters have been to Turkey, where they have encountered a series of proposals and documents which show that this concern of the European Parliament is regarded with due respect and that there is a gradual programme, already well advanced, intended to abolish the emergency legislation over the whole of the country. Finally the emergency legislation has in fact been abolished in roughly two thirds of the country.

Mr Wurtz (COM). — (FR) May I, by way of supplementary question, ask the President how it is that when other countries are involved, the Commission's position on human rights is public, whereas here it manifestly is not, since we do not know what has been said. Secondly, might I know, other than the reports obtained by the Council, what are the precise measures taken, so that from one question time to the next we do not always get the same reply, but achieve concrete results?

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) The contacts which have been made inevitably develop gradually. They consist in the proposal on our part for an extremely precise start, that is the full return to normality as well as an objective recognition of the progress made in the right direction. In the spheres in which there is some delay, which meanwhile the Turkish authorities do not foresee as being of long duration, there are still special situations connected with terrorist activities due to very complex circumstances specific to this country which is not very easily managed or completely homogeneous in its structure. I can say that, whilst it is not possible to make a detailed report here, the fact that this contact continues in being, that there is a progressive contraction of the region subjected to emergency legislation and that at the same time there is recorded the statement that a return to normal legislation is envisaged within the year, all that indicates, I think, concrete results and thus constitutes an objective factor and not a mere general affirmation.

Mr Lomas (S). — I wonder if the Foreign Ministers would comment on the recent statement made by the United Kingdom's Foreign Secretary. He said that he thought the EEC aid programme to Turkey, which quite rightly was suspended because of the appalling repressive nature of that regime, should now be resumed. Do the Foreign Ministers have any comment to make and do they agree with that statement?

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) This argument has not been put before the Council in its corporate capacity and I therefore have no observations to make. I may say, in addition to what I said just now, that after the previous meeting in which this argument was discussed we ourselves recommended that the Turkish Members of Parliament should be permitted to make contact in the various capitals with their colleagues in the national parliaments. This was so as to permit them to

realize the concern which we all feel in this matter and to provide information not only through the intermediary of the governments or the Council of Ministers of the Community but also direct. Thus on the specific subject which has been mentioned there has not been any examination on the part of the Council and hence I could not give information with regard to it.

President. — Question No 116, by Mr Adamou (H-569/84):

Subject: Community abstention in UN vote

Can the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation state why they abstained from voting on resolutions adopted by the UN's First Political Committee at the end of November 1984 by 111 votes in favour on matters concerning peace and disarmament (banning of new weapons of mass destruction, the arms race at sea, international cooperation and disarmament, participation in a conference on disarmament and other related topics)?

Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (IT) The Ten decide their position regarding voting on motions for resolutions presented at the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization on the basis of an assessment not only of the objectives which these texts propose but also of the approach adopted and the means indicated for the attainment of such objectives. There is no doubt that in the First Political Committee of the General Assembly the Ten have constantly exerted themselves in favour of the adoption of constructive and realistic measures intended for the consolidation of peace and the promotion of agreements on disarmament which would be fair and verifiable. The abstention or the negative vote of the Ten on certain motions for resolutions indicates simply that the Ten did not think these texts balanced and capable of making a serious contribution to the realization of the objectives proposed. If the Honourable Member who has raised the question would like to glance at the outcome of the voting he will see that there is a considerable diversity, but he will also see that on the questions of principle there has never been any change from the correct positions on the part of the Ten.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) I thank Mr Andreotti, even though his answer did not satisfy me. The subjects of peace and disarmament are among the most important that affect contemporary international life. I would like above all to ask him whether his reservations are consistent with what was said a little while ago by Mr Craxi. Because it is obvious that in that case there is a difference of opinion and I think the President-in-Office could answer me whether such reservations are justified in connection with matters of this kind?

Mr Andreotti. — (*IT*) I should like to confirm the distinction which exists between the objectives of a resolution and the text of the document itself. Sometimes indeed there may be a question of abstentions; contrary votes are absolutely rare and individual. Moreover, as is well known, on certain subjects individual positions are not always the same or convergent.

However, in the case of problems of principle I do not infer from the list of votes, which I have examined with attention, any divergences of attitude on the part of our countries of the Community. As regards the text on the other hand, we have to appraise it, taking account of the fact that every year in the United Nations votes are taken on some sixty texts on disarmament, some of which are constructed in such a way that they cannot be accepted: not because there is any objection to the principles of disarmament or to the positive principles in all these matters but because we do not think we can approve the text.

And this is the significance of the abstentions, that they are not intended to indicate opposition to the objectives, but simply that there is no agreement as concern the drafting of the document put to the vote.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (*NL*) Could the Ministers state whether they also took account of the positions of the peace movements that are able to mobilize the masses and, according to opinion polls, have the support of 70% of the population of my country Belgium?

Mr Andreotti. — (*IT*) What is really under discussion here is voting attitudes as regards UNO documents.

I have already said that faced with this huge number of documents which exceed eighty a year and more than 60% of which are approved unanimously, there is no question of any difference.

If the Honourable Member is now asking what is the general attitude towards the pacifists I must say first of all that under this generic and composite term there is an enormous variety of positions; intellectual, cultural, organizational, political and para-political. I do not feel able therefore within a brief period for questions to express a comprehensive view, which is extremely difficult to formulate.

Certainly all those who love peace, who organize themselves for it and seek to achieve for this cause a greater consensus cannot merit anything other than all our respect, all the more so in cases in which they act by peaceful means, since sometimes the opposite occurs. But it is a subject which I think perhaps it would be better to examine in its own right rather than as incidentally as this.

Mrs Hammerich (ARC). — (*DA*) I should like to ask the President-in-Office of the Council whether it is

not the case that each individual foreign minister who attends the UN General Assembly retains his independence and sovereignty in full. If a foreign minister or any delegates from a particular country at the UN General Assembly, for example, wish to support an arms reduction proposal, there is no excuse for them to say that other Community countries do not wish to support that arms reductions proposal. Does not every individual country enjoy full sovereignty in the UN? Surely it is not the case that countries put pressure on one another in the UN to adopt a uniform line? It is quite possible to support an arms reduction proposal if one agrees with it. There is therefore no excuse for Denmark not to support an arms reduction proposal because, for example, other Community countries do not support it. I should like to have an answer to this question. Do the representatives of a country at the UN General Assembly enjoy independence as a national delegation?

Mr Andreotti. — (*IT*) I can reply very simply by saying: not only has each State the sovereign power to decide how to vote at UNO, but this power is very widely used.

President. — Question No 117, by Mr Ephremidis (H-659/84):

Subject: Visit of the President of Israel to the European Parliament

Do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation agree that ceremonial occasions such as the visit and address by the President of Israel to the European Parliament during the part-session in February 1985 have no dissuasive effect on the aggressive and expansionist policy of Israel, which is continuing its military occupation of Arab territories, but instead consolidate and recompense the Israeli position and put obstacles in the way of international endeavours to find a just and peaceful solution to the Middle East conflict?

Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (*IT*) The Council, like its Presidency, feels that it should not comment on this subject, since the European Parliament, when it thinks it right to send an invitation and receive a guest, is exercising a power of its own which we must absolutely respect. Hence I think it would be wrong on my part to comment on a decision taken in due form by this Parliament.

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — (*GR*) I am compelled to put a supplementary question because in no way was the sense of my question that Council should intervene in Parliament's competences. It has its own competences, which it exercises on its own responsibility. The sense of my question is whether the Foreign Ministers meeting within the scope of Political Cooperation

Ephremidis

have discussed this case and reached the conclusion that the festive demonstration in question helped to foster a peaceful solution to the Middle-Eastern problem, or whether they concluded that the unilateral invitation to Israel and the failure to invite the other side, the Palestinians, who are presently sustaining yet another attack by Israel, is likely to hinder their own effort to achieve a peaceful solution to the Middle-Eastern problem. Thus, my question relates chiefly to the responsibilities of the Foreign Ministers meeting within the scope of Political Cooperation, and not the responsibilities of Parliament.

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) I am not contradicting myself if I say that the European Parliament invites those whom it thinks it ought to invite and receives those whom it thinks it ought to receive. However, if I am being asked whether we think it correct, in the political effort of seeking the solution to Middle East problems by way of negotiations and not by military means, to make efforts to have contacts with all the parties, my answer is a clear 'yes'.

We must seek to have relations with all the States in the area because amongst other things one of the reasons for which certain initiatives have come to grief was precisely that it was thought better on one side or the other to stay away. Even within the Arab world itself it has been thought possible to have differentiated positions and not to encourage a uniform attitude. I may say that we have always moved in that direction and for example we think that the fact that at the present time an Israeli minister is visiting Cairo is a positive factor.

Naturally all this must not be seen from a biased point of view but must represent so many pages of a discussion of a general nature which in the end all these countries must hold.

President. — Question No 118, by Mrs Hammerich (H-731/84):

Subject: Secretariat in Copenhagen

What are the chances of setting up a permanent secretariat in the near future, possibly with its seat in Copenhagen?

Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (IT) The question of the setting up of a permanent secretariat has not been the subject of discussion within the framework of European political co-operation.

The possibility of a secretariat of that nature is mentioned in the report of the Dooge Committee and will be examined by the Presidency during its term of office.

Mrs Hammerich (ARC). — (DA) When I ask about the secretariat in Copenhagen it is not by any means because I am keen to have such a secretariat in Copenhagen, but because it has been suggested in Denmark in connection with the union process and the Dooge report that, if a permanent secretariat were located in Copenhagen, it would have the symbolic significance of opening up EPC so that countries other than the Member States of the Community, such as Norway, Sweden and Finland, could participate. I should like to ask the following: has an opening up of EPC so that other European countries can participate been discussed by the foreign ministers meeting in EPC?

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) In this House I have to report the opinion of the Council of Ministers and I repeat that the Council of Ministers has not considered this problem. I note that it is being brought forward now so as to create a psychological climate in which progress may be made. We shall have to take up other ideas of this kind if they will serve to remove any more or less serious difficulties on the road to the Union.

Mr Møller (ED). — (DA) I should like to ask the President-in-Office of the Council whether he thinks that it should indeed be in Copenhagen, and whether precisely the views of Mrs Hammerich and her comrades show that it is necessary and imperative to have such a secretariat in Copenhagen, so that perhaps Denmark could learn a little more about what is taking place in the European Community?

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) I think that before deciding where a new-type secretariat ought possibly to go, we should see whether it will be decided to have a new-type secretariat. I understand well from your point of view the political interest, which is considerable. However, the question is absolutely out of place at the moment.

President. — Question No 119, by Mr Tzounis (H-806/84):

Subject: United Nations report on Afghanistan

A recent report on the situation in Afghanistan drawn up by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights contains harrowing details about how the people of this country are being treated by the foreign occupation forces and their local collaborators. Among the serious allegations made in the report, reference is made to the deliberate policy of massacre.

Do the Foreign Ministers agree that this report places them under an obligation to take all necessary measures to condemn the alleged acts and provide all possible aid to the heroic people of Afghanistan?

Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (IT) The Ten are following with considerable concern the progress of the situation in Afghanistan which is continuing to display serious violations of human rights and increasing sufferings on the part of the population which seeks nothing other than freely to decide its own future.

The most recent evidence of such concern is the approval of Resolution 3913 at the 39th General Assembly of UNO and the speech made in plenary session on the same occasion by the President-in-Office of the Ten. Additional evidence is to be found also in the declaration of the Ten of 27 December last on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, a declaration which in particular condemns the continued violations of human rights in connection with the intensification of the Soviet operations in the country as well as the presentation of and support for the relevant resolution adopted at Genova on the occasion of the 41st session of the United Nations Commission of Human Rights.

Consistently with that line the Ten intend to continue to stress their concern in the appropriate international fora and in their bilateral contacts, emphasizing the very strong expectations of the governments and of democratic public opinion in the various countries of the Community for a speedy political solution of the Afghan crisis based on the successive resolutions of the United Nations.

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES

Vice-President

Mr Tzounis (PPE). — (GR) I would like to thank the Chairman of the Council of Foreign Ministers meeting within the scope of Political Cooperation for the answer he kindly gave me.

I would also like to ask him whether in his opinion the efforts made by the Ten on behalf of the people of Afghanistan and to solve the problem in that country are sufficient, and whether they are considering the possibility, apart from their efforts up to now, of undertaking some more general diplomatic and political initiative to find a solution to the problem. Also, whether they are considering sending a fact-finding committee to Afghanistan to gather information about the true situation, and finally, whether they are thinking of sending humanitarian aid to the people of Afghanistan, who are suffering acts of war under the Soviets, perhaps in the form of medical aid in view of our recent information that chemical warfare is being practised.

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) The only thing we can do, hoping that it will have some effect, is to give ever stron-

ger support to the actions of the United Nations and of the Secretariat General. As far as aid is concerned, both the Community and individual countries have given aid for the Afghan refugees who are in the concentration camps. Let us not be asked to send aid to Afghanistan which, amongst other things, I think would be extremely difficult to distribute.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) I would like to put a very brief supplementary question to the President, relating to what Mr Tzounis said, because it was not specifically answered.

Have the Foreign Ministers meeting within the scope of Political Cooperation received accusations or figures indicating that chemical warfare has been waged in Afghanistan by the Soviets? Because in failing to answer the allegation Mr Andreotti could be interpreted as agreeing to some extent with the allegation made by Mr Tzounis.

Mr Andreotti. — (IT) I know of no documentation of the type to which reference has now been made and I understand that none is in the possession of the Council.

President. — Question Time is closed.¹

8. Votes

Report (Doc. A 2-2/85) by Mrs Banotti, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 710 final - Doc. 2-1377/84) for a draft recommendation on social security for volunteer development workers.

After the vote on the draft recommendation

Mrs Banotti (PPE), rapporteur. — I should now like to ask the Commissioner, under Rule 36, whether he accepts the amendments as adopted by Parliament so far.

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — I have been asked by Commissioner Sutherland to say that the Commission agrees with each of the amendments save Amendment No 8, where the Commissioner said in debate this morning, 'the Commission considers that it is not legally possible to propose a directive in this field as the activities of the volunteer workers take place outside the territory of the Community.'

¹ See Annex of 17. 4. 1985.

Mrs Banotti (PPE), rapporteur. — In that case, Madam President, I recommend that we proceed now with the vote.

Explanations of vote

Mr Kuipers (ARC), in writing. — (NL) I shall vote for the Banotti report because it is in essence a good report. I should like to emphasize the two most important aspects once again.

Firstly, today's development worker is someone with experience. He is not someone who has just graduated but someone who can tackle an assignment, which is no more than logical: in the developing countries many people have just left school but they do not have any experience, and they therefore need expert guidance.

Secondly, and this follows on from what I have just said, volunteers are in a different social position. They can no longer offer their services free of charge. As workers, they have a right to a wage, and the development country should not have to pay this wage: it should be provided before the volunteer leaves his own country. This presupposes, in the Community context, the harmonization of the social security systems and also the explicit undertaking that volunteers will receive a minimum wage and benefit from social provisions. A volunteer who leaves his own country without a wage being fixed will usually be a burden on the Third World country or a local community, and this will hamper its development.

It is to be hoped that this report will also put an end to the wretched idea put forward by Mitterrand and Kohl at the Fontainebleau Summit that inexperienced young people trained by the military should be sent out to Third World countries. This idea makes a mockery of presentday thinking on development work.

To conclude, the idea of a European volunteer corps is meaningful against the background of the European idea, but clearly only if the requirements I have just mentioned are satisfied: experience and a wage plus social security.

Mrs Péry (S), in writing. — (FR) I shall vote in favour of this report, because I wholeheartedly support any progress made on social security for volunteer development workers.

I would, however, like to reply to a number of reservations, expressed either in the report or in the speeches of some colleagues regarding the proposals made to the European Council at Fontainebleau concerning the sending of volunteers to the developing countries.

Several criticisms have been made. The terms militarization and bureaucratization have been pronounced; the export of our unemployment and the non-training of volunteer workers have been denounced.

There is nothing to justify such claims. The Franco-German project was evolved in full cooperation with non-governmental organizations. It is a pooling of the efforts and resources of public authorities and the NGOs. Provision is made for the training of young people, and the NGOs are certainly associated with this action because the technical, linguistic and human resources involved are indispensable.

Let us not become divided by quibbles which do nothing to further the interests of Third World countries. Young Europeans have become sensitive to the difficulties of the developing countries. Those countries need the skills and the spirit of solidarity of our young people.

That is why it is our duty to seek to abolish the obstacles to the work of voluntary development workers, to support the proposals made during the European Council at Fontainebleau and finally, by means of our motion, to support the Commission draft relating to social security for voluntary development workers.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-17/85) by Mr Croux, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, on the European Parliament's position on the deliberations of the European Council on the European Union.

After the vote on all the amendments

Mr Megahy (S). — Madam President, I rise on a point of order with regard to the wording of this motion for a resolution which you are now going to put to the vote. The sixth indent of the preamble says: 'Having regard to the interim report by Mr Seeler'. Now it is a fact that we have not yet voted on the interim report by Mr Seeler. We are about to vote on it, and I want to ask whether it is permissible under the Rules of Procedure to include in the resolution a reference to a resolution that has not yet been adopted by this Parliament.

I seek your guidance on this, Madam President.

President. — Thank you for raising that, Mr Megahy. That situation has arisen before. I should, of course,

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1 to 16, 23 to 25.
— AGAINST Amendment No 20.

President

inform the House that if the Seeler report is adopted, that indent will remain. If, however, the Seeler report is not adopted, that indent will be deleted. I hope that that is satisfactory.

Before we begin the explanations of vote, could I please ask Members to be silent and if they wish to converse to go outside. It is extremely difficult for somebody to make an explanation of vote with a lot of noise going on, and explanations of vote are just as important as any other part of any debate.

Explanations of vote

Mr Clinton (PPE). — This report represents an important milestone on the road to genuine European Union. It also indicates the careful preparation that has been made on this occasion to ensure the success of the initiative undertaken by this Parliament some years ago and culminating in the draft treaty. Things have reached a point now where there must be no looking back. Hopes and expectations are rising as never before, and no Member State can afford to be identified as the one putting on the brakes. The time has come when the Members of this Parliament, elected by the people of the European Community, must tell the Heads of State and the Council of Ministers bluntly that they have had enough.

For the past 10 years we have had virtual stagnation. We have seen unemployment grow to its present level of more than 13 million people while Heads of State and Council Ministers have spent a large proportion of their time squabbling about things that could fairly be described as trivialities, about sums of money that were infinitesimal by comparison to the amounts lost through failure to reach agreement on the action needed to overcome the fundamental problems of the Community. They undertook the work of technicians about such things as products and prices instead of concentrating on the work of statesmen. Let us hope that we have seen the end of this and that a new beginning is now under way.

Let us hope also that the pronouncements and decisions made in Stuttgart on the urgent need for European Union are not forgotten and that the same urgency will be shown by the Heads of State in June in arranging for an intergovernmental conference. Every expert, every institution, every politician who stands up to speak about the ills of the European Community, about its weaknesses and paralysis, agrees that this arises mainly from the fact that we are not working as a unit, that we are not combining our forces to jointly overcome the problems.

We can take some pride, perhaps, in the fact that this Parliament or some Members of this Parliament have taken the main initiative in this great effort. Of course, there have been pioneers, completely committed peo-

ple, around for years who have been crying in the wilderness. This time the people who have the responsibility have got to listen.

Speaking on behalf of the Irish members of this group as well as the group, may I say that we joined the European Community as full members and that our first priority is still to remain full members. That is what 83% of our people voted for in a referendum. We feel that our special position on defence is well known, generally understood and accepted. If the majority of our partners in this Community want to remove what is known as the veto, except in very well known and acceptable circumstances, it would be quite wrong for us to stand out against this.

I have to admit that I have been a very strong supporter of the existence of the veto as a means of slowing down the stronger powers sufficiently to take a good look at the special difficulties of their weaker member partners. But I have seen much abuse of this safeguard in recent years. Now, with the further enlargement in the offing, progress in the future would become quite impossible if it is allowed to remain except on the most restricted and definable conditions.

May I say by way of conclusion that we should all have the greatest appreciation for the work of the *ad hoc* committee chaired by Senator Dooge and for the fact that it was able to reach a large measure of consensus on the difficult task assigned to it by the Heads of State. May I, on behalf of this group, appeal to the Member States that may still be hesitating to throw their full weight behind this great crusade we have now embarked on. Let us look on this as a rising tide that is going to lift all ships, and let us never forget that if this ship goes down we all go down with it!

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Mr Herman (PPE). — (FR) As I did not have the opportunity to speak in the debate this morning, I should like to thank the numerous colleagues on all benches who so kindly acknowledged the few additional points with which the Spaak 2 Committee, chaired by Mr Dooge, extended the ideas contained in the draft treaty voted by the European Parliament. I am thinking particularly of the decision-making of the Council of Ministers and of the problems of security.

To pick up the metaphor which was used by Altiero Spinelli and inspired by Hemingway, let me say that the big fish which the European Parliament hooked was not too roughly dealt with by the numerous sharks which infest national waters when it crossed the reefs of the Spaak 2 Committee.

On the other hand, what does disturb me is that, in order to get through the difficult pass which separates us from the Milan Summit, the Italian Presidency, like

Herman

Hemingway's old fisherman, will be on its own when it comes to getting the intergovernmental conference to accept a mandate which is precise and binding. Not that one could doubt its talent and commitment; it has recently given magnificent proof of that at Brussels in the matter of the enlargement. But the waters it will have to get through are very dangerous. And in the absence of a more abundant escort, the Commission should at least act the role of coastguard.

Furthermore, might I insist on the fundamental requirement that once the intergovernmental conference has been convened, the chairmanship should not be subject to the system of six-monthly changeover for obvious reasons of efficiency and urgency.

Mr Plaskovitis (S). — (GR) Madam President, the PASOK Socialists have in principle expressed their support for European Union. However, that does not mean that European Union can be regarded merely as a procedure of modifying the treaties and setting up new political institutions, with no provision for, or progress in the effort towards economic convergence between North and South, nor any solutions for the vital social problems that create great differences in the quality of life in different regions of the Community. In the past we have repeatedly expressed our views and reservations on the matter. We see that our reservations have also been echoed by the Greek Prime-Minister's representative at the special Committee on institutional affairs.

The Committee in question seems to have grasped that it is not easy to create a European Union of any real substance from one day to the next without previously giving the Governments and national parliaments every opportunity to examine most carefully the new obligations to which they will be committed and the undertakings they will be asked to give in relation to their vital national interests and the special conditions prevailing in each Member State.

However, the Croux report and resolution goes too far and repeats some of the serious mistakes that also featured in the Spinelli plan in our opinion. For this reason we declare that we will not accept the Croux proposed resolution, and will therefore abstain from voting to show that whereas we accept European Union in principle, we cannot accept the conditions under which its implementation is being rushed through.

Mr Prag (ED). — I shall vote for this report, first because it was this Parliament's draft treaty which provided the impetus for all the present moves towards closer union. Secondly, because in its amended form I find the Croux report a good report which carries our work a stage further. Thirdly, because I believe that Europe's voice in the world is weak and should be stronger. Fourthly, because I believe that this Com-

munity of ours must work better. Fifthly, because I believe that world peace depends on a strong united Western Europe able to formulate policies and take decisions. Sixthly, because I believe that such a union as we envisage is essential to strengthen democracy in our own Member States and elsewhere in the world.

Finally, because I believe that we have, in 1985, a unique opportunity to take a major step towards building an effective democratic union of peoples able to defend our interests in the world. We must not miss this opportunity.

(Applause)

Mrs Tove Nielsen (L). — (DA) Let me begin by saying that it is of great importance that we really build a united Europe. It is the only position which is right for us in Western Europe with the background we have. It is absolutely necessary for us to bring about a real popular understanding of this valuable cooperation in a united Europe. I deeply deplore the situation one of our Member States, Denmark, is now moving into. I am really afraid that Denmark has not faced up to the facts. Developments will not proceed from Denmark, and only a changed majority in the Folketing which appreciates the value of a united Europe can bring Denmark back to the path of responsibility. I genuinely hope that those in positions of responsibility back home in Denmark will understand that so that we can take our place among the first-class Member States; we do not want second-class Member States. Because we want to join in creating a united Europe with the support of our voters at home in Denmark, Madam President, you must understand that I have to abstain in the vote. I do not seek to deny any of this, but we have a positive will, and when I say 'we' I mean the three Danish conservatives, Mr Møller, Mr Toksvig and Mrs Oppenheim, as well.

Mr Christensen (ARC). — (DA) The central issue is whether the European Union is to include all the Community countries or whether one or more of them is free to remain outside. The Danish People's Movement against Membership of the European Community deplores the harsh treatment given by the Croux report in its final form to that country or those countries which are sceptical with regard to union, including my country. I readily understand that it is fully in line with the thinking of Mrs Tove Nielsen and Mr Toksvig. But it goes against their own government, which is apparently irresponsible in matters European.

We vote against Mr Seeler's report, which is to be put to the vote later, partly because of its unseemly criticism of the Danish market committee. It was an essential precondition for Danish membership of the European Community that the Folketing should retain parliamentary control over matters delegated to through the government to its representatives on the Council

Christensen

of Ministers of the Community. To transfer this control to the European Parliament would mean delegating new powers to the European Community and would therefore require a new referendum.

We vote against Mr Croux's report with its fervent recommendation of Parliament's draft treaty. The Danish conservatives have tabled amendments which in reality support the report. We have to reject them. The proposals are in conflict with the Dooge report, on which the Danish government has reservations, and they are in conflict with the resolution of the Folketing which requires that the distribution of powers between the Council of Ministers, the Commission and Parliament should remain unchanged and which rejects any encroachment on the right of veto.

I will conclude by repeating that we vote against the two reports because they are an attack on Denmark's official policy. We shall defend our country's interests by opposing the motion.

Mr P. Beazley (ED). — I wish to explain my reason for voting for the Croux report although I found it difficult to vote for the original paragraph 6 and Amendment No 35. I considered that paragraph 6 and Amendment No 35 attempted to keep the door open for those Member States which, whilst desiring the closer unity of the European Community, found it difficult to accept all the proposals contained in the draft treaty. I fear, however, that they open the door to a two-speed Europe. I consider that such a Europe would be unworkable. It would diminish the authority of those Member States accepting union and so reduce the strength of the Community to the remaining nations that they might as well withdraw from the Community altogether.

The crucial question is that of sovereignty combined with the right of veto. I believe that no nation could under any circumstances accept a decision that militated against its declared vital national interests. Nor do I believe that any nation would call for that. The solution is to be found along the lines of the Genscher/Colombo proposals with the addition of the Commission submitting its view.

Finally, I am most anxious that Britain should be able to be a first-class member of a first-class European Community with no second and third-class memberships.

Mr Cryer (S). — I shall be voting against this report because of its implicit endorsement of the Dooge report. The Dooge report contains a number of nonsensical and dangerous ideas such as the development of the EMS, the abolition of a large number of State aids, which is expressed and endorsed in a footnote from the Danish minister, and the reliance on competition. If the state aids go in many countries, then that

means more people on the dole. The dependence on competition means that it is every person for himself and the devil take the hindmost, the hindmost being also those on the dole. I would oppose it for that.

I would oppose it as well, incidentally, for the usual hypocrisy which prevails in this Chamber about State aids. There is nothing about the wall-to-wall subsidy which wealthy farmers receive from the common market, because that is not deemed to be incompatible with a competitive system. I would oppose it because of the increase in the power of the Commission and, most of all, I will oppose it because of the erosion of the veto mentioned specifically and endorsed by Malcolm Rifkind in a footnote. This has not been approved by the House of Commons, and Tory ministers are trying by means of a footnote to get rid of a veto which was endorsed clearly in the 1975 referendum.

(Protests from the right)

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, European Union will lead to a Europe that will neither be united, nor democratic.

It will not be united because European Union itself is based on the perpetuation of Europe's division into East and West, since we even see in the Dooge Committee's text how closely this European Union is linked with NATO; we see the pressures exerted on Ireland, and those imposed on Spain for her accession to the European Community.

And it will not be democratic because, as we see, this advance towards European Union is based on the destruction of popular sovereignty, on the abolition of the veto which was a way in which, in theory at least, the Member States could defend their rights; it is based on what has been admitted by Mr Seeler, namely on the transfer of parliamentary control from national to international bodies.

From this standpoint, we can say without exaggeration that for us Greek this European Union constitutes a major national issue, a patent threat to our popular sovereignty, and we view with great concern the participation of the Greek Government on the Dooge Committee, and in particular its participation in efforts towards military integration substantial reservations.

The Members of the Greek Communist Party will therefore vote against the Croux report.

Mrs Piermont (ARC). — (DE) We have before us for our consideration two motions for resolutions which have two different points of departure, namely, the discussions in the national parliaments and the discussions in the European Parliament, and which deliver opinions on the work in hand towards the achievement of a European Union.

Piermont

Anyone that regards a European Union as desirable will logically agree with the demand that the process be speeded up. However, anyone that cannot accept the picture of Europe that emerges from the European Parliament's draft Treaty, a picture that is in many respects made clearer and brought into sharper focus by the Dooge report, will have to reject both reports.

Much has been talked about the common values of our civilization, but this is really only a smokescreen behind which we are really trying to create a third superpower in Europe, which is intent on stepping up the common armaments research, development and production that will provide it with the military resources required by a superpower and on laying the high technology foundations that will make it an industrial giant. And it intends to do all this with the help of majority voting — at the expense of the smaller and weaker Member States!

It is no wonder that the Federal Republic of Germany and France, whose industries — everything from the nuclear industry to the chemical and armaments industries — can look forward to the greatest advantages from all this, are in every respect the driving forces behind this venture, which is, however, going in the wrong direction.

Since I believe that the direction we are taking is a completely wrong one anyway, I cannot vote in favour of a report which would, in addition, step up the speed at which we are getting there.

Mr Sutra de Germa (S). — (FR) The majority of my group is going to vote for Mr Croux's report, but, however large it may be, the majority will be far lower than that which voted last week at Madrid during the Congress of the Union of Socialist Parties of the European Community, of which the Spanish and Portuguese Socialist Parties have been members since we set up the Union. Spain, led by Felipe Gonzales, and Portugal, led by Mario Soares, voted with great determination not just for entry into Europe but to be members of it, fully and totally and to advance it actively and willingly. Thus it is not only Europe that will be strengthened, it is the European movement in Europe that will be strengthened and the European movement in my group and in the Union of Socialist Parties which will be strengthened, and I am delighted.

The old triptych which my party adopted at our Convention in 1973 (enlarge, finance, deepen) had these three themes which are being applied in this year of 1985. The task is not ended, but let those who detest Europe, those who do not want it, those who want to destroy it, let them despair, because it has decided to advance and it will continue to advance.

(Applause)

Mr Staes (ARC). — (NL) I always try to keep my statements to the bare minimum.

This is a question of procedure, but this procedure is nonetheless linked to the vision of a future European Community, and I must therefore refer to the final report of the Dooge Committee, which totally confuses procedural, technical and political aspects. I really believe that a joint European approach is needed because of the magnitude of the present problems, which obviously cannot be solved at national level. But the view reflected in the final Dooge report is, in my opinion, in total conflict in too many respects with what a genuine attempt to solve these problems, which in the final analysis affect the whole world, should entail. An example of this might be the section on peace and security. Other essential aspects are not even covered by this report: decentralization to give a Europe of the regions, policy towards the Third World, unemployment and so on.

I really wonder what is left of the spirit that originally underlay the initiative taken by Mr Spinelli and was taken up by this Parliament not so very long ago. I shall therefore vote against Mr Croux's motion for a resolution, because it simply reflects the contents of the final report of the Dooge Committee.

Lord Bethell (ED). — I shall vote for this report because I believe that our Community is threatened most of all by the paralysis and atrophy of the last 10 years of the European Community's existence. This is the greatest danger that faces all of our 10 countries, and the conflicts have involved sums of money that are very small in terms of national budgets and quarrels that are well capable of solution.

Meanwhile, the voice of Europe has been weak in negotiations with the superpowers, whether concerning the strength of the dollar, interest rates or the strategic defence initiative. Only with European Union, I believe, will we be able to establish relations with the other superpower, the Soviet Union, over trade, communication, human rights and good neighbourliness.

I believe, in short, that the time has come no longer to tremble on the brink, afraid of venturing too deep into European waters, but to pluck up our courage and to have a little faith and to give the ten governments which have committed themselves to European Union, our full-hearted support.

(Applause)

Mr Verbeek (ARC). — (NL) The European Union already has all the features of a myth. A myth is something which you no longer need to justify: all you really need do is discuss it and believe in it. The myth is the trauma of elephantiasis: all that matters is size, and that now means one large European nation. I am afraid of what this signifies, and I am afraid that it cannot be prevented with a democratic façade. The man in the street now knows nothing about all this.

Verbeek

There is no debate, it is not the main issue at elections, and a referendum is not to be held. And the small countries must either join in or play second fiddle. I am afraid of this haste, and I am afraid of these myths, and I shall therefore vote against.

Mr C. Beazley (ED), in writing. — My reason for supporting the Croux report is that, at this initial stage of the development of the EC, it is clear that institutional reform is essential if the much needed fresh impetus to European political cooperation is to be given. In my own country there have been great expectations about the benefits of Community membership and, all too frequently, these have been disappointed by the apparently constant flow of adverse news highlighting the failures of the EC. The genuine reasons for the institutional weakness of the Community are often concealed or ignored. The Croux report is a clear indication to the Council that it would be quite unacceptable for the EC to be allowed to stagnate, to falter or to disappoint the much hoped for progress in the political and economic integration of Europe.

I am totally opposed to the notion of a 'two-speed' Europe; the present Member States must go forward together and permit the two newest members-to-be, Spain and Portugal, to come with them. For this reason I have some reservation about paragraph 6 of the report and trust that no Member State will be excluded from the jointly agreed next stage in the development of the European Institutions.

Britain realizes the heavy price she paid by failing to become a founder member of the EC, and her people could not, in my view, understand it if she were to be 'shut out in the cold' again. I therefore look forward to the successful outcome of the Milan Summit and confidently expect that the UK Government will play a prominent part with the other European Governments in reaching an outcome, which will be welcomed in Britain, as in the rest of the Community, as the most important development since 1973 when the United Kingdom, Denmark and the Republic of Ireland joined the six founder members of the European Community.

Mr Columbu (ARC), in writing. — (IT) Let me state first of all that I shall vote in favour of the Croux and Seeler reports, as moreover I have already done within the Committee on Institutional Affairs. But I think it is my duty to state that I am not fully satisfied with the reports or with the proposal for European Union. My position, which is apparently contradictory, is due to the fact that I was elected on the principle of an ardently federalist and regionalist programme which aspires to a closer union between the peoples of Europe. As a result of political realism however, I am convinced that the Treaty of Union, as it is set out in the draft, is a necessary, inevitable and urgent step so

that Europe may not take a dangerous leap backwards in its history. I shall therefore cast a favourable vote but without giving up my hope and the prospects of a more democratic European Union.

Mr Estgen (PPE), in writing. — (FR) It is with conviction that I shall vote for the resolutions concerning the draft treaty establishing the European Union.

I do this as a representative of the smallest country of the Community, a country which does not need to demonstrate its historic European vocation, or its choice of the 'Europe of the possible', but a country, too, where the fears of Europeans and the critical points in our draft European union, a draft which is coherent but ambitious, are concentrated in the crystalline state as though in a crucible.

The message from political circles and from public opinion in the Grand-Duchy, which I can pass on here is, firstly a message of hope: our congratulations to the European Parliament on taking the lead and mapping out the route away from the impasse of non-Europe, from the indecision in which we find ourselves at present, in order to confront the great economic, monetary, social and ecological problems with which we are faced and which extend beyond frontiers and national capabilities.

Then there is a feeling of confidence in this Parliament, the only Community Institution which is legitimately and democratically called upon to act on behalf of the peoples of Europe. Everyone in the Grand-Duchy, all the main political parties, all the economic and social circles are prepared to grant this Parliament more powers, and because of the steps which we have taken through the institutional delegation, it is understood that it is not so much to the detriment of the national parliaments that there will be this extension of the powers of the European Parliament, but in areas which, in any case, are already outside the control of the national parliaments and which, as things stand at present, are left for the Council to decide without any democratic scrutiny.

It is therefore absolutely necessary that there be codecision making with the European Parliament in the legislative process.

One critical point which always recurs in national reactions is the concept of 'vital interest' and the future decision making process of the Community. There is perhaps so much dispute over this concept because it has been abused in the recent past. Especially for the smaller countries the concept of vital interest is a kind of ultimate barrier with which to protect themselves against the weight of the great powers.

Nevertheless I am personally convinced that Luxembourg is no different from the other founding partners of the Community and we now have once again to

Estgen

give clear evidence of our European feeling on this issue and to leave appraisal of the concept of vital interest to the committee which will have to submit it to the European Parliament, which, quite logically, is the place of privilege whenever there is question of evaluating national interests as against Community interests. It is my opinion that, as the Community spirit develops, members of Parliament from all countries and all parties in their desire for solidarity will take care to respect automatically the genuine legitimate interests of the Member States.

In conclusion there are two things I should like to stress: one, it is absolutely essential that there be an intergovernmental conference, this year, to negotiate the new treaty and it is essential that the EP be party to that work so that we be ready for a second reading with our draft treaty in view.

Two, since we so genuinely want to have our citizens' consent to our draft, we have to achieve close collaboration between the European Parliament and the national parliaments, because in the months to come the future of Europe will certainly figure in our respective national assemblies as much as in the hemicycles of the European Parliament, and I recommend all colleagues to work in their own countries towards the formation of 'committees of European affairs', mixed committees made up of members of the national parliament from all political parties and European members of parliament, to discuss the draft treaty and its implications. A committee of this kind is already operating in the Bundestag and one is in process of formation in Luxembourg.

That too will form part of the next stage towards European union.

Mr Evrigenis (PPE), in writing. — (GR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, colleagues, it would be no exaggeration to say that some thirty years after the Communities were founded, European Union is entering its second important phase. One year after the acceptance of the Draft Treaty on European Union, the scene has changed radically. The proposals being debated, the procedures set or about to be set in motion, the agreements achieved or broken off, generate the feeling that the second great institutional leap towards European Union is not only desirable but within reach.

In this House we cannot but note, with deep satisfaction and without false modesty, that the initiatives, imagination and spiritual toil of the European Parliament have started bearing fruit. Because, to be quite clear, the decision by the Governments finally to accept the institutional dialogue must be seen against the backdrop of our own presence, our own will and our own decisiveness in persuading and acting. It is perhaps the first time in its history that the European Parliament has held the fate of Europe in its hands to

such an extent. We must be aware of this fact. And it is our duty, in the face of the peoples we represent and their history, to continue the effort without slackening. To keep in constant operation and under continuous monitoring the mechanisms of institutional development that exist or are to be created. From this standpoint the texts by our colleagues Mr Croux and Mr Seeler are valuable for their comments, ideas and indications.

Conversion from intentions and drafts to realisations will not of course be easy. Our Parliament must continue to exert methodical influence on the developments that take place by maintaining a dynamic, but in parallel flexible stance. The great act of this Parliament, the Draft Treaty on European Union, must continue to be the source of inspiration and the lever of pressure. We are happy that this fundamental document has ceased being a mere subject for meetings and theoretical analysis, but is becoming, as I am sure is the case, the basis of intergovernmental negotiations.

However, let us be cautious, lest just when we are enlarging the European Community for the third time and discussing the strengthening of our institutions, we might in parallel be preparing a geographical and qualitative dismemberment of united Europe. I hope that now the forces of history are moving Europe towards new, more integrated and active forms of cooperation and unity, no country, no people, and much more so no government will take the responsibility of standing aloof from the new institutional achievements. At any rate we must move cautiously, certainly with a consistent will but also in a spirit of unity and solidarity. That is the spirit which should govern our actions and dictate the content and tone of our words during the institutional dialogue. Because if European Union is to exist, it can only be an act of unity and solidarity between the peoples of Europe.

In that spirit I shall vote in favour of the Croux report.

Mr Filinis (COM), in writing. — (GR) The interior Greek Communist Party has already expressed support for the aim of a United Europe, for the sake of peace and the independence of its countries, and to create the framework of a European Union belonging to its peoples and workers. That is why we shall vote in favour of the Croux and Seeler proposed resolutions, despite certain reservations.

It is a fact that despite its positive orientation the Spaak 2 Committee's report contains certain partialities that must be surmounted on the way to the prospective Intergovernmental Conference. Indeed, while one can unreservedly approve of measures that would bring very substantial democratisation, such as the transfer of certain authorities to Parliament from other bodies of the Community, in contrast there are other measures, for example complete economic unification with the aim of freeing the market, the extension of

Filinis

Parliament's role to matters of foreign policy and defence, and the drastic limitation of the principle of unanimity which are likely to have negative consequences unless accompanied by increased independence of Europe and convergence of the level of economic development and standard of living in the Community's Member States.

In this sense, it is for example unacceptable that in the report by the Dooge Committee article 73 of the Spinelli plan, which provided for 'a system of financial equilibration aiming to reduce the great economic inequalities between the regions' has been deleted. Similar and other drastic measures are essential if we are to arrest what the Commission acknowledges is a widening of the chasm between the richer and poorer countries in the Community.

Mr Gawronski (L), in writing. — (IT) Having heard the declarations of the speakers for the principal groups in our Parliament, one can easily foresee that the report of the Honourable Member Mr Croux will be approved by a large majority similar to that obtained by our draft of a Treaty for European Union in February last year.

This is certainly a positive factor since it is only if we are able to remain united in demanding institutional reform and the transformation of the Community into a political union that our initiative has genuine possibilities of success.

It was the measure of the political support for the new Treaty which compelled the governments to take us seriously and to set up the Dooge Committee and it is essential to maintain a substantial unity of purpose amongst the principal political forces if we wish the voice of Parliament to be heeded by the governments in this sensitive phase of negotiations preceding the Milan summit.

In this connexion I should like to emphasize our gratification at the position taken up by our British Conservative colleagues who, in approving the Croux report and the proposals of the Dooge Committee, are exerting strong pressure on Mrs Thatcher's government to encourage it to participate in the conference on European Union which is to be convened at Milan.

The attitude adopted by the Conservative group therefore allows us to look with greater optimism to the Milan summit and the crucial point of the affair seems to be emerging as that of the mandate which the heads of State and of government will entrust to the conference for European Union.

That is why it is necessary to demand with great insistence that the draft Treaty approved by the Parliament be included amongst the basic documents for the work of the conference, though it is clear that this is not a sacrosanct text and that we are ready to amend it if necessary according to more appropriate procedures.

We are all aware that today the political conditions necessary for taking a decisive step forward towards the political union of Europe within the year are satisfied and that the time at our disposal is limited: in 1986 and 1987 there will be political elections in France and in Germany and very little time will remain for the initiatives at European level.

It is only on the basis of the political proposals already worked out and primarily by our draft Treaty that the intergovernmental conference which is to be convened at Milan will be able to come to a rapid and successful conclusion, whereas a desire to start again from nothing would risk postponing everything to the Greek calends.

A second point on which it is necessary to insist firmly is the spirit of Article 82 of the draft Treaty, and that is the concept that it must be possible to realize the political union even in the absence of the unanimous assent of the Ten or rather of the Twelve, regard being had to the positive conclusions of the Brussels summit.

In this connexion I should like to express my support for the compromise amendment to paragraph 6 of the report, presented by Sir Fred Catherwood and Mr Altiero Spinelli, which has the merit of being diplomatic in its form and firm in its substance.

It is in the light of these considerations, Mr President, that I shall vote, together with the colleagues in my group in favour of the Croux report.

Mr Giavazzi (PPE), in writing. — (IT) The resolutions discussed today present a fresh and significant stage on the way to the completion of the process set in motion by the European Parliament for a more complete European union.

The first of these, the Croux resolution, invites us to attain the realization, by means of the convening of the intergovernmental conference, of the propositional phase of the new Treaty.

The need for the resolution is very clear in the sense that what is necessary is not only the holding of the conference but the issue of a flexible but not ambiguous mandate so that the interpretative points of the Parliament's draft should not be disregarded.

The Seeler resolution takes note of the fact that the national parliaments, political opinion, the world of labour and the individual States have become aware of the process of integration.

The Group of the European People's Party in its turn, without waiting for doubts to arise, has initiated and pursued every appropriate contact either with the parliamentary groups or with members of government who feel the same political inspiration, so that the

Giavazzi

decisive rôle which it has exercised within the European Parliament may be decisive also for the approval of the new Treaty on the part of national parliaments as well.

This represents a constant extension of the political line which the European People's Party has always pursued from the origins of the Community until today.

For these reasons it expresses its own favourable vote for both resolutions, trusting that the favourable moment today for taking the necessary preparatory steps for the summit of the European Council in Milan will be seized, so that it may be decisive for progress towards the European Union, which can no longer be put off to a future date.

Mr Christopher Jackson (ED), in writing. — I shall support the Croux report because I believe it is essential that Europe takes a major step forward.

Success in tackling unemployment and creating wealth will not be solely dependent on European Union, but such a Union will be a major stimulus to this. Equally Europe's security and influence require the cohesion that only union can bring.

The spirit and method of Parliament's draft Treaty is a working model for an intergovernmental conference, but a solution to various problems remains to be found. In particular, vital national interests must be respected through some mechanism which prevents frequent or trivial use of a veto and ensures that Community interest is also taken into account.

Mr Marshall (ED), in writing. — There is an air of complete unreality about the attitude of this House to the Croux report. What is proposed is completely out of touch with the realities of political life. The removal of the national is anathema to Member States, their governments, their parliaments and, most important, to their peoples.

The suggestion of a two-speed Europe is an insult to the deeply-held reservations of the Greek, Danish, Irish and British Governments. We cannot accept that these reservations be lightly cast aside by the whims of some idealists.

We do not need a new Treaty to rebuild the European Community. It does not need a new Treaty to remove artificial barriers to trade, to open up the insurance market to real competition, to create a genuine common market. It needs some genuine good will.

These proposals will not create that good will. They will generate suspicion and ill will. They will not increase enthusiasm for Europe. Instead they will give a new lease of life to opponents of the European

cause. That alone should provide cause for concern and caution.

Mr Newton Dunn (ED), in writing. — Mr President, through you, I wish to appeal for help to the members of the House of Commons:

We here in the European Parliament are discussing various possible amendments to the Treaty of Rome or a new Treaty for the European Community. This is also being debated in nine of the 10 national parliaments in the Community, the one exception being the House of Commons.

We MEPs are not asking to take away a single one of your national powers.

We are seeking something very different — of which you as democrats would thoroughly approve and with which you can help us.

We are seeking to ensure that all the EEC's decisions are properly and democratically controlled. Most EEC decisions — in fact nearly 95% of them — are not democratically controlled!

Nearly all EEC decisions are made by edict, either by the Commission bureaucrats in Brussels or by the small group of ministers who meet in secret in the Council of Ministers. The ministers' decisions cannot be altered by you, nor by any of the other nine national parliaments, nor by us MEPs. You at Westminster, because of pressure of other business, debate only a very small proportion of EEC documents. You cannot change any of them. You only debate 'to take note' of them and you have no power to change them.

You will reply that it would be ridiculous to expect national MPs in 10 different parliaments to control each and every EEC decision: that would be too slow and cumbersome. You might rightly suggest that the job of controlling EEC decisions is what the European Parliament is for, surely.

As MEPs we would agree with you: the situation ought to be that we could control EEC decisions.

But — and here is the nub — MEPs are only empowered by the old Treaty of Rome to give an *opinion* — except on the EEC's Budget — which is not binding on the decision-makers. That is how some 95% of EEC decisions are not properly and democratically controlled.

This alarming 'democratic gap' applies over a wide area of EEC activities: the common agricultural policy (hence the existence of the unwanted surpluses); foreign relations, e.g. Treaties such as the GATT and the CSCE; the customs union for setting external duties; competition policy for controlling national subsidies; transport, in setting quotas for lorry movements between member countries; and so on.

Newton Dunn

So, to my colleagues in the House of Commons I make this appeal: we are not seeking to take away a single one of your powers. All we are seeking is to be given the responsibility for proper control of EEC decisions through the directly-elected European Parliament. Please help us to reassert democratic control of the EEC by first debating and then supporting our proposals!

Mr Normanton (ED), in writing. — Twelve years ago I came into this Parliament. I had one political objective foremost in my mind — to influence the further development of Europe along the lines underlying Winston S. Churchill's historic call to the peoples of Europe in 1946.

The creation of the European Economic Community was the most significant event in our long recorded history, and important progress towards European unity has been achieved. But in recent years it has become manifestly clear that further progress is being inhibited by an inability on the part of the Community to reach common agreement on matters of mutual and pressing importance. The Stuttgart Declaration, signed by heads of all Community governments, confirmed their commitment to a new initiative. By voting for this report I am confirming my support for them.

Mr O'Donnell (PPE), in writing. — The achievement of European Union presents this Community with exciting possibilities of devising new policies and new strategies designed to tackle the major economic and social problems with which the Community is now confronted. There is an old Irish proverb, 'Ni neart go cur le cheile' — Unity is Strength.

There is no doubt that the Community of Twelve has enormous potential for economic expansion and social progress. The most serious problem facing this Community is the problem of regional disparities. This also represents the greatest failure of the Community since its establishment a quarter of a century ago. This Community can have no real meaning for the people who belong to it, as long as we allow a situation to continue where the rich regions continue to get richer while the poor get poorer. This problem will be exacerbated by the forthcoming enlargement. The gap between the richest and the poorest regions has continued to widen and will continue to do so unless realistic policies and appropriate strategies are formulated and implemented.

It is pointless talking about European Union and a new Treaty unless we are determined to bring about the vast transfer of resources from the richer to the poorer regions without which economic integration cannot take place.

A realistic and coherent European regional development policy backed by adequate funding is a *sine qua*

non for economic integration and European Union. The peripheries must be brought into the mainstream of Europe, otherwise we will have a Europe of haves and have-nots, a situation which would represent an insurmountable barrier to the achievement of European Union. We are now embarking on an exciting journey. If we work together, we can achieve our objectives.

Mr Prout (ED), in writing. — I will vote for the Croux report because I believe it vital that the member governments hold an intergovernmental conference to confront the institutional problems of enlargement. I would have preferred the House to have adopted Amendment No 21, because I believe that the draft Treaty is an incomplete and over-simplified response to the need to increase Parliament's powers and to the complexities of incorporating the existing Treaty obligations. Majority voting in areas in which vital national interests are not affected is a necessary step in a Community of 12. But it will not happen by changes in mechanisms. It will only happen if the states in the minority are now prepared voluntarily to enforce rules agreed by the majority.

Mr Ryan (PPE), in writing. — Twelve years ago when I first took my seat in this Parliament on the occasion of Ireland's entry into the EEC — (I am the only Irish survivor from those days — whatever that may signify) — I urged that Ireland's neutrality be respected. I did so not only because neutrality was Ireland's entitlement but because the Community's interest could best be served by having in its membership a State which was committed *not* to join any military alliance. I argued then and still believe that Switzerland, Sweden and Austria are qualified for EEC membership, and were they to apply, they could not be denied because of their neutrality.

With sincere thanks I want to put on record the fact that this Parliament has always respected Ireland's neutrality. Likewise in the Council of Ministers, of which I was a member for four and a half years, Irish neutrality has never been questioned. In no quarter has Ireland's position received more understanding and tolerance than in our own Christian Democratic Group — the European People's Party. Though Parliament has from time to time expressed views on defence issues, no pressure has been brought to bear upon us from Ireland to support those opinions. Indeed, our objections to debates on military matters have always been faithfully recorded.

Christian Democratic statements on security matters recognize Ireland's neutral position and emphasize that comments on defence issues affect only member States of the Christian Democratic Union which are also members of NATO (which, of course, Ireland is not). The 1979 report on arms procurement, the author of which was the Christian Democratic Group

Ryan

leader, Egon Klepsch, specifically said that special arrangements would have to be made to respect Ireland's neutral position.

The one occasion on which Irish neutrality was called into question is scarcely worth recalling, but it helps to demonstrate the disposition of other Member States to Irish neutrality. To their credit the Political Affairs Committee, with expedition and contempt, rejected a call from Mr John Taylor from Northern Ireland for a declaration that neutrality was incompatible with membership of the EEC.

I have used this opportunity to screw these irrefutable facts into the record in order to dispel some misconceptions in Ireland about the stability of Irish neutrality. As one who has been consistent in espousing the case for Irish neutrality, I am encouraged by many assurances from fellow-Europeans that they will ensure that Irish neutrality will be accommodated by them in any new treaties as Europe proceeds towards closer integration.

European Union involves questions of trust. Surely our collective experience to date in the European Economic Community gives us cause to trust one another. The enemy of us all is mistrust of one another. Let us face that enemy and together destroy it.

We Europeans are all the better off for having worked together at the limited extent permitted by the Treaty of Rome. I am convinced that there are better days ahead for Europeans, provided we work more closely together in implementing a much greater mandate to improve Europe's economic and job-creating performance. At one time I believed with others that a real economic and social union would have to be in place before there could be a move towards a political union. Lack of political will is the primary cause of European weakness. I am now therefore convinced that political union and economic and social union must go hand in hand.

If we continue to allow European progress to be obstructed by the use of the veto by any one of 12 Member States, Europe will strangle itself by an excess of selfish interests. Policy must be made by the majority, not by a minority of one which says 'no'. Some see the retention of the veto as a necessary safeguard for national interests, but it is well to remember that the right to use the veto is not exclusive to one Member State, it has to be available to the other 11 members. One's vital interests can be more threatened by the retention of the veto than by its abolition. For every time one Member State invokes the veto there are 11 other times when any other Member State can block the adoption of policies which could serve the vital interests of others.

Europe has greater wealth, technical skills and experience than any other region on earth and yet is lagging

behind America, Japan and South East Asia in spheres where Europe ought to be in the lead. Internal suspicions and divisions with roots in history are the reasons why Europe's repository of genius and ability is not being used to its full potential. It is a time for generosity and courage. Those with political responsibilities have a duty to give leadership to the people of Europe at this vital time. Massive support for a new Treaty in this Parliament would give Europe the injection of confidence that her people require to overcome the challenges of today and tomorrow.

Mr Van der Waal (NI), in writing. — (NL) According to many Members of this Parliament, Europe's future lies in the development of the Community into a political organization. This is also the tenor of Parliament's draft Treaty establishing the European Union. The Croux and Seeler reports follow this line closely.

We are not in favour of this. We feel that the Community of the present twelve Member States should be developed on the basis of the existing Treaties and the *acquis communautaire*. They provide sufficient means for achieving efficient working methods and — taking Article 235 of the EEC Treaty as a basis — for Europe's economic recovery, in line with the Commission's programme. The success of the ESPRIT programme shows that in principle this Treaty offers sufficient scope.

We should not seek power in a new structure or another Treaty but by strengthening the political will of the Member States to achieve the economic objectives set out in the Treaty. We also find, contrary to what many claim, that the citizens of Europe have been hardly involved in this institutional debate, and by no stretch of the imagination can it therefore be said that the European Parliament was given a mandate to draw up this draft Treaty.

Mr Welsh (ED), in writing. — I shall be voting for this report for precisely those reasons that Mr Cryer has adduced for voting against it.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Mr Poettering (PPE). — (DE) Madam President, I asked to speak this morning, but unfortunately the President-in-Office did not notice me at the time. Today a document was distributed, an official Parliament paper, subtitled 'European Parliament working

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 9, 23, 35 to 37.
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1, 4, 5, 8, 11 to 14, 17 to 22, 26 to 29, 32, 34.

Poettering

party on nuclear disarmament', signed by van der Lek, Boserup and Viehoff. That gave the impression that a European Parliament working group on nuclear disarmament existed. I am not aware of this. There is a sub-committee on security and disarmament, and I would ask the Bureau to ensure that in future documents are not distributed that make a claim to which the author is not entitled.

(Applause from the centre and right)

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Madam President, we had to give up our group meeting yesterday. We have again given up twelve minutes of this meeting. So could I ask you to carry out the vote very quickly now and not to permit procedural debates, otherwise we will leave the Chamber.

President. — I absolutely agree with you, Mr Arndt. Nobody wishes to end these proceedings more than I do.

Interim report (Doc. A 2-16/85) by Mr Seeler, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, on the progress of deliberations in the national parliaments on the draft treaty establishing the European Union

Explanations of vote

Mr Cryer (S). — I am concerned about two things in this report and its endorsement of the Treaty of European Union. The first is the waiver of the veto which is involved in the Treaty of European Union after 10 years, and I would just like to remind Members of this Assembly that, in fact, UK Members of the Council of Ministers are actually elected and accountable to the House of Commons. If they use the veto, then they are accountable for that. That veto, which was stated clearly by all the pro-marketeters in the 1975 referendum to be a constitutionally important matter, I do not want to see eroded. The last point I want to make is that the Treaty of European Union is not about Europe. It is about a section of Europe. It is about dividing Europe. If this Assembly and the rest of the people are going to survive this huge accumulation of nuclear weapons, we have got to have some kind of talk across East and West in Europe and this Treaty of European Union is not going to help that.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Heinrich (ARC), in writing. — (DE) We are against a European Union of this kind, whose proceedings take place behind closed doors and in selected bodies. 'Europe of the citizens' — what a lovely phrase. But in what way does this Europe serve

the citizens' interests? Where is the progress in the institutional field? And where are the proposals to make the Community more democratic? Who elects the Commission? Who controls the Council? The citizens by any chance?

The people who are most satisfied with this European Union are surely the representatives of large finance, the export industry, the nuclear industry, the agricultural multinationals, the arms industry.

The common arms policy, the common arms export policy, the common defence policy — significantly disarmament is mentioned last of all — proposed in the European Parliament's draft treaty of February 1984 are surely visions of a Europe that is an arms market and a military power. We had hoped the dream of a great power extending from the Atlantic to the Ural was at last a thing of the past.

And the so-called European legal area: of course everyone wants border controls abolished. But how is a uniform legal body to do justice to the needs and traditions of people who come from the most disparate regions and cultures, from Andalusia, Scotland, Sardinia, Frankfurt and Copenhagen? It will simply be imposed on them. And what will remain of the right of asylum of political refugees who flee from one Community country to another?

If we have common external borders that become even more difficult to cross, what will become of refugees from what is called the Third World, or persecuted minorities such as Kurds and Tamils? If one country refuses them entry at present, will the whole Community do so in future?

We want a Europe with more human rights, more democracy, less centralism, with autonomous regions, where political decision-making is closer to the citizens, more transparent and easier to control.

Mr Iversen (COM), in writing. — (DA) I must say that after a while it takes an awful lot for anyone to be shocked at the reports and pronouncements produced by this assembly. But the comments in the Seeler report on the political decision-making process in Denmark constitute an unbelievable argument.

I should really like to know from Mr Seeler what he means when he says that in Denmark parliamentary control is being exerted at the expense of decision-making.

In addition the report criticizes Denmark for adopting a negative resolution on Community cooperation. This claim is also unbelievable. The Danish resolution on Community cooperation which Mr Seeler has included as an annex to his report unequivocally states that the retention of the right of veto is fundamental to Danish membership of the European Community, and the Spinelli report is emphatically rejected.

Iversen

The Danish resolution also clearly indicates some areas of international work which are necessary. In these areas my party supports unreserved cooperation. But we have seen again and again that the edifice of the European Community is not capable of meeting the great international challenges. Our formula for cooperation in the fight against unemployment is therefore European cooperation *à la carte*, in which those countries which can agree get together and solve the problems. That applies equally well to the environment area, in which the Community system is an obstacle to getting on with the job of implementing the necessary solutions.

Instead of fine words and common anthems in this Parliament we should, if only we are to retain a modicum of credibility among the populations of Europe, get to grips with the solution of the great and fundamental problems that are facing us.

Mr Staes (ARC), in writing. — (NL) The Seeler report at least has the advantage of confining itself solely to procedural matters.

It is logical, of course, that the Spinelli proposals should be discussed by the national parliaments and that this should be done as seriously and quickly as possible.

This was also the position that my party immediately adopted in the Belgian Parliament.

It would after all be highly questionable if a report, drawn up democratically, should run the danger of being blocked or even of sinking into the obscure morass of diplomacy which has swallowed up so many frank and democratic ideas and proposals in the past.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)^{1 2}

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-162/85), tabled by Mr de la Malène and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, winding up the debate on the European Council meeting in Brussels on 29 and 30 March.

Explanations of vote

Mr Chanteric (PPE), in writing. — (NL) The European Council meeting held on 29 and 30 March 1985

was the first in five years to succeed in rising above the basic problems and devoting itself once again to the broad lines to be followed in European policy. This is due in no small measure both to the Italian Presidency and to the Commission's new approach.

The conclusions now before us and the statements we have heard from Prime Minister Craxi and Commission President Delors differ in a positive sense from previous statements, especially in the areas of economic and social policy. It is pleasing to note that the Heads of Government of the ten Member States have realized that a global strategy must be developed to tackle unemployment in Europe. The European Parliament provided the inspiration and impulse for this during a special part-session devoted to employment in April 1983.

Four major areas of action are postulated:

1. The achievement of one large undivided market by about 1992 to create a more favourable climate for the stimulation of enterprise, competition and trade.
2. Encouraging the establishment of SMUs by substantially easing administrative and legal requirements.
3. Adjustment of the conditions of employment to the new social, economic and technological circumstances to improve the effectiveness of the labour market.
4. Specific measures to increase jobs, aimed primarily at certain problem groups in society.

If in addition a Community policy on scientific research is established and the technological base is strengthened, we shall have at last taken significant steps towards creating new jobs. All we have heard in recent years are solemn declarations. It is to be hoped that decisions that will make a major contribution to economic recovery will now be taken.

Mr Lalor (RDE), in writing. — While I can join with so many others in Parliament in welcoming President Craxi's good tidings regarding enlargement, environmental protection, movements towards peace in some parts of the world and the positive steps the Council has taken to combat the scourge of hunger, I am, none the less, very concerned at the inadequacy of the Council's plans to combat and overcome unemployment.

It is nothing new to be told here and elsewhere that the level of unemployment in the Community is still unacceptably high, and that guidelines for dealing with this problem were laid down at the Brussels meeting, and that the Commission has been instructed to submit specific proposals as soon as possible.

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendment No 3
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 and 2.

² Mr Columbu, Mr Filinis, Mr O'Donnell and Mr van der Waal gave the same explanations of vote on this report as on the report by Mr Croux.

Lalor

With all due respects, all this is bunkum! We and our growing army of unemployed want *action* — not simply guidelines and proposals. The best medicine for the ills of drug addiction, mass vandalism, destructive joy-riding, indiscriminate attacks on the old, the infirm and the defenceless, and the destruction and defacement of property — apart altogether from the soul-destroying scourge of idleness and unwantedness — is employment.

President Craxi, I had hoped that, following on the pious resolutions adopted in Brussels to which you referred, you might have had something to add and to propose to us arising from what you might have learned from the International Conference of Labour and Employment Ministers which you opened in Venice last week.

From there, we all learned that, while the acceptance of new technologies in the USA had led to the creation of 7.2 million jobs there since 1982, Europe's fear of the effects on labour of new technology has resulted in nearly *two thirds* of the industrial world's unemployed being in Europe.

Youth unemployment in Europe is more than 25%, and there has been absolutely 'no net job creation in Europe since 1975'.

We should positively look at and get involved in the use of new technologies in the services sector, because it was in this area that 26 million jobs were created in the USA over the past 15 years. I exhort the Council and the Commission to involve themselves in this type of positive action immediately.

I was encouraged to read today that a former colleague of ours here, Minister Martin Bangemann, reported in Hannover yesterday that West Germany industry had now moved to being five times ahead of Japan in the patenting of key high technology products.

Let us confidently move forward in these sort of times and positively tackle, rather than blue-print, the unemployment problem.

(Parliament rejected the motion for a resolution)

(The sitting was closed at 7.20 p.m.)¹

¹ *Agenda for the next sitting: see Minutes.*

Annex

I. Questions to the Commission

Question No 16, by Sir James Scott-Hopkins (H-649/84)

Subject: Mobility of labour within the Community

Does the Commission share my view that, in order to encourage the mobility of labour within the Community, a greatly simplified system of the transferability of entitlement to national welfare benefits is required and how does the Commission propose to devise a suitable scheme to satisfy this need?

Answer

1. By national welfare benefits, it has been assumed that the Honourable Member is referring to social security benefits. The Community Regulations on the application of social security schemes to employed and self-employed persons and members of their families moving within the Community, Council Regulations (EEC) Nos 1408/71 and 574/72, coordinate the differing social security systems of the existing Member States of the Community.

2. It is regrettable but not unexpected, in the Commission's view, that such a system will prove complex and sometimes cumbersome to administer; this is because national social security systems are themselves extremely complex and cumbersome, as any one who has had to claim benefits from them will know.

However it should be emphasized that from the inception of the European Economic Community the Commission has been, and is continually working with representatives of the ten Member States who are experts in the social security systems of their own States, to simplify the operation of those Regulations, with the constant object of improving conditions for migrant workers.

3. As an example of the improvements effected, the Commission can point to the standardization of forms used in the administration of the Regulations. The texts of these forms, which are produced in the seven official languages of the Community, are superposable thus facilitating their universal comprehension by both the social security officials in each of the Member States whose job it is to process them, and the workers who must rely on them.

4. A more recent project, the product of extensive and complex work, takes advantage of the increasing use of computers in the recording and storage of social security data. This project, when fully implemented, will facilitate and expedite the transfer of social security information between Member States, by permitting the use of a programme which translates social security data to be transferred from each of the Member States into a standard form which can be utilized anywhere in the Community. These new arrangements should greatly accelerate the calculation of pensions, and thus their award and payment.

*
* *

Question No 20, by Mr Raftery (H-654/84)

Subject: The flying of the flags of the Member States throughout the Community

Is the Commission aware that in a part of the European Communities it is illegal to fly together the flags of all 10 Member States? This is the case in Northern Ireland, where under legislation dating from the now defunct Stormont Parliament, it remains illegal to

fly or display the flag of Ireland. Can the Commission indicate whether similar legislation exists, in any other part of the Community and if so, where, and would the Commission not agree that this situation is clearly contrary to the spirit of the Treaties; if so what action do they intend to take?

Answer

The subject raised does not fall within the sphere of competence of the Commission. Nevertheless, the Commission would like to see all the flags able to be flown together in all Community countries.

*
* *

Question No 21, by Mr Møller (H-673/84)

Subject: Residence of EEC citizens in other Member States

The fact that EEC citizens are still required to hold a special residence permit in order to take up permanent residence in another Member State, despite the Treaty of Rome's stipulation that Community citizens shall be free to move anywhere within the territory of the Member States, frequently gives rise to unfortunate situations for the individuals affected by this problem. When does the Commission intend to take steps to have uniform rules implemented for all Member States, eliminating the need for any EEC citizen to hold a residence permit?

Answer

Broadly speaking residence permits are only required for persons not gainfully employed — mainly pensioners and persons of independent means.

As long ago as 1979 the Commission submitted a proposal for a Directive on a general right of residence for nationals of Community Member States and members of their families. Parliament sought various changes to the proposal and the Commission accepted certain amendments. The revised draft has been before the Council since 1980. Like Parliament, the Commission feels that a decision should now be taken.

*
* *

Question No 23, by Mr Pannella (H-707/84)

Subject: European Convention on Human Rights

In view of the established case law of the Court of Justice to the effect that the European Convention on Human Rights is already considered an integral part of the Community legal order, does the Commission not intend to propose to the Council of Ministers, as it did once before in a 1976 memorandum that the Community should accede to that Convention?

What are the reasons that would prevent the Community from acceding to that Convention?

Answer

As the Commission has already had the opportunity to explain to Parliament, it wished, before making any formal proposals, to hold talks with the Council on whether or not the Communities should accede to the European Convention on Human Rights.

These talks with the Council were held, and it emerged that most of the Member States consider that accession is fraught with very many difficulties and prefer to consider the matter thoroughly at national level before resuming the discussion.

In view of this, it would not seem an appropriate moment for the Commission to submit formal proposals.

*
* *

Question No 31, by Mrs Van Hemeldonck (H-502/84)¹

Subject: Import and export fraud

A court action was recently brought against two German meat wholesalers who defrauded the EEC of several thousand million ECU by declaring offal or inferior quality meat as beef for export and, conversely, by declaring prime quality beef as offal for import purposes. Can the Commission give a rough indication of how many million ECU the Community loses each year through fraud in connection with import levies and export subsidies and what percentage of cases the Commission successfully brings to court?

How many staff and what financial resources does the Commission allocate specifically to the detection of fraud of this kind?

What is the Commission's view of the assistance given by the national administrations in detecting and pursuing this type of fraud?

Answer

In respect of the import levy, the Commission is not in a position to indicate the total annual amount of irregularities since Member States are not obliged to communicate details to the Commission except for certain cases of particular interest, including cases under Regulation 1468/81 'Mutual assistance'.

It should be mentioned, however, that the Commission in March 1979 submitted to the Council a proposal for a Regulation on the measures to be taken in the event of irregularities affecting the own resources referred to in the Decision of 21 April 1970 and the organization of an information system for the Commission in this field.

This proposal which received a favourable opinion by the Parliament and by the Court of Auditors had not yet been adopted by the Council. This is why the Commission does not have at its disposal all the information necessary to answer the question in full.

The cases communicated by the Member States under the mutual assistance system and for which details as to amounts were stated totalled 2.5 million ECU in 1981 (the first year of application), 5.4 million ECU in 1982 and 22.4 million ECU in 1983.

*
* *

Question No 33, by Mr von Wogau (H-540/84)

Subject: Bureaucratic obstacles to bus and coach traffic at borders between Community countries (manifests)

For travel between Community countries West Germany, invoking Directive 117/66/EEC,² requires bus and coach operators to complete a manifest containing a full list of the names of all passengers: No 6: 'List of passengers' (Surnames and initials).

¹ Former oral question without debate (0-66/84), converted into a question for Question Time.

² OJ L 147 of 9. 8. 1966, p. 2688.

Does the Commission consider West Germany's requirement that a manifest listing the names of all passengers be produced for bus and coach travel between Community countries to be compatible with the EEC Treaty and with its goal of removing all obstacles on the Community's internal borders?

Answer

1. The obligation incumbent on carriers effecting occasional services (not regular of shuttle services) within the Community to carry a duly completed passenger waybill on board their vehicles is laid down by a Community Regulation which ranks as secondary legislation, i.e. derived from the Treaty.

The purpose of the passenger waybill is to ensure effective control of these occasional services, most of which are exempt from any transport authorization. Under the Community legislation Member States may also agree bilaterally or multilaterally to dispense with the passenger list provided for in point 6 of the passenger waybill. In this case all that has to be indicated is the number of passengers.

Belgium, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Luxembourg and the United Kingdom have already introduced or are considering introducing this simplification from certain transport routes.

*
* *

Question No 37, by Mr Deprez (H-610/84)

Subject: Adjustments to the income tax system

Recently the Commission approved a memorandum on the equal treatment of men and women with regard to income tax. The memorandum reached the conclusion that equality could best be ensured by the system of separate taxation. Parliament's committee of inquiry into the situation of women has come to the same conclusions. What does the Commission intend to do to ensure that the principle of separate taxation is adopted by the Member States?

Answer

The Commission's efforts are also directed towards achieving equal treatment in taxation. In December of last year it forwarded to the Council and Parliament its Memorandum on this subject, in which it describes the present situation, outlines the link between tax rules and the principle of equal treatment, and singles out possible areas for corrective measures. The purpose of the Memorandum is to initiate a debate on this extremely complex question throughout the Community and thus to obtain pointers for future action.

The Memorandum is currently being discussed by Parliament's Committee on Women's Rights and in the Economic and Social Committee, and we hope that the Council of Ministers will place it on its agenda in the near future. If the Commission's budgetary situation allows, a seminar on this subject could be held later this year.

*
* *

Question No 39, by Mr Wurtz (H-722/84)

Subject: Appeal by IFAD to the President of the European Parliament

In its resolution of 16 November 1979 the European Parliament expressed its support for the activities of IFAD. In view of the budgetary difficulties which IFAD is currently exper-

encing and which threaten the continuation of its activities, could not the Commission, as the President of IFAD suggests, recommend that the Council of Ministers consider giving a contribution from the EEC as such to boost IFAD's funds; this would enable it to continue to pursue its objectives, namely to increase food production and combat rural poverty in the developing countries, particularly the poorest.

Question No 58, by Mr Moorhouse (H-829/84)

Subject: International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

What relations does the Community have with the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), and what financing has the Commission offered and intends to offer to IFAD? If the Community has no formal relations with IFAD, what action does the Commission intend to take to establish such relations and particularly to obtain full membership or observer status?

Joint answer

Following the consultative meeting on 28 February 1985, it would appear that the second reconstitution is going to cost between US\$ 500 and 650 million. The final formula should be agreed on 17 or 18 May 1985. Even if the level of finance is low, there is no question mark over the survival of IFAD.

As soon as an agreement is reached, the President of IFAD will approach his contributors, among them the individual European Member States as well as the Community, to request voluntary additional contributions to the Fund.

As far as a Community contribution is concerned, the Commission believes that, despite the high regard it has for the work of IFAD, it would be unwise to make a direct contribution from the Community budget. Having regard to current and foreseeable budgetary constraints and difficulties, it believes it should keep the scant resources available for the new development policies which the Community has to pursue itself.

All the same, the Commission will do all it can, on the one hand to help the United States overcome any hesitancy it may feel about reconstitution itself and, on the other, to persuade its Member States to make additional voluntary contributions once the second reconstitution is concluded. It is this desire to play an active role in solving these problems which has prompted the Commission to accept IFAD's offer of observer status.

Finally, given that our objectives are so similar, the Commission is hoping to establish closer links with the Fund at operational level with a view to achieving better coordination between our respective rural development activities among the poorest sectors of the world's population.

*
* *

Question No 40, by Mrs Hammerich (H-729/84)

Subject: Participation in EPC

It is often said that EPC ought to be independent of the European Community and this is a condition for countries other than the Community's Member States being prepared to take part in it.

Participation in EPC by the Commission is a conspicuous sign of the fact that the European Community and EPC are closely bound up with each other.

Would the Commission be prepared to withdraw from EPC and no longer 'take part at all levels' in the Foreign Ministers' work if other countries, not members of the Community, were to join — for example, countries such as Norway, Sweden and Finland?

Answer

As the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers, Mr Forte, stressed in his reply to the honourable Member's oral question H-730/84 in this Chamber on 13 March last, the Ten do not envisage extending their political cooperation beyond the Member States of the Community.

The hypothetical situation referred to by Mrs Hammerich will thus never arise.

*
* *

Question No 41, by Mrs Castle (H-733/84)

Subject: Regional Fund

Is the Commission aware that the United Kingdom Government has imposed restrictions on capital spending by local authorities for the coming year 1985/86 which prevent them from taking up grants which may be allocated to them under the ERDF or could be allocated under the non-quota textile scheme; whether this is contrary to the regulations of the Fund and, if not, whether it will amend those regulations to ensure that grants under the Fund must be accompanied by a permission to spend being given by the government concerned.

Answer

Since its approval, in December 1984, of the United Kingdom's programme implementing the specific Community measure in favour of zones adversely affected by the decline in the textile industry, the Commission has been informed of the potential difficulties facing certain local authorities in taking up the funds made available to them under this measure.

Naturally, the Commission's approval of the programme in question was given on the understanding that there be no impediment to the take-up of ERDF grant by local authorities.

While it might be premature at this stage to assess the extent to which the restrictions referred to by the honourable parliamentarian will affect the use of the Community funds in question, this is clearly a matter of considerable concern to the Commission.

Accordingly, the Commission is raising the matter with the United Kingdom Government in order to ensure participation by the local authorities in question in this Community initiative to offset the detrimental effects of the decline in the textile industry.

*
* *

Question No 42, by Mr Pearce (H-734/84)

Subject: Shipment from one Member State to another

Will the Commission indicate whether it would support a proposal to build upon the success of the single customs document and the Caddia system to provide for a computer-readable card inscribed with details of the shipment to be issued at the point of dispatch of a shipment from one Member State to another and for this card to be presented for computer scrutiny at both sides of the intervening frontier and at the destination, with a view to the frontier being passed with almost no delay at all, unless the shipment is selected for checking for security, medical or veterinary reasons?

Answer

The Commission sent to the Council last November a communication on the coordinated development of computerized administrative procedures (the CD project).

The Commission has examined the possibility of using computer-readable cards in the context of the CD project. In the current state of development, however, they are not considered to be technically suitable, because of their limited storage capacity, limited functional use and relatively high unit cost.

The Commission's declared policy is one of abolishing checks and formalities at internal frontiers and of concentrating any residual formalities at points of departure and destination, while improvements in procedures at the frontiers are valuable the more appropriate long-term policy would be the one of removing the frontiers altogether.

*
* *

Question No 43, by Mrs Cinciari Rodano (H-736/84)

Subject: Sanitation in Vietnam

Why, contrary to the European Parliament's resolution of 17. 2. 1984 on the granting of Community aid to Vietnam, has a project costing 331 000 ECU been stopped which had been submitted by Trocaire in Dublin on behalf of the CISDE (International Cooperation for Development and Solidarity) for the purpose of improving sanitation in the town of Nha Tueng, which was hit by hurricanes in 1981 and 1983 and where drinking water is in seriously short supply?

Answer

The Community has not provided normal development assistance to Vietnam for several years.

On several occasions since, the Commission has said that it would not be prepared to consider resuming such assistance until there was some sign of a positive evolution in the political situation of the region.

However, the Commission has always been prepared to consider providing humanitarian aid, through international or non-governmental organizations, whenever a specific need arises and when it is satisfied that it will effectively reach the populations in need. In recent years, such humanitarian assistance has been provided on several occasions: in 1980, 1981 and 1982.

Requests received in 1984 were differing in nature. Two of them, although channelled through an NGO, were tantamount to outright development projects. Following its previous attitude, the Commission rejected those in December 1984. On the other hand, the Commission decided on 13 February 1985 to give a favourable reply to a request from Unicef for 300 t skimmed milk powder and 100 t dried fish for distribution to mothers and young children, victims of the recent typhoon, 'Agnes', which meets the humanitarian conditions spelled out above.

*
* *

Question No 45, by Mrs Crawley (H-743/84)

Subject: Changes in food aid procedures

Given the criticism levelled at the Commission in the Annual Report of the Court of Auditors that the time taken to deliver food aid in 1983 was still 'abnormally long', can the

Commission explain when, and in what ways it will review the entire management system of food aid, and can it then explain how it will implement rules and administrative procedures to rectify the defects and in this way avoid a repetition of the Court of Auditors' criticism that these defects 'keep recurring and even worsening, at the expense of the poorest countries of all'?

Answer

Detailed replies to the criticisms of the Court of Auditors on the delays in delivery of EEC's food aid raised by the honourable Member of Parliament have already been given by the Commission and are published in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* C 348 of 31 December 1984 pp. 225-228. In addition, in the presence of the Court of Auditors, the Commission provided further information in the course of the debate in the Development Committee of the Parliament on the Vergeer Report for the discharge of the 1983 budget. The Commission of course keeps the management of its food aid programmes under constant review, feels that the considerable improvement in the implementation of the 1984 programme reflects its determination in this matter, and is presently examining what general procedural improvements can be made on the basis of experience of emergency food aid management in 1984/85.

*
* *

Question No 47, by Mr Collins (H-774/84)

Subject: Harmonization of speed limits in the EEC

It was reported on 18 January 1985 in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* that the application of speed limits can result in the reduction of pollution by up to 15-20% without using any other control devices. In view of this, does the Commission consider that it should bring forward proposals for a harmonization of speed limits in the EEC?

Answer

In the context of the decisions taken by the Council of the Environment on 20 March 1985 on vehicle emission standards and the lead content of petrol the Commission will present proposals concerning speed limits before the end of 1985.

As part of the process of preparing a proposal on this topic the Commission will examine as many of the relevant factors as possible in the time limits set. These include the influence of speed limits on air quality, energy consumption, road safety and traffic flow, bearing in mind the interaction between vehicles, the infrastructure and driver behaviour.

*
* *

Question No 49, by Mr Wedekind (H-67/85)¹

Subject: Discrimination against foreign tourists in Greece — introduction of an extortionate tax on those leaving the country

It recently became known that the Greek Transport Minister has proposed that foreigners should pay twice as much as Greeks on domestic flights within Greece on the Greek State airlines 'Olympic Airways'. The Greek Government is also considering the introduction of a tax on those leaving the country.

¹ Former oral question without debate (0-146/84), converted into a question for Question Time.

I would therefore ask the Commission,

- how it regards such a tariff policy;
- whether it believes that a special tariff for Greeks would represent discrimination and, if so, against whom: foreigners who pay double, or Greeks who only pay half;
- whether it believes there is a danger that this will lead to the practice of charging higher prices to foreigners than local people, which is certainly common in tourist countries on an unofficial basis, now being officially approved and becoming the tariff policy of the Greek Government so that subsequently special high prices, also known as cut-throat prices, will be introduced, possibly graduated according to country of origin, for other goods and services to non-Greeks, such as in the hotel and catering trade but conceivably also extending to simple pleasures such as ice-cream where foreigners would in future only receive half portions;
- whether it believes that a tax on people leaving the country is compatible with freedom of movement in the European Community or whether it in fact believes that tax on people leaving the country is not in fact more comparable with the crime of extortion extracted by the deprivation of liberty and is therefore a violation of human rights similar to the practice towards people leaving Eastern European countries?

Answer

The Commission services have sought further information and observations from the Greek authorities about the two proposals to which the honourable Member refers. I will be happy to reply more fully to the honourable Member on receipt of this further information.

*
* *

Question No 54, by Sir Peter Vanneck (H-818/84)

Subject: European aerospace industries

What are the implications for the future of European aerospace industries of the decision by the NATO Conference of National Armaments Directors, 19 March 1985, on the proposed development by five European States of a European fighter aircraft?

Answer

To the best of the Commission's knowledge, the development of a European Fighter Aircraft (EFA) is still at the negotiation stage.

The talks conducted by the aircraft industries of the five countries involved — United Kingdom, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy and Spain — have proved to be very difficult and the outcome is not yet clear. At the moment, it would therefore be difficult to assess the implications until an agreement has been reached.

In general, it is however true to say that this is a very significant project for the aircraft industry because production of the Tornado, a programme which has provided the bulk of the military contracts for the last few years, has passed its peak and will, from now on, experience a gradual reduction.

The Commission hopes that the defence ministers of the five countries involved will reach agreement in the near future.

*
* *

Question No 55, by Mr Habsburg (H-820/84)

Subject: Transport of horses intended for slaughter

A year ago the European Parliament adopted a resolution on this subject on the basis of a report by Mrs Luise Herklotz. There have been a growing number of complaints recently that the provisions on humane treatment are not being implemented satisfactorily.

What has the Commission done in response to Parliament's resolution? Are adequate checks carried out during the periods of transport referred to in the motion for a resolution? In particular, does the Commission intend to implement the improvements proposed in the opinion of the Committee on the Environment as soon as possible?

Answer

I am aware that public opinion is upset by the trade in live horses, and the Commission has been closely following this question.

On a proposal from the Commission, the Council has already adopted a number of directives on the protection of animals during international transport.¹ They are based on the Council of Europe's International Agreement on the subject, contain precise regulations for the protection of all types of animals, and apply to all forms of transport. One of the directives also provides for a special certificate which must accompany the animals during transport, as well as inspections to check compliance with the stipulated conditions.

With a view to establishing what further measures it can take, the Commission has carried out a thorough study of the transport of animals for slaughter last year. A detailed report is now available.

Precise information is required so that the legislation can be adapted. But even at this stage it will be possible to adopt a number of practical measures to improve the situation. We consider that this can be done by adjusting the Community code of conduct for this sector. An urgent investigation is currently being undertaken to provide a sound basis for such adjustments.

Furthermore there are Community health rules for intra-Community trade in fresh meat, including horsemeat.² These stipulate that horses must be inspected before being slaughtered, in particular to check whether they are suffering from fatigue, anxiety or injury. Animals may not be slaughtered unless they have been allowed to rest completely; tired or anxious animals must be allowed at least 24 hours' rest.

The Commission is taking further measures to ensure that these Community rules are more strictly applied by the Member States.

*
* *

Question No 56, by Mrs Viehoff (H-822/84)

Subject: Plan to send young people to developing countries

The communique from the Fontainebleau summit of EEC Heads of State or Government in June 1984 contained the following sentence:

'Expressed the hope that Member States would take steps to encourage young people to take part in the activities conducted by the Community outside its frontiers and in particular that they would support the creation of national Committees of volunteer develop-

¹ OJ L 200 of 8 August 1977, p. 10; OJ L 150 of 6 June 1981, p. 1.

² OJ 121 of 24 July 1964, p. 2012/64.

ment-workers in Europe to unite young Europeans wishing to work on projects in developing countries.'

On the basis of this passage a French committee of development workers led by Bernard Kouchner has drawn up a plan to send hundreds of young people aged between 18 and 20 to developing countries each year where they would be trained by French and German army officers, with the assistance of civilian experts. The first 500 volunteers will arrive in April and the numbers will increase to 3 000 in two years' time.

These plans were submitted for approval to the French-German submit on 28 February 1985.

Is the Commission aware that the volunteers are to be trained by French and German army officers and what are its views on this matter?

Answer

The Commission has never been officially informed of such a plan and has not been involved either in its conception or in its subsequent development.

Thus the Commission has no knowledge of the arrangements made by the plan's initiators.

The Commission is in favour of non-governmental organizations sending volunteers as long as the latter are suitably qualified and prepared for their tasks. But it doubts whether it is a good idea to send every year hundreds of 18 to 20-year-old volunteers who do not meet these criteria.

*
* *

Question No 57, by Mrs Nielsen (H-823/84)

Subject: Consequences of enlargement for other Mediterranean countries

Why in the part of the programme of the Commission for 1985 concerned with the 'consequences of enlargement for other Mediterranean countries' is there no mention of the consequences for Israel?

Answer

The part of the 1985 Commission programme dealing with the consequences of enlargement for the Mediterranean countries refers, like all the documents issued by the Commission on this subject since the beginning of the process of Community enlargement, to all the countries covered by 'the global Mediterranean approach', and this obviously includes Israel.

In its communication to the Council in June 1982, and in its subsequent communication in March 1984, the Commission demonstrated that, among the Mediterranean partners, Israel is one of those most exposed to the consequences of enlargement, particularly in view of the large quantities its agricultural exports which come under the heading of 'Mediterranean products', which are in direct competition with Spanish products. The countries or groups of countries mentioned in the Commission's programme are only given as examples, and it is not meant to be an exhaustive list of the Mediterranean countries effected by the enlargement of the Community.

*
* *

Question No 59, by Mr Gerontopoulos (H-832/84)

Subject: Community financing for preparatory research for integrated action in the prefecture of Rodopi

Would the Commission be prepared to finance, under Article 5410 of the budget, preparatory research for integrated action in the prefecture of Rodopi, which is the most disadvantaged prefecture in Thrace and one of the three most disadvantaged prefectures in the whole of Greece, on the submission of an appropriate request by a Greek State or regional authority?

Answer

The Commission is prepared to examine any application submitted to it by the Greek authorities for financing a preparatory study for integrated action in the prefecture of Rodopi (Thrace).

*
* *

Question No 60, by Mr Marck (H-833/84)

Subject: Freedom of movement of goods in the United Kingdom

I have, on a number of occasions in the past, been alarmed by the unbelievable customs clearance procedures for goods entering the United Kingdom and I have been looking for details of an actual incident to illustrate the situation.

This incident occurred in Felixstowe on Wednesday, 27 February 1985 and involved the importation of a small consignment intended for the International Food and Drink Exhibition in London.

- It was at least two hours after the local customs agent had handed in the papers to the customs before there was any sign of the customs officials.
- The vehicle then had to be presented for examination by the customs officials. The fuss they created was absolutely incredible. First of all they went to great pains to ascertain whether there were any customs seals on the vehicle. Next, they checked whether the goods were genuine and counted the number of packages.
- Whilst this was going on, the officials discovered a spray can in the cab which was used for damping vegetables. This had to be opened up in their presence so that they could make sure that it contained no alcoholic beverage.

The rolls of paper which are taken along to protect the vegetables in the event of frost then had to be unrolled so that they could be checked.

- Whilst these checks were being carried out, someone waited at the dock exit where the papers were collected together. This waiting period was extended by a further two hours before the certificate needed to leave the docks was issued.

Will the Commission inform me:

whether it condones this state of affairs and what steps it intends to take to change the United Kingdom's protectionist attitude into more of a 'Community' attitude conducive to creating a people's Europe?

Answer

The Commission has already followed up the matter raised by the honourable Member and has asked for an urgent report from the United Kingdom authorities on the allegations made.

The Commission's commitment to reducing and, where possible, abolishing border checks and formalities is manifested in a series of legislative proposals that are well known to the House.

*
* *

Question No 61, by Mrs Jepsen (H-13/85)

Subject: Ban imposed by Sweden on imports of salad vegetables originating in Denmark

Citing risks to plant health, the Swedish Government has decided to impose a ban on imports of salad vegetables from Denmark from 1 May 1985. The same grounds have already been used by Sweden to institute a ban on imports of Danish chrysanthemums — an issue which, moreover, has not yet been fully resolved. The Commission has indicated on several occasions that such bans are in contravention of the free-trade agreement between the European Community and Sweden. Can the Commission say what the position is with regard to the Community's plant-health directive? What is the situation *vis-à-vis* Sweden, for example? What does the Commission propose to undertake to thwart what is clearly a protectionist measure by Sweden, with a view to preventing the implementation of the ban on salad-vegetable imports?

Answer

The Commission has no knowledge of a formal prohibition of the import of lettuce seedlings from Denmark into Sweden with effect from 1 May 1985. I have instructed my departments to enquire, through the competent Danish authorities, whether there are any practical difficulties for plant health reasons in exporting lettuce seedlings from Denmark to Sweden.

In the light of the outcome of these enquiries, the Commission will examine the plant health basis for any such Swedish measures and, if necessary, will take appropriate steps to have Sweden lift any that are not justified.

The Commission takes this opportunity to inform the Honourable Member that, as far as the Commission is aware, the chrysanthemum problem, to which she refers, was in fact resolved as a result of the technical contacts arranged by the Commission with the Swedish authorities in 1983.

*
* *

Question No 62A, by Mr Hume (H-18/85)

Subject: Demonstration projects in the field of energy

How many demonstration projects in the field of energy have been grant-aided by the European Commission in each year since 1973: (a) for the United Kingdom; (b) for Northern Ireland; (c) for the Republic of Ireland?

Answer

Since 1979 the Commission has been running four programmes of demonstration projects in the field of energy.

The four programmes are as follows:

- a programme on alternative energy sources including the following sub-programmes: biomass and the exploitation of waste since 1983, geothermal energy since 1979,

hydro-electric energy since 1984, solar energy since 1979, a solar pool project in 1981 only and wind energy since 1983;

- an energy-saving programme;
- a programme on the liquefaction and gasification of solid fuels;
- a programme on the substitution of hydrocarbons, with the following sub-programmes: heat and electricity since 1984 and solid fuels since 1983.

In addition to these four programmes of demonstration projects, there has also been a programme in the field of hydrocarbons since 1975. This programme provides for support to be given to technological development projects which are of major importance as regards security of supply of hydrocarbons in the Community.

The number of projects supported in the United Kingdom and Ireland is shown in the attached table.

The only project chosen in Northern Ireland, in the field of energy saving and involving a sum of UKL 751 808, is included under the projects for the United Kingdom.

Programmes

Year	Country	Alternative sources	Energy saving	Liquef. gasif.	Substitution of hydrocarbons	Hydrocarbon technology	Total
1975	UK					8	6
	IRL					1	1
1976	UK					12	12
	IRL					1	1
1977	UK					13	13
	IRL					2	2
1978	UK					15	15
	IRL					1	1
1979	UK	2	9	1		7	19
	IRL	1	2			1	4
1980	UK	—	15	2		7	24
	IRL	—	2			1	3
1981	UK	11	16	—		10	37
	IRL	2	4	—		1	7
1982	UK	—	6	—		11	17
	IRL	—	1	—		2	3
1983	UK	14	7	5	4	7	37
	IRL	2	2		2	2	8
1984	UK	10	7	3	4	13	37
	IRL	10	1		1	3	15
Total	UK	37	60	11	8	101	217
Total	IRL	15	12		3	15	45

— = no decision taken for the programme concerned.

The 217 projects financed in the United Kingdom represent $\pm 18.5\%$ of all Community projects (UKL 175 in total) and the 45 Irish projects 3.8%.

*
* *

Question No 63, by Mr Clinton (H-28/85)

Subject: Community grain

Having regard to the very large tonnage of grain in Community storage and bearing in mind the heavy cost of this storage has the Commission given serious thought to measures that would have the effect of substantially increasing the percentage of indigenous grain in Community feedingstuffs so as to clear storage space in time to accommodate the 1985 harvest?

Answer

Particularly in recent years, the Commission has followed a policy of keeping internal market prices for cereals at a moderate level. The greater competitiveness led to a remarkable increase of the animal consumption of cereals. This evolution has continued in 1984/85. Due to the record crop of 1984, the EEC will nevertheless be confronted with unusual carry-over stocks, as pointed out by the Honourable Member of Parliament.

Additional measures to increase the animal consumption further have therefore been examined in this context. The conclusion however was that these possible measures were no solution in the present situation. An obligatory incorporation of a certain percentage of cereals into the animal feed, as suggested by some, seems not to be compatible with the basically liberal principles of the market organization. A sale of denatured wheat out of intervention would be very expensive and would displace feed cereals especially barley, on the market causing them to go into intervention.

*
* *

Question No 64, by Mrs Jackson (H-38/85)

Subject: Nutritional labelling of food

Does the Commission have any plans to introduce legislation on the nutritional labelling of foodstuffs for human consumption?

Answer

The Commission is presently examining nutritional labelling of foodstuffs for human consumption. It is gathering information from as many sources as possible, including the FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme and the European Food Law Association.

There is a need for a Community approach to this complex question which will have to take into account Community law on food labelling and the necessity to provide general consumer information. It will be essential to ensure that such an approach avoids creating barriers to trade. It is too early to give an indication of the nature and content of any action the Commission might propose.

*
* *

Question No 65, by Mrs Oppenheim (H-32/85)

Subject: Relations between the enlarged Community and Israel

The Community has stipulated in previous decisions that the interests of third countries will be fully taken into account in the accession negotiations between the Community and Spain and Portugal and that the applicant countries will have to accept the results already attained at Community level. What information can the Commission provide on the implications of enlargement for Israel's economy and what initiatives has the Commission and/or the Council taken to ensure that the enlargement of the Community will not prejudice relations between the Community and Israel?

Answer

When considering the consequences of enlargement for the countries of the Mediterranean region, the Commission has always treated as a whole all the countries covered by the 'global Mediterranean approach', and this obviously includes Israel.

In its communication to the Council in June 1982 and in its subsequent communication in March 1984, the Commission demonstrated that, among the Mediterranean partners, Israel is one of those most exposed to the consequences of enlargement, particularly as regards its agricultural exports which are in direct competition with Spanish products. In its communication of March 1984 and in its most recent communication of March 1985, the Commission proposed measures to deal with the problems of the Mediterranean countries.

In January 1983 the Council set about defining the guidelines on which to base the enlarged Community's Mediterranean policy before the end of the enlargement negotiations. On 30 March 1985 the Council adopted a declaration on the Community's Mediterranean policy, in which it reaffirmed the policy's global character and announced its intention to seek solutions to the preoccupations of the Mediterranean countries. The Commission was asked to propose negotiating guidelines as soon as possible with a view to adopting cooperation agreements and association agreements. In these proposals the Commission will endeavour to take account of the specific interests of each country.

*
* *

Question No 66, by Mr Nord (H-33/85)

Subject: Cigarettes in France

In connection with the publication by the French Government on 24 January 1985 of an official notice instituting a procedure for establishing cigarette prices in France, has the Commission obtained satisfactory guarantees that, in the event of disagreement between the manufacturers/importers and the French Government, the ultimate right of the former to insist on the retail prices of their products (in the way that is guaranteed in Article 5 of Directive 72/464) will obtain?

Answer

Point 2 of the Notice to which the Honourable Member refers provides unequivocally that the sales prices of manufactured tobaccos shall be fixed on the basis of prices lists established by manufacturers and importers.

The principle laid down in Article 5 of the abovementioned Directive that manufacturers and importers shall be free — as that term has been interpreted by the Court — to determine the maximum retail selling price for their products, is therefore established in the French system.

The Commission has no reason to believe that the system thus established and the obligations which it entails does not in fact guarantee the rights in question.

Should it prove, however, that practical difficulties arise in the operation of the system, of such a nature as to put in question the operation of Article 5, the Commission will examine the possibilities of action.

In any case, the Commission has not yet completed its examination of the conformity of the notice published by the French Government with the provisions of Article 5 of the 1972 Directive.

*
* *

Question No 67, by Mr Martin (H-34/85)

Subject: Health and safety at work

Reports in London suggest that the UK Government is seriously considering legislation to weaken the health and safety at work Act, in particular by removing obligations from small firms. In view of Articles 117 and 118 of the Treaty of Rome, would the Commission please state: what steps it has taken to promote improved working conditions and whether such a retrograde step as suggested in the preamble would contradict moves towards harmonization at the highest possible level and what action the Commission could take to reverse such a decision by the UK Government?

Answer

As regards the UK Government's intention to modify the health and safety at work Act, the Commission has been informed by the UK Authorities that they remain committed to the maintenance of standards of health and safety for all firms.

An essential step forward in safety and health at work was the adoption by Council in 1980 of a Directive on the protection of workers exposed to chemical, physical and biological agents, which laid down the basic philosophy needed to limit exposure, prevent risks, and protect workers likely to be exposed to these agents. This directive also foresaw the adoption of individual Directives containing other specific requirements, and to this end the Council has already adopted Commission proposals on two of them, namely, lead which was adopted in 1982 and asbestos which was adopted in 1983. Furthermore the Council is currently discussing Commission proposals on noise and on the proscription of specified agents and/or work activities.

Another Council Directive of importance for the protection of workers was adopted in 1982 on the major accident hazards of certain industrial activities. Also of importance to workers are the Council Directives concerned with the classification and labelling of chemical substances and preparations.

The success of the first programme of action of the European Communities on safety and health at work led the Commission to propose a second programme which was adopted by the Council in 1984. It both continues and extends the actions of the first programme and thus reflects the changed needs and concerns of today's society.

To implement this programme the Commission prepares annual work programmes after consulting Member States. The implementation plan for 1985 which foresees several proposals, was established in January of this year after discussions with the Advisory Committee on Safety, Hygiene and Health Protection at Work and government representatives.

It is the Commission's belief that all Member States wish to see improvements in working conditions and to this end they will work with the Commission to progressively achieve a better working environment throughout the Community.

*
* *

Question No 68, by Mr von der Vring (H-40/85)

Subject: Regional Fund regulation

On 1 January 1985 a new Regional Fund regulation entered into force which provides no legal basis for a non-quota section. What steps does the Commission intend to take to ensure that the promised second part of the second tranche of the non-quota section of the Regional Fund, relating to steel, shipbuilding, textiles and fisheries, can be implemented without further delay?

Answer

When the second series of non-quota measures was adopted in January 1984, the Commission undertook to propose to the Council the strengthening of non-quota measures to help the regions affected by the restructuring in the shipbuilding and steel industries by increasing their territorial scope to include new regions which have become eligible under the criteria laid down. It also undertook to propose the strengthening of the measures relating to the border areas the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland as well as the introduction of new measures concerning the Community fisheries policy. These proposals were forwarded to the Council by the Commission in December 1984.

As the honourable Member points out, the new Regional Fund regulation, which came into force on January 1985, no longer provides a legal basis for adopting these proposals. In this connection two possibilities are currently being studied by the Commission. The first is an *ad hoc* regulation enabling the Council to adopt in 1985 non-quota measures in accordance with Article 13 of the former regulation, and also seeking to amend Article 45 of the new Regional Fund regulation. The second is to convert these proposals into Community programmes under Article 7 of the new regulation.

*
* *

Question No 69, by Mr Ephremidis (H-44/85)

Subject: Measures to ensure the survival of the Greek footwear industry

Since Greece joined the EEC, the once vigorous Greek footwear industry has been going through an unprecedented crisis owing to the huge quantities of shoes imported from EEC countries and countries which maintain preferential links with the Communities, thereby displacing Greek shoes from the market, with imports rising from 614 000 pairs in 1978 to 2 830 000 pairs in 1983. Greek shoe exports, on the other hand, fell from 6 290 000 pairs in 1978 to 5 410 000 pairs in 1983. As a result, the standard of technological equipment in the industry has remained low, leading to high production costs and making the industry uncompetitive.

Since the footwear industry in Greece comprises more than 9 000 small and medium-sized undertakings employing 33 000 craftsmen and workers, who now face the spectre of unemployment, does the Commission propose to take steps to safeguard it from imports, to ensure the survival of the Greek footwear industry and those working in it?

Answer

The Commission would assure the honourable Member that the reduction in unemployment and the creation of jobs are among its chief concerns.

Since 1983 the Commission has authorized protective measures for a number of industries on the basis of Article 130 of the Act of Accession of Greece to the Community.

As far as the footwear industry is concerned, the Commission would remind the honourable Member that it authorized protective measures for 1983 by limiting imports into Greece of certain types of footwear from other Member States and one non-Community country. Although the Commission is sympathetic to the problems facing the Greek footwear industry, such difficulties are also prevalent in other Member States.

The Commission is aware that a plan for restructuring the footwear industry is now being drawn up in Greece; we shall make a contribution to this in so far as our competence permits.

*
* *

Question No 70, by Mr Tognoli (H-49/85)

Subject: Measures for a policy to assist SMUs and the craft industries: creation of a European centre

Is the Commission aware that paragraph 12 of the final motion adopted on 9 December 1983 at the end of the closing conference of '1983: European Year of Small and Medium-Sized Undertakings and Craft Industries' — an event sponsored by the European Parliament, the Commission and the Economic and Social Committee — called for the creation of a European centre for SMUs and the craft industries to help formulate a comprehensive medium and the long-term Community policy for their benefit?

Question No 71, by Mr Didò (H-50/85)

Subject: Measures for a policy to assist SMUs and the craft industries: creation of a European centre

Is the Commission aware that, in its resolution of 19 February 1982, the European Parliament mooted the idea of setting up a European centre for SMUs and that the Commission itself took up this idea in its communication COM(84) 263 to the Council of 22 May 1984? To date, what practical steps have been taken with a view to creating this centre, having regard to the key contribution made by the SMUs and the craft industries to the economic development of Europe and the creation of jobs and to the need for coordination at Community level?

Joint answer

In several opinions issued since 1979 on the situation of small and medium-sized businesses and the craft industry, the European Parliament has drawn attention to the need for a European Centre for SMEs and the craft industry. At the opening and closing conferences of '1983: European Year of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises and Craft Industry', it also agreed in principle to the creation of a liaison body between SMEs and the Community institutions. The Commission supported this initiative and took it up in its communication to the Council entitled 'Community Policy with regard to Small and Medium-sized Enterprises and Craft Industry — Follow-up to '1983: European Year of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises and Craft Industry (COM(84) 263 final of 22 May 1984). In this communication the Commission based itself on the ideas expressed by representatives of SMEs and the craft industry during the events to mark the European Year of SMEs and set two conditions for the setting up of such a Centre: '(a) it must have

the support of all the European organizations representing small and medium-sized enterprises, and (b) it requires an adequate research and documentation capacity enabling it to gather basic data and information which all too often are still dispersed in the Member States.'

- With a view to setting up such a Centre, 100 000 ECU was entered in the Community's 1984 draft budget.
- However, the bodies representing SMEs were unable to agree on a common position.
- This being so, a working party was set up, but the relevant organizations were reticent towards the setting up of a Centre.

At the end of October 1984 a few organizations proposed the setting up of an SME contact group; the Commission once again endeavoured to obtain a consensus on this at least.

It emerged from the discussions that only a few organizations were prepared to participate in a contact group open to all organizations representing SMEs and the craft industry.

So that the funds entered under Item 7777 of the draft budget would not lapse, on 31 December 1984 the Commission earmarked 100 000 ECU for those organizations which were prepared to form a contact group.

This contact group was given the title 'European Group of Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises and the Craft Industry'. It comprises four organizations:

- EUROPMI (European Committee for Small and Medium-Sized Industrial Enterprises)
- EMSU (European Medium and Small Business Union)
- AECM (European Small and Medium-Sized Business Association)
- CCADD (General Committee of Agricultural Cooperatives of the European Communities), which subsequently decided to adopt observer status only.

The Commission would welcome it if the other European organizations of SMEs joined this group. Work on a European economic policy for small and medium-sized enterprises and craft industry is still in progress, but will be completed before the end of 1985.

*
* *

Question No 72, by Mr Adamou (H-62/85)

Subject: Quota restrictions on agricultural products

The Community has imposed quotas on the production of certain Greek agricultural products — 290 000 tonnes for sugarbeet, 290 000 tonnes for ginned cotton, 500 000 tonnes for raw cotton, 93 000 tonnes for currants, 65 000 tonnes for sultanas, cereals, tomatoes, etc. In fact these crops enjoy favourable weather and soil conditions in Greece that are found in no other member country. In addition, they are produced in single-crop areas or in areas where it would be difficult to replace them with other crops (Crete and the Western Peloponnese). In the case of cotton and currants, which no other Member State actually produces, there is a shortage of these products in the Community. The Community therefore imports similar products from the USA and other non-Community countries, in violation of the principle of Community preference.

Since the abovementioned quotas cause the Greek economy enormous problems (imports of similar products, the loss of valuable foreign exchange, underemployment in the agricultural sector, etc), why does the Commission not apply the principle of Community preference, which of the above products are imported from the USA and other countries outside the EEC, what proportion of the Community market is covered by Community and extra-Community production respectively, and, to conclude, does the new Commis-

sion, given that production quotas cause Greek farmers great problems, propose to do anything about the violation of the principle of Community preference, and, if so, what?

Answer

The honourable Member is reminded that there are no quantity restrictions (e.g. quotas) for Greece.

It is, however, true that the Council has decided that according to certain criteria adopted for the Community (risk of structural imbalances, excessive increase in EAGGF expenditure) it is necessary to keep down the increase in Community production of certain agricultural products. The Commission sees no reason why these Community criteria should not also apply to Greece in respect of the various sectors concerned.

*
* *

Question No 73, by Mr Tzounis (H-53/85)

Subject: Special training for diplomats from Community Member States

Diplomats from the Member States of the European Communities are called on to defend increasingly large numbers of common European interests. It is hoped that they will be called on in the future to implement a common European foreign policy. Young diplomats should, therefore, be as widely informed as possible on European subjects. It would be a good idea if training were carried out in common and at some special Community institution.

Does the Commission share this view, and will it be willing to examine the question?

Answer

For twelve years the Commission has regularly (twice a year) organized short courses to provide the Member States, and recently also the applicant countries, with Community back-up in the training of their young diplomats.

Since 1980, at the request of the Foreign Ministers of several Member States, the Commission has also organized once a year seminars for diplomats with about ten years' career experience who wish to learn more about the European Communities.

As regards both the courses and the seminars, the Commission has endeavoured from the outset to organize them to take account not only of the topical problems connected with the Community's development and of diplomats' specific interests, but also of the need to provide diplomats with as wide a range as possible of opinions and information on European integration. To this end the Commission also invites representatives of the other Community institutions (Members of the European Parliament, Permanent Representatives) and Ambassadors of non-member countries accredited to the Community (ACP, Asean, Andean Group) to contribute to each course or seminar.

*
* *

Question No 74, by Mr O'Donnell (H-56/85)

Subject: Cardia Report on transport problems

Does the Commission propose to take any action on the Cardia Report on transport problems in the remote regions of the Community, which are in urgent need of improved

transport services and infrastructure and, in particular, is it proposed to examine the possibility of applying some formula, such as the road equivalent tariff, to transport services to and from peripheral island regions?

Answer

In its communication to the Council relating to a medium-term infrastructure programme¹ the Commission indicates the improvement of transport links with peripheral areas among the four principal goals of Community action. Following the examination of these objectives in the Council's next session (23 May 1985) the Commission will choose the most appropriate projects with respect to these goals.

The Commission recalls that the Council Regulation of 19 December 1984² on a specific measure in the field of transport infrastructure, provides for assistance to a certain number of projects aiming at the improvement of links with peripheral areas.

On the question of road equivalent tariffs on ferry routes, the Commission confirms its views expressed on former occasions: in general, the design of a fares system for local public transport is a matter for the Member States to decide.

*
* *

Question No 75, by Mr Iversen (H-58/85)

Subject: Use of hormone-treated meat

Paragraph 2(a) of the Commission's answer to my oral question No H-802/84³ during the March 1985 part-session reads: 'The Commission considers that the full and detailed application of the measures it has proposed, including proper conditions of use and control of those conditions, will provide much stronger safeguards to the consumer than those at present generally available.'

Can the Commission specify what consumers currently need to be safeguarded against in respect of hormone-treated meat?

In Denmark, for example, there is a total ban on the use of sexual hormones in production, and the Danish Minister for Agriculture has given the Danish Parliament an assurance that there is now no hormone-treated meat on the Danish market. It therefore seems strange to say that there would be stronger safeguards for customers in Denmark if people were allowed to export meat to Denmark in cases where sexual hormones had been used. Furthermore, I would request the Commission to produce some figures for the extra storage charges that increased production resulting from the use of hormones would incur.

Answer

In June 1984 the Commission proposed to the Council a draft Directive on the use of hormones for fattening animals.

The proposal provides that Member States:

- (i) may authorize three natural hormones
- (ii) must prohibit the use of two synthetic hormones (Trembolone and Zeranol)
- (iii) must apply a system of controls at all levels (production, handling and distribution of meat) to detect the presence of hormone residues.

¹ COM(84) 709 final of 14 December 1984.

² Council Regulation (EEC) 3620/84 of 19 December 1984.

³ Verbatim report of proceedings, provisional edition — Annex — 13. 3. 1985, pp. 22-23.

This proposal has provoked much interest in the Parliament, and a good degree of support. But Council has not yet reached a decision. The Commission regrets this delay, for we know that for Parliament, the press and the public, the question of hormones is of real concern.

In reply to the Honourable Member, I can say that the proposals of the Commission should ensure that there will be *no* harmful levels of hormones in meat in circulation on the Community market. If proper controls are applied in all Member States, both for their domestic market and for export to other Member States, consumers will be better safeguarded.

Moreover, the Commission takes this occasion to announce to Parliament that, in response to the discussions which have already taken place, the Commission has just modified its proposal in a way that we believe responds to public concern. This new modification removes nothing from the safeguards in the existing proposal, but adds an additional safeguard, namely: the obligation for Member States to ensure that all meat treated with hormones is identified by means of appropriate labelling and documentation, at all stages from slaughter to the final sale to consumers.

The text of this modification, made under Article 149(2) of the Treaty, will be transmitted to Parliament. I hope that it will receive your support.

*
* *

Question No 76, by Mr Lomas (H-60/85)

Subject: Grants for improving health and safety conditions in small firms

Is there any possibility of the EEC giving grants or loans to small or medium-sized firms in the clothing industry, in the East End of London, in order to improve health and safety conditions at the work place and, if not, will the Commission examine ways in which such assistance could be given?

Answer

There are no existing means for the granting of aid or loans for this specific purpose and the Commission does not foresee provision for such sectoral assistance.

*
* *

Question No 77, by Mr Christopher Jackson (H-68/85)

Subject: Proposed starch regime from August 1985

The price of starch used by paper and board makers in Europe is higher than world market prices due to the levy imposed on imports into the EEC under the CAP. This has put our paper industry at a disadvantage when compared with Scandinavian and other non-European paper competitors. A higher price has in the past, however, been partially alleviated by a production refund granted to European starch producers which they in turn pass back in part to the food and non-food users. There is considerable concern in the paper industry particularly for those paper products in which starch forms a significant part of the final cost about the impact on their competitiveness with non-EEC suppliers of the new starch regime proposals.

Can the Commission assure that the new regime being proposed will not place any European paper makers at a competitive disadvantage with respect to non-EEC paper makers?

Answer

The Commission's proposals for the starch regime envisage the payment of a production refund, based on the actual difference between world and Community raw material prices, to producers of starch which is subsequently used for the manufacture of certain industrial products. Discussions have been taking place about these proposals, and certain industries have been mentioned where they are major starch users and where the final product includes a high percentage of starch.

The Commission is well aware of the problems caused for the European paper makers, who use some 20% of European starch production, by competition from third countries, and is confident that the proposed regime would remove any competitive disadvantage caused by the relatively high price of starch in the Community.

*
* *

Question No 78, by Mr Christiansen (H-69/85)

Subject: Allegation by the Danish National Association of Local Authorities that the Danish Treasury is misappropriating aid from the Social Fund

'Government steals Social Fund aid.' This was the headline of an article in the Commission's Danish publication 'EF-Avisen' No 3, March 1985. In the article, the headline is attributed to a statement made by the chairman of the Danish National Association of Local Authorities, Mayor Evan Jensen, who is also quoted as saying: 'Every time a local government authority receives EEC aid from this source (the Social Fund), the equivalent amount is deducted from the block grant from the Treasury.'

Has the Commission set up or will the Commission set up an inquiry into whether the Danish Treasury has received money from the Social Fund unduly and in contravention of the guidelines for the management of the Social Fund and whether there is any connection between this and the fact that Denmark's share of Social Fund aid in 1983 was 42.2 m ECU or 2.23% and in 1984 95.14 m ECU or 5.12%?

Answer

In the case referred to, the question is to determine whether European Social Fund contributions are additional to the financing habitually granted by public authorities.

Although additionality is the aim, there are no rules that require it. It cannot be completely ruled out — in the case of operations carried out by public authorities at government level in particular — that Fund contributions result in an increase in vocational training operations.

The responsibility for undertaking operations likely to benefit from assistance from the European Social Fund lies with the Member States themselves, within the framework of their own labour market policies. The Commission then applies its selection criteria, taking account of the need to promote new projects and endeavouring to grant Community aid to operations for which Fund assistance is particularly important. It is these factors which determine the share of Fund aid received by any country.

The Commission does not intend to set up an enquiry along the lines suggested by the question.

*
* *

Question No 79, by Mr Van der Waal (H-70/85)

Subject: Use of the official languages in the Community

The prospective enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal will entail an increase in costs for translation and interpretation. On 12 March 1985, the Dutch Parliament declared itself in favour of maintaining the use of the Dutch Language in the Community in accordance with Council Regulation No 1 (see Official Journal 385/58 of 6. 10. 1958). Can the Commission undertake to ensure that the active use of every Community language, both spoken and written, is maintained so that the principle of equal status for the official Community languages continues to be upheld in the future?

Answer

As the honourable Member points out, the accession of Spain and Portugal will considerably increase the translation and interpretation load borne by the Community institutions and bodies.

Aware of these problems, the Commission is applying and will continue to apply, in accordance with the provisions of Council Regulation No 1 of 15 April 1985 on the use of languages in the Community, pragmatic formulas which take account of actual needs (as well as the resources at its disposal) and which ensure that no language is excluded.

(Furthermore the Commission has made special efforts to promote multilingualism in Europe, particularly in its projects in the field of terminological data banks etc., and to promote computer translation, all with a view not only to making the best use of the resources available but also to preserving the cultural wealth represented by the different languages of Europe.)

*
* *

Question No 80, by Mrs Dury (H-79/85)

Subject: Provisions applicable to mortgages

The proposal for a Council directive on the freedom of establishment and the free supply of services — in the field of mortgage credit (COM(84) 730 final) contains no chapter on provisions applicable to the conclusion of mortgages. Does the Commission not think that, in the interests of those European consumers who have cause to deal with mortgage credit institutions, a section on provisions applicable to mortgages should be added to this proposal?

Answer

It would not be appropriate to supplement the Commission's proposal for a Directive on mortgage credit with provisions concerning mortgage contracts. Our existing proposal deals with questions of supervisory law, which would allow certain types of institutions, such as building societies, to operate in other Member States.

Moreover, the contract law in this field is complex and its harmonization would be difficult. All that can be usefully done is to find solutions in accordance with the principles of private international law. These principles would, even in the absence of specific coordination, make the law of the consumer's country applicable in many respects, for instance when it comes to constituting the mortgage. I should add that the Commission considers that the mortgage laws of the Member States, with all their differences, have quite equivalent results in protecting the borrowers. Our proposals do not therefore endanger consumer interests even in the absence of specific rules on mortgage contracts.

*
* *

Question No 81, by Mr G. Romeos (H-82/85)

Subject: Cancer in cypress trees

At the beginning of the 1950s an incurable disease broke out in southern Europe attacking and killing cypress trees.

This disease — known as cypress cancer — is spreading very reapidly and causing extensive economic and environmental damage.

In Greece, and in the Peloponnese in particular, approximately 50%-90% of trees are now affected.

Can the Commission state whether:

- it has taken measures to prevent the spread of cypress cancer in mainland Greece and on the islands where the disease is also beginning to appear,
- it has studied the possibility of financing new plantations to produce cypresses in large numbers so as to enable the trees which have already died to be replaced?

Answer

The reply to both parts of the question is positive.

1. Since 1979, the Commission has sought to promote research in the fight against cypress canker which afflicts the Mediterranean basin. Coordinated research is carried out with financial help from the Community at several centres (Antibes, Florence and Athens). It is particularly concerned with providing users with varieties resistant to this disease.

2. In its proposal to institute integrated Mediterranean programmes, the Commission has foreseen the possibility of aiding the setting up of forest nurseries.

The important Community aids for afforestation and the improvement of neglected forests accorded to Greece already represent a powerful factor for the development of forest nurseries in this country.

*
* *

*II. Questions to the Council**Question No 82, by Mr Vandemeulebroucke (H-698/84)*

Subject: Situation and problems of the aged in the European Community

1982 was the Year of the Elderly, in view of which the European Parliament adopted the Squarcialupi report on the situation and problems of the aged in the European Community (Doc. 1-848/81).

Parliament asked the Commission and the Council to put forward practical initiatives in a number of policy areas.

What measures has the Council taken in response to this report?

Answer

The Council will examine carefully any proposals on the matter that the Commission might submit to it.

*
* *

Question No 87, by Mr Andrews (H-771/84)

Subject: Mobilization of aid to famine stricken countries in Africa

In the press release issued following the 960th meeting of the Council on Development Cooperation, which was held on 6 November 1984, the Council stated in relation to the mobilization of aid for the Sahel region that account must be taken of the crucial role played by the WFP.

Will the Council elaborate on the role of the WFP and the information which this organization can supply regarding ports and railways, storage capacities and internal transport and distribution facilities, and will it further agree to ensuring that this information is tel-exed to the Commission offices or Foreign Affairs Offices of each of the Member States at least twice weekly, so that charities know exactly where supplies are in transit and exactly when the supplies will arrive which will help religious communities and charities to cope with rationing?

Answer

In line with the conclusions of the Dublin European Council, the mobilization of aid from the Community and the Member States to the famine stricken countries in Africa is carried out in close coordination between the Commission and the Member States and in liaison with the other bilateral donors and international organizations.

*
* *

Question No 94, by Mr Ephremidis (H-778/84)

Subject: Mediterranean programmes

Can the Council state whether, with a view to the European Council meeting, the negotiations on the Mediterranean programmes have been concluded and can it, in particular, state when they are to enter into force, the amount of appropriations adopted and whether these appropriations are additional or not?

Answer

The European Council has stated its position regarding the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes in terms which were made public following the meeting on 29 and 30 March in Brussels. I would moreover refer the honourable Member to this morning's debate on this subject.

*
* *

Question No 93, by Mrs Thome-Patenôtre (H-773/84)

Subject: Validity of the European passport

The purpose of the European passport is to strengthen the feeling of unity amongst EEC citizens and also to reinforce the image of the European Economic Community outside its external frontiers.

Can the Council indicate the precise validity of this passport outside the EEC? If it is only partial, what action does the Council intend taking to make it complete?

Question No 97, by Mrs Boot (H-815/84)

Subject: Standard European passport

According to the Council resolution of 23 June 1981, the Member States apparently agreed to introduce a standard passport as of 1 January 1985.

Five of the Member States have announced that the passport will be introduced as of 1 January 1985. But it would appear that only three Member States in fact are issuing this standard passport to citizens who apply for them.

Can the Council inform Parliament what measures it has taken *vis-à-vis* the other seven Member States since its answer of 29 November 1984 to Written Question No 623/84 from Mr Chambeiron?¹

Joint answer

With your permission, Sir, I propose to give a joint reply to the two questions relating to the European passport put by Mrs Thome-Patenôtre and Mrs Boot respectively.

The uniform passport is issued by the authorities of the Member States. It is for them to define, where appropriate, its territorial validity.

The Council is aware that some of the first holders of the uniform passport have met with difficulties when wishing to use it. These difficulties are due to the fact that certain passport authorities were not adequately informed of the introduction of the uniform passport. The Presidency has asked the Member States to inform all passport authorities of the introduction of the uniform passport.

As regards the issue of uniform passports it is true that, to date, six Member States are actually issuing them.

However, since the 1981 Resolution does not prevent them from doing so, Member States' authorities can issue uniform passports once existing stocks have been used up, and it may well be that in certain of these Member States the authorities have comparatively large stocks of old passports.

As for the other Member States, Greece and the Netherlands will be issuing the uniform passport shortly.

The Federal Republic of Germany intends to issue a European passport in 1987.

The United Kingdom might issue this passport in 1987.

*
* *

Question No 98, by Mr Pearce (H-817/84)

Subject: EEC-Cyprus Association Council on 17. 12. 1984

At the meeting of the EEC-Cyprus Association Council on 17. 12. 1984, did Ministers address themselves to the need to make the benefits of this agreement applicable to both parts of the island and, if so, with what result?

Answer

I can assure the honourable Member that, on the point he has raised, the Community's position is unchanged and that it considers that the advantages granted by the Community

¹ OJ C 19, 21. 1. 1985, p. 7.

under the EEC-Cyprus Association Agreement should benefit the whole population of the island.

This principle has been continually adhered to within the framework of EEC-Cyprus relations. Finally, I should like to point out that within the second financial protocol, which entered into force at the end of 1983, projects of joint interest for the whole population of the island were identified.

*
* *

Question No 99, by Sir Peter Vanneck (H-819/84)

Subject: European aerospace industries

Will the Council consider the implications for the future of European aerospace industries of the decision, by the NATO Conference of National Armaments Directors, 19 March 1985 among five European States on the development of a European fighter aircraft?

Answer

The question raised by the Honourable Member has never been discussed in the Council. Moreover, as the Honourable Member is aware, questions relating to defence do not fall within the Council's field of competence.

*
* *

Question No 100, by Mrs Viehoff (H-821/84)

Subject: Plan to send young people to developing countries

The communiqué from the Fontainebleau summit of EEC Heads of State or Government in June 1984 contained the following sentence:

'Expressed the hope that Member States would take steps to encourage young people to take part in the activities conducted by the Community outside its frontiers and in particular that they would support the creation of national Committees of volunteer development-workers in Europe to unite young Europeans wishing to work on projects in developing countries.'

On the basis of this passage a French committee of development workers led by Bernard Kouchner has drawn up a plan to send hundreds of young people aged between 18 and 20 to developing countries each year where they would be trained by French and German army officers, with the assistance of civilian experts. The first 500 volunteers will arrive in April and the numbers will increase to 3 000 in two years' time.

These plans were submitted for approval to the Franco-German summit on 28 February 1985.

Is the Council aware that the volunteers are to be trained by French and German army officers and what are its views on this matter?

Answer

The Council welcomes initiatives aimed at giving effect to the hope expressed by the European Council in Fontainebleau in June 1984 that Member States would encourage national Committees of development volunteers bringing together young European work-

ers wishing to help carry out projects in developing countries, including the plan referred to by the author of the question. The Council has still not been informed of the details of this initiative.

The success of the initiative obviously depends to a large extent on the quality of the training and how well the young workers adapt to the projects concerned. It is for the competent bodies in the Member States to decide on the detailed arrangements for the dispatch of young volunteers, including their training.

*
* *

Question No 103, by Mr Maffre-Baugé (H-9/85)

Subject: New regulations on the manufacture of chocolate

At present only products derived from cocoa can be used, together with sugar, milk and/or dried fruit, for the manufacture of chocolate in the EEC. Has the Council decided to reject the Commission's proposal to authorize the inclusion of vegetable oils and fats, which would have serious repercussions for the ACP countries which export cocoa?

Answer

The proposal for a Directive to which the honourable Member refers, which provides, *inter alia*, for the possibility of using oils and fats other than cocoa butter for the manufacture of certain chocolates, was forwarded to the Council on 17 January 1984.

The Council cannot take any decision on this proposal, including the problem of the use of vegetable oils and fats, until the European Parliament has adopted the Opinion requested of it on 27 January 1984. The Council is unable at this stage to give any indication of the position it may take on the matter.

*
* *

Question No 105, by Mr Wurtz (H-39/85)

Subject: Human rights situation in Turkey

Does the Council endorse the view expressed by the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, in Ankara on 13 February 1985, that the sum of 600 million dollars set aside for Community loans to Turkey should be released, or does it not consider, on the contrary, that this finance should continue to be withheld, as the European Parliament clearly recommended, until such time as full democratic rights have been restored in Turkey?

Answer

As I pointed out at your part-session last March in reply to an oral question from Mr Pannella on the same subject, the Council does not normally comment on statements made by one of its members outside the Council framework.

As regards the substance of the honourable Member's question, I would reply by referring to the reply given by the President of the Council, also in March, to Question No H-749/84 from Mr Alavanos. I can therefore confirm that discussions have taken place at various levels within the relevant Council bodies on the position the Community should adopt with regard to Turkey, particularly as regards financial cooperation, following political developments there.

These discussions have not yet been completed. No decision has therefore been taken on the possible release of the 600 m ECU laid down in the 4th EEC-Turkey Financial Protocol, which, I would remind you, has not yet been signed.

*
* *

Question No 106, by Mr von der Vring (H-41/85)

Subject: Regional Fund regulation

On 1 January 1985 a new Regional Fund regulation entered into force which provides no legal basis for a non-quota section. What steps does the Council intend to take to ensure that the promised second part of the second tranche of the non-quota section of the Regional Fund, relating to steel, shipbuilding, textiles and fisheries, can be implemented without further delay?

Question No 112, by Mr Clinton (H-55/85)

Subject: Special Border Areas Programme

In view of the fact that Ireland has now used up its full share of the Special Border Areas Programme which is due to expire during the current year, and in view of the desirability of continuing this very worthwhile scheme, could the Council indicate when they will be able to adopt the Commission proposals presented to them in December 1984; will the Council also indicate if there are any special difficulties involved in the adoption of these proposals and if so, explain in detail what these difficulties are?

Joint answer

I am taking the liberty of answering two questions with the same subject matter, put by Mr von der Vring and Mr Clinton.

1 January 1985 saw the entry into force of the new ERDF Regulation, which, as is pointed out in the questions put by the honourable Members, makes no provision for a 'non-quota' section.

'Non-quota' measures were provided for under Article 13 of Regulation No 724/75. The Commission submitted four proposals for Regulations concerning a series of 'non-quota' measures based on this provision which were received by the Council at the beginning of January 1985, that is to say after that Regulation had expired.

To date the Council has not received the Commission communication indicating how it intends to resolve this legal problem and is therefore not in a position to complete its examination of the proposals in question. Meanwhile it awaits the Opinions of the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee on these proposals.

*
* *

Question No 107, by Mr Mallet (H-42/85)

Subject: Action taken on the Solemn Declaration on European Union

At the meeting of the European Council in Stuttgart in June 1983 the ten Heads of State or Government signed a Solemn Declaration on European Union which contained a number of undertakings relating to institutional matters. Can the Council give a detailed account of the measures which have actually been taken as a follow-up to the declaration?

Answer

The Solemn Declaration on European Union contains several points concerning the relations of the European Parliament either with the European Council or with the Council.

As regards relations between the European Parliament and the European Council, it should be noted that:

- the European Parliament has been informed of the outcome of the proceedings of the European Council, in several cases by the President of the European Council (point 2.1.4 the Solemn Declaration);
- the European Council has forwarded to the European Parliament an annual report on progress towards European Union (point 2.1.4. of the Solemn Declaration).

As regards relations between the European Parliament and the Council, it should be noted that

- during the meeting between the Enlarged Bureau of the European Parliament and the ten Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Member States of the European Community, Mr Barry gave an account of progress within the Council on the Commission proposals for improving the conciliation procedure. This question was referred to in point 2.3.6. of the Solemn Declaration on European Union, on which one delegation entered a reservation (point 2.3.6. of the Solemn Declaration). The Council also stated its position in a letter dated 12 March 1985;
- by letter dated 13 March 1985 the Council informed the European Parliament that for agreements of major importance the Council expected the Commission, when submitting its recommendations for authorization to negotiate, to indicate to the European Parliament and the Council whether an agreement was of major importance.

As regards the question of extending to agreements of major importance the existing procedures for informing the European Parliament confidentially and unofficially of the progress of negotiations, the Council notes that paragraph 2.3.7. of the Solemn Declaration would entail the application, bearing in mind the need for urgency, of the existing procedures for trade agreements (Westerterp procedure) which gives the European Parliament more comprehensive information.

Finally, the Council will obtain the Opinion of the European Parliament on agreements of major importance after they have been signed but before they are concluded (point 2.3.7. of the Solemn Declaration);

- in the same letter of 13 March 1985 the Council indicated that it would obtain the Opinion of the European Parliament when implementing Articles 98 ECSC, 237 EEC and 205 EAEC.

I propose this evening to have an exchange of views with the Political Affairs Committee on the detailed arrangements for obtaining this Opinion in the case of Spanish and Portuguese accession (point 2.3.7. of the Solemn Declaration).

Moreover,

- the Council has adopted a position on various Resolutions adopted by the European Parliament (point 2.3.3. of the Solemn Declaration);
- the Presidencies-in-Office of the Council have presented to the European Parliament their programmes of action and their progress reports (point 2.3.4. of the Solemn Declaration).

*

* *

Question No 108, by Mr Alavanos (H-47/85)

Subject: Greece, Mediterranean programmes, five-year programme

According to official OECD and EEC figures for the five-year period from 1980 to 1984 (published in articles by Professor Dretsakis in the 'Ta Nea' newspapers from 18 to 21 February 1985),

- the annual rate of increase in the gross national product was 0.88% for the EEC and 0.7% for Greece (in the preceding five-year period the figures were 2.6% and 5.4% respectively);
- the annual rate of variation in gross fixed capital investment was 0.3% for the EEC and -4.06% for Greece (the figures for the preceding five-year period were 1.16% and 5.92% respectively);
- Greece's per capita gross national product was 41.8% of the EEC average, compared with 44.9% in the five-year period from 1975 to 1979.

This means that not only has Greek accession to the EEC not led to economic 'convergence' but the gap is widening and Greece, by joining the EEC, has become 'less European' from the point of view of economic development.

How is the Council dealing with this problem, and how does it explain its attitude both to the provision of finance through the Mediterranean programmes and to the Greek five-year programme?

Answer

The problems raised by the honourable Member have been a cause of particular concern to the Council.

That is why I welcome the fact that, at its meeting in Brussels on 29 and 30 March 1985, the European Council reached the conclusions concerning the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes which have just been set out by the President of the European Council.

The financial assistance which will be granted to Greece by the Community pursuant to these conclusions will certainly be a significant contribution to the solution of the problems raised by the honourable Member.

*
* *

Question No 109, by Mr Adamou (H-48/85)

Subject: Imports from Israel — withdrawals in Greece

In his speech to the European Parliament on 12 February 1985, the President of Israel admitted that Israel exports 80% of its citrus fruit to the Community and that of Israel's exports to the EEC, worth 2 048 m ECU in 1983, one third is composed of agricultural products. Greece, on the other hand, which produces almost the same agricultural products as Israel and is an EEC Member State, is compelled to withdraw (i.e. plough under) its agricultural products in larger and larger quantities. 769 512 tonnes of fruit and vegetables were withdrawn in the period from 1981 to 1983, and in January 1984 alone 125 000 tonnes of citrus were withdrawn.

Why does the Council allow such an open violation of the principle of Community preference, which is guaranteed by the Treaty of Rome?

Answer

I would point out to the honourable Member that trade between the European Economic Community and the State of Israel is subject to the provisions of the Cooperation Agree-

ment between the European Economic Community and the State of Israel, which entered into force on 1 July 1975.

These provisions also govern trade arrangements in the agricultural sector, including citrus fruits, to which the honourable Member specifically refers. These provisions do not allow a flat prohibition on imports of these citrus fruits into the Community in cases where these products are withdrawn in certain Member States.

*
* *

Question No 111, by Mr Tzounis (H-52/85)

Subject: Special training for diplomats from Community Member States

Diplomats from the Member States of the European Communities are called on to defend increasingly large numbers of common European interests. It is hoped that they will be called on in the future to implement a common European foreign policy. Young diplomats should, therefore, be as widely informed as possible on European subjects. It would be a good idea if training were carried out in common and at some special Community institution.

Does the Council share this view, and will it be willing to examine the question?

Answer

The Council would draw the honourable Member's attention to the fact that the Commission organizes in-service training for young diplomats.

Moreover, several Member States's Permanent Representations to the European Communities take on people whose course requires them to undergo in-service training as part of their studies. Lastly, several Member States second a number of new officials to their Permanent Representations to give them a training which includes a European aspect.

*
* *

Question No 113, by Mrs Dury (H-64/85)

Subject: Delays in the adoption of directives

The proposal for a Council directive on EEC-accepted plant protection products has been before the Council since 4 August 1976.

According to the timetable adopted by the Council in its resolution of 10 May 1984¹ establishing a programme of work in the field of the harmonization of veterinary, plant health and animal feedingstuffs legislation, the Commission's proposal to the Council on EEC acceptance is to be adopted by 1 January 1986. This means that more than nine years will have elapsed before the directive finally comes into force.

Can the Council explain why it will have taken so long for the proposal for a directive to be adopted, and can it give an assurance that the 1 January 1986 deadline will be met?

Answer

The proposal for a Council Directive on the placing on the market of EEC-accepted plant protection products has indeed been before the Council since 1976 and appears in the

¹ OJ C 134 of 22 May 1984, p. 1.

timetable in the Council Resolution of 10 May 1984¹ as one of the proposals to be adopted by 1 January 1986.

The reason the proposal has not yet been adopted is that major difficulties have arisen, particularly as regards agreement on the principle of granting acceptance for plant protection products at Community level. No consensus has yet been achieved on the guarantees which authorizations valid throughout the whole territory of the Community, with its geographical and climatic differences, should provide in particular as regards the effectiveness of products and the protection of human and animal health, not forgetting the protection of the environment.

If a satisfactory compromise could be reached on this fundamental question, the other outstanding problems, which are essentially of a legal and technical nature, should not stand in the way of the adoption of the Directive.

*
* *

III. *Questions to the Foreign Ministers*

Question No 122, by Mr Tomlinson (H-825/84)

Subject: The Community's relations with Pakistan

Do the ministers consider that the recent general election held in Pakistan was either fair or free such as to constitute a democratic basis on which the European Community's relations with Pakistan can be strengthened?

Answer

The Ten have closely followed the progress of the recent general elections in Pakistan that undoubtedly constitute an initial step towards the establishment, albeit slowly and gradually, of more representative institutions. The renewal of the government, the selection of the speaker of the new parliament and the appointment of a Prime Minister for the first time since 1977 all confirm this trend.

The Ten welcome these developments and hope to see their promise fulfilled as soon as possible, thereby helping to strengthen relations between the European Community and Pakistan.

*
* *

Question No 127, by Mr Dury (H-14/85)

Subject: Statement on Nicaragua by Mr Reagan

What is the Foreign Ministers' attitude to Mr Reagan's statement on Nicaragua and what stage has been reached in preparations for the meeting between the Foreign Ministers of the Ten and the Contadora group?

Answer

The Ten have consistently expressed their conviction that the problems of Latin America, including Nicaragua, cannot be solved by resorting to force but only by means of a political solution issuing from the region itself. With this in mind, the Ten have repeatedly expressed their support for the initiative of the Contadora Group, which seeks a peaceful

¹ OJ C 134 of 22 May 1984, p. 1.

and global solution of the region's problems. This support was reaffirmed at the ministerial meeting in San José, Costa Rica. The Ten are keeping in contact with the countries of the Contadora Group and the Central American countries with a view to organizing, before the end of the year, a further ministerial meeting with the same participants as in San José. The United States administration is naturally well aware of the position of the Ten and of the above-mentioned initiative.

*
* *

Question No 129, by Mr De Vries (H-37/85)

Subject: Ratification of the Council of Europe convention on the combating of terrorism

In view of the resolutions adopted by the European Parliament, contained in documents 2-1605/84, 2-1618/84, 2-1641/84, 2-1643/84, 2-1644/84 and 2-1650/84, calling for coordinated action to combat terrorism, and in view of the announcement that a meeting of the ministers responsible for counter-terrorist action is to be held before the end of the Italian Presidency, could the Foreign Ministers state what factors have prevented six Member States from ratifying as yet the convention on the combating of terrorism signed under the auspices of the Council of Europe in 1977? And are they prepared to urge these Member States to ratify the convention at an early date, a step that could facilitate coordinated action to combat terrorism?

Answer

The Foreign Ministers of the ten Member States meeting in political cooperation share the view of the European Parliament expressed in the resolution referred to by the honourable Member on the need for greater coordination of anti-terrorist action.

The subject was last dealt with in February at the ministerial meeting in Rome, during which the Ministers stressed the need to continue and increase the existing cooperation between the Ten to tackle this problem.

As regards the ratification of the 1977 Convention of the Council of Europe by those Member States which have not yet done so, this question must be examined by each of them in the light of their respective national constitutional and legal provisions.

*
* *

Question No 130, by Mr Lomas (H-30/85)

Subject: Sentence and imprisonment of İsmet İmset

I refer to my Question No 1679/83,¹ when I asked the ministers to intervene in the case of İsmet İmset and persuade the Turkish Authorities to cease the harassment of Mr İmset. Mr İmset has now been sentenced to 4 years and 2 months imprisonment for membership of an armed gang, a charge which has never been mentioned since he was originally charged in 1978 with illegal ownership of a pistol. This charge he admitted to under torture. Mr İmset has been out on bail for five years. No new evidence was presented for either the original or final charge. Will the ministers as a matter of urgency press the Turkish Authorities for the immediate release of Mr İmset?

Answer

The case of Mr İsmet İmset raised by the honourable Member has not been the subject of special discussion by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation.

¹ Annex to the Verbatim Report of Proceedings, 13. 3. 1985, p. 27.

The Ten, as pointed out on numerous occasions, are closely monitoring the human rights situation in Turkey and have repeatedly, in their contacts with the authorities in Ankara, voiced their concerns in this respect.

*
* *

Question No 132, by Mr Alavanos (H-63/85)

Subject: Attitude of the Ten to the situation in Turkey

In reply to my Oral Question No H-749/84¹ on the situation in Turkey, the Council states that 'the Ministers of the Ten once again addressed themselves briefly to the question of developments in Turkey at their meeting of 18 February 1985'.

Can the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation say to which precise aspects of the situation in Turkey they gave their attention, what points of view were put forward, whether there was any convergence of views and, if so, to what extent, and, to conclude, why the Ten have not so far reacted to the continuing persecution, torture and conviction of Turkish democrats, particularly the mass death penalties meted out to Turkish patriots?

Answer

The meeting of 18 February referred to by the honourable Member was not a political cooperation meeting but a meeting of the Council of Ministers. The Council has not changed the position it adopted in 1980/1981 as regards relations with this associated country.

As regards the question of human rights in Turkey, the Ten — as has been repeatedly stated — are following the situation very closely and have repeatedly voiced their concern on this matter during their contacts with the authorities in Ankara.

*
* *

Question No 133, by Mr Iversen (H-59/85)

Subject: Sanctions or an oil embargo against South Africa

Have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation discussed the savage attacks carried out by the South African government on the black population in the last few weeks? Have they, in this connection, discussed the sanctions taken against the South African Government by, among others, Norway and Sweden, and, in the context of political cooperation, have they discussed the Danish Parliament's resolution of March 1985 on the situation in South Africa? Can the Foreign Ministers say what their attitude is to further sanctions and a possible oil embargo on the apartheid regime in South Africa?

Answer

The recent events in South Africa to which the honourable Member refers were the subject of a statement which the Presidency issued on behalf of the Ten on 25 March last and which reads as follows:

The ten Member States of the European Community express their grave concern at the tension which has arisen in South Africa as a result of the indiscriminate acts of repression carried out against the black population.

¹ Annex to the Verbatim Report of Proceedings, 13. 3. 1985, p. 27

In particular, they strongly condemn the behaviour of police units during the events of 21 March in Uitenhage, as a result of which many black residents died.

The Ten, recalling the Ministerial Declaration of 11 September 1984, reiterate their appeal for an end to apartheid and for a process of dialogue to bring about major reforms designed to fulfil the legitimate aspirations of the black population.

Since the Member States participate in European political cooperation on the basis of their respective political positions, the resolution of the Danish Parliament to which the honourable Member refers has of course been brought to the attention of the other partners.

Lastly, as regards the problem of sanctions against South Africa, the Ten are strictly applying the mandatory measures adopted by the United Nations.

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 18 APRIL 1985

Contents

Mr Sherlock; Mr von der Vring; Mr Segre

1. *Approval of the minutes:*

Mr Chanterie 215

2. *Topical and urgent debate:*

- *Terrorism — Motions for resolutions (Doc. B 2-131/85) by Mrs Veil and others, (Doc. B 2-146/85) by Mrs Fontaine and others, (Doc. B 2-155/85) by Mr Piquet and others, (Doc. B 2-156/85) by Mr Cervetti and others, and (Doc. B 2-161/85) by Mr Le Pen and others:*

Mrs Veil; Mr Mallet; Mr Wurtz; Mr Novelli; Mr Collinot; Mr Saby; Mr Casini; Mr Seligman; Mr Filinis; Mr Malaud; Mr Härlin; Mr Ford; Mr Ripa di Meana (Commission); Mr d'Ormeson 216

- *Fixed link across the Channel — Motions for resolutions (Doc. B 2-133/85) by Mr Newton Dunn and Mr Prag and (Doc. B 2-143/85) by Mr Habsburg and others:*

Mr Newton Dunn; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mrs Fontaine; Mr Newman; Mr P. Beazley; Mr Raftery; Mr Cot; Mrs Faith; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs Thome-Patenôtre; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission) 222

- *Economic summit — Motions for resolutions (Doc. B 2-135/85) by Mrs Scrivener, (Doc. B 2-150/85) by Mr Seeler and others, (Doc. B 2-154/85) by Mr Linkohr and others, and (Doc. B 2-169/85) by Mr Bonaccini and others:*

Mrs Scrivener; Mr Seeler; Mr Linkohr; Mr Bonaccini; Mrs Weber; Mr Herman; Mr Moorhouse; Mr Verbeek; Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Zahorka; Mr De Clerq (Commission) 226

- *Steel sector — Motions for resolutions (Doc. B 2-147/85) by Mrs Van Rooy and others and by Mr De Vries and Mr De Gucht, (Doc. B 2-157/85) by Mr Wagner and others and by Mr Bonaccini and others, (Doc. B 2-160/85) by Mr Le Pen and others, and (Doc. B 2-166/85) by Mr de la Malène and others:*

Mrs Van Rooy; Mr Peters; Mr Buttafuoco; Mr Fitzgerald; Mr Visser; Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mr De Gucht; Mr Christensen; Mr Cassidy; Mr De Clerq (Commission); Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Patterson 232

- *South Africa — Motions for resolutions (Doc. B 2-119/85) by Mr Lomas and others, (Doc. B 2-121/85) by Mr De Vries and Mr De Gucht, (Doc. B 2-132/85) by Mr Prag and others, (Doc. B 2-142/85) by Mr Habsburg and others, and (Doc. B 2-153/85) by Mr Wurtz and others:*

Mr Lomas; Mr Nordmann; Mr Prag; Mr Habsburg; Mr Trivelli; Mr Ulburghs; Mr De Clerq (Commission); Mr Arndt; Mr Segre; Mr Prag 237

3. *Commission statement:*

Mr Christophersen (Commission); Mrs Barbarella; Mrs Castle; Mr Cornelissen; Mr Curry; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Bonde; Mr Bardong; Mr Pasty; Mr Dankert; Mr Christophersen; Mr Cot 241

4. *Easing of controls at the intra-Community borders — Report (Doc. A 2-18/85) by Mr Rogalla:*

Mr Rogalla; Mr Patterson; Mrs Vayssade; Mrs Boot; Mr Turner; Mr De Gucht; Mrs Oppenheim; Mr McMillan-Scott; Lord Cockfield (Commission); Mrs Boot; Mr Rogalla; Lord Cockfield 247

5. *European Environment Summit — Report (Doc. A 2-7/85) by Mr Collins:*

Mr Collins; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs Weber; Mrs Schleicher; Mrs Jepsen; Mr Adamou; Mr Maher; Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Muntingh; Mr Iversen; Mr Kuijpers; Mr Bombard; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission); Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Clinton Davis 254

6. *Noise emission of rail-mounted vehicles — Report (Doc. A 2-11/85) by Mr Bonaccini:*

Mr Bonaccini 264

7. *Votes:*
Mr Seal; Mr Marshall; Mr Welsh; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Sutra de Germa 265
8. *Noise emission of rail-mounted vehicles (contd):*
Mr Vittinghof; Mrs Lentz-Cornette; Mr Sherlock; Mr Kuipers; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission); Mr Roelants du Vivier . . . 267
9. *Indication of prices — Report (Doc. A 2-6/85) by Mr Nordmann:*
Mr Nordmann; Mr Hughes; Mrs Banotti; Mrs Jackson; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission) 270
10. *Turnover taxes — Second report (Doc. A 2-15/85) by Mr Beumer:*
Mr Beumer; Mr De Vries; Mr Gautier; Mr Bocklet; Mr Pasty; Lord Cockfield (Commission); Mr Beumer; Lord Cockfield; Mr Patterson; Lord Cockfield 274
11. *FAO World Conference on Fisheries — Report (Doc. A 2-3/85) by Mrs Ewing:*
Mrs Ewing; Mrs Pery; Mr Ebel; Mr Battersby; Mr Clinton; Mr C. Beazley; Mr Christophersen (Commission) 279
12. *Customs debt — Report (Doc. 2-1590/84) by Dame Shelagh Roberts:*
Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mr Rogalla; Mr Seeler; Mrs Van Rooy; Lord Cockfield (Commission); Mrs Van Rooy; Mr Rogalla; Lord Cockfield 284
13. *Transport — Report (Doc. A 2-9/85) by Mr Marshall:*
Mr Marshall; Mr Ebel; Mr Visser; Mr K.-H. Hoffmann; Mr Turner; Mr Pearce; Mr Carossino; Mr Pearce; Mr Wijsenbeek; Mrs Ewing; Mr Welsh; Mrs Ewing; Mr Van der Waal; Mr Stevenson; Mr Cornelissen; Mrs Oppenheim; Mr McMillan-Scott; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission) 288

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 10.00 a.m.)

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Madam President, I believe the attention of the House has been drawn to a misuse of the service provided by Members' boxes in that a document was inserted in mine — and I have every reason to believe in everyone else's — which has no authorship, no attributability and was not distributed in the approved manner.

President. — Mr Sherlock, your comment will be referred to the Bureau so that the Quaestors can look into the matter.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Madam President, would you please tell the Bureau that what is put in the pigeon-holes is totally irrelevant, since it is only a postal matter. We ought not constantly to be acting as censors.

President. — Yes, I shall do so.

Mr Segre (COM). — (IT) Madam President, I also wish to draw attention to the fact that this morning we

found in our pigeon-holes a sort of anonymous leaflet with a racist content. We would also urge you to refer the matter to the Quaestors.

President. — I assure you, Mr Segre, that this will be done without fail.

1. *Approval of the minutes*

President. — The minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting have been distributed.

Are there any comments?

Mr Chanterie (PPE). — (NL) Madam President, with regard to what is stated on page 21 of the Dutch text under item 11:

Statement by the Council and the Commission on the European Council of 29 and 30 March 1985 (vote). The next item is the vote on the motion for a resolution,

I should like to point out that I asked to speak at that point — but was not called — to say that I wanted to give a written explanation of vote. I did in fact hand in the explanation of vote, but in the rush at the end of the sitting I was unable to inform you. I wanted to ask whether this can be included in the minutes.

President. — It will all be duly recorded.

(Parliament approved the minutes)¹

2. Topical and urgent debate

Terrorism

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-131/85) by Mrs Veil and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on measures to combat terrorism;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-146/85) by Mrs Fontaine and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the attack in Paris on 29 March 1985;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-155/85) by Mr Piquet and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on racism;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-156/85) by Mr Cervetti and others on the murder of Professor Ezio Tarantelli and the resurgence of terrorism in Europe;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-161/85) by Mr Le Pen and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on terrorism.

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, once again we find ourselves voicing our feelings about the plague which violence and terrorism have come to mean to all of our countries.

During our last session we already had to make very serious and urgent representations to the Council and our governments about the gravity of the situation; since then we have seen renewed manifestations of terrorism and violence which have claimed new victims. Last week we had scarcely finished drafting our resolution when we found ourselves having to amend it twice because violence — and I mean violence — had struck yet again over the weekend in France and Spain.

People some times talk of mindless violence, probably meaning gratuitous, but what we have here is far from mindless: it is terribly rational and organized. Each time there is a clearly-defined objective and an obvious target, be it a particularly vulnerable group or community, an organization or a building.

Over and above the immediate aim of spreading anxiety and fear, seeking to intimidate some, incite others to suspicion and prejudice, and sometimes to provoke still others into over-retaliation, the real objective is to sabotage social stability, democracy, freedom — the very foundations of our societies and our values.

We have to accept that the resistance our countries are showing to these factions by our very union gives them sufficient grounds for seeking to destroy us.

The resolve of the Atlantic Alliance to strengthen democracy through the Community is intolerable to those who want to let evil take over the world. This is why our Community, our democracies, have to be undermined, destabilized and destroyed!

We have already made several appeals to our governments to react, to make a concerted Community effort to punish these criminals, using every method of prevention and law enforcement at their disposal. It goes without saying that we now call once again for collaboration in terms of the police, the law and extradition, but this is no longer enough.

We also have to ask ourselves who is gaining from these crimes because, I repeat, the victims are all innocent people, but there is no such thing as an innocent crime. We must take concerted action through diplomatic channels, and not merely through our security arrangements. We must find out whose finger is on the trigger, who is the brain behind all those who seek to destroy democracy!

We all know the answer. What we are facing today is a genuine alliance between factions on the extreme right and the extreme left. They have the same interests and they are joining forces. They are trained in the same camps in Beirut and Libya — we have a number of examples of this; they have the same weapons and the same sources of finance. It is only if we act together, respond by diplomacy, by taking sanctions against these countries, that we can really show our refusal to put up with this terrorism any longer. We must make it clear that there have been enough victims, that we have had enough and that we will not sit back and let our democracies be destroyed.

(Applause)

Mr Mallet (PPE). — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, terrorism has struck yet again.

The outrage committed in Paris against the Jewish film festival at the Rivoli-Beaubourg cinema has aroused justified anger in France and in Europe. We should however, make no mistake about the nature and origin of this abominable crime. It appears to have been more an anti-Zionist act than an anti-semitic one. It was not committed by a French racist organization. I cannot emphasize this too strongly: it is the work of

¹ *Membership of committees — Documents received — Referral to committee: see Minutes.*

Mallet

an international terrorist movement. Which one? No-one is quite sure. The name 'Islamic Jihad' covers various terrorist organizations in the Middle East. We are well aware that this region contains three terrorist governments which are seeking to attack the West via Israel.

All of these movements have multiple inter-connections. They get their weapons from the same countries, are trained in the same camps, are driven by the same revolutionary ideology, sometimes mixed with religious fanaticism. It is, in reality, one and the same terrorist tendency which is masquerading under various titles, belongs neither to the right nor to the left and deserves universal condemnation.

These days we can really talk in terms of a multinational terrorist organization, one which is actually in collusion with multinational criminal organizations. The outrages committed recently in France, Belgium, Portugal, Italy, Spain, as well as the assassinations of General Audran and the industrialist Mr Zimmermann in the Federal Republic of Germany, show that this international terrorism has just entered a new phase. It is no longer content to intimidate and frighten public opinion in our democracies which it wants to destabilize. It is resorting to genuine acts of war by mounting direct attacks on military bases, on American soldiers, on institutions and on individuals who play an important role in the defence of Europe.

We should be aware of the escalation of this threat if we are to face it resolutely and cohesively.

During earlier debates, Parliament stressed the need for an international and primarily European counter-attack on international terrorism. Cooperation between the government departments dealing with internal affairs, the intelligence services and the police should be strengthened. We also need joint action to combat illegal immigration at European frontiers, even though we must, of course, maintain the traditional right of asylum accorded to political refugees who have fled from totalitarian or dictatorial regimes but refrain from using violence in our countries for their own political ends. We must facilitate and speed up the extradition of criminals, whatever their motives may be. The end does not justify the means; none of our countries must let itself be used as a sanctuary.

This is why the time seems to have come to implement the idea of a European legal zone which attracted a wide measure of agreement between our countries some years ago, and also, as Mrs Veil has just said, to make the countries instigating this violence take heed of our determination to resist.

In a nutshell, the democracies of Europe have a duty to defend themselves with the weapons of the law. They are particularly vulnerable and therefore a special target. Their commitment to freedom should not condemn them to impotence in the face of a

mounting danger which is threatening their political stability, their security and their independence. Let us not confuse freedom with laxity or a commitment to peace with weakness. We must not become 'useful idiots', as Lenin ironically called the 'bourgeois' democracies. Our very survival is at stake.

(Applause from the centre)

Mr Wurtz (COM). — (FR) Madam President, I shall restrict myself to a single issue on the agenda of this debate, and that is racism.

I say this firstly because nothing is more contrary to our Communist ideal, more opposed to the civilization we are fighting for, than this lethal scourge of racism, anti-semitism and xenophobia.

Secondly, because this malign obscurantism has taken on an increasingly criminal bent recently, particularly in France. In the space of a few days, two immigrant workers have been assassinated, a young man from Réunion has been burnt to death by three assailants, and eighteen people have been injured in an anti-semitic attack on the Jewish film festival in Paris.

This recrudescence of racist hatred is no isolated phenomenon, but has emerged from a political and social climate which encourages potential criminals to think that they now have a chance to act. They have a lot to answer for, these people who do not hesitate to appeal to the most base human instincts in order to divert others from effective action against the real causes of the evil which are eroding our societies. The same applies to those who have taken it upon themselves to popularize racist and fascist ideas, or to give unlimited media coverage to those who propagate these views, or even to label them defenders of Europe's moral values.

This obscurantist crusade is a danger to democracy. If we are to do justice to the 40th anniversary of the victory of the people of Europe over nazism and fascism, we must also unite, whatever our differences, in safeguarding and promoting the humanitarian and democratic values of our time.

We Communists are ready to play a full part in this collective march towards tolerance and freedom. As Bertolt Brecht wrote, '*Der Schoß, aus dem das kroch, ist fruchtbar noch*': 'Still fertile is the womb which bore that beast of doom'. With only a few days to go before 8 May, we would do well bear this in mind.

Mr Novelli (COM). — (IT) Madam President, the resolution we are discussing today are all linked by a single thread: violence, intolerance, mindless killing. We must condemn it, unequivocally, without hesitation and without any feeble-minded allowances, in acknowledgement of our duty to stand up against this

Novelli

distorted conception of social and political struggle. We offer our solidarity to the victims and their families.

But if our words are to mean anything, if we are to refuse to tolerate terrorism and racism, we must ask ourselves whether our governments have done all they should to combat them, coordinating action and instruments, to crush terrorism and racism whenever and wherever they appear and prevent their organization and resurgence.

In my opinion, more effective repression, much as it is needed, is not enough on its own. We are living through an exceptional period in our history, marked by serious crises, described by an eminent Christian academic as an epochal crisis. Even if redistribution is an issue — and we need only remember that 20% of mankind is consuming 80% of the world's resources — the problem is not just one of structure, of raw materials, of energy sources, of resources in general.

It is also a problem of superstructure, of information, education, culture, which are problems affecting the life of every individual, his way of life, behaviour pattern, consumer pattern.

A great deal has been said, in the past new days, about the economic and employment crises, and here, too, we have to bear in mind not just what we know as the 'Law of the four Ps': property, production, productivity, profit. They are, of course, four very important factors, but there is a fifth 'P': in Italian 'popolo', in English 'people', in French 'peuple', in other words mankind. If human values and hopes and needs can once again be restored to the centre of our *raison d'être*, our obligations, our political and civil actions, we would significantly reduce the margin for manoeuvre of those who turn to violence, those who would have us believe, and especially the young, that we can solve some of our problems with terrorism and racism.

This common cause can and must involve all the forces of democracy: its common denominator can and must be a faith in progress for the benefit of mankind: it can and must wipe out racism and terrorism because racism and terrorism do not belong in a civilized world.

Mr Collinot (DR). — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, terrorism is on the increase in Europe. The various networks which seemed until recently to have been acting in isolation have joined forces to make their campaign against the Western military defence system a more effective one.

As everyone knows, the aim of these murderous attacks is to hit at various NATO installations and destabilize the Western democracies but also, in their present phase, to exert pressure on US policy to co-

incide precisely with the announcement of the visit by the President of the United States. It is hardly surprising, then, to see the ideological allies of terrorism, who at various times have acted as agents for Soviet policy in Europe, agitating quite openly and in this very Parliament against the visit of President Ronald Reagan.

What we in the Group of the European Right are demanding is for a free Europe, allied to the United States of America and to all countries of the free world to give itself the means to counter this terrorism.

We advocate a truly European cooperation against terrorism and we call on the French government to ratify at the earliest possible opportunity the European convention on the suppression of terrorism signed at the Council of Europe in 1977.

As soon as another of these ghastly outrages has taken place, the political spokesmen of the 'gang of four' in France or the 'Fortitocracy' in Italy cry out for a European anti-terrorist policy, and yet, since 1977, neither the Barre government nor those of Mr Mauroy or Mr Fabius has been prepared to place this European accord against terrorism before our national parliament.

Why not? Because, without doubt, some people are working hand in glove with the agents of European terrorism.

I should like to take as an example the case of the leader of the terrorist group 'Action directe': Jean-Marc Rouillan. I have here a police incident sheet dated 6 December 1981 which is very revealing. It is a report by Constable Cipolin Toulant to the 'Goutte d'or' police station in the 18th Arrondissement in Paris. What does it tell us, this innocent-sounding report which was drawn up following the occupation by 20 or so squatters of an uninhabited building at 3 Villa Poissonnière?

All it is is a three-line statement from Mr Jean-Marc Rouillan. I quote: 'We are a group of 20 squatters who have been occupying the building for four days. Mr Jospin, the MP, knows all about it'. End of quote.

Revealing, isn't it, when you know that Mr Jospin, the representative in the French parliament of the 18th Arrondissement in Paris and such an unobtrusive member of this Parliament, is also the first secretary of the French Socialist Party and that he could not, of course, have been ignorant on 6 December 1981 of the identity of Jean-Marc Rouillan, who had just been pardoned, it is true, but who had committed an impressive number of misdeeds, outrages and hold-ups during the previous presidency.

Yes, I maintain that it is up to the politicians first and foremost to show their willingness to fight terrorism

Collinot

and not to work hand in glove with it, whether intellectually or otherwise!

Following the assassinations of the director of an Athens right-wing newspaper, Mr Nicolas Monferatos, and of General Audran, 'Euro-terrorism' has just struck in Madrid, where a bomb placed in a bar frequented by American soldiers killed eighteen people. Last weekend in Paris, it was again Jean-Marc Rouillan's 'Action directe' which claimed responsibility for three new attacks, one against an Israeli bank and another against the weekly newspaper 'Minute'. In all three cases traces were found of this organization, which had already committed serious crimes in September 1982 against the Israeli consulate, injuring several pupils of the Lycée Carnot, and against 'Minute'; the leaflets found at the scenes of these atrocities called for the dissolution of the *Front National*.

I note that the Socialist and Communist members, who are so quick to denounce their political opponents in general and those of the *Front National* in particular, sit there in silence when confronted with such outrages.

It is for all of these reasons that we are now presenting our own text, which is the only one suggesting actual measures for combating terrorism. We cannot give our approval to the compromise solution about which, as usual, we have not been consulted and which, curiously, links the Communist Party, the instigator of terrorism, with the Socialist Party: the party which only yesterday received three members of the PLO — Shawki Armahi, Abraham Souss, El Assad and Abdala Frangi — on the premises of this Parliament.

Let me remind you at this point that the Group of the European Right and its President, Jean-Marie Le Pen, have ceaselessly condemned all forms of Palestinian terrorism, the PLO and the PFLP alike. On behalf of the Group of the European Right I call upon Parliament to vote in favour of our well-intentioned proposal.

Mr Saby (S). — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it is not by irresponsibly condemning, nor by shifting the onus of proof, that we shall convince people of the rights and wrongs of this matter.

The Socialist group put its signature to the compromise amendment on the fight against terrorism, and we shall therefore be voting for it. We are greatly concerned by terrorism in general, but what we must condemn most strongly now is the racist terrorist acts of the last few days.

Those responsible for spreading xenophobia have a heavy burden of responsibility. When foreigners have become the scapegoats for every evil, the causes of Europe's present economic distress, it can hardly come as a surprise if some individuals take their obsession as

far as acts of racial terrorism. This House must express its concern at the spread of terrorism in Europe. We must speak out against these attacks on institutions, these demonstrations whose aim is to remind us of the tragic dangers and consequences of a gain in racial tension and hatred such as history has already shown us. However, whilst we express our horror at any act of terrorism, no matter what its political motivation, we must also express our satisfaction at the level-headed reaction to racism perceptible here and there amongst the people.

This House can and must contribute to defusing the political situation and improving relations between different ethnic, racial and religious groups. That is why I call on the House to support the compromise amendment, and to reject the motion for a resolution tabled by the xenophobic extremist European Right group: our Commission of Enquiry into the rise of racism and fascism in Europe has an essential role to play in the fight to prevent the spread of fascist, racist and xenophobic thought. I also call on Parliament to support the SOS Racism movement in its work.

This House, ladies and gentlemen, should be paying its tribute to European democracy by condemning terrorism — terrorism which stems not, as I have heard said, and as is stated in the European Right's motion for resolution, from marxism, but from xenophobic, racist fascist. History goes on showing us this undeniable fact...

(Interruption from the Group of the European Right)

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, in this House everyone has the right to speak. No one prevents anyone from speaking! So I would ask you to let Mr Saby speak!

(Applause)

Mr Saby (S). — (FR) ... I should like to say very calmly that in the democracies which we have built in Europe it is not the one who shouts the loudest or hits the hardest who is right: it is the one who gets through to people's minds and hearts.

Mr Casini (PPE). — (IT) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the European People's Party will vote for the joint amendment, comprising the motions for resolutions tabled by the Liberal and Democratic Group, the European People's Party and the Communist and Allies Group.

I must stress the significance of a joint, or virtually joint motion for a resolution on terrorism. We in Italy have a long experience of terrorism. As a Magistrate (I was a public prosecutor for 13 years), I know something of these matters and am persuaded that a decisive campaign to combat terrorism can be achieved only when

Casini

the political powers have finally realized that terrorism cannot be treated as a political issue, that it cannot be overcome by hurling accusations backwards and forwards, attributing this incident to the Right, that to the Left, but that we must stand together to fight it. That would demonstrate real progress. We should remember this when we vote and I hope we can minimize our differences as far as possible.

Terrorism thrives, in fact, on a kind of negative ideal, grown in a kind of 'culture medium', which is public opinion, and the political powers can have tremendous influence, either stirring it up or repressing it. Words are not enough to condemn terrorism. More is needed and once again, calling on my experience as a magistrate, I must say that I agree with Mr Novelli that the various facts listed in Amendment 1 are linked by the thread of violence, though the origins of this violence are very different.

The problem, and again I am calling on my own past experience, is that in a complex society like ours we have to realize that organized and violent crime, extremely mobile on an international level, educated and intelligent, is a reflection of our changing society.

A complex society offers many benefits, but, throughout the history of mankind, dominated by ambiguity, it has also had its darker sides. Organized violence is one of these negative aspects inherent in the very progress of man and it requires an integrated and united response.

This is why I think it extremely important that Point 3 of the resolution is not restricted to words of condemnation but also calls for joint European action, involving not only coordination of policy, but also coordination of procedures. The fact that each country has its own procedures can only create problems.

I would like to tell you one thing which struck me when I was listening to the other speakers: yesterday, we talked of the unity of Europe with a note of hope in the wake of recent events: if terrorism and violence are often the fruit of a complex society and negative ideals, I believe that the ideal of European unity is a positive ideal, and that it, too, could help to stamp out terrorism.

Mr Seligman (ED). — Madam President, Western nations are at war with an invisible and cowardly enemy which uses mindless violence to achieve political aims. International conventions are not enough. We have to establish a central Community authority to harmonize anti-terrorist law, to enforce extradition and, above all, to speed up political authorization for the police to act internationally and to coordinate transfrontier anti-terrorist campaigns.

We know where all the terrorist training camps are in Africa and in the Middle East. We must eradicate

them. We must also eradicate the sanctuaries to which terrorists retire like wasps to their nest. Terrorism flourishes on publicity. We must deny them the publicity on which they thrive but, above all, we must realize that we are fighting a modern war against an invisible enemy using modern technology. We must do the same.

(Applause)

Mr Filinis (COM). — (GR) Mr President, the murders condemned in this House and other violent, purely racially motivated acts should be a danger sign to all democrats and to all civilized people. The Greek Communist Party of the Interior considers that it must be brought home to as many people as possible that these unparalleled crimes are directly connected with fascist and racist propaganda. Thus it is not at all by chance that there is an increase in murderous attacks in France, particularly against foreigners, in the very country where there is at the same time an increase in the activity of an extreme right-wing racist and fascist party, the National Front. A party which is unfortunately represented — if only by a small number of members — in this House and which is perhaps not unconnected with the ridiculous racist propaganda leaflets which have been placed in Members' pigeon-holes. We must certainly combat nuclear terrorism, wherever it comes from, since it helps to promote pro-war propaganda, undermines democracy, and hampers any attempt at genuine participation by workers in decision-making bodies, and we must not forget that racism and fascist propaganda are the real instigators of terrorism and assassination. It is obvious that broad joint action by peoples and governments is required, and Parliament must play a decisive part in it.

Mr Malaud (RDE). — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I myself am particularly concerned by the problem of terrorism since my own offices were recently bombed. A fairly powerful explosion too, since it devastated not only my own offices but those of a number of my neighbours. The damage was restricted to property, I am glad to say, since it took place at 10 p.m., that is, when the children who habitually play in and around the building were away and when I myself was away, attending a meeting in support of Senator Ukeve, President of the territorial government of New Caledonia. I am not saying that the two events were in any way connected.

The event would have been far less serious had Action Directe, which claimed responsibility for bombing my offices, not assassinated General Audran a few days earlier. This organization's leaders were freed during the amnesty which followed 10 May 1981 in France, and I made the fact plain to the press.

What was strangest of all was that as soon as I made that comment everybody — political, police and legal

Malaud

authorities — chorused that it could not possibly have been Action Directe: it was not their kind of bomb; it was not their way of claiming responsibility and therefore, in the words of one public prosecutor, it could only have been the work of the extreme right wing. You can imagine my wry smile at that.

All of which is to say that those responsible for the campaign against terrorism cannot be taken seriously. At present, the first point made in any statement in France concerning an attack of this nature is that it is the work of the extreme right — particularly in the case of anti-semitic attacks such as those we have been told about, whereas it has in fact been demonstrated, particularly by the claiming of responsibility for these acts, that more often than not they are the work of the Islamic Jihad movement...

Moreover, if there are any extreme right-wing attacks as well, quite clearly the terrorists' inspiration and training originate with Ghadaffi or in Palestine; indeed, it is well-known that there is a Bulgarian connection...

President. — Mr Malaud, I am afraid you have well exceeded your speaking time, and I must now stop you.

Mr Härlin (ARC). — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, may I briefly relate to you the opinion of the Head of the Hamburg Office for the Protection of the Constitution, Mr Lochte, a member of the CDU and representative of the Federal Republic of Germany in the TREVI Group, on the subject you are dealing with today. The question put to him in relation to TREVI was as follows: 'Do you not think that West German anti-terrorist experts, who meet so frequently, might be tempted to invent a West European terrorist movement?' His answer was: 'No, that would be grotesque, there is absolutely no danger of this; on the contrary, the experts all say that it is out of the question. Politicians are more likely to assert that it all comes from outside, and in so saying they often fall victim to their own propaganda'.

Mr Ford (S). — Madam President, it is clear we need maximum consensus on this issue and I welcome the joint resolution by the major groups in this Parliament. Clearly there are connections between international terrorist groups on the left and on the right across Europe. The streets of London and of other cities in Europe have seen the activities and have become battlegrounds for Colonel Gaddafi's terrorists and other terrorist groups. We have had examples of fascist terrorism on a number of occasions. The GLC's ethnic minorities unit was fire-bombed recently by fascist groups and if it had not been for the intervention of Providence there would have been a number of deaths and it would now be on our agenda.

Governments and security forces lack the will to enforce security. We have had Mr Seligman's call to deny sanctuary to terrorists. We have safe houses in London being used by fascist terrorists. The Home Secretary refuses to do anything about it. I hope Mr Seligman will put pressure on his own government to take action.

The Notting Hill Carnival would have been bombed by Nazis in Britain in 1981 if it had not been for the activity of anti-racist groups in Britain rather than the activities of the security forces or the government.

We must condemn hate and violence in Europe. There is hypocrisy on the part of the European right. Hitler condemned street violence consistently throughout the 1930s. Well, in the 1930s his storm troopers were wreaking violence on the Jews, the gypsies, the homosexuals, and everyone else...

(The President urged the speaker to conclude)

... we have yet even to hear Mr Le Pen condemn members of his party, including those on his European list who have been arrested for bombing and terrorist charges. We are still waiting for Mr Almirante to condemn members of his group. Members of his party, accused of terrorist charges. We have...

President. — (IT) Mr Ford, you, too, have exceeded your time: I am afraid I must stop you.

Mr Ripa di Meana, Member of the Commission. — (IT) May I begin by declaring publicly and solemnly the Commission's condemnation and abhorrence of the resurgence of terrorist and racist attacks both inside and outside the European Community.

The Commission joins the European Parliament in expressing its sympathy and solidarity with the families of the victims.

Secondly, I must stress that I believe it was quite right to discuss racism and terrorism in the same debate, not simply because the two have reemerged at the same time, and with a vengeance, and in the past few weeks have become intermingled — as in the attack against the Jewish Cinema Festival in Paris — but also because, objectively, these phenomena must be based on the same feelings of hatred and denial of the values on which our social order in Europe, our democratic system and the freedom of our countries to maintain their own security, are founded.

Racism is the denial of the principle of equality, which is a cornerstone of democratic order.

Terrorism is the rejection of law and order which are also fundamental to any social and political organization. Simone Weil was quite right when she said that

Ripa di Meana

this terrorism is purposeful, coordinated and brings into Europe its own campaign of terror.

The Commission will therefore continue to do all that it has to, working as before with Parliament, participating in the work of the Committee of Inquiry into Racism and Fascism, doing all that is in its power.

It will insist on applying the force of law and order to combat racism and terrorism and, above all, on the fundamental right to life and to our communities' cultural and ethnic identities.

It will look very carefully into the proposal for a large-scale publicity campaign against racism and xenophobia and will inform Parliament of its decision in due course.

However, any such campaign would have a much broader and warmer reception if it were preceded by efforts to shed light on the deep cultural and therefore civil significance — as Mr Casini said — of union between the peoples, summed up so succinctly in the word 'Community'.

Madam President, in conclusion, I can inform Parliament that at the ministerial meeting on political cooperation of 12 February this year, it was decided that there would be an informal meeting under the TREVI agreement, of the Ministers for Internal Affairs and Justice of the Ten, together with the Ministers of Spain and Portugal, in May.

If invited, the Commission will not fail to do its duty there as well.

Mr d'Ormesson (DR). — (FR) On a point of order, Madam President, I cannot let Mr Ford get away with his irresponsible remarks about Mr Almirante.

Like our group, Mr Almirante condemns all forms of terrorism. And I would remind you that all acts of terrorism are masterminded by the same man, Boris Pomonarev, the Politburo member in charge of external relations.

(Applause from the right)

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted compromise Amendment No 1 to replace motions for resolutions Docs B 2-131/85, B 2-146/85 and B 2-156/85, and rejected the motion for a resolution Doc. B 2-161/85)^{1,2}

Fixed link across the Channel

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

¹ Amendment No 1 tabled by Mrs Veil and Mr De Vries on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Mrs Fontaine on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, Mr Prag on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Hänsch on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of the Democratic Alliance, and Mr Cervetti.

² The motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-155/85) by Mr Piquet and others was withdrawn.

— the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-133/85) by Mr Newton Dunn and Mr Prag, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on a fixed link across the Channel between Great Britain and France;

— the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-143/85) by Mr Habsburg and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on a fixed link across the Channel between Great Britain and France.

Mr Newton Dunn (ED). — Madam President, an idea which has been continually deliberated for nearly 200 years is surely now overdue, and therefore urgent. That idea is the creation of a fixed link across the Channel between Britain and France.

It was first proposed by Napoleon, it is said, nearly 200 years ago. Indeed a tunnel was started in the 1870s and another tunnel was started in the 1970s. That latter tunnel was stopped by the very last British Labour Government.

With the birth and the continuing growth of a European Community, the creation of a fixed link is surely now both appropriate and urgent. There are overwhelming advantages in favour of the idea. For the public, our public, for the consumers, there will be an increased choice in their method of travel and there should be lower expenses for crossing the Channel.

Madam President, you may not know this, but there is enormous room for competition. The sea crossing between France and Great Britain is, I am advised, the most expensive sea crossing in the world. But sea ferries need not fear that they will go out of business. Traffic forecasts suggest that there will be a great increase in the demand for movement both ways across the Channel in the next 20 years. There is room for more opportunities for crossing: room for competition, room for lower fares.

Another overwhelming advantage is the creation of new jobs in the attack on unemployment. In the short-term the construction of such a fixed link will create many new jobs particularly, in the more deprived regions of Britain and France. My colleague Sheila Faith will be talking about this in a moment. In the longer term many new jobs will be created as well through easier, cheaper, and therefore increased trade. Surely, Madam President, a cause dear to all our hearts, the cementing of European unity, will also be assisted by the creation of a fixed link.

British people on our island greatly envy the freedom of continentals to cross frontiers in their motor cars, sometimes on a day trip. That is, at the moment, not allowed to us. If we can have a fixed link we will be able to understand our continental partners more easily. I hope that will contribute towards the cementing

Newton Dunn

of Britain firmly to Europe. Surely, Madam President, a project which has been put off frequently for nearly 200 years because of mutual fear of each other and the fear of wars will help to eliminate those fears and create our unity together.

Madam President, I started by mentioning long-term urgency. There is an immediate urgency as well, which is this: On 3 April the two governments concerned, the British and the French, invited consortia to put in their bids for the construction of a link. These bids must be in by 31 October and the governments tell us they hope to take a decision within three months after that. So the matter is now very topical and very urgent.

I think that we should congratulate the two governments on their insistence that only private capital be used for the construction of this link which will leave taxpayers' money free for many other deserving areas of interest; though we should remind the governments that EEC finance is available for preparatory studies and for the improvement in road and rail infrastructure at each end of the link once it has been constructed.

Madam President, a message should go out from Parliament today to the national governments and to the Commission. We believe the link should be constructed as soon as possible and we shall be watching with great interest in this Parliament. To the British and French Governments we say: 'We are watching you, the British and French people are watching you, the people of Europe are watching you. This is the moment. Do not fail us'.

(Applause)

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC). — *(DE)* I should like to state that I expressly asked to speak before we began the debate because I find it is a really shameful reflection on all of us — since we are always talking about our ancient and cultivated Europe — that we are holding an urgent debate on a subject that has been around for hundreds of years...

President. — I would remind the honourable Member that the agenda was decided by this House.

Mrs Fontaine (PPE). — *(FR)* Ladies and gentlemen, as Mr Newton Dunn pointed out just now, European public opinion has looked forward to the prospect of a tunnel or permanent link across the Channel between the United Kingdom and the continent for nearly two centuries.

After short-lived projects and interrupted works, the decision taken on 3 April this year by the British and French Governments to invite tenders for surface, underground or mixed projects is an important step forward. It marks a political willingness on both sides

to succeed and it is the European Parliament's duty to welcome it.

The United Kingdom is and will always remain, thankfully, an island. It would take more than a tunnel or a bridge to take away the originality and insularity to which it owes its prestigious history. But we can consider ourselves fortunate that today our British partners are prepared to accept this physical link with the continent, because it is a reflection of the unity and reality of Europe.

We therefore warmly support this project and I am very happy that our group chose me, a Frenchwoman, to present a motion for a resolution to this effect. But setting the symbolic and political value of this project aside for a moment, we have a duty to ensure that the conditions are right for its economic, social and cultural success.

The tunnel or bridge which will cross the Channel will increase trade and reduce industrial costs. It will provide an incentive for economic development and the growth of tourism between our nations. But it is important that the two governments are aware of the possible negative side-effects of this link. Its creation could well mean a shift of trade and industry from certain regions to others and could jeopardize a number of ports. Road and rail infrastructures and handling facilities will be needed to ensure a proper balance between all the regions concerned.

I hope that the Community will bear these needs in mind, to ensure not only the technical success of the permanent cross-Channel link but a broader success in terms of employment, the economy and the cultural wealth of European trade.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MRS PERY

Vice-President

Mr Newman (S). — Madam President, I believe that some of our colleagues are getting carried away with their grand European designs. A Channel tunnel or other fixed link across the Channel would require massive investments — human, financial and material, and in my view this investment would be for doubtful and limited immediate benefits.

My reservations, I must point out, are not nationalist or anti-European. I am not in principle forever against a fixed link across the Channel. Indeed, a socialist Europe — one that was prosperous with an expanding economy abolishing unemployment and poverty — would no doubt, at some stage in the future, construct

Newman

a Channel tunnel or other link, concentrating on the most appropriate form of transport, which would be a rail link. However, the compromise amendment states that the fixed link would lead in the near future to the creation of jobs in peripheral areas and suggests that Common Market finance could contribute to this venture. I oppose this nonsense and hence also the amendment itself. The jobs created for contractors in the so-called peripheral areas of Britain — areas of massive unemployment such as my own area, the North-West of England, also Scotland, Wales, the North, Midlands and South-West England, would be minimal. The British investment would be concentrated in the South-East of England and other areas adjacent to the likely English end of the fixed link.

Massive investment is needed now as an alternative in the peripheral areas, in the regions of high unemployment. A Channel tunnel or other fixed link is not a priority. Investment by the British Government is needed now in the existing rail network in Britain. Building workers need to be taken from the dole queue and given jobs, not constructing a dubious Channel link but building much-needed houses for the many homeless, Community and social welfare facilities, hospitals and the like. EEC funds should assist this work and not that of building a Channel tunnel. The millions of unemployed working-class people and their families in Britain — and, I might say, in France also — cannot afford to motor down to the Channel for a continental holiday or for a holiday in Britain. They cannot take advantage of such a link because of the poverty and unemployment. The investment that is wanted for a Channel tunnel should be put instead into the creation of real jobs and real resources that will benefit the mass of the people of Western Europe.

Mr P. Beazley (ED). — On a point of order, Madam President. I think you stated that Mr Newman was speaking for the Socialist Group. Is that correct? Is that the view of the Socialist Group of Europe? Or was it the view of the British Labour Party? If it is the British Labour Party, would you kindly correct your statement?

President. — That is not a point of order.

Mr Raftery (PPE). — Madam President, I am pleased to support the construction of a fixed link between Britain and mainland Europe, for I believe it to be important both economically and psychologically — economically, because it will facilitate the movement of goods and people and psychologically because it will help people, particularly in Britain, who see Europe as something remote and damaging, to feel more European. The construction of such a high-profile and imaginative project will not only do much for the steel, cement and many other industries, but it will also, I believe, help to revive economic confidence, something which is sadly lacking in Europe today, as

is evidenced by the flight of capital from Europe to the United States, thereby inflating the value of the dollar, with all the serious consequences that has produced in recent years.

No country in Europe suffers more from the cost of its products than Ireland. This is due not only to our remoteness, but also to the fact that we export a much higher proportion of our products than any other country in the Community. Also, our products — mainly the agricultural ones — tend to be of high volume and low value. Consequently, the cost of transport is a very severe burden for us. A fixed link would facilitate the transport of these products and thereby reduce the cost.

Our second largest industry, tourism, would also be helped. I believe that tourists from the Continent if they could bring their motorcycles, motor-cars and caravans to my beautiful country, would come in increasing numbers. Of course, tourist traffic would increase in both directions, but I believe we would be net beneficiaries from this increased tourist traffic.

It would be a mistake to believe, as the last speaker said, that only those in the building and other industries I have mentioned would benefit from the construction of this link. Many other industries, in addition to the steel and concrete industries, would benefit — for example, electronics and the building of railway carriages and railway lines. All of these would benefit.

We should also not underestimate the impact such a spectacular project would have on the confidence of workers, management and investors. The repercussions of this increased confidence would go far beyond direct and indirect sums spent on the link itself.

For these, and for other reasons, I would strongly urge the construction of this link — a link which, in my view, would become one of the most significant infrastructural links in the entire Community.

(Applause)

Mr Cot (S). — *(FR)* On a point of order, Madam President, I should like to point out that Mr Newman did not speak on behalf of the Socialist Group but presented the minority view of the British Labour Members. Our group supports the joint amendment and is in favour of a Channel tunnel.

(Applause)

President. — I note your remarks, Mr Cot.

Mrs Faith (ED). — Madam President, this highly desirable Channel link will reduce industry's costs, but I also want to see people being able to travel more eas-

Faith

ily between our countries. This will increase understanding and will do more for developing the unity and union of Europe than anything else. By building this link we shall not be draining life from the North but allowing this region to come closer and to participate more fully in the European prosperity that we all desire.

What is most important, there will be new employment opportunities in the steel and in the shipbuilding industries in the North of England. For example, British Steel have two plants at Workington, an area of high unemployment in my constituency. One of these plants manufactures railway lines, and whilst I hope that a scheme will be chosen which will also permit people to drive from Britain to France, the Channel link will at least be partly rail-based, so there will be great opportunities there for new business.

The other plant concentrates on heavy engineering and is looking forward to assisting in building the structural fabrication of the new link. One thousand five hundred people are now employed by British Steel in Workington, and they look forward to and welcome with open arms these new opportunities. The European Parliament must urge the French and British Governments to proceed as soon as possible with this project, which will bring inspiration and hope, strengthen the European ideal, and bring so many real benefits.

It is because Europe feels, and is, more secure than at any time in its history that we are now able to think of proceeding with this most exciting project.

(Applause)

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, I would just like to point out that the environmental impact of such a massive undertaking as a tunnel beneath the Channel should be investigated. We should ensure that an operation on this scale will not have grave consequences for the environment, and positive results only for man.

Mrs Thome-Patenôtre (RDE). — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, I would like to tell you briefly why we are in favour of this motion for a resolution on a fixed link between the United Kingdom and France and, of course, the continent as a whole.

Leaving aside the technical aspect of this work, may I begin by reminding you that a permanent link is one of the better known of what could amount to a whole programme of major European projects, which could make a valuable contribution to reducing unemployment.

Apart from the practical advantages of a through-route for travellers and goods, there can be no doubt that it would also serve to cement and tighten the bonds between the citizens of the continent and those of the British Isles and — and this is very important — to strengthen European unity.

The Group of the European Democratic Alliance will therefore vote for this motion for a resolution.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC). — *(NL)* Ladies and gentlemen, I have mixed feelings about the Channel tunnel. Firstly, I cannot see why the matter should be so pressing. People have been drawing up projects for 90 years now, and Parliament has already twice adopted a report on the Channel tunnel, in which support was even requested from the Social and Regional Fund.

I realize that the building of such a tunnel would boost employment in the steel industry in both Britain and France. At the same time, however, we should also remember that from the Hook of Holland to Brittany there are, an enormous number of ferry services and rapid sea and air links.

Secondly, I would point out that if aid is requested from the Social Fund for the creation of jobs, we shall have to consider the social consequences of the loss of jobs elsewhere. The existing links provide tens of thousands of jobs, and it would be ironic if aid from the Social Fund were used for the large-scale destruction of job opportunities.

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Madam President, this debate has been a short but interesting one in which a variety of contradictory views have been expressed, and I will come to some of those points towards the end of my observations.

Let me start by saying that the Commission has been notified of the conditions under which the two governments — British and French — are prepared to consider offers for the construction of a link. The document setting out the conditions under which offers can be considered makes it quite clear that no support from the public sector can be expected, save as concerns the signature of the Treaty establishing the project and in respect of the statutory procedures with regard to planning and other requirements. The stipulation that the project will neither be supported nor guaranteed by the governments would appear to rule out the possibility that an application for a loan from the European Investment Bank would be possible. This conclusion would also, in all probability, apply to the new Community instrument.

The only current areas where some form of Community assistance would appear to be feasible would be, first, in the field of traffic forecasting — where the

Clinton Davis

Commission already has some experience — and, secondly, in relation to the research work necessary to develop new techniques of construction for tunnels and bridges. This clearly would have to be within the framework of a programme that would be of general benefit not only to this project but also to similar schemes in the Community. This might also be useful in the context of the competitive position of the Community in the world construction market.

After the project is under way, there would be a possibility that the Community could assist with the construction of associated infrastructure. This could come within the field of action of the Community medium-term plan for transport infrastructure. The two governments would be required to notify the project to the Community, once approved, under the 1978 regulation.

I now turn to the specific contributions that have been made by the speakers in this debate. I think there is truth in the assertion that has been made by Mr Newton Dunn and Mrs Faith, among others, that there would be some job-creation benefit which would accrue to certain hard-hit areas in Britain and in France. I do not think we can regard this as a panacea as far as the problem of unemployment in these areas is concerned, but it could clearly make a contribution. I think to that extent the remarks by Mr Newman are those which I would have some scepticism about.

(Cries of 'Hear, hear!')

On the other hand, let me say that I too am concerned about the possibility of an unplanned development which could lead to a drift of resources from hard-hit industrial areas in the north of Britain and elsewhere to an overpopulated and relatively rich south-east.

(Cries of 'Shame, shame!' by Mr P. Beazley)

All I am saying in this regard — and I am rather surprised that Mr Beazley should become so excited by a fairly neutral remark — is this: that I do not believe that the arguments which have been adduced are mutually exclusive. I think that it is important to ensure that there is adequate provision made for the struggling industrial areas of Britain and of France but in no way does the development of the Channel Tunnel in itself mean that these areas have to be relegated to a position of inferiority. There is truth — I repeat — in the argument that by the development of the tunnel there clearly will be a valuable input into the work that can be undertaken in areas that are producing steel and other products which are essential to its development.

That is my view and I therefore believe that the debate which has taken place today is useful and I hope that some of the remarks — and some of the concerns too

— will, in fact, be heard by the governments of France and Britain.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1 seeking to replace the two motions for resolutions)¹

Economic summit

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-135/85) by Mrs Scrivener, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the Bonn Summit of industrialized countries;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-150/85) by Mr Seeler and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the Western economic summit in Bonn;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-154/85) by Mr Linkohr and others on the debt burden of the Latin American countries and the summit of the seven industrialized countries in Bonn (May 1985);
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-169/85) by Mr Bonaccini and others on the Bonn Summit on 4 and 5 May 1985.

Mrs Scrivener (L). — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in two weeks time, the Heads of State or Government of the seven most highly industrialized countries in the world will meet in Bonn to review the world economic and political situation and to try to find a common solution to the grave problems we are currently facing.

We believe that the political and economic climate today is right for us to be able to reach important decisions at Bonn to try to stimulate the same economic recovery in Europe which began in the United States three years ago and to reduce unemployment. This would give us the scope for further measures which would guarantee greater trade freedom and greater stability in the international monetary system.

In fact, the conclusions reached by the OECD ministerial meeting last week, when the United States finally responded to the European request to call a sum-

¹ Amendment No 1 by Mr Prag and Mr Newton Dunn on behalf of the European Democratic Group and by Mr Habsburg on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party.

Scrivener

mit meeting to try to restore to the international monetary system a stability it has not known since 1971, have come at a particularly opportune moment. The dollar seems to have finally reached its peak, the United States has for the first time since 1914 become a debtor state internationally and all the main trade partners have a clear interest in a flexible stabilization of the American dollar. We must therefore grasp this opportunity to reach international agreement, possibly involving a substantial reduction in interest rates to stimulate non-inflationary growth. This is the main objective of the motion for a resolution which I submitted on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group: to demonstrate the support of the European Parliament for a conference to reform the monetary system. However, Europe must be able to show that it is ready to shoulder, with Japan, greater monetary responsibilities, to strengthen the European Monetary System and the role of the ECU and to speak with one voice on this issue.

I hope, then, that the European Parliament can reach a clear decision and I ask you to support the resolution I am presenting on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

(Applause)

Mr Seeler (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, when we discuss the forthcoming economic summit this morning, the major issue must be unemployment in Europe, which is growing ever more serious. Twelve million unemployed are not just a numerical problem, but are throwing increasing doubt on the stability of our democratic form of government.

One of the necessary measures and decisions which we expect from the economic summit in Bonn, and which can help to reduce unemployment, is the revitalization of world trade. For this we need a better and more stable world currency system. The one-sided dominance of the US dollar is a danger in the long term not only for Western Europe and the Third World, but also for the USA itself. The outflow of capital to the USA which has been going on for years has given people there the impression that their own economy can be financed by budget and foreign trade deficits alone, without damage and without tax increases. The consequences of this policy are high interest rates and increasing impoverishment in the Third World. Moreover, our Community's export boom, which was triggered off by the USA, is being paid for with the European capital which is being attracted there month after month by high interest rates. On top of this, the downturn in exports to the Third World is proportionately at least as great as the increase in exports to the USA.

The aim of the Bonn negotiations must therefore be a long-term strengthening of the European currency system in order to provide a second currency for world trade and also as a reserve currency, one which

is free of the growing risk of dollar speculation and is not dependent on the budget and trade deficit of the USA. Secondly, the ground must be thoroughly prepared for the new round of GATT talks. GATT has proved its worth, but is in need of reform. Trade with the Third World and between the countries of the Third World also needs regulating, as does world agricultural trade. Another necessity is the inclusion in GATT of the groundrules of the ILO. The Commission deserves our support when it insists that, before talks can be started with Japan about new GATT rules, Japan must open up its market more widely to the Community as well.

What we expect from the Bonn summit is not an impressive-sounding communiqué and not the kind of decisions taken in Williamsburg and London, which have not even now been implemented, but effective political action. That is our mandate to the heads of government in Bonn.

(Applause)

Mr Linkohr (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the motion for a resolution on Latin America's indebtedness is intended to make the world economic summit and particularly the European heads of government wake up to the fact that the debt problem is a political issue and that they cannot just leave it to the banks to sort it out using financial methods.

When the Uruguayan Foreign Minister Enrique Iglesias was in Brussels recently he pointed out that the increase in interest rates alone in the United States meant that 40% of Latin America's debt is now attributable to these increases. What we have here is not a banking phenomenon, but a political one which must be thrashed out in Bonn at the world economic summit.

This year alone, Latin America's 37 thousand million dollar trade surplus had to go towards paying off the interest burden. We are squeezing the life-blood from the countries of Latin America, which find democracy such hard going, just when they have a chance to develop it. It is no use our talking in this Parliament and in Europe about the democracies of Latin America and what we intend to do for them unless we are prepared to rid them of this millstone round their necks, which is threatening to strangle them. It is high time this fact were understood in Bonn!

Mr Bonaccini (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, this is not the first time we have faced the prospect of an international summit and it is not the first time that we have faced a series of disappointments. I do not want to go into that now, but would remind you only of Williamsburg, although opinion in this House was divided.

Bonaccini

It is significant, however, that we are discussing these resolutions the day after a vote which gave me great pleasure, because it saw this House for once speaking with a very clear voice on the development of European Union and because it means, as Mr Delors said, that our Community can go to this meeting not just as a technical presence but as an institution capable of expressing itself with one voice.

I am disappointed then that we are discussing four different resolutions, which are, in effect, saying more or less the same thing with different words. My group will therefore vote for all four to contribute to the consolidation of our will and of our united voice and at the same time to give the Commission united support.

The root of this issue is the concern which was also apparent in the debate on unemployment in the last few days over the fact that, and Mr Seeler explained this very clearly a few minutes ago, as long as our resources continue to be drained by the activity of the dollar on the international market, we will never be able to deal with the problem of unemployment.

That this view is now widely held is partly due to the fact we were reminded of it yesterday by Mr Craxi, who also stressed the need for an international monetary conference.

I, like Mrs Scrivener, am pleased with the conclusions of the OECD Summit, although — and I think my colleague would agree with me — I believe that a good deal still remains unclear and that Parliament should insist on being given a definite date and agenda. It is also vital, that trade as well as monetary aspects are discussed at the same time. This is why Mr Delors wondered whether the European monetary system and the ECU should continue to be our point of reference.

Well I can assure him that this is what Parliament wants and that we want to see this position adopted firmly at the Bonn Summit.

Mr Weber (S), Chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. — (DE) Madam President, our Committee has been doing some intensive work on the issues to be covered at the world economic summit, because the environment is to be a major topic for discussion. I draw attention to this just to make it clear that this morning's urgent debate together with this afternoon's debate following our usual agenda will constitute the European Parliament's political brief to this summit conference.

Mr Herman (PPE). — (FR) Madam President, I want to make four points concerning the approaching Bonn Summit, and the first relates to the International

Monetary System. Europe must argue the idea that the monetary system cannot continue as it is, eternally salvaging the banking system and rescuing the Third World debtor countries from their insolvency. The IMF should be doing what it was originally created to do, and that is ensuring a more ordered development of the exchange market, with the courage to make recommendations to industrialized countries which would make them better equipped to coordinate their budgetary and monetary policies. The results would undoubtedly be mutually profitable not only for the industrialized countries but, more importantly, for the developing countries as well. It goes without saying, of course, that Europe's credibility here will depend on its ability to achieve its own monetary integration.

We should also argue in favour of a related issue, the reform of the World Bank. Between the Reagan idea of reducing its role to that of a commercial bank and refusing it new resources and the more generous idea of the third-worldists who believe that an abundance of cheap money will solve the problem of underdevelopment, there is room for a bold and realistic reform. The era of grandiose projects, huge dams costing 150 million dollars, is over. The future lies in projects on a more human scale which can pay their own way, particularly in the rural or agro-foodstuffs sector, less spectacular but more effective. The structure of the world bank is certainly not suited to this. Weighed down by its highly qualified staff of 6 000 officials it needs to be reformed to adapt to a new situation.

My third point concerns the debts of the Third World. Here again, Europe must make the voice of reason felt and for once it is not so far removed from the voice of the heart. To make the reestablishment of balance depend on internal adjustment alone is unacceptable, counter-productive. It could mean an explosion of the political situation and increase instability. But by blithely delaying we are only putting off the problem and allowing inflation to persist.

Lastly, if the nuclear holocaust is the most dire threat humanity has ever faced, it is difficult to understand those who are quite rightly horrified but who also oppose the possible limitation or reduction of this threat. In any case, the United States will not wait for our approval to go ahead. Since this is unavoidable, we can only do what is best for us, in other words take advantage of the offer which has been made.

(Applause from the centre)

Mr Moorhouse (ED). — Madam President, what can we realistically propose as solutions to the complex problems that the heads of government will be grappling with in Bonn? What we propose at least is a series of simultaneous measures designed to attack different aspects of the world economic and monetary system.

Moorhouse

Firstly, the United States Congress must follow the initiative of the US Administration in bringing down drastically the American budget deficit. The consequences in reducing interest rates, depressing the dollar, and increasing US export competitiveness will all be widely welcomed.

Secondly, we need to accept the American initiatives of opening international monetary discussions and starting up a new GATT round as soon as possible — the latter is particularly important.

One of the most crucial achievements of the Bonn Summit would be a clear agreement to begin a new GATT round at a stated time. That round must address the key issue of services, agricultural trade and a strengthened disputes settlement procedure.

Thirdly, we need direct and clear concessions on the part of the major actors on the world trade scene — the Europeans and the United States. This means a mutual and balanced de-escalation of agricultural export subsidies to avoid a dangerous and damaging trade war in foodstuffs. This will benefit both parties and act as a major inducement to the Third World to accept an opening up of the services sector to international free trade. On the part of Japan, this approach requires greater openness to foreign imports and an awareness that sudden export surges on foreign markets can have very disruptive effects.

Mr Verbeek (ARC). — (NL) Full marks for choice of venue and timing. The seven most powerful nations of the West are to meet in the Federal German capital in May when the world commemorates the ending of the Second World War and when important elections are looming up in Germany. The venue and timing of the meeting have implications which smack of propaganda — the message being that the capitalist nations of the West have been safeguarding world peace since 1945.

My own view on the matter is that the free market of the most powerful nations keeps the machinery of world war in constant motion. Since 1945 there have been 150 wars, and the big nations have been directly or indirectly involved in them all, whether through their economic or military interests or through their trade in arms. The Iran-Iraq war would grind to a halt tomorrow if Europe stopped supplying them with weapons. Nicaragua would soon get back on its feet if its powerful neighbour stopped interfering with it. Madam President, economic war is still war. The dollar, the pound, the mark, the franc, the guilder, the yen — and soon even the ECU — are instruments of death, for to capture a market, they say, is to wage war.

The large-scale terrorism of governments and military and economic forces gives rise to the terrorism of freedom movements — a highly emotional subject and rightly so. This is a fact which more and more people

are realizing. They can see that even though the fascism of Hitler, Mussolini, Franco and the Vichy government is over, the instincts and impulses underlying the fascism of that period have not been eradicated. They are still alive in the powerful nations, respectably institutionalized, protected by their parliaments and made ideologically acceptable. The result is the destruction of jobs, people, plants and animals, raw materials, the environment and the world itself.

Madam President, the prevailing free market economy system is incompatible with freedom and democracy. We shall therefore be supporting the motions for resolutions by Mr Seeler, Mr Linkohr and Mr Bonaccini.

Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul (S). — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to explain why the motion of the Socialist Group is centred on, and specifically criticizes, the role played by the economic policy of the United States.

In the first place, we now know that, although the USA made verbal concessions at previous summits, its policy has in practice, not changed one iota. Secondly, the European Parliament will have no opportunity on 8 May to tell President Reagan personally what it thinks of his economic policy. This is why we want to make our expectations clear in a European Parliament position during the run-up to his visit.

Our major point of criticism is the high US budget deficit, which is estimated at 235 thousand million dollars for 1985, and the 110 thousand million dollar current account balance deficit. We are prepared to state openly what many of you prefer to sweep under the carpet: the main reason for this is the US weapons policy, which is on the point of being expanded still further.

On an economic level this means that the outflow of our capital and particularly that of the Third World countries is giving the USA the means to expand its weaponry, even though we need these funds to combat unemployment at home and famine in the developing world. The USA has founded a new form of colonialism and we Europeans have a duty to speak out against it.

US protectionism is one of the consequences of the high dollar exchange rate; even the US Secretary of State, Mr Shultz, has admitted this openly. When it comes to the world economic summit, then, we would wish the Community and its Member States to press for the following: for a reduction in US interest rates, since these lead to world competition in real interest rates, for the prevention of protectionist measures, for limitations on currency speculation (Mr Seeler has already mentioned this), and for concerted action by the OECD countries to generate new jobs which are socially and environmentally acceptable.

Wieczorek-Zeul

We ask your support for our motion. We ourselves intend to lend our support to the motions by the Liberal and Democratic Group and the Communist and Allies Group.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — *(NL)* Madam President, the Latin American peoples are burdened by the biggest debts in the third world. These debts are due first and foremost — and here I agree with Mr Herman — to a naive view of economic development based on the large-scale economic model which is found mainly in the United States and which has brought these countries to the brink of bankruptcy. Secondly, they are due to the increase in the value of the dollar — although enough has already been said about this — which has made the Latin American peoples pay for the unjustifiable economic and military policies of the United States and for its huge budgetary deficit.

We therefore call upon the seven most industrialized nations meeting in Bonn in May 1985 to consider the following solutions: firstly, the remission of all or part of Latin America's debts; secondly, the promotion in Latin America of economic production based on the continent's own needs, and thirdly, the fostering of a Latin American market which would strengthen its economic and political independence of the United States and other countries. We could also call for support for the Contadora initiative for the benefit of Nicaragua. Thus, Madam President, Europe must first achieve economic and monetary independence itself.

Mr Zahorka (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the world economic summit is to take place in Bonn in a few weeks at a time of substantial increase in world trade. Despite the upturn in world trade in 1984, protectionism has also been on the increase, and this applies directly to us as the major world trading partner and one whose external economic policy is not always above reproach.

The Bonn summit will, we hope, give a major boost to the finding of international solutions to problems originating with world trade but having repercussions for the promotion of Third World development, collaboration on environmental protection, space exploration, the energy supply and the food supply for the sub-Saharan region. My Group hopes that the summit will reach definitive positions on these issues, which has not been the case at all too many meetings of the Council of Ministers.

Since the meeting of the OECD Ministers there is also widespread agreement that exemplary measures have to be taken to combat the protectionism which is growing all over the world. Perhaps 40% of all world trade is now carried out according to GATT rules and the rest has to pick its way around obstacles. By creat-

ing our own effective internal market we would be setting an example of the beneficial effects of the removal of trade barriers.

What we expect of the Bonn summit are specific plans for a new round of GATT talks, and these must include the opening of our markets to the Third World. Our Group stands for an international social market economy, for free world trade, but also for solidarity with economically weaker partners. We also oppose international economic regimentation, which can only have an obstructive effect, particularly on the job market.

After the summit and before the GATT talks, Parliament, too, will have to get to grips with Community strategy on world trade, which means agricultural trade, technology transfer, conciliation structures and services. The first statement on this by the Council of Ministers is partly right but partly vague, and reads as though someone were trying to pin down a jelly.

We welcome Mrs Scrivener's motion for a resolution, which is echoed by our platform.

The motion by the Italian Communists sounds good, but its regulative intent is a different matter.

The Socialist motion I find disappointing. It is blatantly anti-American and full of cheap polemics. Without the security guarantee provided by the USA, this Parliament would be at best a kind of local soviet, but by no means would it be a freely-elected body. This should be clearly understood.

(Interruptions from the left)

There is no US neo-colonialism, and I have not, incidentally, noticed any comments from that side of the House about Soviet neo-colonialism in Afghanistan. It is not always the fault of the USA if there is famine in the world, nor is the CIA responsible for bad weather in Brussels, but this is what these motions would sometimes lead one to believe.

We should be generally wary about expecting too much of the world economic summit. We do, however, expect to see a shift towards improvements in world trade in the interests of the Third World and our own stability, and to show our own open, socially responsible system to be more attractive than other, closed systems which were probably created merely to fit a particular label.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr De Clerq, Member of the Commission. — *(NL)* Madam President, western economic summits have become highly important events in the international calendar. As various speakers have already pointed out, they provide an opportunity for coopera-

De Clerq

tion at the highest level on all the main economic questions. They have also at various times made it possible to add fresh political impetus to the efforts of the national governments to come to terms with the main problems facing society.

Of course, the same will also be true of the forthcoming summit in Bonn, to be presided over by Chancellor Helmut Kohl. The number of motions for resolutions tabled by the various political groups — and in particular the similarities they share — certainly underline the importance which Parliament rightly attaches to this event.

The important topics to be discussed in Bonn directly affect each one of us. They include international trade, in particular the launching of a new round of trade negotiations. Also under discussion will be the strengthening of the International Monetary System, the problem of the developing countries' debts, and in particular our number one priority — the fight against unemployment on the basis of concerted action aimed at revitalizing the economy.

I would like to add a few very brief comments, since the observations made here — and I thank the speakers for this — have contained a great deal of substance.

(The speaker continued in French)

With your permission, Madam President, I shall begin with international trade. The Commission will be taking an active part in the preparatory work in connection with GATT before the end of the summer with a view to achieving a broad consensus on the substance of and practical arrangements for a new round of multilateral trade negotiations. However, it believes that if we are to safeguard the multilateral trade system and create a climate of confidence — which is necessary for any new, large-scale initiative — the first requirement will be to respect commitments already entered into.

The Commission will therefore continue to insist first and foremost on the complete abolition of protectionism and on the gradual phasing out of existing protectionist measures. The Community has also called for firm and concerted action to improve the functioning of the international monetary system and to increase the flow of aid to the developing countries. It has expressed the hope that results will be achieved in the monetary and financial spheres at the same time — and I underline this — as in trade.

The recent declarations by Mr Backer, the Secretary of the US treasury, in my view now open up the possibility of holding the trade negotiations in parallel with the monetary discussions already in progress among the Ten. The guiding principles governing the future of these talks will of course have to be made clear at the economic summit in Bonn.

Secondly, Madam President, I should like to refer to the International Monetary System and to the European Monetary System.

First, the International Monetary System. The preparatory work which the Ten embarked upon following the economic summit at Williamsburg on the possibility of improving the functioning of the international monetary system is now coming to an end. We have recently noted that America's change of attitude with regard to an international monetary conference — it was Mr Backer who issued the invitation — will enable the participants at the Bonn summit to examine more thoroughly the first results achieved. The Commission supports the requests made here concerning specific undertakings with regard to the holding of the international monetary conference and to the wishes which the Member States have unanimously expressed concerning the arrangements, participation at the conference and the range of subjects to be discussed.

As for the European monetary system, this has made a substantial contribution towards improving the stability of exchange rates. The Commission will do its utmost to help strengthen the European monetary system as well as the ECU, as various speakers have proposed. The recent coordinated interventions of the central banks at the same time as peripheral interventions by the US monetary authorities have played a considerable part in helping to halt and reverse the steady upward trend of the US dollar.

The Commission welcomes this concerted action, which it sees as a means of contributing towards exchange market stability.

Thirdly, the developing countries' foreign debts. The remedies so far attempted have been based on talks between all parties concerned. Since 1982 the terms of international cooperation have been gradually defined on the basis of numerous agreements between countries in debt, international institutions, private banks and the governments of the industrialized countries. Progress must be made in this field. The Community is anxious that dialogue should continue, a fact borne out by the meeting between Mr Cheysson and Mr Iglesias, Secretary of the Cartagena Group.

Measures to stabilize the international monetary system would help to overcome the problem of the indebtedness of the developing countries. I shall be very brief on this point and shall confine myself to what we regard as our four main priorities for the immediate future.

Firstly, the industrialized countries should adjust their policies to reduce effective rates of interest. The second priority is to foster the growth of world trade and to combat protectionism. This would also benefit the developing countries.

Thirdly, every effort should be made to enable the developing countries to use the capital market, and

De Clerq

more generally to give them access to financial support appropriate to their widely differing conditions. The fourth priority for the immediate future is that the developing countries should make an effort to adjust and reorganize themselves at home.

Last but not least, a concerted effort should be made by the Community.

This should aim towards the revitalizing of the economy. I do not think I need stress this point. As you know, the Commission sees its priority as the combating of unemployment on the basis of economic growth backed up by measures to boost employment. We regard international cooperation as indispensable, and we shall encourage this since it will enable us to minimize economic stability and the associated costs in terms of exchange rates, inflation and damage to world trade.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Commission has adopted a clear stand against the persistent and excessive macro-economic imbalance in the United States, in particular in connection with public financing, and against the danger of an upsurge of protectionism. It has also deplored the excessive insularity of the Japanese home market. For this reason we in the Commission welcomed with satisfaction the results of the OECD Council meeting at which the United States and Japan undertook to act in accordance with the wishes of their trading partners. This is an encouraging sign for the opening of the Bonn summit. Of course, only the summit itself can confirm whether our hopes will be crowned by positive results.

Madam President, I have noted everything which has been said here, as well as Parliament's wishes on this matter. These are our wishes too, and the Commission will be very attentive to them.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the four motions for resolutions in successive votes)

Steel sector

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-147/85) by Mrs Van Rooy and others on behalf of the group of the European Peoples Party and Mr De Vries and Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the United States' import restrictions on steel products from the European Economic Community;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-157/85) by Mr Wagner and others, on behalf of the Socialist

Group, and Mr Bonaccini and others, protesting against escalating protectionism by the USA against Community steel imports;

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-160/85) by Mr Le Pen and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on EEC-US relations in the steel sector;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-166/85) by Mr de la Malène and others on recent protectionist measures taken by the United States in the steel sector.

Mrs Van Rooy (PPE). — *(NL)* It is a distressing fact that this is the second time in six months that we have had to hold a debate by urgent procedure on the United States' protectionist policies in the steel sector. Even though the agreement on restrictions on the import of steel pipes and tubes has only just been signed, the US is now calling for cuts in imports of the last category of steel products which could still be freely imported. The US is applying what can best be described as 'salami' tactics. As soon as import restrictions on one category of steel products have been decided upon, another category is sliced away.

We are forced to conclude that things have now gone far enough. We are fed up with these tactics. To give in to the US demands would only reinforce its protectionist inclinations. The fact that the US is concerned only with protecting its own industry is clearly borne out by its restrictive interpretation of the short supply clause in the agreement on steel pipes. What this amounts to is nothing more than a refusal to apply the clause. We therefore fully support the Commission's interpretation of the clause and urge it to stand by it firmly.

We are not only angry that the US also wants to restrict the import of the 'consultation products' we are also worried by the behaviour of the US, that is by its threat of a unilateral ban on imports. The US is using aggressive tactics, to which there can only be one response: the Community must give the US a taste of its own medicine in the form of firm countermeasures in sectors which are very sensitive for the US, and we support the clear statements made by the Commission and the Council on this question.

Madam President, the behaviour of the US, and especially of Congress, once again confirms our suspicion that the US supports free trade when this is to its advantage. However, if free trade means an increase in imports to the US, its own arguments in favour of free trade soon go by the board. Such inconsistency is unacceptable to us and also runs counter to the United States' commitment to maintain free trade throughout the world, together with the Community. Hence our request, in the joint motion for a resolution, for this matter to be discussed at the Economic Summit in Bonn.

Van Rooy

Of course we realize, Madam President, that the United States' \$ 100 000 million trade deficit for last year is an enormous problem — one which mainly affects its relations with Japan. However, it is caused by internal rather than external, involving the uncontrolled rise of the dollar. The problem cannot therefore be solved by protectionist measures but by a policy aimed at controlling both the exchange rate for the dollar and interest rates. If the United States seriously wants to help strengthen the international monetary system, it can prove it at the Bonn summit.

(Applause from the centre)

Mr Peters (S). — *(DE)* The United States of America have always paraded free trade as one of their loftier ideals, but what are they doing, particularly in the steel sector? They are shutting it off, sector by sector. They began with negotiations on crude steel imports and got the European Community to sign a self-limitation agreement.

I said here at the time that it was a mistake and that such an agreement would not prevent the United States from demanding and getting further self-limitation agreements, and this is precisely what happened. The second step was special steel limitations, to which we also agreed. The third was a reduction in tubular steel imports from approximately 12% to 7.6%.

The Community made it a precondition of these negotiations that additional quantities could be imported wherever US companies were unable to supply the same quality. What are the United States doing? They are considering avoiding implementing this bottleneck clause and meeting their obligations, even though they cannot supply the same quality of oilfield pipes at the moment and despite the fact that the pipeline cannot be completed and part of the Community supply is already on its way to the United States by ship.

The fourth step, then, was the refusal to implement this clause. The fifth step has already been announced: import restrictions are also to be imposed on semi-finished steel products and on all other steel products.

All this is happening with unilateral threats and massive interventions. This is total protectionism!

Let me say on behalf of the Socialist Group that we cannot and must not allow this to continue. Strongly worded statements by the Council, the Commission and the European Parliament are no longer sufficient. It is not enough to put the whistle to our lips — the time has come to blow it!

When it comes to the world economic summit, the Presidents of the Council and the Commission must make the point that, if the United States manage to force this one through, we shall pay back these unworthy protectionist measures in kind: with trade sanctions where it hurts the United States most.

Those trade sanctions, which are lying ready for use in the Commission's files, must be taken out and used, most particularly where the GATT rules on agricultural products and coal imports are concerned. We really must press this one home!

We Socialists support the compromise motion, and not because we think the United States responsible for all the sins of the world — even though they certainly are responsible for the ones I have been talking about.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Buttafuoco (DR). — *(IT)* Madam President, the EEC and the United States of America are currently discussing a clause of the agreement on imports of steel pipes by the United States and the possible limitation of steel products not subject to quantitative restrictions.

The assumption that the United States are on the point of taking unilateral protectionist measures and perhaps even imposing a complete embargo on Community steel products is nonetheless quite justified.

We therefore urge the Commission to take strong action and to be extremely vigilant in the negotiations on the agreement concluded in 1982. May I quote a few very significant figures. In 1981, steel exports by the EEC to the United States amounted to approximately 36% of US imports in this sector. In 1984, this 36% had dropped to 24%. At the same time, the third countries as a whole, that is Japan, Sweden, Mexico, Korea and Formosa, increased their steel sales to the US from 64% of the American market to 76%.

Still in the 1981-84 period, US steel imports rose from 11 000 to 17 000 tons but the additional steel was imported from third countries, not the European Community.

We must be quite clear that the difficulties in the American steel industry are not due to an aggressive EEC policy but to competitiveness in the American steel industry which has not been restructured.

This is why we cannot tolerate protectionist measures by the US. The EEC has always scrupulously respected the commitments it made in the 1982 agreement. No complaint can be filed against Europe, either in its approach to quotas or in any other way. There can be no denying that, if anything, it is the strengthening of the dollar which is to blame and that is entirely the result of the USA's inability to produce certain products. The Commission must therefore be supported in its negotiations with the US. In recent years more than 200 000 jobs have been lost in the European steel industry. The effect on our countries of US protectionist measures in this sector would be the loss of thousands more jobs, and this we cannot tolerate. Our only defence, unless we take reprisals, is to reach a global agreement as quickly as possible.

Mr Fitzgerald (RDE). — Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it is regrettable that yet again this House is obliged to take issue with the United States Administration over its actions; actions which will have a major impact on the future of the Community steel industry. I am concerned about the consequences of the recent unilateral measures which they have taken and which are clearly protectionist. The Community made concessions to reach an agreement with the United States and they are now exploiting ambiguities in the 1982 general steel arrangements and the recent 1985 agreement on pipes and tubes. There is clearly one purpose behind their action: to restrict European exports to the United States and to limit the application of the agreement already reached.

The European Community's steel industry, which is of major economic importance, has been subjected to a continual crisis now for several years. Employment has been severely affected and, indeed, whole communities have been devastated by the job losses of recent years. The development of the Community has been impeded by many things. Despite our continuing agricultural surpluses, the Community is importing dairy products and grain and cereal substitutes. On the other side, we have the United States with their great free enterprise policy protecting their steel industry. Because of the consequences within the Community of the enforced reorganization and rationalization of the steel industry, we have spent a great deal of time in this Parliament discussing related unemployment issues. Are we to sit here quietly now and accept new protectionist measures which could further jeopardize more jobs in the steel industry?

The constituency which I represent in Ireland has suffered enormous job losses in the last two years, particularly in the shipbuilding sector. We also have in Cork harbour the only Irish steel mill which has been subjected to an approved rationalization and reorganization programme. Hundreds of jobs in our steel industry have been lost and everything must be done to ensure that the remaining jobs are protected.

I would like to conclude by saying that I find it extremely regrettable that my group was excluded from signing the joint compromise amendment replacing all resolutions and to which we had indicated our agreement. In spite of this, we will be supporting the joint amendment.

Mr Visser (S). — (NL) Madam President, the complaint by the United States that European producers are circumventing the 1982 Steel Agreement by exporting more and more semi-finished products to the United States is totally unreasonable. Why?

First of all because semi-finished products are expressly excluded from the 1982 Agreement. And besides, it happens to be an American tradition to obtain such products from abroad. In this case there

can definitely be no talk of unfair competition, of which the Community has also been unjustly accused with regard to the export of steel pipes, since pipes are supplied to the American Steel industry, which needs them for further processing. So the complaint does not come from the American steel industry but from firms in the United States which have difficulty selling their own semi-finished products. Another reason for the higher exports is the high value of the dollar, and the United States has itself to blame for that. So we are faced here with genuine protectionism.

Although President Reagan pays lipservice to liberalizing world trade, the actions of his government produce the opposite effect. In this way the United States is spoiling our mutual trade relations. Any measures the United States may take with regard to this import restriction are unacceptable and, what is more, are technically unenforceable. The production of semi-finished products is very erratic and fluctuates greatly from year to year. It is practically impossible to find a reference year and to spread any export quotas there may be fairly among the various countries and steel companies in the Community. This is why a sharp protest and tough countermeasures are called for.

It must be absolutely clear that in this case we as a Community will definitely have to take strong countermeasures. Enough is enough!

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED). — Madam President, the regrettable differences between the Community and the United States over steel derive from the interpretation of agreements. It is a highly technical matter and I doubt myself whether this House is best placed to know who is in the right. But I would like to see this House set a lead and take a constructive approach instead of exchanging recriminations and calling for retaliatory measures. I would like to see the House reaffirm its support for the principles of free trade. I would like to see the House call for a fresh round of GATT in 1986 which should be based firmly on the removal of all protectionist measures and the phasing out of subsidization of exports on both sides of the Atlantic. That is the route which I believe will lead to greater prosperity for the Community.

The compromise amendment is an improvement on the original resolutions but I still think that it is provocative rather than constructive and I would hope that if we return to this issue in further debates, as I expect we shall at subsequent plenaries, the House will adopt a more constructive approach.

Mr De Gucht (L). — (NL) Madam President, there are ever increasing signs from the United States that there is growing pressure on the US government to adopt protectionist measures. President Reagan has already had to lobby on several occasions to keep Congress under control.

De Gucht

This is a very worrying situation, especially now that the world needs free trade more than ever to boost economic growth and thus end this continuing crisis. It also suggests that America's position with regard to steel forms part of a broader policy. Its position on steel is totally unacceptable. The Community has complied with the 1982 agreements, and the fact that market conditions for the 'consultation products' have changed in the US is the fault not of the Community but of the substantial increases in imports from other countries. The Community should therefore not be required to pay customs duties, since it was the first to accept trade restrictions under the 1982 agreements. This would be very unfair on the Member States.

The same applies to the agreement on tubes and pipes, where it was understood that the short supply clause could be invoked under the all-American pipeline contract — and now the Americans are refusing to play the game.

The Liberal and Democratic Group therefore welcomes the very clear stand taken by the Council of Ministers and the determined attitude of the Commission, and feels that the Commission has adopted the right tone and has acted in a straightforward, uncomplicated and unaggressive way. We therefore hope that this signal has had the desired effect and that the US is prepared to allow the situation to calm down. For that reason, Madam President, we would like to hear from the Commission whether the many contacts since then have produced any results, or whether there is any hope of results in the near future.

We want negotiations and cooperation, not confrontation. The US must realize that if there are no negotiations and no cooperation, confrontation will be all the more difficult to avoid, and this would be damaging to both sides.

The matter under discussion is an important test case: important, because the measures which the US is or has been considering could jeopardize the restructuring of the European steel industry and the healthy development of which there are now signs. It is a test case because the US is clearly wavering between free trade, to which it pays a great deal of lip service, and a protectionist approach. It will also test the credibility of the US in requesting a new round of GATT negotiations. A request for a new round of GATT talks cannot be taken seriously if existing GATT agreements are not respected.

Madam President, all barriers to trade create problems. In principle, we all agree that we shall have to get out of this mess together. We all advocate free trade as the remedy, but if this remedy is to work, it must actually be applied.

Mr Christensen (ARC). — (DA) Madam President, it is regrettable that the USA should have introduced

protectionist measures against steel imports from the EEC. However, it would not be wise to react with protectionist reprisals against American exports of coal, chemicals and agricultural products to the EEC.

The authors of the motion for a resolution condemn protectionism while at the same time advocating it. All this motion can lead to is in fact more protectionism. In my view, trade wars are unjustifiable and we should therefore bear in mind that of the main reasons for American protectionism is the European Community's subsidized exports of many goods, including agricultural produce.

Consequently, Madam President, I believe there would be more future in it if we were to take the lead and put an end to the Community's own protectionism, especially in the steel sector, since the artificially high prices cost the Danish metals industry thousands of millions per year, as well as reducing its competitiveness and threatening jobs.

Mr Cassidy (ED). — Madam President, I speak in support of Amendment No 1 to the various motions for resolutions on US import restrictions. The amendment is in the name of the European Democratic Group, the European People's Party, the Liberal and Democratic Group, the Socialist Group and the Communist and Allies Group. It is, therefore, a genuinely ecumenical amendment and will, I hope, be adopted.

My colleagues and I join in condemning the unilateral action by the United States of imposing import restrictions on all carbon steel, special steel and pipes and tubes. During the negotiations between the Community and the USA towards the end of 1984 it was apparent that the United States' own industry did not have sufficient manufacturing capacity to meet demand there for specific types of steel. The Americans also appear to have overlooked the part played by the strength of the US dollar in increasing Community steel exports to the USA. This effectively makes European steel attractively cheaper than the home-produced products.

At the same time we must not overlook the recent decision by the US Court of International Trade that Community aids to the steel industry go beyond what is needed to enable the closure of excess capacity. It would be foolish of us therefore to imagine that the American Administration position is solely a response to lobbying by their steel barons.

Mr De Clercq, Member of the Commission. — (FR) There can be no doubt that relations between the Community and the United States in the steel sector are very strained at present and the impressive number of motions for resolutions which have been submitted bears witness to this. We thank Parliament for its valuable support for the Commission's efforts.

De Clercq

We are continuing to do all we can to defend our rightful interests.

It is important, ladies and gentlemen, to see our present problems in the context of the general situation in the steel industry. We have problems, the Community steel industry is in the throes of reorganization. It has made and continues to make an enormous contribution economically and socially, but the fact is that the world steel industry, including the United States, is going through a very severe crisis.

Let me assure Parliament, however, that the Commission is watching the situation very closely. We do not want to see the negotiations breakdown altogether. I hope very much that it can be settled without confrontation. But if it cannot, and if our partners take unilateral measures, I can assure you that the Commission is determined to make a firm stand.

We feel that the refusal of the American authorities to apply the short supply clause to exports for the American pipeline project is contrary to the letter and the spirit of the agreement we concluded with the United States, we consider that any unilateral American measures on steel products not so far subject to quantitative restrictions would also be contrary to the letter and spirit of the agreement. We are doing all we can, as I said, to avoid a further serious deterioration in relations in this area. There can be no doubt that a stalemate would jeopardize the coming economic summit in Bonn and would impair the credibility of the new round of commercial and multilateral negotiations.

A question was put by one group on special steels. The Commission has responded to the approach adopted by the United States government since 1983 by taking counter-measures and these measures are still in force.

As regard the possible renewal of the 1982 agreement, as you know, negotiations are due to take place in 1985 to discuss its extension or modification. I want to make it quite clear that it would be premature to adopt a stand here and now, partly because our American partners have not yet approached us on this issue and partly because the question has as yet been debated neither in the Commission nor with the Member States. I must also stress that it is not up to us to make the first move in this case. May I say, ladies and gentlemen, that whatever happens the Commission will continue to do its utmost to defend the interests of Community steel on the American market.

(Applause)

Mr Narjes, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(DE)* Madam President, if I am the last to speak, this is simply because the excesses and the style of US steel protectionism demand that I make some final and fundamental points. First, the crisis in the steel industry

has existed on both sides of the Atlantic since 1977. In order to avoid a trade war, the OECD tried to reach a consensus then about the need for restructuring procedures for bilateral agreements in the event of difficulties.

The Community has kept to this consistently. By the end of 1985 we shall have dismantled 32 million tonnes of hot-rolled product capacity. When we began to have trading difficulties with the United States in 1981, the Community was soon prepared to reach a steel trade agreement limiting its exports, in the spirit of the OECD consensus. For a long time this was the only agreement of its type between the United States and its trading partners. In other words, the Community at that time conceded trade diversions in favour of third countries as a European contribution to the restructuring of the United States steel industry. Despite this, the European Community has been hit repeatedly since 1983 by unilateral escalations in US steel protectionism. With high-grade steel it has had to resort to retortion measures since 1983.

With tubular steel exports, an unsatisfactory self-limitation agreement had to be reached on 9 January 1985 under the duress of unusual circumstances and because of the inadequacy of the GATT provisions. Talks are still going on about a further increase in protectionism which may involve those products which, according to the crude steel agreement, are not subject to quotas.

The points I wish to make about this are as follows: first, one important reason for the reduced competitiveness of the US steel industry is the unusually high dollar exchange rate. To attempt to use protectionist devices is like treating a disease through its symptoms. Secondly, the actual causes are the serious public authority deficit in the United States, the high level of real interest rates there and the flow of imports these generate, i.e. the import pull on goods of all types and also on capital, which, by financing the trade deficit, leads to a further capital import pull. Thirdly, it is imperative in these circumstances that we put an immediate stop to the existing inappropriate protectionist measures.

It is against this background that we are expressing our concern and our serious objections to (a) the one-sidedness of the measures, particularly the one-sided interpretation of the agreements reached, (b) the retroactive effect and (c) the systematic disregard for legally valid private-law agreements concluded in good faith between European exporters and US importers.

The Commission will, as Mr De Clercq has already explained, continue to defend the interests of the Community's steel industry with increased vigour and will not fight shy of further retaliatory measures. I should like to warn the United States against interpreting our readiness to discuss these matters as indecision. It is regrettable that the United States under-

Narjes

mines the credibility of its own demands for free world trade through its steel protectionist practices.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

We shall now vote on Amendment No 1 seeking to replace the four motions for resolutions.

Mr Patterson (ED). — On a point of order, Madam President, could I ask you to make sure that in all languages the texts of this amendment on which we are going to vote are aligned on the German text which was the language used in drafting the compromise. The reason I make this point is that in paragraph 4 the German text says '*Vereinigten Staaten*', whereas the English text still has 'the American Administration'. It is an important point because it is not the American Administration alone that is responsible, it is also both the American Courts and, more than that, Congress. So could we have *Vereinigten Staaten* translated properly into all the languages?

President. — Thank you. The necessary will be done.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1¹ seeking to replace the four motions for resolutions)

South Africa

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-119/85) by Mr Lomas and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the current situation in South Africa;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-121/85) by Mr De Vries and Mr De Gucht, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on violence in South Africa;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-132/85) by Mr Prag and others, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on South Africa;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-142/85) by Mr Habsburg and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Demo-

cratic Group), on the recent violent events in South Africa;

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-153/85) by Mr Wurtz and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the situation in Southern Africa.

Mr Lomas (S). — Madam President, I hope everybody in this Chamber today, whatever our different views, will join with us in expressing our absolute condemnation of the brutal attack by the South African police on a peaceful march at Langa a few weeks ago, and we send our sympathy to the relatives and friends of those who were murdered. This barbarous act has been condemned throughout the world. The UK Foreign Secretary said it was indefensible and showed the evil of apartheid; US Secretary of State Shultz said it was evil and unacceptable.

Madam President, twenty-five years ago at Sharpeville the world was horrified at the butchery that took place on that day, and still it goes on. Over 200 black South Africans have been killed in the last few months, so the time for pious platitudes is over. We must now demand some economic pressures on the South African Government, for that is the only thing they understand. We must end investment. We must end trade. We must stop the links in sport and culture. These demands are supported throughout the world. In the US Senate there is now a bill supported by many respected senators calling for the same thing. Our own ACP-European Parliament Joint Assembly also called for these measures. US banks are stopping loans now to South Africa. In Britain a leading electronics firm is pulling out. So we are in good company.

Of course, it will be said that these measures would hurt the black population. Yes, they would. However, they have made it clear — as clear as they can, given that it is actually illegal in South Africa to utter publicly support for sanctions — that this is what they want, because their lives could not be any worse. I appeal to the Members opposite in this Chamber: if you have reservations about this part of our motion, then abstain on it; do not oppose it, because all you will do is to bring comfort to the government in Pretoria.

Finally, I say this. Let us make sure today that this Parliament sends out a clear message to the South African Government that we shall no longer tolerate the evil, brutal regime that exists there. That until the government can behave in a civilized manner, we shall cut off links with it and it shall form no part of the civilized community.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Nordmann (L). — (FR) Madam President, this debate is far from being the first on the situation in

¹ Amendment No 1 tabled by Mr Wagner and Mr Arndt on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mrs Van Rooy, Mr Franz and Mr Klepsch on behalf of the European People's Party, Mr Patterson on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr De Vries and Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, and Mr Bonaccini, Mrs De March, Mr Alavanos and Mr Filinis on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Nordmann

South Africa, but I believe it has come at the right time, because it should allow us to go beyond the slightly ritual character of the litany which usually opposes the various groups when this question arises.

Naturally, we shall repeat our condemnation of apartheid on the basis of Western Europe's democratic traditions and on the basis of the universality of human rights. This has to be said and done. But it is essential to see this condemnation against the background of the gradual process now taking place and which has two possible courses — a violent development which, once again, we have to condemn or, on the same level as this violent development, a peaceful development by public debate — in particular, by parliamentary debate.

I am struck by the fact that, during the recent events in South Africa, the truth and the challenge to authority have come from a parliamentary institution — the South African Parliament, which is built on pluralism and free debate. It is from that Parliament, and through that Parliament, that apartheid will be abolished. I was also struck by the fact that the bending and dismantling of apartheid have begun and that a decisive stage has been reached with the moves towards legalizing mixed marriages. But this is only a beginning. We need to see the generalization of property rights, the end of restrictions on movement for individuals and more emphasis on freeing political prisoners, a process which has, in fact, already started. Something is happening, a peaceful development is being initiated. What matters now is that Western Europe should not just give out warnings, but that it should also support the non-violent forces which will push through this development which is, in all senses of the word, liberal.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Prag (ED). — Madam President, a black life is as sacred as a white life or any other. If the South African police had held this view and it had the same rigorous training in riot control and the discipline customary in the police in our own countries, these deaths would surely never have occurred. In my group we understand the real problems of South Africa and it makes no sense to criticize the policies of that country without understanding their motivation. We recognize that there are 4 1/2 million whites and 16 million blacks. We should also recognize that there have been great changes in the last 20 years in the treatment of the black majority in South Africa, and in their social and economic status, and in sport too. There are now black trade unions and even some mixed trade unions. The repeal of the Mixed Marriage Act and the Immorality Act — the intention to repeal them has just been announced — will be notable steps forward and we recognize this. But we also recognize that the nub of apartheid, the bulk of the massively retrograde steps of its initial years just after the war, has not been

removed. Above all, the so-called Bantustans remain and with them the refusal to give the black population South African nationality. The Group Areas Act remains which tells black, coloured and Indian people where they can live and where they cannot live and orders them out of white areas. A pass law still exists, though applied less vigorously. Above all there are no political rights for the black majority.

On these matters our views are no different from those of our colleagues on the other side of the House. The joint motion for a resolution of the EPP, the Liberals and the European Democratic Group makes this crystal clear. We condemn racism in all its forms. Where we differ is in the solutions recommended. There are many countries — most countries indeed, I regret to say — whose record on human rights is very far from what we who are fortunate enough to live in Western European countries would desire. Are we to end all investment in all of them? Are we to suspend all sport with all of them? Worst of all, are we gradually to reduce our trade with them as the Socialists' resolution would do with regard to South Africa? It would be the height of folly, Madam President, not only for the development of world trade and prosperity but above all for the people most involved — the poor and the unfortunate, in this case the black majority in South Africa. That is why we shall vote for our joint resolution and against the Socialists' resolution.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — (DE) Madam President, South Africa seems to be an ongoing issue for the European Parliament, and once again, we find ourselves having to deal with two completely contradictory pieces of information in the urgent debate.

On the one hand, we have the deeply disturbing attitude of the South African police, which we cannot condemn too strongly, because, as my friend Derek Prag has said, a black life is just as sacred as a white life.

On the other hand, there can be no doubt that considerable steps have been taken towards the dismantling of apartheid since our last part-session. Anyone who has had the opportunity of getting to know South Africa personally will realize the far-reaching significance of the fact that a clear step forward has now been made in mixed-marriage and other related legislation.

I believe that in the light of this we should acknowledge something else. South Africa is one of our major partners. Those who believe that we could simply cut off links with that country would be responsible, if their wishes were carried out, for our then having millions more unemployed in Europe. Neither do I think that this would be in the interests of the black population of South Africa which, as certain important organizations keep telling us, is not in favour of this boycott at all. Of course, it is relatively easy to decide on a boycott here in Strasbourg, but it is the people of

Habsburg

South Africa who will have to pay for it, and let us not forget that the vast majority of them are black.

There is something else we should not forget: if we break off our links with South Africa, other countries will definitely not follow us, and the black states which are calling upon us to impose this boycott are the very ones which have recently increased their trade with South Africa the most.

That is why we should support the joint amendment tabled by three groups, which expresses exactly what we want to say. Apart from that, we need to continue the pressure on South Africa, but not to such an extent that this creates a disadvantage for its people and the economy of Europe.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Trivelli (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, the main message of the resolution we have tabled is quite clear: it denounces and condemns apartheid and the recent violence and urges economic, political and cultural measures and sanctions, which will really have some effect on the situation in South Africa and help to change it.

I would like to draw Parliament's attention to a very serious contradiction in the joint motion from the European People's Party, the European Democratic Group and the Liberal and Democratic Group, a contradiction between condemnation of apartheid, which of course I welcome, and total silence on the measures which should and must be taken if we are to see any real change in the situation in South Africa.

I feel that this is quite important for two reasons. The first concerns us all, all my colleagues, sincere Europeans, in other groups: if you want the European Parliament, Europe, to count, this House has to do more than simply adopt a position and then sit back. What is needed is real, effective action as we suggest and as the motion tabled by the Socialist Group suggests.

But there is another reason: we have recently had new news from South Africa which needs to be assessed. The Government in Pretoria has announced its intention to withdraw its military forces from Angola by tomorrow and that a parliamentary committee has been set up to look into the possibility of eliminating racial discrimination in marriage and sexual relations. It is not for me to say how far this action is sincere, how far merely a sop. I say only that concrete and effective action by the European Parliament could lead to more steps of this kind, effective steps, and not mere pretexts for maintaining the present situation.

President. — In view of the time, I shall put a proposal to the House.

All the political groups have expressed their wish to have a number of Members put forward their views, which means that there will not be enough time for the vote. I therefore propose to the various political groups that they give up their speaking time to hear the Commission, and this will enable us to vote.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — *(NL)* Madam President, you are addressing yourself to the large groups, but the small ones are, as usual, given no chance.

President. — Mr Ulburghs, I am addressing myself to all the Members present. I hope you appreciate that.

(Parliament agreed to the President's proposal)

Mr De Clercq, Member of the Commission. — *(NL)* Ladies and gentlemen, many speakers here have expressed their disgust, indeed their revulsion at the policy of apartheid and the distressing events to which this regime inevitably gives rise, whether in Soweto, Uitenhage or elsewhere.

The Commission fully shares the view expressed here. Apartheid is an unacceptable system which we should condemn in all its forms. The Commission condemns it, as it condemns the violence used against those who oppose the regime, and is appalled at the number of victims of repression. It once again appeals to the South African government to put an end to this universally condemned policy.

Progress is being made in South Africa, real progress, but it is still not enough. What the South African government seems not to understand, or not to want to understand is that there can be no half measures where human dignity is concerned — either it is respected or not. The authorities in Pretoria must realize that their policy has no future. The longer it continues, the more opposition and violence will ensue. The longer it continues, the more remote a peaceful solution will become. South Africa therefore faces the choice of either applying a peaceful solution itself or waiting for a solution to be imposed on it — and such a solution would certainly not be peaceful.

We should therefore maintain pressure on the South African government to abolish apartheid and should mobilize our own ideals and world opinion. This debate here is an important contribution towards this, and the Commission feels privileged in taking part.

I realize, Madam President, that people are beginning to feel impatient with the obduracy of this system, and that voices are being raised, both here and elsewhere, in favour of economic sanctions against South Africa. The Commission, for its part, is open to any measures which could bring South Africa to reason. But what matters to the Commission is the effectiveness of the measures, and they can only be effective if they form

De Clercq

part of a coherent Community policy. The Commission therefore thinks that before it proposes any measures, the Member States should examine the various possibilities in the context of political cooperation, that is on the basis of the existing allocation of responsibilities.

The Commission President, Mr Delors, has brought the Commission's concern to the attention of the Council President and mentioned the need for the Community to adopt a joint approach to this problem as soon as possible with a view to persuading South Africa to abandon its policy of apartheid.

President. — The debate is closed.

(In successive votes Parliament adopted:

- *the motion for a resolution Doc. B 2-119/85;*
- *Amendment No 1¹ seeking to replace motions for resolutions Docs B 2-121/85, B 2-132/85 and B 2-142/85;*
- *motion for a resolution Doc. B 2-153/85)*

*
* *

President. — Mrs Boot has submitted a request in writing for the motion for a resolution on the recognition of university degrees to be put to the vote without debate. Personally I would be in favour of putting this proposal to the House, but I am not empowered to change the order of motions. I would therefore put the following overall proposal: since there are no amendments on Items VI and VII, I am in favour of voting on these proposals without debate.

(Parliament agreed to the proposal)

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-152/85 by Mr Cervetti and Mr Piquet, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the murders of Guerrero, Parada and Nattino and the further increase in repression in Chile: *adopted*.

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-165/85) by Mrs Anglade and others, on behalf of the Group of the

European Democratic Alliance, on the massacre of prisoners of war in Iran: *adopted*

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-171/85) by Mr Ephremidis and others on the ruthless violation of human rights and the bloody reign of terror in Turkey: *adopted*

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-145/85) by Mrs Boot and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the recognition of national university degrees and professional qualifications at European level: *adopted*

*
* *

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) I request a vote on Item VIII also.

President. — I put this proposal to the vote.

(Parliament agreed to the proposal)

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-98/85/CORR.) by Mr De Vries and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the official visit of General Stroessner, President of Paraguay, to the Federal Republic of Germany: *adopted*

*
* *

Mr Segre (COM). — (IT) Madam President, there are only three more motions for resolution on the agenda, and since it would only take a minute to vote on them, I think we can reasonably do so.

Mr Prag (ED). — (FR) Madam President, we must finish the votes at one o'clock. We cannot go on like this.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, my decision is to suspend the sitting.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.05 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

¹ Amendment No 1 tabled by Mr Prag, Mr Price, Mr Cassidy and Mr Pearce, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr De Vries, Mr De Gucht and Mrs Veil, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, and Mr Habsburg, Mr Croux, Mr Ryan, Mr Herman and Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party.

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

Vice-President

3. Commission statement

President. — The next item is the statement by the Commission on the draft budget for the European Communities for the 1985 financial year.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, in the past few months, the European Community has made substantial progress and a whole series of problems facing the new Commission when it took office have now been resolved.

One major problem was the lack of a budget for 1985. We have now reached a situation where this difficulty can be cleared up. On 1 April 1985, the Commission issued Amendment No 3 to the draft budget for 1985. This became possible when on 21 March the Council reached agreement in principle on the raising of the Community's own resources and the financing of part of the 1985 budget with advances which are not to be reimbursed to the Member States.

The amendment contains four major changes to the original draft budget. First of all, it was necessary to increase the appropriations for the EAGGF guarantee section by 640 million ECU. There are three reasons in particular for this increase: a transfer of payments from 1984 to 1985, increased expenditure resulting from the Commission's proposed agricultural prices for 1985-1986 and finally, economic developments since draft budget was drawn up. Secondly, it was necessary to increase the appropriations for food aid as a result of economic developments, especially the rise in world market prices. Thirdly, the appropriations had to be increased in order to cover the deficit for the 1984 financial year. Fourthly, an adjustment on the resources side was made following a revised estimate of own resources for 1985.

All in all, these changes mean that just over 2 900 million ECU are required over and above the funds available within the 1% VAT ceiling. This is the amount to be financed out of the non-refundable advances from the Member States. Compared with the draft budget produced by the Council in November 1984 and rejected by Parliament, a smaller sum is required, namely 2 300 million ECU, which is in line with what the Commission indicated to the two institutions, Parliament and Council, as early as January.

Finally, the amendment illustrates the unity between the Member States achieved in the Council on 21 March with regard to the correction of the United Kingdom's 1984 contribution. The correction consists in a reduction in the United Kingdom's VAT contribution and a corresponding increase in that of the other Member States.

On behalf of the Commission, I would express the hope that Parliament and the Council will act swiftly,

since the difficulties facing us as a result of not having a 1985 budget yet are increasing day by day.

Mrs Barbarella (COM). — (IT) I have just one question to put to the Commission on the changes it is proposing for the VAT allocation key for the individual Member States or, if you prefer, on the Commission proposal for the British repayments.

My question is this: how can the Commission, which is supposed to be the custodian of the Treaties and the primary acts of the Community, present us today with a proposal to allocate VAT, which is contrary to the primary legislation and to the 1970 legislation on own resources which is still in force?

How, I repeat, can the Commission present us with a proposal contrary to the basic legislation and therefore void of any true legal basis?

Mrs Castle (S). — Is not the Commissioner being wildly optimistic in saying to us that a solution has now been found to the budgetary problem? Is not, for example, the Commission's estimate of a short-fall of nearly 3 000 million ECU this year based on the assumption that the Commission's price proposals for this year will be adopted? What will happen, for instance, if the German Government refuses to accept a cut in the cereal price of 3.6%, as it is threatening to do? Will the Commission please produce for us detailed estimates of the increase in the deficit this year that will result from the refusal of the Council of Ministers to accept the price proposals which the Commission has said are the absolute necessity?

Mr Cornelissen (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, would the Commissioner first explain why the original proposals on farm prices have been retained in the Commission's latest proposals? What concrete factors led the Commission to completely ignore Parliament's opinion that farm prices should be increased by an average of 3½%, and how does the Commission therefore imagine that the required additional funds will be made available if the Council decides, contrary to the Commission proposals, to increase prices by only a few percent?

Secondly, why do the Commission proposals again refer to advance payments from the Member States to provide the supplementary funds for 1985? I assume that the Commission also subscribes to the view that an intergovernmental agreement on such payments cannot be regarded as a Community solution. Why has no other approach been adopted?

My last question, Mr President: when does the Commission expect the advances to be paid, bearing in mind the time required for their approval by the national governments, and what does it intend to do in the meantime?

Mr Curry (ED). — Mr Commissioner, would you outline for us the consequences for the budget of the European Community and the policies of the European Community if this House were to take its objections to the payment of the British rebate on the revenue side to the point which is logical — if it objects — which is a second rejection of the budget or a disputed budget? Could you outline for us what the consequences could be of such an action for the Community?

Would the Commissioner agree, following the report of my friend and colleague, Mr Peter Price, that Italy has, in fact, received an abatement on the revenue side for years and years because of a differential in the way own-resources are collected? Would he also agree that his forecasts depend on a number of uncertainties, notably whether or not the Council will accept his estimates of a deficiency in farm spending, the level of the dollar, the level of the farm-price increase? Would he admit that there is a possibility — for which we do not reproach him — namely that the Commission may find itself forced to defer and carry over premiums and advances in the agricultural sector for 1985-86 because, in fact, the budget may not — through no fault of his — be, after all, a 12-month budget?

Mrs Scrivener (L). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think it should be stressed that the Council of Ministers' figures differ from those of the Commission. We would be inclined to be guided by experience and accept the Commission's figures as the right ones. We definitely do not want the Council to indulge in its regular practice of minimizing the Commission's estimates.

What does the Commissioner think about this and how does he propose to remedy the situation?

My second question concerns the financial cover for farm prices, which has not yet been decided. Is it true that it will influence the level of the non-refundable advances made by the Member States? In other words, if we have to pay more for farm produce, will there be an increase in these non-refundable advances? Is this what will happen?

Obviously, as everyone can see from reading the letter of amendment, the main problem is the payment of the British rebate. How can the Commission follow the Council in proposing a correction of 1 000 million ECU to be paid in 1985, when the new own-resources do not come into force until 1 January 1986 at the earliest. In other words, Mr Commissioner, how can one pay out money which one does not have? The only possible solution seems to be to wait until 1 January 1986 before paying the United Kingdom its planned rebate. These, Mr Commissioner, are the three questions that I would like answered.

Mr Bonde (ARC). — (DA) Mr President, 1985 will presumably be the year in which Denmark's contribu-

tion to the EEC will pass the five thousand million kroner mark. If the dollar falls below the present level, the amount will rise even further and if the Council of Ministers increases the Commission's proposed prices, the cost of this will have to be added as well. This is money collected from consumers in the form of customs and excise duties as well as VAT. These are taxes which make life even more difficult.

Those of our fellow citizens who can least afford it are the ones who pay most in relative terms, while those who are best off receive the largest payments from the EEC budget. A company like Philips, and I can easily confirm this since it is a statement from *Agence Europe*, has just received DKrs 640 million in research subsidies under the so-called Esprit programme. The consumers of the EEC countries are paying the subsidies, but it will be Philips shareholders and the other recipients who benefit from the new inventions and patents resulting from them. Those paying the money will not even get joint ownership rights. This is just an example of how the EEC fund operates like Robin Hood in reverse: with the money taken from the poor and given to the rich.

In agricultural policy, the process is more or less the same. But on top of the direct contributions, our consumers pay more for food in shops.

My question is therefore whether Mr Christophersen intends to ensure that the next draft budget also lists the recipients of subsidies from the EEC budget, and not just the various items of expenditure. Who, for example, are the top ten individual recipients of contributions under the EAGGF? Who are the top five individual recipients from the EAGGF in Denmark. May we be allowed to see where the funds end up, so that we are not just presented with a few figures in a few columns which hide more than they reveal?

Mr Bardong (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, I have three questions.

Does the Commission think it possible that any changes in farm costs will be taken into account in time, and why has it completely ignored Parliament's proposals on this? Is it sure that there will be no need for a supplementary budget because of this, and are there any other reasons why a supplementary budget may become necessary, even though this year's budget will be adopted very late? Is it correct that no account is taken of the integrated Mediterranean programmes in these texts, although a decision has been taken on them?

Mr Pasty (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, I would like to ask the Commissioner the following question: is the Commission aware that on two main points raised by the previous speakers — the United Kingdom's budget contribution, set according to the level of receipts

Pasty

rather than the level of expenses, and the matter of farm prices — the letter of amendment submitted the Commission deviates considerably from Parliament's proposals, and does the Commission know what will happen if, as we hope, the Council does not accept the Commission's proposals on farm prices? Taking into account the impending exhaustion of own resources, how will this expenditure be met during the financial year? Is there not a danger that we will not have a budget covering the full twelve months of the budgetary year, as Parliament is hoping?

I would like to ask another question which has not yet been raised and which concerns food aid: as the only amendment made is a readjustment of the price of commodities with no tonnage modification, does the Commissioner think that this will be sufficient and that it will not be necessary during 1985 to considerably increase the tonnage of foodstuffs for food aid?

Mr Dankert (S). — My question concerns agricultural expenditure and the procedure to be followed to include possible increases in budgetary volume decided by the Council. I foresee a difficulty here. If we do not have the figures during the first reading it will not be possible to follow normal procedures as far as amendments or modifications are concerned in order to include them in the second reading. Should we not get them in time the Commission rules out a supplementary budget.

So I would like to know how the Commission thinks this can be fitted in.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, I would like to thank Parliament for the understanding it has shown for our letter of amendment, although I did of course note a certain degree of scepticism expressed occasionally in contributions. However, in spite of the scepticism on individual points, I believe the question put show at any rate that there is agreement with the Commission on an extremely important point, namely that there is a need for a real, genuine budget for 1985. This was one of the reasons behind the question as to how we can now be certain that agricultural expenditure will be covered, or, as Mrs Scrivener put it, that the figures will hold. I shall endeavour to answer the questions asked.

Mrs Barbarella ask — and I find this quite natural — how the Commission, as the guardian of the Treaty, can submit a letter of amendment on the mechanism for calculating the British budget adjustment. What I actually said in my statement on behalf of the Commission was as follows:

'Finally, the amendment illustrates the unity between the Member States achieved in the Council on 21 March with regard to the correction of the United Kingdom's 1984 contribution. The correction consists

in a reduction in the United Kingdom's VAT contribution and a corresponding increase in that of the other Member States.'

This was a sober, cool assessment of what the Member States had agreed to submit to their national parliaments for ratification. One may regret that the Member States want to submit such a proposal to their national parliaments for ratification, but nevertheless I think that it is reasonable for the Commission to recognize the fact that the Member States will ask for such ratification.

The important thing for the Commission at the moment is to prepare a realistic analysis of the best and quickest way of resolving the budget problem in 1985. The Commission cannot, nor does it want to, prevent Parliament and Council discussing the matter. I can well imagine that such a discussion will take place, and the Commission will naturally follow it with great interest. But we believed that it was correct, after the Member States had taken this decision in the Council — not as the Council but in their capacity as Member States — for us to acknowledge it and take it into account. Moreover, I would like to say that this issue does not in fact relate to the shortfall for 1985, it concerns a redistribution of contributions. The Member States have accordingly chosen to incorporate this in the treaty on the increase in own resources, and — I regret to have to say this — it is the Member States' right under the Treaty to do so, even though we might disapprove.

Mrs Castle asks whether the Commission is not being too optimistic in estimating the consequences of the farm price proposals on the basis of its own proposals. Many other speakers have asked the same question: what will happen if more costly price proposals are adopted instead of the Commission's. In the view of the Commission, there can be no doubt as to what should happen. If the Council of Ministers takes a decision entailing costs over and above the expenditure called for by the Commission's letter of amendment, the Council naturally has to accept the necessary budgetary consequences of such a decision, and the only way to do this is of course to increase the amount provided for under the inter-governmental agreement. This is a matter of simple logic.

I would thus urge, if I may, that neither Parliament nor Council should for this reason delay completing their deliberations on the 1985 budget. For just as there is a need for a budgetary discipline, in the view of some Member States, there is also a need for political discipline in the Member States: if one day a particular Council meeting takes a decision with consequences for expenditure, the next day another Council meeting must be prepared to take decisions to cover these consequences. But the Commission can only go by the figures arising from its own farm price proposals. It has not abandoned its proposals, and will not start submitting alternative figures to Parliament or the

Christophersen

Council. The Commission stands by its proposals. Although it is aware that Parliament and a number of Member States think otherwise, the Commission takes the view that the price proposals it has submitted are in the current situation necessary and realistic. We may disagree on this point, but the Commission will naturally take its own policy as its starting point.

Mr Cornelissen asks when the advance payments will be made. In fact this is the same question as that raised by Mrs Scrivener in a slightly different context: how and when can the UK rebate mechanism come into effect? This depends on how quickly the Member States are ready to ratify the treaty on own resources, and how quickly the Member States are prepared to ratify the inter-governmental agreement on the non-refundable advances. The Commission can only appeal to the Member States and their parliaments to do this as quickly as possible. It is clear that delays may lead to liquidity problems, and we must work together to resolve these. But here we have a problem outside the competence of the Institutions, because it is up to the national parliaments to decide how quickly they will ratify such agreements. We may regret this situation, but we have no way of changing it. On behalf of the Commission, I can only urge that this be done as quickly as possible.

In this connection — and in reply to Mrs Scrivener — I would like to draw attention to the fact that whereas the actual increase in the ceiling on own resources is conditional upon ratification of the accession treaties the proposals by the Member States for new own resources contain a special provision for the British adjustment mechanism allowing it to come into effect immediately following the ratification of these proposals. So this mechanism may well come into effect before 1 January 1986.

Mr Curry asks what would the consequences be if Parliament amended the refund to the United Kingdom. I do not think it is the Commission's task to provide such an analysis at this juncture. I feel that the institutions themselves must first endeavour to assess the consequences of the decisions they take. Clearly, decisions might be taken which the Commission must caution against, but I do not now want to start commenting on behalf of the Commission on hypothetical consequences of particular decisions by the Parliament or the Council. Being a Member of Parliament, Mr Curry, does now and then involve a certain risk — and part of this risk involves attempting to reach one's own assessment of the outcome of a particular proposal or decision. As we all know, this is part and parcel of the job. I therefore cannot and will not answer this question.

I now come to the question, as I understand it, as to whether the farm price arrangements will be postponed from 1985 to 1986. I cannot imagine this happening. The Commission hopes for a speedy decision, but I cannot actually imagine any postponement.

Mrs Scrivener asks whether the Commission is confident that the resources it is requesting are sufficient. I think this is an important question, for I must emphasize that the Commission has attempted to carry out the necessary adjustments on the basis of assumptions we feel are realistic. I would like to repeat what I said the first time I had the opportunity of addressing Parliament on these problems: the Commission has opted for assumptions that are not too optimistic, as this would be of no benefit to anyone. We have tried to choose assumptions that are as realistic as possible, because — I would like to say this to both Parliament and the Council — if we were instead to adopt optimistic assumptions that later proved to be untenable, what would be the result? Maybe we would have to adopt a supplementary budget for 1985. And what would then happen, Mr President? The result would be that the Member States would have to go to their parliaments not once but twice. Would this be in anyone's interest? I have emphasized this point to the Council on behalf of the Commission, and I would also like to stress this before Parliament. The ultimate consequence of a supplementary budget would be a second inter-governmental agreement. This would not be in anyone's interest.

I believe I have answered the question on farm prices put by Mrs Scrivener. More explicitly, if prices are adjusted upwards, there is only one way of meeting the additional costs, namely by increasing the figure in the inter-governmental agreement, for own resources are unable to cover such an increase.

I have no particular comment to make on Mr Bonde's contribution. This is because it did not in fact concern the Commission's letter of amendment. His contribution was a general observation setting out his views on Denmark's membership of the Community. I see no reason to use a debate on a letter of amendment for such a discussion. Moreover, I do not see that Mr Bonde's comments have added anything original to the debate. I believe I have heard these views before, so I have no comments to make on them. On the other hand, I can say I have no intention of changing the form taken by the budget proposal; after all, the work of the Committee on Budgetary Control offers plenty of opportunity to see how resources are used. Furthermore, it should be said that it is simply impossible to determine from the Community budget what the advantages and disadvantages of membership are.

Mr Bardong asked three questions, and I believe I have answered the first two. The third was one concerning the integrated Mediterranean programmes. I am pleased that Mr Bardong put this question, for I have heard this asked on other occasions and also seen it mentioned in the press. Fortunately, I can give an answer that I believe will satisfy Mr Bardong: we did not include this point in the letter of amendment quite simply because the provisional budget for 1985, thus the Commission's original budget proposal, already contains appropriations for the integrated Mediterra-

Christophersen

nean programme. A commitment appropriation of 140 million ECU is set aside for the current year, together with, as far as I recall, a payment appropriation amounting to 20 million ECU. In the Council's discussions in November, this figure was reduced to 50 million ECU, I believe, but the line is there. There is no reason for Parliament to feel it has no influence on this question, but we did not want to adjust our original figure of 140 million ECU, because quite simply we have not yet submitted to the Council our draft framework regulation for the integrated Mediterranean programmes. Moreover, as we also consider that we cannot begin to decide on appropriations until some way into 1985, the amount set aside in the original proposal accordingly had to be of a reasonable size.

Mr Pasty asked a concrete question about food aid. I can state that in the Commission's amendment concerning food aid the quantities to be supplied remain the same — no more and no less. But this will cost more because prices have risen in the last few years. On behalf of the Commission, I would strongly urge Parliament to respond positively towards this proposal.

Mr Dankert raised a question in fact addressed to both the Commission and Parliament themselves as institutions. This was the question of how the 1985 budget could be settled quickly if the necessary information on the definitive farm price package was not received in time. I am well aware of this problem, which has also concerned the Commission. We had naturally hoped that the Council of Ministers would have completed its farm price negotiations. It has not. I can only appeal to the Council to complete its negotiations as quickly as possible, and urge Parliament to show the necessary flexibility to ensure that the 1985 budget will cover all the financial consequences when it is finalized in order to avoid the situation I referred to: the need for a supplementary budget — which would create a particular problem this year. I say all this because the Commission is not in principle an advocate of supplementary budgets; this method of budgeting can occasionally be necessary or appropriate, but this year in particular it could create distinct complications.

Mr President, I hope with these remarks to have answered the questions asked in response of the statement I gave on behalf of the Commission.

Mr Cot (S), Chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (FR) Mr President, I am anxious to make some additional observations at the end of this debate and to explain to the House the direction of the work which we are now going to undertake in view of the letter of amendment which Mr Christophersen has just presented to us.

First of all, please allow me to make apologies on behalf of the general rapporteur who, for reasons

beyond his control, cannot be here today, although he would have particularly liked to have been able to take part in this debate and to hear the Commissioner's remarks.

Firstly, Mr Commissioner, I would like to thank you for this letter of amendment, which I feel comes at an appropriate time. Some people had urged you to initiate the budget procedure earlier, but I believe that it was necessary to wait for a certain number of political preliminaries to be fulfilled. This has now been done. We can discuss the matter and we, the Committee on Budgets, intend to do this calmly and thoroughly.

Having said that, I would like to make three brief observations on the content and some remarks on the procedure.

Basically, I think that Parliament will be particularly interested in three points which have already emerged in the questions put to you, Mr Christophersen. The first concern is the twelve-month budget. This was the reason why we rejected the budget last autumn. We are pleased that the principle of having a budget for the full year has been reestablished and vigorously reaffirmed. We feel that this is confirmation of Parliament's position, and I am happy that the Commission is cooperating. However, the forecasts also have to be fairly reliable the day they are drawn up, and it will be our jobs, the job of our committees, to check the figures, your figures, but especially those of the Council, because it is this body which will be submitting the draft budget to us on the basis of the preliminary draft and the letter of amendment. You can be sure that the investigation will be close and painstaking.

Let me repeat what others have said before me. From now on we have the problem of fixing farm prices. The difficulty has been clearly pointed out by Mr Dankert. Whatever the level of farm prices, these will have to be included in some form of budgetary procedure. Well, as you know, if these prices are not included in the first reading, we will either have to have a supplementary budget or there will have to be unwelcome carry-overs to the 1986 budget. There is no getting away from the contradiction.

As for your in-depth reply, Mr Christophersen, I am not sure that I can accept it. If the Council was to adopt a different position on the prices you have proposed, it would naturally be up to them to make the corresponding financial resources available at the same time, and to provide for the corresponding supplementary financing. We shall keep our eyes open.

Secondly, the matter of the United Kingdom's compensation is being dealt with in a way which I find regrettable. In this case, Mr Commissioner, you and the Commission have been the humble executor of the national governments' wishes, and I regret this. At this stage, I can only record the disagreement on the part of this branch of the budgetary authority on the way

Cot

things have been handled. You know our position on the substance. Your letter of amendment goes against what the European Parliament decided last year in the first reading. I would also like to say that you are not giving any indication — and this remark is also meant for the Council — about how the Fontainebleau provision will be applied, to the effect that, in the long run, expenditure policy constitutes the essential means of resolving the question of budgetary imbalances. We need to know if this is a temporary situation or not. Fontainebleau was clear, but after that we have been waiting for something to happen. You are not saying anything. I hope that the Council will be able to say something, and I am sure that the budget debate will centre on the problems of development, so as to find some more healthy principles. All the same, I might argue with your remarks that the Member States could initiate this bargaining in opposition to the Treaties. I believe that this matter of the United Kingdom's contribution raises the problem of the constitutionality of the procedure. I am not at all convinced by your arguments on the legality of the matter.

Finally, the third point to which we will give our attention, has to be the integrated Mediterranean programmes and the need to approach them correctly and adequately. You mentioned this in your answer, and I am sure that this will be an issue which our Committee on Regional Policy as well as the Committee on Budgets will follow with care.

Mr President, I now come to the procedural problems, and first of all I would like to make it quite clear that we want to make rapid progress here. The European Parliament will not want to be responsible for holding up the adoption of the budget. There is one essential political requirement. We have to go back to the accepted principle that the budget should cover the whole year. There is also an essential budgetary requirement. What I mean to say is that, if we adopt the budget too late, it will be of little use, because it will mean that the Commission will not be able to commit the expenditure in time, and whatever is gained in terms of discussing the budget will be lost in its implementation. It would be a case of out of the frying pan into the fire. Finally, I am concerned about the budgetary problems of the 1985 financial year, since these could start to affect the preliminary draft for 1986. So I hope that the budget debate for 1986 can be conducted properly according to the anticipated timetable, if this is within the bounds of possibility, so that our committees responsible for the substance can examine the budgetary guidelines and decisions at the required length and under the proper conditions. It is obvious that this, examination cannot take place until the matter of the 1985 budget has been settled.

There are major difficulties which, as we have just seen, we cannot avoid and which will make it necessary, certainly for the 1985 budget — contrarily to what happened in 1980 — to have two readings, split

between two different part-sessions of Parliament, so that talks with the Council may be properly conducted and all possibilities of agreement explored.

In order to reconcile the need for speed with the need for in-depth talks, Mr Ove Fich and myself have proposed to the chairmen and rapporteurs of the committees involved with the budget that we simplify the discussion at the first reading, thus avoiding reopening the discussion on all the budgetary headings — which would force us to more or less repeat all our work from the previous autumn. We will take as being approved at the first reading — except, of course for technical changes — all amendments adopted at the plenary session during the first reading last autumn. For the 1986 budget, but not for the 1985 budget, we will introduce amendments laying down new budgetary policies or aimed at rectifying imbalances in the budgetary structures beyond what had been voted last autumn. In other words, we do not intend to reopen the whole budget discussion which took place last autumn, during the debate on the 1985 budget. This would result — of course, it would be a matter of good will between the committees concerned and between you all, ladies and gentlemen — this would result in limiting the proposed modifications and draft amendments to new elements introduced since last December: first of all, the letter of amendment, of course, the draft budget which the Council will be submitting to us and which we must be able to discuss fully, the EAGGF Guarantee Section, food aid, etc. plus, in some sectors, the proposed modification or draft amendment which changes in certain projects since the beginning of the year have made necessary — for example, in the field of research and technology. This simplified form of discussion, with our debates focusing on essential political questions, would allow us to guarantee a full second reading in the normal budgetary conditions laid down by the Treaty.

It is with this in mind that a delegation of the European Parliament will meet in Luxembourg next Tuesday with the Council of Ministers for a preliminary conciliation which we will report on at the meeting of the Committee on Budgets to be held in Brussels on Wednesday and Thursday, 24 and 25 April. I repeat the invitation which Mr Fich and I put to the rapporteurs and chairmen of the committees of Parliament which are involved in this matter to attend this meeting of the Committee on Budgets on 24 and 25 April, because the budget procedure is once again on the move, and it is important that all the committees should participate in this work and not just the Committee on Budgets.

President. — That brings to an end the proceedings under Rule 40.

4. *Easing of controls at the intra-Community borders*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-18/85) by Mr Rogalla, on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-1652/84 — COM(84) 749 final) for a directive on the easing of controls and formalities applicable to nationals of the Member States when crossing intra-Community borders.

Mr Rogalla (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this important report represents a stagingpost in this House for the people of Europe journeying to one another. It should serve young people, workers, citizens and senior citizens who want to efface the hors of 40 years ago with conversation, travel and shopping for personal needs without formal identity controls, stamps and the nuisance of hanging around and without anyone sifting through their shopping bags and car boots. As a socialist, I take particular pleasure in being rapporteur for the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights. I also think of my co-campaigners from the 'Kangaroo' working party on freedom of movement. I thank them for their tireless assistance and also all those who have made it possible for us to be able to discuss and vote here this afternoon in front of a large number of European visitors.

I am very concerned about five main points. First, in 1919 Max Weber, a well-known German philosopher, listed three main qualities required for working in politics (at that time, Europe as such did not exist but nevertheless what he said still applies today): dedication to objectivity, a sense of responsibility and judgment, in other words the capacity to allow new ideas to mature, and these qualities have more importance with respect to freedom of movement for people within the Member States than anywhere else. Serious problems stand in the way of the legal right to the removal of all obstacles to the free movement of persons as set out in the Treaty, to freedom from harassment and the saving of time and money for everyone: these are public order and safety, the protection of human and animal health, the battle against drugs and crime and international terrorism. Only this morning we were complaining that this is on the increase. However, the option is clear — we must give priority to the growth of Europe and its people and we must fight against the risks mentioned with united strength. In this way we compensate for the lack of contact, rather than a lack of safety. The only way we can make things better is by rolling up our sleeves, putting new ideas and methods into practice and working alongside the specialists in various fields (the safety and drug authorities instead of against them.

Secondly, the Commission has finally taken the initiative. The pressure from this House had become too

great. The chosen legal vehicle, the directive, is still too timid for myself and the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights. In view of the objective of the EEC Treaty, its principles and the case-law of the European Court of Justice, a regulation would have been more appropriate, especially when one considers the limiting clauses of Article 36. However, dear colleagues, let us forget the past and look for allies for the future. Two-thirds of the people of Europe would like to see the remnants of our built-in hostility and particularism, the controls of our internal borders quickly disappear. Who will stand in their way? The Committee's approach is as follows: the aim should be not the easing of personal controls but their abolition, even if this has to be in stages. We have until 1992, that is still 8 years away, to find every last police and customs officer on the borders something more useful to do; the sooner the better.

Thirdly, because of our Committee's wish for change, all types of personal checks should gradually be removed, including the health of your pet dog and the psychology of plants you take with you (yes, even plants have their own psychology, you know — just imagine the sort of things which can be used as a pretext for a check). The Commission should coordinate the Member States' measures: it should not just observe and take note, but, as an ally of the Parliament and of the people, it should exert pressure and present reports to the House and to the relevant Committee.

The Community should now polish up what Kohl and Mitterand have initiated during the past year in response to increasingly louder demands from Euro-MPs.

Fourthly, free movement at intra-Community frontiers and the transfer of controls to the Community's external borders. Checks which protect our citizens from cocaine and heroin. There is no need for protection just for German or French young people, there is only a need to protect European young people. These checks must be moved to the Community's external borders, with a Community customs or investigation administration which use all the modern means available to keep a check on the countries where these dangerous drugs are produced — from Lima to Bangkok. Our island Member States, like Great Britain and Ireland, or those where external and internal boundaries are the same, those with coastal regions (in other words all except Luxembourg) have special features. But statistics show that only a third of all contraband is seized at internal borders and two-thirds at ports and airports and at third-country frontiers. So the Community has a lot to do at these interfaces and at the same time an obligation remove controls at the internal borders, which cost a lot of money and obstruct people.

My fifth point concerns the proposed amendments. For visas which Member States issue to third country nationals, there must be general recognition from one

Rogalla

Member State to another, along the lines of what has already been agreed for standards and foodstuffs. Airports which are to have two channels for arrivals from 'abroad' will have to be allowed to this without too much expense. A red or green sticker is sufficient. If there is only one door, the rule should be that the individual is not unnecessarily obstructed.

Amendment No 20, relating to Paragraph 2 Subsection 2, is a consequence of the jurisprudence of the European Court. Travellers need money and must be allowed to carry it with them.

No one will blame me for being especially pleased about Amendment No 21 — the removal of the signs bearing the superscription Zoll-Douane-Customs. Despite being rich in tradition, they have become contrary to Community law. So we are back where we started as regards the People's Europe. The Committee, instituted by the heads of state or government, has set itself the task of taking measures, of immediate significance to the citizens of the Community, measures which offer them obvious advantages for everyday life. So I hope that the Council, which impressed upon us the urgency of this report now succeeds in showing Parliament rapid results of real help to the citizen.

(Applause)

Mr Patterson (ED), draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy. — Mr President, the first thing my committee would like to do is to agree with the Legal Affairs Committee that this directive should be seen, as the Commission itself states, as a first step towards the complete abolition of all frontier controls within the European Community — not just easing but abolition. We were promised in the 1985 programme a fully unified internal market by 1992, and that must mean the end of all internal frontiers by that date. The Commission makes a distinction in the directive between police checks and customs checks, and it is with the latter I want to deal.

The first thing I want to say about them is that 'customs' is the wrong word. There are no internal customs duties in a common market. There can be none. Therefore, controls at internal borders do not arise from customs duties but from differences in VAT and excise duties. They should probably, therefore, be called tax checks. As Mr Rogalla has said, the very idea of internal customs posts should be removed.

Secondly, of course it is clear that the need for tax checks of any kind will recede with the progress of fiscal harmonization. The Commission has promised us a programme to harmonize VAT and excise rates in the very near future. Meanwhile certain things can be done to improve the position for travellers. For example, this directive will replace systematic checks by

spot checks throughout the Community. I know that some Member States may be worried that this will produce an orgy of smuggling across internal borders. Therefore, it would be very interesting to know from the Commission exactly how much excess VAT or excise duty is actually collected at internal borders from travellers who exceed their allowances. I very much doubt, for example, whether the amount collected, in fact, defrays the cost of the customs officers involved.

The second way in which these controls can be eased, of course, would be by increasing these allowances themselves. I notice that the People's Europe Committee have recommended that allowances should be increased by 25% from 1 July this year — that is, from exactly the same date that this directive should come into force. I suggest that 25% is a very modest increase, and I hope that in any case it will be repeated up until 1992 until those duties disappear.

There is one additional economic matter which my committee would like to draw to the attention of the Commission, and that is the controls which still exist at some internal frontiers on the movement of currency. We look forward to the day — and it is to be hoped it will be quite soon — when there will be no more exchange controls in the Community. Meanwhile, it is quite intolerable that travellers sometimes have their personal effects searched to see whether they are carrying too many French francs, drachmas, etc. As Mr Rogalla has pointed out, the Court has given every traveller the absolute right to carry all the currency necessary to pay normal hotel bills and other services. The Commission should ensure that this ruling is applied, so that a traveller complying with the Court's rulings is entitled to cross frontiers through the green channel or using green stickers. I have submitted an amendment to the directive to make this absolutely clear, and I hope Mr Rogalla and the Commission can accept it.

I wanted to agree with Mr Rogalla that the key to the whole operation and continuance of this process is to move controls from internal to external frontiers. In the economic field we have one good sign and that is the adoption of the new Community instrument, which will prevent checks on dumped goods at internal frontiers.

Finally, I say that Article 14 is a key article in this directive. It calls on the Member States to comply by 1 July this year. My committee and Mr Rogalla in the Legal Affairs Committee have acted with considerable speed, so let us hope that the Council and the Member States will now do the same, so that this summer the holiday-makers of Europe will really see the tangible benefits of belonging to a European Community.

Mrs Vayssade (S). — (FR) Mr President, in June 1984, during the elections, we were all able to see just

Vayssade

how indifferent or even hostile the majority of our fellow citizens were towards Europe. It all went just as if everything that had been done since the Community was first established nearly 30 years ago — or more than 30 years ago in the case of the ECSC — did not concern them, their day-to-day life or their future. Of course, they blamed the Community for not having grappled with a certain number of problems, in particular for not having made much progress with economic problems, unemployment, job creation, etc.

I also believe that they have the impression that this Europe is not really their territory. They are still very much locked away in their national territory. It seems to me that it is time for us to implement what is set out in the treaties. We need real freedom of movement, not just for workers, but for everyone who wants to move around Europe as freely as possible. Then they will finally start being Europeans.

From this theme and from this election, we have seen the idea of a Europe of the people emerge. Today, I would almost prefer to change the words round and start talking about the people of Europe and I would like this territory of ours of ten (and soon twelve) countries to become a legal area for everyone, a place where they are at home and where the first manifestation of their freedom is the right to come and go as they please.

I am sorry that the directive which has been submitted to us today has taken so long to materialize. I would have liked us to have discussed it several years ago. It is, however, a first step and, in my opinion, a step in the right direction. I hope that the Council, who asked for urgency in this matter, respects its own request and that no time will be lost in adopting a directive and transmitting it to Member States for implementation. It is a first step towards removing the frontiers, or at least Parliament would like to affirm that it is a first step towards removing frontiers. Admittedly, that would pose a number of problems — security, health control, the harmonization of a certain number of measures and of tax and trade arrangements and problems concerning the right of abode and the development of this, because if you make travelling more easy then you have to make residence easier too.

However, I believe that we should not wait for all these problems to be resolved before allowing free movement at frontiers and that once we have taught the European people to move freely, they will then force us, the European Institutions, to take steps towards relevant legal harmonization to uphold the rights they can expect.

So we, the socialists, are totally in favour of this directive and hope that it will be applied as quickly as possible. We agree to all the amendments proposed by the Legal Affairs Committee and which we have voted in committee. Even so, I would like to say that, as a socialist, I was a little surprised that Mr De Gucht kept

in the amendment that he had withdrawn in favour of a compromise amendment of the Legal Affairs Committee, and it seemed to me that the solution adopted satisfied everyone. I would have preferred not to have seen this amendment reappear.

Finally, I would like to say to Mr Price and Mr Patterson that I found their amendment somewhat complicated because at the same time as they are speaking in favour of at least 2 channels in ports, airports and sometimes at borders, they ask that we make a distinction between those who move within the Community, those who are entering and the others. I do not think that this will simplify matters.

So, I hope that the Parliament will follow the Legal Affairs Committee today and that the Council will lose no time in adopting this directive.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Boot (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, when returning recently from Brussels to the Netherlands, my car broke down just six kilometres outside Rotterdam — where I was heading — and so I was obliged to walk. It was nearly midnight and I was looking for a phone to call our much praised breakdown service. As I was walking, I was passed by the Koninklijke Nederlandse Marechaussee. Not only did they offer me a lift, they also towed my car the last six kilometres and took me home. When we arrived, my car was returned to me, and there was a brief conversation. When the officers learned that I was one of the 25 Dutch Members of the European Parliament, they told me that if they had known that before, they might not have given me a lift! I should point out, Mr President, that that branch of the Netherlands police force is also responsible for frontier patrols. So they knew exactly who they were talking to, since they are very well aware of Parliament's desire to simplify customs checks and formalities for European citizens.

We welcome this proposal from the Commission, even though it was possibly a little slow in coming. It is a step — a first step — in the right direction. We quite definitely want customs controls to be completely done away with so that the people of the Community will finally realize they are Community citizens. If the directive is passed, they will immediately enjoy more favourable treatment than the citizens of non-Community countries.

This brings me to my next point, Mr President, which is that nationals of non-Community countries who have been living for a long time in the EEC but have not acquired the nationality of one of the Member States, will still have a lot of problems to contend with. A more permanent solution should therefore be based on harmonization of legislation on aliens and recognition by all Member States of visas issued in any one Member State.

Boot

My Group is in favour of the Commission proposal and of the amendments tabled by the Legal Affairs Committee. As regards the implementation and monitoring of the directive, my Group proposes that the Commission should be assisted by a kind of 'watch-dog' committee. I am saying this because there was an error in the German translation of the amendment. Such bodies are effective in a national context and could also prove useful for monitoring the application of Community law.

I also believe, Mr President, that we, the citizens of Europe, need a genuine European government.

(Applause)

Mr Turner (ED). — Mr President, this proposal is in line with a people's Europe. Some national civil servants, particularly those in charge of frontier matters, probably regard the idea of a citizen's Europe as sentimental rubbish and do not believe that this is to be taken seriously. I think they are completely wrong. People do take an interest in the simple aspects of the EEC. Secondly, I think that such civil servants probably say that the principle is unimportant and that all that people want to avoid is inconvenience at the frontier. Again I think these civil servants are wrong. People do want a gesture and a sign of change occurring in Europe.

Such civil servants say: We will take more seconds off the inspection time taken — for instance, in British customs — by having computerized passports. Indeed, there is a boast that they will reduce it from 12 seconds down to something shorter. I believe that that is also totally wrong. I am very worried about the idea of computerized passports. I think they would be a retrograde step and would extend government and national interference unnecessarily. This Parliament should positively oppose the idea of computerized and machine-readable passports. I would like to hear the views of Members much more frequently on this matter. There is no objection at all to having computers to make passports and to get them issued and that sort of thing; it is the use of the computers to invigilate us that I am worried about.

What is the legal position of EEC citizens? They are entitled to enter any of the EEC countries. They are entitled to stay there to work or study.

They are entitled to retire or live there, so long as they do not become an economic burden on the social services. Now if that happens, it becomes self-evident when they go along and apply for some social services. So there is no need to anticipate the possibility of their becoming a charge upon the State by invigilating them when they arrive at the frontier. Thus, I believe that for an EEC citizen to show a closed passport or to go through a green channel or any other step like that is perfectly practical and sufficient at the internal frontiers of the EEC.

Other objections put forward are in relation to drug smugglers. Now, drug smugglers at this present time are not stopped because they have a passport looked at, they are stopped because of the sagacity and instinct of customs officers who know very often whom they ought to stop because they have the experience. Exactly the same applies to rabies. You do not inspect everybody's handbag to see if they have got a pet dog inside, you choose somebody who you think will have one inside. These are spot checks, and spot checks are permitted by this directive.

Then you come to criminals. I doubt if any criminal was ever stopped at the frontier because the passport officer read his name in the passport. He is stopped because the immigration officers have an instinct for knowing who is a criminal and they have seen photographs of criminals particularly wanted. Then you come to terrorists. No terrorist crosses a frontier with a genuine passport, and so it doesn't matter whether it is looked at or not.

That is the position for EEC citizens. For non-citizens, of course, the worry is that they will hold up a fake European passport or go through the green channel when they should not do so. That is a crime of deception. But what is the effect? We have got two sorts of non-citizens to worry about, namely illegal immigrants and illegal visitors. As to illegal visitors or tourists, I doubt if any are kept out. As to illegal immigrants, there are two public policy reasons for keeping them out. One is that they take jobs from citizens and the second is that they may become a charge on the State. If an illegal immigrant does come in by going through the wrong channel, then he will be found as soon as he goes to get a job or as soon as he goes to get his social services.

Therefore, may I conclude by saying that I believe the proposal is absolutely practical. It does not in the slightest degree lessen the defences which some people think they ought to have at their frontiers against rabid foreigners. We therefore support it. May I say to Mrs Vayssade that Mr Price's amendments have been withdrawn.

Mr De Gucht (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, the citizens' Europe begins where the frontiers end. The Commission proposal to the Council to ease customs checks and formalities at the internal frontiers of the Community could be an important first step in this direction. It is also particularly significant that the Council has asked for this report to be debated by urgent procedure. The Italian Presidency seems to be seriously interested in tackling this question — a fact which we can but welcome. Good intentions and the will to achieve results are shared by the Commission and the Council Presidency. However, it is impossible to overemphasize the danger of having this matter dealt with by groups of national officials and by Coreper diplomats.

De Gucht

If the Council Presidency continues to give this matter the priority which it itself called for and wishes to ensure that a decision is taken before July, the question must be discussed as soon as possible at the most appropriate level, that is at the political level of the Council of Ministers. Progress may be seriously delayed if administrative questions and technicalities — which are often introduced deliberately and live only in the minds of short-sighted national officials and not in the hearts of hundreds of millions of Europeans — are allowed to predominate.

For this reason, Parliament's Liberal and Democratic Group is firmly and unconditionally in favour of the Rogalla report. This is a matter which is of crucial importance for the credibility of the European Parliament. We support all the amendments to the Commission proposal in the Rogalla report, since these simplify the proposal and make the idea even more attractive to European citizens. The amendments are based on the conviction that the cost of customs controls, which are still necessary for the time being, should not be borne by the people of Europe but by the Member States.

Psychologically, there is a big difference between a regulation whereby international travellers by land, sea or air are divided into two groups, one of which can in principle move freely while the other is subject to checks, and a regulation according to which Community travellers have to display red or green stickers.

The amendments tabled by the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, which wants the Commission's proposal to take account of these considerations, have been to a large extent retained in the Rogalla report. In our view this approach can be taken a step further. We therefore call for your support for the only amendment which our Group has tabled — the scrapping of the possibility of requiring stickers, a possibility which was treated only as a subsidiary matter in the Rogalla report.

In the past, customs offices have been set up even at the smallest frontier crossings. At such points there should be a very simple, clear indication of the routes to be taken by travellers with nothing to declare and by those who have to be checked.

To conclude, Mr President, we regard the Commission proposals not as a final stage but as the beginning of the complete lifting of all internal customs checks, a process which must be completed not later than 1992. The Commission proposal under discussion today may be an important step in the right direction, since it could create the conditions required for the complete abolition of customs checks on the Community's internal frontiers. I would like to end by thanking Mr Rogalla for his excellent report, which he drew up at very short notice.

Mrs Oppenheim (ED). — (DA) Mr President, those Members who have travelled in Scandinavia will have

noticed how pleasant it was to cross the internal frontiers of the countries forming the Scandinavian passport union. This is the kind of thing which the series of draft directives which will most certainly follow the one we are debating today should be aiming at.

However, great importance should be attached to making some real headway on the problems we would all like to see solved and achieving the single market everyone is talking about. Fortunately there is not much disagreement between the Commission and Parliament and the committee which has dealt in particular with this proposal. However, the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, and Mr Rogalla particularly, should be thanked, for the amendments in the report, which I mainly see as a well-intentioned attempt at streamlining the rules contained in the proposal and the reasons behind it.

In this connection, one thing I would like to point out is the question of time limits. According to the proposal for a directive, these simplified rules are to be applied as from 1 July this year, but would it not be a good idea — and I would like to ask the Commission to think about this — to start earlier so that Europe's holiday-makers will be able to benefit from the easing of controls and see that the Commission is really trying to do something to achieve its higher objective of a single market?

Mr McMillan-Scott (ED). — Mr President, on behalf of Europe's tourists I should like at the beginning of the tourist season simply to say that any proposal which is likely to make life easier for them in the future is to be welcomed and to point out also that this is an enormously important growth area in our economies. Secondly, on behalf of the tourist industry of Europe I wish to commend the proposal, because anything which creates an external border and increases the sense of Europeanness is of great advantage. We are now the major tourist area of the world. We must maintain our lead, and I am quite certain that this proposal will do everything it can to help.

Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, if we are to achieve our aim of completing the internal market by 1992, we have a long and at times arduous path to tread, but this makes it even more important that we should make a good and determined start. The Commission is therefore grateful to Parliament for giving this matter priority and for the universal support our proposals have received.

The importance of easing border controls has been stressed many times, both here in Parliament and by the European Council at Fontainebleau last year. The Council called for significant progress to be made to this end, and the directive with which we are concerned today is an important step in this direction. It is of the utmost importance that this political will, which

Lord Cockfield

has been demonstrated by the Council, by Parliament and by the Commission, should be translated into legally binding instruments in the Member States. This directive is essential if we are to ensure that honest law-abiding citizens can travel without let or hindrance from one Member State to another.

Mr President, I should like to state the Commission's position on the 15 amendments tabled by the committee and the other five tabled by individual Members. In general, we are prepared to accept most of Parliament's suggestions. It is only with a small number of items that we do not agree or that we think further consideration necessary.

Perhaps I should say that in referring to individual amendments I am referring to them by the numbers they bear on the amendment paper and not the numbers they bear in the report itself.

May I start appropriately with Amendment No 1. I accept the reasoning behind this amendment. What we are doing is only the first step in abolishing controls and formalities, and we are happy therefore to accept the amendment.

Amendment No 2 would add the words 'as requested on numerous occasions by the Parliament'. We entirely agree that Parliament has been most active in campaigning for measures of this kind, and it is only right that tribute should be paid to what Parliament has done. This is, in fact, already brought out very clearly in the fifth recital.

Amendment No 3 — we accept this one. Amendment No 4 — we agree with the principle underlying the first part of this amendment, but we really would like to look at the drafting. The second part of the amendment deals with certain aspects of fiscal harmonization, and we should be happy to accept that amendment.

We should be happy to accept Amendment No 5, which makes it clear that the directive lays down a number of conditions for progressively abolishing controls before 1992. We are prepared to accept Amendment No 6, which is essentially a drafting amendment.

Amendment No 20 — this is Mr Patterson's amendment relating to currency. We agree with the principle underlying this. We are prepared to accept the amendment, but, of course, he will be well aware of the fact that objections may be raised by certain of the Member States.

Amendment No 7 — we agree the point here which seeks to restrict Member States increasing the number of mobile units for checking persons in border areas. What underlies this amendment, I imagine, is a desire to prevent the Member States actually increasing the controls just inside the border at the time that they

abolish the controls at the border itself. We entirely agree with the committee on that one.

Amendment No 8 — we accept the principle that the Commission should be informed of any changes once they have been introduced but perhaps the Parliament would agree that we should look rather carefully at the wording of this amendment which in places is not entirely clear.

Amendment No 9 — the second paragraph of Article 5, as amended by this amendment, would provide that the provisions apply to foot passengers. Paragraph 3 of the amended article provides that speed restrictions should be indicated in good time. We accept the first change proposed by the amendment. So far as the second change is concerned, we are not entirely certain that it is appropriate to deal with speed limits and speed restrictions in this present directive, but we will look at the matter and we will look at it sympathetically.

Amendment No 21 — this is the amendment to which Mr Rogalla spoke specifically and it is designed to remove signs bearing the superscription: *Zoll, Douane* or *Customs*. I well understand Mr Rogalla's feelings on this point and one would like to see these signs disappear. I gather, however, that he is perfectly prepared to see them replaced by other signs which bear the word: *Taxes*. While, of course, this would be much more accurate, we may find some difficulty on this ground because Member States may seek to argue that it is an unnecessary expense. But so far as the principle of this is concerned, he and I find ourselves once again on the same side of the line.

Amendment No 10 — we accept the principle behind this amendment but it could, in fact, only apply at crossing points where physical conditions would so permit. With this qualification, we would be prepared to accept the amendment. We accept the part of the amendment dealing with Article 6(2) which is a minor drafting point and also Article 6(3) which provides that the green discs be supplied free of charge. We accept that one too.

Amendment No 18 — this makes the same point, in fact, as Amendment No 10 which, subject to some qualification, the Commission is prepared to accept.

Amendment No 11 — this would provide that no controls should be carried out at departure from airports or ports. We would accept this if it applies to all crossing points. Application to airports and ports only would be inconsistent.

Amendment No 12 — while we agree with the principle underlying this amendment, we would not accept the amendment as drafted simply because the original drafting is more flexible and on this ground is preferable.

Lord Cockfield

Amendments Nos 13 and 14 — these are purely textual amendments which we are happy to accept.

Amendment No 15 — there are three parts to this. The first is simply a drafting point which we accept, the second part asks for yearly reports instead of two-yearly reports. We appreciate the Parliament's wish to be kept regularly informed but we would think that the reports as originally proposed would be adequate. The third part of the amendment asks for further proposals at an appropriate time. We are happy to accept that one too.

Amendment No 22 by Mrs Boot, Article 13 — there are three parts to the amendment. The first one simply repeats the original draft. The second part asks for an annual report and I have just dealt with that. The third part of the amendment asks for a consultative body to be set up. We do, in fact, already have quite a number of consultative bodies and we would not really think it is necessary to have another consultative body on this point, particularly in view of the general interest which is shown in these matters. The Commission is therefore very happy to accept most of the amendments. In one or two instances, we think that further consideration needs to be given to the actual wording and this we will most certainly do. Only in a very few instances would we regard the amendments as unacceptable.

I am most grateful to the Parliament and to all of those who have spoken for the support they have given to the draft directive and particularly to the policy which underlies it. The adoption of the directive will be an important step forward in the economic integration of the European Community, an aim which we all share.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER*Vice-President*

Mrs Boot (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, I would like to raise a very minor point, since I fear, as I have already pointed out in my speech, that my amendment is not clear in translation. In amendment No 22, I am not calling for a 'consultative committee', Mr President, but merely for an advisory committee to monitor the implementation of the directive. This would be a sort of 'watchdog' committee which could sort out the problems of ordinary citizens more quickly. I have already pointed out that the German, and probably also the English, does not reflect the original. What I am proposing is not a consultative body but an advisory committee to which citizens can address their complaints. Such committees are very effective in a national context, as I hope they will prove to be under Community law.

Mr Rogalla (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, the Vice-President's very detailed statement corresponded with the terms of Article 36, Paragraph 1. I would like to make two observations and ask one question.

The observations concern amendments 8 and 11. As regards amendment 8, the Legal Affairs Committee decided that the appropriate authorities, i.e. the Commission, must be informed retrospectively about adequate special measures in accordance with Article 4. I agree with the Vice-President as regards amendment 11, namely that there should be no exit controls at any crossing point, not just at ports and airports.

Finally, I would like to ask the Vice-President whether I am right in saying that since the Commission drew up this Directive the situation in the Member States and in the Council has changed, that the Committee for the People's Europe, which is composed of representatives of the heads of state or government, places particular importance on measures which are of immediate significance and obvious advantage to the people. Does he think that this Directive has done this and does he share my hope that the Member States will accordingly soon organize discussions, which will allow us to actually keep to the schedule — 1 July 1985?

Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, may I start with a point raised by Mrs Boot. I entirely accept what she says about the translation of the document — a matter for which, fortunately, I have no responsibility. But it is, of course, the responsibility of the Commission itself to ensure that directives are complied with and we will most certainly watch for compliance in this field. I do, in fact, myself already address a large number of letters to Member States, following interventions in this House on border difficulties and I will certainly keep a very close personal eye on this. I do not think that adding a further administrative layer to this would really carry us very much further forward. But I do ask her to place her trust in the Commission because we have a great interest ourselves in ensuring that this matter is dealt with properly.

So far as Mr Rogalla's points are concerned, as far as I can see, nothing whatever separates him and me on this. It is simply that we want to make quite certain that the wording of the two amendments gives effect to what he and I want to do and I am sure he would be happy to leave it on that basis. I am only asking for the opportunity to make quite certain that the wording complies with what both he and I want.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

5. *European Environment Summit*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-7/85) drawn up by Mr Collins on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the European Environment Summit in May 1985 and the OECD meeting in June 1985.

Mr Collins (S), rapporteur. — Mr President, I must say, looking around the Chamber right now that we really look like a meeting of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, but in a somewhat different setting. So perhaps I should begin by welcoming any visitors who may have turned up to this meeting of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. You are very welcome indeed and I hope that you will come to future meetings of our committee.

(Laughter)

However, first of all, let me say that it is a matter for rejoicing that the World Economic Summit and the OECD have chosen to discuss the environment at their meetings in the next few weeks. It is a recognition, I think, of two things. It is a recognition, first of all, that the environment is an important political issue affecting and affected by other policy areas. Environmental policy is not something that you can simply isolate. It is about economic policy, it is about energy policy, it is about agricultural policy, it is about all of these things. So we have an important recognition of that.

Secondly, I think, it is a recognition that environment is a matter that is genuinely global in its scope. It is a recognition, in fact, that nation States have to learn to forgo at least some of their sovereignty in order to be good neighbours in environmental terms. That seems to me to be a very positive development and I think and I hope that the Parliament will welcome it.

My intention this afternoon is to argue basically two points. I simply want to concentrate on these. First of all I want to argue that environmental protection makes sound economic sense. I want to argue that positively but I also want to attack the notion that environmental policy is somehow or other anti-worker or that environmental policy is somehow or other anti-prosperity.

Secondly, I want to argue that our own environment here in Europe and, come to that, our own economy here in Europe is profoundly affected by the environment of the Third World and that therefore we have a duty and a responsibility to those areas far beyond the European Community itself.

First of all, on the economic front. Sometimes, Mr President, we are told — in fact all too often we are

told — that environmental policy costs jobs. The trade unions get very worked up. They get very worried. They feel that if we increase the standards then somehow or other we are attacking the basis of their livelihood. And when we search around for the reason why they think this, we find that very often it is their own companies who have been telling them precisely this. So, on the one hand, we get the trade unions saying that they are worried about environmental protection and, on the other hand, we get organizations like UNICE and the Confederation of British Industry and so on telling us that the time is not ripe or that costs will rise, or that there will be unemployment, or that there is no money for such development. This is a very familiar cry. I do not think you have to be a great historian to recognize that these are precisely the arguments that were used against the abolition of the slave trade, that these are precisely the arguments that were used when we tried to abolish child labour. I think we should give them about the same level of credence as we gave these arguments in those times.

The fact is, Mr President, that without environmental protection, without a degree of good sound environmental policy, there are still costs. These are costs in lost production, they are costs in lost health, they are costs, come to that, in lost beauty — not necessarily in a personal sense but certainly in an environmental sense. There is certainly a cost in lost species, a cost which can never be measured. So it is our contention in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, and I hope the contention of this Parliament, that higher environmental standards, better environmental standards, will actually have the effect of stimulating work, stimulating employment, because they will stimulate cleaner and better and more efficient technologies and therefore leave us better able to compete on world markets. Better environmental standards are therefore an investment in the future. They are an investment in better, more prosperous and more healthy societies here in the industrialized, developed, advanced and still prosperous countries of the world.

Now can I turn to the Third World, Mr President. We have recently seen harrowing pictures of famine and drought and disease in East Africa. These pictures have brought home to us the extent of poverty in much of the Third World and yet there is much Western investment, much industrialized investment there. There is building financed by the industrialized world. There is forest clearance financed from the same sources. There are massive agricultural developments on occasion. Yet a great deal of this investment will, in the long run, do very little for these areas because if forests are devastated for their timber, the soils too may well be destroyed. Such is the delicate balance of forest and soil in the tropical areas. Wildlife disappears, and there is a profound long-term effect on the world's atmosphere as well. The long-term effect of much of this investment is therefore likely to be yet another area with little resistance to disease, famine

Collins

and drought, and in the end the desert will be everywhere.

Investment in the Third World is vitally important. Development aid is crucial. Help with new agricultural technologies is essential. But unless these are managed with the welfare of the locality in mind — and not just the markets of the industrialized countries — and with an understanding of the ecological complexities involved, then the result will simply be this lack of resistance to drought and ensuing hunger. Environmental policy, we argue, sets the limits to, and is the basis of, economic and social progress.

To sum up, Mr President, our contention is that environmental policy in its widest sense — that is to say, the carefully planned use of resources and the conservation of species — is in the end precisely as I have said. It is the basis of, and sets the limits to, any economic or political improvement that extends beyond a few years. We ignore that, I think, at our peril.

The OECD and the World Economic Summit therefore have a tremendous opportunity. They have a tremendous opportunity to set aside the mistakes that have been made in previous years in Europe, in North America and in the rest of the world. They have an opportunity to set that aside, to get away from the exploitation of trade relations, of relations with the Third World generally, and an opportunity to do something about the health of the environment here in the industrialized world as well.

I think the opportunity is to be no less than a force for good in the world. I think the European Community can be part of that. I fervently hope that the European Community will be. But on this occasion we are addressing ourselves to the OECD and the World Economic Summit. I hope that we seize this opportunity before it is too late.

I can run through the amendments very quickly because there are only eight of them. Amendment No 8 I accept. In Amendment No 3, by Mrs Squarcialupi, if she agrees to insert the words 'of damage' after the word 'prevention', then I am happy to accept it. Otherwise it makes little sense because of the grammar of it.

I think Amendment No 4 is superfluous, because it is contained essentially elsewhere in the resolution. I accept Amendments Nos 7 and 5. I reject Amendment No 1. I accept Amendment No 6 and I reject Amendment No 2.

(Applause)

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM), draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs and Unemployment. — (IT) Mr President, as draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs and Unemployment, I

have tried to summarize in three amendments the nine points adopted by the Committee on Social Affairs. I am sorry that the rapporteur did not accept two points which, I felt, deserved a warmer reception.

None the less, we would like to thank Mrs Weber, in particular, who tried to look beyond the borders of the Community, stressing the importance of the environment in which we live and the resources on which we depend.

Certainly environmental problems can have a number of very important social implications which merit our full attention. The environment — and this has been proved by studies and by practical achievements — can offer employment opportunities, which are considerable in terms of quality and quantity.

May I remind you that an EEC macroeconomic study has shown that in the next ten years sensible policy on waste could lead to the creation of between 1 million and 200 000 jobs, with additional advantages such as the conservation of raw materials and energy, recycling and an alleviation of the problems for which society pays dear, such as acid rain and toxic and harmful waste.

As regards the quality of the work, the jobs would be in such fields as research into clean technologies and the conservation of raw materials and energy, as I mentioned earlier, and above all the use of new technologies, many of which are completely new. The young are especially interested in this type of work, either because they believe in the environment or because they are particularly interested in new work, with immediate results to be seen.

The second point — and I hope that Mr Collins, on a second closer reading will be able to accept it — concerns investments, in particular investment in infrastructure and building which the Commission of the European Communities has promised for coming years. It is our wish that these major projects, which will require considerable finance, will not be detrimental to the environment and that for the sake of the Community and the rest of the world, the provision of low-interest funds and aid of any sort, national, Community or international, will be conditional on the assessment of the environmental impact.

If, Mr President, my time is up, I will use my group's time, if I may.

My final point, and this was discussed in an amendment of the Committee on Social Affairs, concerns the relationship between the environment and the institutions.

The environment has awakened the political awareness of large sectors of the public, particularly the young, who have already demonstrated their lack of faith in the institutions in a number of ways. The envi-

Squarcialupi

ronment may then provide a way to bridge the gap between citizens and institutions, to look for a new way to govern, to give citizens a new involvement, widening our environmental culture with the institutions consulting the people on major environmental projects.

In short, consulting the people on environmental issues, as many European countries do, could be a way increasing citizens involvement in the environment.

These, Mr President, are the observations we wanted to make and I would ask the rapporteur to change his opinion on the amendments proposed by the Committee on Social Affairs in the light of my explanations. Furthermore, the report was drawn up in a hurry and perhaps we did not have time for the most important thing, which was an in-depth exchange of views between the committee responsible and the committee whose opinion was requested.

Mr Weber (S), Chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. We are of course pleased that the economic summit of the western industrial nations should emphasize environmental issues but it is perhaps rather optimistic to use the term Environment Summit. We are also glad the Council gave environmental protection special high priority in its statement of 29 and 30 March but nevertheless, painful experience has taught us to be sceptical as well. The state of our environment is too serious for us to be content simply with announcements and declarations.

It is time to act. I would just remind you of our discussion on Global 2000 a few years ago. When the Council, for example, announces that 1987 is to be the year of the environment, we believe this must mean, above all, a year of decisions and the end of discussions. A year of checking existing legislation and putting it into practice, and not another year of high-flown phrases.

The economic nations' summit must, in our view, analyse the current situation, use existing analyses and immediately take appropriate action. Priority must be given to preventive environmental policy, in other words environmental compatibility studies, and this includes projects backed by the European Community and major financing institutions such as the World Bank. Swifter and more effective remedial action is equally necessary, i.e. emissions from industrial furnaces in all the countries concerned must be lowered, because it costs much more to provide environmental protection afterwards than to provide it right from the start.

Both types of action have repercussions on the employment situation, as my colleague Mr Collins has already mentioned. We have already taken a decision on the world economic summit this morning by calling

for concerted revival by means of investments in sectors relating to the environment.

The new technologies which, on the one hand, are capable of threatening so many jobs can also help to improve the quality of economic development when applied in a social or environmentally compatible manner. However, this involves accurate and effective assessment of technological consequences, since already 60% of the population believe that technology is destroying the environment. Over 50% of our citizens are fearful about the future of technological development, and environmental awareness has changed. More and more people want an industrial society which is careful and thrifty in its dealings with animal and plant species, air, water, soil, energy and raw materials.

This can only work if, as stated in the Council Resolution of 30 March, environmental policy becomes a major component of economic, industrial, agricultural and social policy, and this, too, has just been mentioned by my colleague Mr Collins. We are glad — since we have often had to repeat it in this House — that the Council is now at long last tackling what the European Parliament has been demanding in precisely this form since 1979.

The problems we are faced with, including the economic issues, can only be solved if economic developments change course and take more account of environmental and social considerations. We need ecological reforms in our industrial society, without attempts to discredit technology on the one hand or over-confident propaganda on the other. No 'Chip, Chip, hurrah!' as one leading German newspaper recently wrote, and no 'dropping out' either.

Environmental protection is necessary and technically feasible; it is also sensible social and economic policy. In our view, employment and environment go hand in hand. But clear decisions are necessary in the form of legislation and policy objectives, because the so-called free market cannot solve these problems, as a glance at the current state of the environment will show. These policy objectives and decisions are precisely what we expect from this economic summit.

Mrs Schleicher (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. In environmental protection, the wheels turn slowly, but they are turning. This is evident from the forthcoming event. On 3 and 4 May, the eleventh world economic summit of the western industrial nations is being held in Bonn and this time it is being called an 'environment summit'.

How did this come about? The tenth paragraph of the joint declaration of the ninth world economic summit, held in Williamsburg at the end of May 1983, mentions environmental protection for the first time with the following words: 'We have agreed to increase

Schleicher

cooperation in environmental protection, better use of natural resources and health research'. This was the start of the process of dealing with environmental issues.

A year later, in June 1984, a whole paragraph was devoted to environmental policy in the joint declaration in London. This year, environmental policy is at long last to be a separate item on the agenda. We are eager to know what the conclusions and practical repercussions in the different countries will be.

So far, the summit has dealt with the major economic and financial topics and has often conducted a sort of crisis management, involving discussions which led to practical policies and actually affected the attitudes of the countries concerned.

We only have to think of topics such as the crisis of the indebtedness of the major developing countries, the restraining of protectionist tendencies in order to maintain free world trade, or the promotion of research and technology in certain sectors to realize that it is all the more significant that this the subject of the environment should now be receiving serious attention in this forum.

The fact that the European Community also participates in the drafting of the declaration provides justification for my request to the Commission to defend the Community's interests as indicated by its assembly, the European Parliament.

In the knowledge that 80% of the population are very worried about the need for environmental protection, according to a survey commissioned by you, you must encourage the representatives of the European governments to see that action is in fact taken.

My Group supports the Collins report as a joint decision on the part of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. We regret the many proposals for amendments, which in our view go into much too much detail. There is also the general question of why these amendments were not presented at the Committee stage.

It has come to my knowledge that France does not intend to participate in the drafting of the declaration at the Environment Summit. Can the Commission tell us a little more about this, since our Parliament places great hope in the participation of the French because the French Minister for the Environment has in the past worked courageously for environmental protection? And what reasons could there be for their not taking part?

What will the British government's attitude be? When it came to putting into practice the Geneva Agreement on the prevention of trans-frontier air pollution in Europe the British government refused to implement the appropriate resolutions of the British Parliament.

Is it not shortsighted first to allow the environment to be damaged and then spend infinite amounts of money trying unsuccessfully to remedy the situation? According to an OECD study, there is evidence of damage so far to the tune of 3 to 5% of our gross national product.

Our resolution also calls for use of the third environmental action programme of the European Community as a basis for the declaration. Since different continents are represented at this summit — i.e. Asia including in addition to Europe and North America — the long-term aim in the exchange of information on environmental problems must be to obtain comparable data.

Since the European Community is currently working on an extensive system of information on environmental questions it would be very useful if this system were linked with areas outside Europe. How often have we wanted to take account of America experience in our consultations but have run into major difficulties because documentation was not directly comparable with ours. What progress is being made in establishing environmental indicators, for example? The industrial countries in particular should be highly interested in investigating the causes of damage to the environment.

Worldwide criticism of the industrial countries on environmental issues has become political capital for those with quite different ulterior motives behind their politics. Our trade unions have understood these disputes very well, since it is a question of keeping good jobs or creating new ones. Environmental protection provides exceptional possibilities in this field and will most probably have beneficial effects as well.

Lack of reliable data on damage to the environment and its causes, however, at times leads to misinformation and therefore provides encouragement for those prophets of doom who unfortunately are all too ready to indulge in environmental sensationalism. I hope this summit enables us to obtain genuine results. However, it will still be up to this House to judge the governments by their actions.

Mrs Jepsen (ED). — (DA) Mr President, it is a fact that environmental issues are penetrating ever deeper into public awareness and it is gratifying to find that there now appears to be willingness to make a really big effort in this area, which is of such great importance for all forms of life and their well-being on this earth. I agree with the rapporteur that it is encouraging that both the OECD and the Ministers of the Environment are to discuss these questions within the next few months.

Since swift action is necessary and it is in everyone's interest to make as much use as possible of the available funds, environmental problems must be discussed internationally. It is obviously inadequate for each

Jepsen

country to have its own separate environmental policy. To obtain satisfactory results we need cooperation in both research and implementation of the anti-pollution measures developed from the research.

So far, most receptiveness towards the environment has been shown by industry, but it is becoming clearer than ever that agriculture, too, is pressing for complete clarification of the problems, followed by effective steps to prevent pollution. Since this is a sector which could run into serious economic problems as a result of implementing a reasonable environmental policy, it might be a good idea if the European Communities considered subsidizing measures to combat pollution instead of supporting surplus production, but this question can suitably be dealt with in the Agricultural Committee, on some other occasion.

Even if this report is aimed at producing a general strategy, I believe that, when we consider how quickly air pollution causes devastation, this House should take this opportunity to urge the Council of Ministers to agree on deadlines for effective measures to prevent pollution from motor vehicles. We Danish conservatives have strongly advocated the shortening of the deadlines as far as possible and we shall continue to do so. We wanted to keep as close as possible to German policy on this subject because our countries are linked geographically and we agree with the German government's attitude. However, now that Germany has accepted a compromise in the latest negotiations, Denmark is left on her own with her reservations.

Recognizing that the second best solution is better than none at all, and that certain factors may have to be considered with regard to the car industry, we are prepared to exert our influence so that Denmark does not block the deadlines now under discussion. We believe that it is important to reach agreement and that Denmark must give in first time round. Subsequently, however, the matter must be reviewed regularly in the light of developments in the car industry so that the regulations can be tightened up as quickly as possible. Having made these comments, we are prepared to support this report.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) Mr President, environmental protection is one of the most vital and urgent problems requiring immediate solution, since damage to the environment has taken on horrific proportions. Atmospheric and marine pollution, the pollution of harbours and rivers, chaotic town planning, the irresponsible use of natural resources, the destruction of forests, and damage to our cultural monuments — all these are but a few of the consequences of this disaster. And the reason for all of them is the headlong pursuit of profit, which is what monopoly employers and unrestrained private initiative are mainly out to achieve in the so-called free world. Take Athens, for example, which in order to become a speculators' paradise has ceased to be a city fit for people.

The attempt which is being made to blame the present critical ecological situation on industrial and technological development in general seeks to conceal the social causes behind it. Science and technology are dangerous to the environment only when they are used indiscriminately to make excessive profits. Thus the basic principle which must be applied here is the 'polluter pays' principle, which must be enforced with strict legal measures. The governments must declare that they have the political will. The governments must not hesitate to enter into conflict with big business interests and large-scale speculators in order to protect the health and lives of millions of people.

Will something of the kind be ventured at the forthcoming Bonn summit of the eight Western industrialized nations at the beginning of May and at the OECD Summit in June? We doubt it very much. We will most probably get more general appeals and sermons. In our view, without the massive mobilization of the people, the situation will go from bad to worse. Mr Collins' report has some very positive points and sound proposals, and so we shall vote for it.

Mr Maher (L). — Mr President, if one were to judge from the attendance in the House this afternoon — and I notice not even the rapporteur is present at the moment — one might conclude that this question was of very little importance.

However, I suppose that those who are here, are some indication that we are treating this subject with the seriousness that it deserves and even if it has to be in his absence I want to praise the rapporteur for his work on this report.

There are a few points I want to draw attention to. The first is that there is little use in my view in national governments, or agencies under their control, trying to impose pollution and environmental controls and restrictions if they themselves very often commit the sins that they are blaming other people for and imposing penalties for. It is a bit like a preacher who stands up in the pulpit and advises everybody to be sober when, in fact, everyone knows that he himself is a drunkard. So he does not sound very sincere, and it is the case very often in our countries that public bodies and authorities are themselves polluters, are themselves failing to respect the very laws that they are charged with putting into effect.

I have many examples, my own country, of local authorities acting under the national government damaging the environment in various ways. We have a recent example — and I mention it because I think it is of international interest — in the Austrian Government which has begun, although they have been temporarily stopped, to demolish much of the famous and beautiful Vienna Woods in order to construct a large hydro project which many experts would claim is unnecessary because Austria has, in fact, a surplus of elec-

Maher

tricity at the moment. The Worldlife Fund has been instrumental in preventing that damage from taking place, at least temporarily — a year's respite has been given. I think it is something, and I mention it in passing, which the European Parliament might take some interest in because I think the Vienna Woods are of international interest and international significance.

I understand fully why Mr Collins is advocating the notion that the polluter pays — and perhaps it is right. There is a question though in my mind and that is exactly what this is going to cost. I think it is time that we came up with some estimate. Perhaps it ought to be the responsibility of the Commission, together with the national governments, to give us some idea of what this will cost and who pays at the end of the day. Because if the polluter pays, and if he is producing a product that is sold to the general public, without doubt he is going to pass on the cost of that pollution control to the consumer. I think the consumer is entitled to know what exactly it is going to cost him in terms of the extra price he pays for his product. What will the effect be on insurance companies? Obviously these organizations have to ensure against the risk if, for instance, it is a question of product liability — which Mr Collins is also advocating. I am not against that either. I think we need to be more specific: we need to find out exactly what it is going to cost and to measure the cost — in other words, to see more clearly what it all means.

Mr Collins talks, for instance, about soil pollution. I know there is pollution in the soil and part of that perhaps is caused by farmers themselves. I am a practising farmer. At least I practise when I am not in the European Parliament and God knows that is little enough! But for many years, I believe, I was using my farm in such a way that it was not causing any pollution. I was farming in an organic fashion; I was not using artificial fertilizers or pesticides. And I kept on doing it until I could no longer afford it. That was my problem! I would have been able to get a much higher price for my product had I not been using these things. Will people in this Parliament please stop the Jekyll and Hyde attitude of saying at one and the same time that we have got to have clean food and clean products, but when it comes to fixing prices for agricultural products we have got to keep prices down. The two things are not compatible. If you want all this done without using pesticides and artificial fertilizers and so on, you will pay an extra price for the food. Please do not be playing Jekyll and Hyde! Be honest about it!

Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC). — (FR) Mr President, Commissioner Clinton Davis, we see that the environment has returned to the summit. Let us hope, however that it is not all downhill from now on because, judging from what I have heard from some of my colleagues speaking before me, I cannot understand why the governments of the same political colouring have failed more or less to resolve the problems of the environment.

What we expect is decisions followed by effects. May I remind you that, since the famous Paris summit in the early 1970s, instead of being reduced, the damage to the environment has only increased. And I think we can cite the problem of acid rain as a fairly basic example. What has been done? Problems have been largely attributed to specific sectors, standards of varying stringency have been stipulated and, above all, the decisions taken by the Community have not been put very much into effect.

Since I share the view of the ecologists, I would like to say first of all that the approach followed so far is questionable, and secondly, that once an approach has been chosen it should be followed up to the hilt, and above all, standards must be adhered to: that, at least, should be done.

Generally speaking the environment should not be split into sectors but treated holistically. It is obvious that if the European Community simply legislates on the question of waste materials in the ground without considering the dumping and burning of waste at sea, pollution is simply going to be transferred from the land to the sea. It is obvious that the European Community is increasing its monitoring of every aspect of waste management within its territory while ignoring exports to other countries — especially the Third World, which is being used as our dustbin. It is obvious that the European Community is setting aside protected zones for birds, for example, but is at the same time polluting most of its soil with unsuitable agricultural and industrial techniques. The end result is the same — the birds disappear.

The key to the approach to be chosen today is therefore integrated policy. But we must go the whole hog, Commissioner, and include the environment in all policies: in development models and growth models. I believe this is really something which must be stressed more and more each day. We can only be delighted, therefore, when we hear the President of your Commission declare, and I quote, 'The Community is searching for another form of growth incorporating the potential of new technologies as well as social aspirations and individual hopes.' It is now up to the Community to go beyond the stage of looking for a new type of growth and adopt real measures, especially taking account of the quality of the environment in its legislation.

Does this Parliament itself take the environment seriously enough? Is this House being consistent, when it decides for example that International Acid Rain Week — which is this week — does not even merit a vote on an urgent resolution on the question of acid rain?

However, let us get back down to summits, if you will forgive the paradox. We would like these summits, for example, to decide quite specifically to make environmental impact studies obligatory for all major projects,

Roelants du Vivier

especially international ones or those drafted by the Community itself, and also to decide to apply a total ban on the dumping of waste at sea, and in remembrance of Bhopal, to create an international fund financed mainly by the chemical industry, to provide compensation for chemical damage. These major summits should also decide to review, on the basis of ecological criteria, the main options for energy policy, agricultural policy, transport policy and Third World aid policy.

These are all matters of urgency. The environment is, as paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution quite rightly states, the basis as well as the limit for economic and social development. In other words, if we do not think about the environment today, our economic and social development and very survival tomorrow will be impossible.

How can we fail to understand that the environment is not, and must not be, the concern of the ecologists alone — 'the Greens' as they are called — and a few isolated individuals in the traditional parties, but the preoccupation of all men and women and all political groups? It is high time the environment was understood in terms of the whole complex of problems associated with raw materials — both minerals and agricultural resources. These raw materials are limited in quantity and spread unevenly throughout the world. Their production, transport and use cause a range of different types of pollution there. A holistic approach — and we always come back to this same term — is therefore needed to deal with them.

We thus argue for a European policy for dealing with all aspects of raw materials, whether vegetable or mineral. We urgently request that a European policy be drawn up to prevent the formation of desert regions. This topic is now discussed under the *Desert Convention*, but in actual fact there is hardly any policy on this subject. How can we fail to see that the error of past and present development aid policies lies in their failure to take account of various ecological factors? The spread of deserts and deforestation are now major problems and millions of people are suffering and dying as a result. It is time to activate ecological development aid policy and to draw up a budget and specific measures to prevent the spread of deserts, otherwise Mr President, the desert will gradually replace our sacks of wheat and powdered milk, and only dried carcasses will be there to collect our parachuted food aid.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (NL) Mr President, I shall be recommending that the environment summit to be held in May of this year should discuss as one of its priority topics, the Mediterranean.

Why? To begin with, environmental problems have become so extensive that we hardly know where to begin. The earth, air and water have become hope-

lessly polluted. But the Mediterranean is one of the world's most beautiful natural environments. In the course of its rich history this area developed into a cultural treasure-house. Cultural and religious developments and its uniquely beautiful setting have made this region an ideal meeting place where millions of tourists converge each year in search of relaxation, inspiration and rejuvenation. Now the Mediterranean is becoming even more relevant to us with the accession of Spain and Portugal, two culturally important countries which could help us to strengthen our links with the Arab Mediterranean countries.

But as you may know yourself, Mr President, this unique wonder of nature is dying. It is more heavily polluted than any other stretch of water on earth, which is why it is sometimes called the cesspool of Europe. More and more beaches are being sealed off because they are dangerous. The fish cannot survive or are no longer suitable for human consumption, and can only just be used to feed pigs and chickens. Major natural and cultural centres, for example Venice, Istanbul and Athens, to name but three, are threatened. On top of this, nuclear power stations and even nuclear missiles have recently been set up on the shores of the Mediterranean.

I therefore propose that the Mediterranean should be included on the agenda of next month's summit. The meeting should lay down stricter standards to be applied in accordance with the principle that the polluter pays. Secondly, special appropriations should be made available for pollution abatement and for anti-pollution measures in industry. Thirdly, talks could be held with non-Community countries around the Mediterranean. And fourthly, the Mediterranean area could be declared a nuclear-free zone.

Mr President, saving the ecology of the Mediterranean could have a snowball effect resulting in the saving of other regions. It could become a symbol of peace in which man can live in harmony not only with his fellow man but also with his natural environment.

Mr Muntingh (S). — (NL) Mr President, not much can be said in three minutes. I shall therefore confine myself to one of the many points discussed in Mr Collins' excellent report, namely the threatened species and their natural habitats. What we are concerned with here is not all plants and animals, although they are implicitly concerned, but with plants and animals which are threatened with extinction or are actually becoming extinct. Virtually every day one or other species of plant or animal must be dying out — and I mean dying out for all time, never to return. It is a completely irreversible process. Living organisms which have evolved over millions of years, like man and alongside man, are now being callously and senselessly destroyed.

In our cosy, disgusting Western luxury, in Parliament's plush galleries, we are witnesses to and part of

Muntingh

— even partly responsible for — the greatest mistake of all time. We are living in an era of unimaginable ecocide on a world scale. In less than 50 years — less than the twinkling of an eye in evolutionary terms — we shall have destroyed a large part of our natural environment.

The effects will not be quantitative — rats, mice and cockroaches will still be with us — but qualitative. Future generations will no longer be able to enjoy the richly variegated, highly complex and colourful ecosystems which invite study or artistic representation in words or pictures. They will no longer be able to enjoy the endless variation and interrelation of countless plants and animals which soothe or stimulate the human spirit, which can provide the basis for rich aesthetic experiences, and which, since the dawn of civilization, have been the very fount of our culture.

What is perhaps even worse, Mr President, is that future generations will be unable to enjoy the economic and material benefits so richly and bountifully bestowed by all these plants and animals. The energy they give us, the warmth, protection, natural medicines, clothing and foods will all be gone — like all the gifts which flow so freely from the harmonious co-existence of man and his environment. If Western societies, industries and governments do not react immediately to the recommendations of countless anxious environmentalists and others, recommendations which have been formulated yet again in such a sober and forthright way in the Collins report, our planet will become the Universe's latest dead star.

(Applause)

Mr Iversen (COM). — *(DA)* Mr President, in Denmark we have a famous saying: everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it! Something similar could be said about the solution to the major environmental problems facing Europe and the world. We all agree, at least in theory, that the environmental catastrophes which the next few decades threaten to bring us, must be prevented by international agreement, because pollution, as everyone knows, does not stop at frontiers.

The contribution of the EEC countries towards a solution to some of the major environmental problems is disgraceful. In the last few months, agreement has been reached on future regulations for exhaust gases and lead in petrol: a compromise which means that 95% of all new cars in the EEC can continue to be driven around as before right up to 1990. It is really astonishing that the EEC should not introduce the same vehicle pollution restrictions as the USA until 12 years later.

This compromise clearly showed that there are limits to the improvements which can be made to the environment in the EEC. Whilst all consumer organizations in

the EEC countries protested against the compromise which has just been agreed, the car manufacturers were jubilant. If the EEC's environmental policy and initiatives are to have any credibility at all — and I personally have nothing against this — then we will need resolutions which dare to go against the interests of the producers and — as Mr Collins also points out in his report — the need for solutions has become urgent in a whole series of areas, since unsuccessful environment policy will not wait for us. The Collins report points out that, according to scientific studies, an estimated 12 ½% of all the world's forests will have disappeared by the year 2000 if current trends continue.

The outlook for the environment in the years to come is bleak and the compromise last month in Brussels was unfortunately — and I mean unfortunately — one more example of the EEC being better at spouting fine words and declarations than at solving down-to-earth problems.

Mr Kuijpers (ARC). — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in 1970 the OECD Environment Committee was set up to discuss problems of cross-frontier pollution and to coordinate national legislations on the basis of a consultation procedure. The following results have been achieved.

First, certain general principles have been established. The OECD has accepted the principle that the polluter pays, since it is usually governments who foot the bill for clearing away pollution, and their attempts to impose levies for this are usually unsuccessful. It was therefore a good idea to reaffirm this principle in our motion for a resolution.

Secondly, all citizens must have access to information concerning the environment, to plans and to reports concerning their effect on the environment. The OECD also recognizes that the people should have a say in the drawing up of plans.

Thirdly, with regard to legislation on cross-frontier pollution, the OECD has adopted the principle that the inhabitants of a country have a right to information and that their views must be heard concerning pollution caused by neighbouring countries. The fact that many nuclear power stations have been built near frontiers makes a mockery of this principle, and we are glad that the motion for a resolution has drawn attention to this question.

The OECD names seven sectors which require a concerted approach; but if we consider the concrete measures actually taken — to combat acid rain, for example — the results are rather depressing. Pollution is getting steadily worse and the environment is being over-exploited, not least in the third world. We therefore welcome the inclusion in the report of the new concept of the producer's responsibility for his prod-

Kuijpers

uct. The importance of this cannot be stressed too much.

To conclude, Mr President, there has been an enormous increase in pollution in recent years. This is due largely to the fact that many industrialized nations are getting the third world countries to do their work for them. The third world is thus in danger of becoming a rubbish dump for the rich nations of the West — and this cannot be allowed to happen.

Mr Bombard (S). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think it is important that a French socialist should speak in this debate on the environment since the socialists are in power in France. Well, the situation has been clearly spelt out in the excellent and courageous report by our friend Mr Collins, describing how man can live in harmony with nature by adapting progress and way of life. Paragraph 14 is especially clear and could be the key to the priorities to be worked on jointly by industrialists and ecologists.

Nevertheless, I would like to make several points: first of all, as far as the standards proposed by the industrialists are concerned, I do not believe that the principle of the polluter pays would be satisfactory without a rising scale of penalties, otherwise the sums would turn into pollution licence fees. Secondly, with regard to the transfer of waste materials, what happened in France last week with the lorries shows that the safest form of transport for dangerous products is the railway.

Whilst congratulating the rapporteur for his courageous and lucid report, I would like to sound the alarm. I have just heard from Mrs Schleicher that Mrs Bouchardeau will not be attending the Bonn Summit. Now I would like to tell you something: France is currently building an aerodrome on Adélie Coast in the Antarctic, which will probably result in the death of over a million emperor penguins, not to mention many other species. Now that we are beginning to recognize that through ignorance we have polluted the ocean, air and soil of the continents we have always inhabited, how can we try to repair the damage whilst at the same time, on the sixth continent, where we have only just set foot, the first French project which was badly prepared by an impact study conducted by people with vested interests in the project, constitutes a real crime against the environment? This is still a virgin continent and so let us not kill it at the very moment we set foot on it, otherwise this would demonstrate that we had not really taken into account the environment as a whole.

I have cited this example to show you that at the moment we are sectorizing, which is wrong. All species are threatened by man. If man does not decide to save them we will see, as my friend Muntingh said, whether we are serious or not.

(Applause)

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, may I say first of all that it is very appropriate that this debate should have been concluded from the floor by the last honourable Member who has such a record of devotion to ecological protection and to whom we ought to pay, I think, that tribute. May I also congratulate Mr Collins, the rapporteur, and Beate Weber, the chairman of the committee, and, indeed, the members of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, for their invaluable report. It is a report which I very much welcome on behalf of the Commission.

Perhaps it would be helpful if at the very beginning I were to summarize our views concerning the amendments. Like Mr Collins, we recommend the acceptance of Amendments No 3, subject to the reservation which he himself outlined, Nos 5, 6 and 7; the rejection of Amendments Nos 1, 2 and 4 and, as far as Amendment No 8 is concerned, I can only say that it is outside the competence of the Commission.

Mr Collins was, in my view, absolutely right in asserting that environmental issues are rightfully gaining a prominent place in our affairs. It is increasingly recognized that it is wholly unacceptable that our countryside should be scarred and ruined by the remorseless demands of industry and modern agriculture, that our forests and lakes should be poisoned, that our citizens should be robbed, in other words, of their heritage. Moreover, it is clearly perceivable that strict environment policies can, and indeed must, play a vital role in promoting economic growth and creating new types of employment. I am wholly at one with him on that.

So it is urgent that considerations for the protection and improvement of the environment must become central features of economic and social planning and that specific objectives and timetables should be laid down for dealing with the most pressing of today's environmental problems. Member States too should recognize that it will be deeply resented if progress is held up by introverted and all too often misguided perceptions of narrow national self-interest. Indeed, the Community's third action programme provides the firm basis for just such an approach. For all these reasons — as I have indicated — Amendment No 4 is certainly one which we warmly support.

European industry cannot afford the loss of international as well as domestic markets. Yet failure to reach the ecological standards maintained by our principal competitors will undoubtedly have this disastrous effect. Let it be remembered that loss of markets also means the loss of jobs. The danger signals have already been hoisted, and we shall ignore them at our peril. Indeed, we have to be more ambitious, more far-sighted, and recognize the scope for job creation that exists in our leading the field and not lagging behind, by adopting environmental improvement policies, such as the treatment of waste or the improvement of soil and water, and that reclamation and envi-

Clinton Davis

ronmental renewal can lure back jobs to the deprived inner-cities and older industrial areas. This approach is wholly consonant with Amendment No 5 which has been tabled.

The Commission is determined to advance still further the 'polluter pays' principle. Something has been said about that by a number of honourable Members during the debate, notably Mr Maher whom I do not observe in his place now. I too am rather concerned about the efficacy of the 'polluter pays' principle, because it is true that in the final analysis costs are passed on to the consumer. That, regrettably, is true of many other areas of legal sanction — the costs of fines imposed in criminal cases, the costs of awards of damages are also passed on to the consumer. Until we can find a better solution to this problem I think we have to still insist upon the advance of the 'polluter pays' principle.

I think more important is the next phase of policy which is summarized by the maxim: 'pollution prevention pays'. To this end the long delayed — but none the less welcome — adoption by the Council of the environmental impact assessment directive is essential to our future work. This procedure must be implemented rapidly by the Member States, and we shall use every endeavour to seek to secure that objective. It follows also that greater openness and effective consultation, as is suggested in Amendment No 5, should be part and parcel of this approach.

There can be no doubt that the most urgent environmental problems besetting the Community today relate to atmospheric pollution, the impact of agriculture on the environment, massive pollution and waste management — a daunting quartet! As far as atmospheric pollution is concerned, the outline agreements reached at 8 o'clock in the morning — as I learned to my cost on 21 March — by the Environment Council when dealing with exhaust gases, and also the mandatory introduction of lead-free petrol, cannot I would say, with respect, to Mr Collins, as he suggested the other day — and I heard him — be written off as being simply too little too late. Yes, they were compromises reached by the Member States, notably those with major car industries; but hitherto-entrenched positions were abandoned in the quest for viable Community solutions respecting the development of new superior technologies, the maintenance of important industries and jobs, the safeguarding of the internal market and the deep concern about damage to the environment. This did, in my view, represent a major breakthrough.

Now we must utilize every pressure, including that of this Parliament, to build on these agreements, but also, as Mrs Weber said, to ensure that the declaration of the Brussels summit, demanding progress concerning pollution emitted from large combustion plants, does not just become a political tranquilizer. It has to be made meaningful. However, I think it would be

unwise of us to underestimate the political influence and muscle of those, who engage in every pretext to avoid action now. Emission controls may be costly, but acid deposition can cost billions of pounds, and the end of these costs and the scale of the disaster simply cannot be forecast if we remain inert.

Action to limit the use of chemicals and to encourage environmentally-sensitive farming is also urgently needed to protect the rich variety of our wildlife, as Mr Muntingh pointed out, and our water supplies. Concern is growing in many Member States over pollution of the sea. The Commission will shortly make a series of proposals aimed at reducing this pollution. We shall be consulting with Parliament's Environment Committee, and we shall be urging strong Community support for actions to protect, as Mr Ulburghs wanted, the Mediterranean and also the North Sea.

The Community's waste management industries employ 5 million people. They handle huge quantities of waste each year, and shortly the Commission will propose an overall strategy for the more rational management of waste throughout the Community, aimed at achieving economic and employment gains and a major reduction in our dependence on imports.

There is also growing concern over the international movement of dangerous chemical wastes and plants, a point made during the course of this debate. Accidents, though rare, can be devastating, as Seveso and, more recently, Bhopal tragically and vividly demonstrated. Yet, whilst we must always remember that the legitimate trade concerned is important, urgent action is needed to develop adequate control measures as well as notification and authorization procedures. There is a strong, indeed an overwhelming case for the Community to promote the rapid development of worldwide codes of practice to supplement the specific legislative measures needed to cover some aspects of these matters, not least in relation to the protection which must be afforded to developing countries, which may not always have the internal administration available to ensure that the higher standards of safety we seek for ourselves are equally available in their countries. The Commission insists that a directive on product liability is indeed an important part of our whole philosophy. Accordingly, we would be, as I said before, unable to accept Amendment No 1.

This brings me to the environmental disasters of the Third World, a point which was made by a number of honourable Members, not least the rapporteur, in very moving terms. I think there can be no doubt that the attention of all of us has been horrendously focused almost daily on the tragic events in Ethiopia, Eritrea, Tigre, the Sudan and elsewhere. On our television screens we see so many people, young children, dying of hunger and disease before our very eyes. This has happened after years of comparative indifference and inaction.

Clinton Davis

What it has done is to awaken an unprecedented public consciousness and response, and we must be thankful for that. This must now be followed up by tackling the problems of desertification, deforestation and inappropriate rural development. All these are to be found in the Community's development policy under Lomé III. But even this is not enough. What we have got to have is major financial help, changes of attitude, changes in the trading and pricing policies of the developed world. This has got to ensue if we are to avoid international catastrophe. These issues will undoubtedly be at the centre of the discussion at the forthcoming Bonn Summit and OECD meeting.

Mrs Schleicher said during the debate that France does not want to participate in the Environment Summit. While I pay tribute to her work in the development of this report, I think that in this regard she is wrong. France has not formally refused to attend the Summit but has intimated that summit meetings devoted entirely to environment problems should not become routine affairs. I do not go all along with that myself, but it is different from the proposition that she advanced. May I also say that the French Minister at the Environment Council, Mrs Bouchardeau, played an invaluable role, and I think it is right that I should pay that tribute to her in the light of the criticism that has been made of her government.

Mrs Schleicher also criticized the British refusal to implement decisions of its own parliament. I am advised that Great Britain has, in fact, signed and ratified the Geneva Convention on atmospheric pollution. What Great Britain has not done is to become one of the members of the 30% club. I deeply regret that failure.

(Applause)

I think I should take up one or two other points that were made during the debate. The question of cooperation raised by Mrs Jepsen is a very important point. However, I think we ought to pay tribute to the cooperation which did ensue following the collision in the Messina Strait recently, a tragic collision leading to loss of life and substantial injury. Substantial support for the Italian authorities came from the French, Belgian, Netherlands and UK authorities as well as my own officials, one of whom was immediately dispatched to the scene and rendered invaluable support.

There was also a point made by Mr Muntingh about the eradication of species of wildlife. I very much support what he has said.

I am very happy that Parliament shares the view that I have expressed that a strong environment policy is essential and that such a policy is fully compatible with sustained economic growth and will contribute to restoring higher employment in the Community. Prevention will remain the major objective of the common environment policy. The use of environmental impact

assessment procedures and the integration of an environmental dimension in the economic activities of the Community will contribute to ensure a sound management of resources and of the natural environment as well as guiding development in accordance with quality requirements.

I shall certainly convey the opinion of Parliament and its suggestions to the participants at the various meetings. I think we are agreed in saying that the choice not only before us in the Community but before the whole world is absolutely stark. It is chaos or community.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM), *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.* — (IT) Mr President, I should like the Commissioner to clarify a very important point.

If I understood correctly, you first of all said that you accepted Amendment No 4, which I tabled on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, but then you said you did not accept it.

I should therefore like to know whether this Amendment No 4 is accepted by the Commission, or at least whether the Commission is in favour or not.

Mr Clinton Davis, *Member of the Commission.* — One of the troubles of being innumerate is that you do tend to get your numbers wrong sometimes. In fact, I am saying that we should reject Amendment No 4.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

6. Noise emission of rail-mounted vehicles

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-11/85) drawn up by Mr Bonaccini on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection on

— the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(83) 706 final — Doc. 1-1241/83) for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the noise emission of rail-mounted vehicles.

Mr Bonaccini (COM), *rapporteur.* — (IT) Mr President, the revival of an effective and coordinated environmental effort is directed towards many issues and we welcome this. We are also pleased to see that one of these issues is noise pollution, although it must be said that this proposal for a directive seems to have

Bonaccini

been inspired more by a desire to defend competition than by a desire to combat noise pollution.

Our view of the situation, which is also the view of the Commission itself, is summarized in points A, B and C and in particular in point F which describes this directive as a 'modest' contribution. It is none the less a proposal, a proposal which enables us to say to our colleagues on the Transport Committee that we cannot accept their suggestions to raise the noise tolerance thresholds.

I would like to thank the French and German railway authorities as well as a number of Italian universities without whose help, relying only on the proposals made by the Commission, I would have been unable to carry out research in this field, which I have done, I hope, reasonably competently. The proposal made by the Committee on the Environment aims to encourage a fuller initiative and to harmonize legislation in the Member States.

Turning to the Directive, the Committee on the Environment has proposed a number of amendments which are quite straight-forward and need no further explanation. They are intended to improve the text and prevent any of the ambiguities arising in particular in the Italian version. It also proposes amending the date on which this Directive should take effect, for the simple reason that it can no longer take effect at the beginning of 1985.

In the light of this, I cannot give my support to the two proposals for amendments to the establishment of a supervisory committee and its composition — I say this straight away — because under the present circumstances, as I mentioned earlier, I do not think them either realistic or reasonable. Perhaps in the future, but certainly not for the present.

Given these circumstances, the Committee on the Environment felt it would be useful, on my instigation, to accompany the amendments to the Directives by a motion for a resolution, which deals with a basic question, suggested in Mr Sherlock's amendment, which has been rejected once by the Committee and has now been repropoed. My thanks to Mr Sherlock for his amendment because with his customary clear-sightedness he has brought us to the very heart of the problem: either we do nothing with the proposal for a Directive and defer its examination to a later date or we start to act under the present conditions, limited as they are.

The opinion of the Committee, which is also my own was that despite the modest conclusions which the proposal for a Directive reaches, we must act now. Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the resolution suggest how the Commission should act. I think that even Mr Sherlock will, on the whole, be quite satisfied.

Basically, we can decide either to make a lot of noise about nothing — and if we reject these proposals and

the Commission has made us wait thirteen years before putting forward even these modest proposals, we can be sure that nothing will happen — or we can try to do all in our power to reduce noise emissions.

IN THE CHAIR: MR ALBER*Vice-President*

President. — We shall now suspend the debate on the Bonaccini report until after the votes.

7. Votes

Report (Doc. A 2-18/85) by Mr Rogalla, on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-1652/84 — COM(84) 749 final) for a directive on the easing of controls and formalities applicable to nationals of the Member States when crossing intra-Community borders

Explanations of vote

Mr Seal (S). — I feel I must give an explanation of vote on this report because, although I sympathize with the aims that were originally assigned to the rapporteur to try to make it easier for individuals to cross frontiers, I am afraid that in his enthusiasm Mr Rogalla has gone far too far. Obviously, we have some sympathy with the directive that has been issued, but here again the directive goes far too far. Of course, we all want to make it easier for individuals to cross frontiers. Of course, we all want to make it easier for people going on holiday by car or on foot to cross frontiers. We even want to make it much easier for transport to cross frontiers. We do not want the situation we have at present, where wagons and trucks loaded with goods wait days and days at some of the frontiers. We want to make that much easier. What we cannot agree with are the aims which are spelled out at every stage of this directive and which Mr Rogalla in his enthusiasm has put into the report. The aim is the complete abolition of all kinds of frontier checks and controls. We cannot agree with that because, first of all, we think that there are specific problems for the United Kingdom when it comes to drugs and rabies.

(Protest from the Right)

We also feel that as Socialists we want a situation where we have planned socialist trade.

(Laughter from the Right)

Seal

You cannot have that, in spite of the stupid laughs from the Conservatives, when you have a complete lack of internal frontiers. So, whilst we sympathize with Mr Rogalla, we feel that we cannot support his report. It is very unfortunate that he has gone further than his remit and has made it impossible for us to give him our support.

Mr Marshall (ED), in writing. — I shall not be voting for the Rogalla report because of the extremely unfortunate views of the Economic and Monetary Affairs Committee which are included in that report. That committee has been able to shrug off — indeed welcomes — the possibility of duty-free concessions being ended.

In a few sentences it is not possible to enter into all of the arguments for duty-free concessions. But to abolish duty-free concessions for travel within the Community while retaining them for travel outside the Community would be the height of folly. Certainly it would do nothing to foster the Community tourist trade. It would be nonsense to cancel duty-free concessions to EC tourists in Greece but allow them for EC visitors to Cyprus.

Lord North lost the American colonies because he chose to tax tea. If the economic theorists and the fiscal purists want to make the EEC stand for more expensive wine and spirits, then their fate will be most unpleasant.

Duty-free shopping provides for many a pleasure out of all proportion to the benefits it provides. Let no one seek to take away this popular and useful concession. Do not let Europe be personified by Scrooges and miseries seeking to end some of the pleasures of our citizens!

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-7/85) by Mr Collins, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the European Environment Summit in May 1985 and the OECD meeting in June 1985

Mr Welsh (ED), chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. — Mr President, I hesitate to make another contribution after Mr Seal's but could I say, on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, that the amendments tabled to this

report by Mrs Squarcialupi are in fact in the name of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment although that does not appear on the face of the amendments. Unfortunately there was no time to circulate a corrigendum.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC). — (DE) My group is grateful for the report by Mr Collins and for the productive work done in the Committee on the Environment. We shall naturally vote for it. I should like to add that, as a conservationist, I feel that this debate could be one of the most gratifying moments in Parliament

(Applause)

if only we did not have this dreadful experience with lead in petrol, and so we have become sceptical and shall request a roll-call vote. We shall therefore come back later to everything that has been said this afternoon about what has highest priority, what is important etc.

(Applause)

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — (IT) Mr President, of course I shall vote for this motion, although I wonder how it is possible to maintain any sort of uniform attitude when amendments are rejected which state that a sound policy of environmental protection and of respect for and improvement of the environment can have a positive effect on the number and quality of jobs — ideas which have been approved so many times and which today the majority of Parliament suddenly decides not to approve.

I think that we really are faced with a very difficult situation. We call on major institutions, such as the summit meeting of the industrialized countries or the OECD, to do certain things, and then we as a Parliament go back on things which were said about a fortnight or a month ago. I think, Mr President, that if the majority of this Parliament maintained a more uniform attitude, it would not only increase our political credibility but in this particular case would also benefit the environment.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Mr Sutra de Germa (S). — (FR) Mr President, I should merely like to inform the House that following

¹ The rapporteur was
— AGAINST Amendment No 18
— IN FAVOUR OF all the other amendments.

¹ The rapporteur was
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 2-3, 5, 6 and 8
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 and 4.

Sutra de Germa

this morning's speech by Mr Collinot, who made certain allegations against our honourable colleague, Lionel Jospin, in a way which deserves nothing but contempt, a reply was drawn up and distributed in the press room. It is a pity that we have to treat this kind of thing as important by replying, but on the other hand, we are bound to make it known that the necessary reply has been made.

8. *Noise emission of rail-mounted vehicles (contd)*

Mr Vittinghof (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. The debates and votes this afternoon have made it clear to me just how many contradictions there are in the attitudes and statements of certain parties. For this reason I believe that we should be pleased when small steps can be taken in the field of environmental protection and I would like to say that I am not in favour of returning or rescinding the present report, but hope it will be accepted, even if only minor progress is made.

We are all aware that rail-mounted vehicles are much less harmful to the environment than motor vehicles. However, it is still necessary to combat noise wherever it occurs — including railways — as noise is not only unpleasant for people and animals, but has been proved to cause illness. It is regrettable that the provisions cannot cover all vehicles, but too many would be involved. In the opinion of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, the proposed directive should cover new vehicles only. Even in this field the Commission's draft is not satisfactory, since it does not provide for sanctions if maximum noise emission levels are exceeded and a certificate of conformity is refused or later withdrawn.

If this guideline is to have a point, an amendment is urgently required. This is also the opinion of the Committee on the Environment. We therefore support the Committee's demand that from 1 January 1989 operating permits should no longer be granted for rail-mounted vehicles for which no certificates of conformity have been issued. Secondly, rail-mounted vehicles for which the certificate of conformity has been withdrawn following tests, must be withdrawn from service if the deficiency is not rectified within a period of six months. We also support the demand of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection that further technical measures to combat noise are necessary.

In conclusion I would like to add that such regulations will not be to the detriment of rail-mounted vehicles, but might make them more attractive; increased use of the railways will take some of the traffic from the roads, leading to what is of course the most important goal, a gradual reduction of the burden on the environment.

Mrs Lentz-Cornette (PPE). — (DE) The Group of the European People's Party welcomes this proposal for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the noise emission of rail-mounted vehicles. We therefore support Mr Bonaccini's motion for a resolution and the amendments by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

We too are of the opinion that it is only a small step in the right direction, but small steps are better than standing still, as this is the only way to make progress.

We welcome the fact that measures similar to those taken to reduce noise pollution caused by road and air traffic are now being introduced in the railway sector. We are aware how important railways are for both passenger and freight traffic and that this clean and safe means of transport must be given maximum support, particularly in the face of increasing air pollution and the dangers of road traffic.

It is a fact that over the years improvements to both rolling-stock — locomotives and trucks — and track have contributed towards a considerable reduction of noise. This is particularly apparent in Japan, but also in Europe. Examples include the TGV expresses in France, the APT in the United Kingdom, the Intercity trains, and the underground systems in various cities.

In diesel and electric locomotive engineering sound emissions have been restricted as far as possible at source. The streamlining of the trains travelling at up to 200 km/h and more and the specially constructed tracks reduce wind noise. The progressive renewal of track and rolling-stock will certainly reduce noise level to the values laid down by the Commission in Annex 2. As there is no legislation on railway noise in most of the Member States, it is important for this to be introduced at European level. However, this is not enough. Everyday thousands of rail-mounted vehicles from outside the Community cross our borders. This means that agreements with third countries under the auspices of the Union International du Chemin de Fer are essential. This is the only way to guarantee free movement of goods without distortion of competition.

There is still work to be done on harmonizing rail traffic. There are, for example, four different types of electrical current supply in Europe. Trains travelling from Paris to Amsterdam need to be able to run on three different kinds of current. If these trains come from Madrid they have to cope with two different gauges.

On 16 April a 'European Train' left Vienna on a 9-day tour of seven European countries. The destination was Brussels. The aim was to publicize the railways. It is the wish of us all that more and more freight and passenger traffic should move from road to rail, thus becoming clean, safe, fast and quiet.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Mr President, we have had a wonderfully woeful afternoon of Cassandra-like wailings. You all know, of course, that her predictions were true, but nobody believed them. When we get down to doing something about the environment, of course, we have to get down to nuts and bolts — and you know that I am really fairly good at that.

Let us have a look at the nuts and bolts of this. And I will tell you something: they will come undone before they ever reach the stage of legislation, let alone ever go into effect. We all know perfectly well — those of you who are still listening and are not going to come back and vote tomorrow from portfolio of prejudice — that when a train goes by your hotel bedroom in the middle of the night it is not only the engine that makes the noise. This report devotes itself to testing the prime mover, but the train goes on rattling and rattling — it is steel on steel that does it. Mrs Lentz-Cornette has taken a perfect example: across the frontiers from the eastern part of this continent alone come 20 000 tonnes of trucks a day — most of them substandard from our point of view. I repeat, 20 000 a day that will not conform at all. We could test the prime mover, we could test it statically, we could test it sensibly. Only the prime mover comes under the Section 100 aspect of this where any aspect of competition policy is concerned. There is no competition policy in those components which make up the track, and certainly this does not envisage any alteration to competition policy on rolling-stock. So that is right out for a start. I am afraid this is doomed before it is ever truly born.

From the environmental point of view: yes, noise is one of the nastiest components of our modern-day life; yes, let us reduce it; yes, let us take this report back and have another look at it and come out with something that really addresses itself to the problem.

There is one other point to which I would direct your attention, and that is the patent lack of enthusiasm in our most excellent rapporteur, Mr Bonaccini, a man renowned for his enthusiastic support of most things. He stood there and he hardly got a breath of enthusiasm in his voice for the whole of this potentially disastrous project.

Mr Kuijpers (ARC). — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I myself live in an area which has for some time been suffering from noise and vibration caused by trains. I fully appreciate, therefore, what a nuisance these can be for those living nearby.

A scientific survey conducted with the help of our local authority showed that the internationally recognized ISO standard was being blatantly ignored. But the general public is powerless to do anything, since it has no legal backing. So far none of the Member States has introduced legislation on noise pollution caused by trains. Belgium, for example, has for some

years had an outline law on noise pollution, but its implementing provisions have not yet materialized. This is another reason for introducing an EEC directive on this problem, since in ten years of Community environment policy there have been few directives relating to noise pollution.

In my opinion the problem of noise is underestimated, especially since it can often be subjective. Yet international research suggests that noise causes anti-social behaviour, that it adversely affects the learning capacity and intellectual performance of children and that it has a bearing on heart and vascular diseases.

But there are still more reasons for combating this evil at Community level. We live in an age of international travel. In Flanders I can catch a train straight to Strasbourg, and my journey takes me through three countries. Is there any more telling example of the need for an international approach? And now plans are being drawn up for a high speed train link running from France to Belgium and from there to Germany. The planners do not consider the laws in force in the different countries and they fail, in particular, to take account of the effect on the environment, regional planning and traffic.

This report therefore provides only a partial approach to the problem. Various techniques can be applied to combat noise pollution, but these do not provide an overall solution. In my opinion this can only be achieved on the basis of a thorough and objective preliminary report on environmental effects, the findings of which should be made available to everyone.

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, may I start by thanking both committees — Environment and Transport — for the care and concern which they have invested in the report and in considering our proposal, and I particularly welcome the positive approaches which the committees have shown.

The proposal itself aims at limiting the nuisance caused by railways by reducing at source the noise of rail-mounted vehicles within a uniform regulatory framework throughout the Community while at the same time ensuring free circulation of rail traffic.

The committee graphically illustrates the difficulties associated with effective legislative action, which must also be capable of effective enforcement, in dealing with railway noise. This has also been illustrated during the course of the debate.

There is, of course, as honourable Members have pointed out — particularly, I think, Mr Sherlock — an international dimension which attaches to this problem, quite apart from the technical issues to which the rapporteur has himself referred.

Clinton Davis

I think I should also inform the House that UIC — *Union Internationale des Chemins de Fer*, which is a non-governmental body representing, I think, 83 countries — has undertaken a major study of the technical problems but, unfortunately, their report is not due, I understand, for presentation until the end of 1987.

Having set out this background information, I turn to the directive itself. It applies, of course, only to new vehicles. This was always the Commission's intention, and the Commission is willing to support an amendment to Article 1 so as better to reflect this intention. I would also like to assure the House that all the amendments proposed by the Parliament have been seriously examined by the Commission and the Commission, while being able to accept Amendments Nos 2, 4, 5, 6 and 10, is unable to accept the remaining amendments. Partly this is due to the fact that the Commission is convinced that its proposal represents a reasonable compromise having regard to the many constraints which exist — involving improving the environment — without unfairly impeding the railways' efforts at growth and free circulation throughout continental Europe. Partly it is due to the fact that a number of amendments would cause serious technical difficulties.

May I perhaps just give some brief examples? Amendment No 1 would include those private railways which circulate exclusively within the confines of a large industrial complex and even those preserved steam railways which use lines bought from the national railway companies by enthusiasts, neither of which, of course, relate to the problem at which the draft directive is aimed.

Amendment No 3 ignores the fact that there are a number of rail-mounted vehicles in service today which do not have a certificate of conformity but which would meet the emission levels of the directive when it comes into force — the anticipated dates being between 1988 and 1989. Some of these vehicles will have a 20-year lifespan, and therefore to seek to withdraw the vehicles by 1 January 1989 — as the amendment suggest — is utterly unrealistic.

As far as Amendment No 7 is concerned, the Commission is unable to accept this because the present state of technical competence in this field suggests that fixing noise-emission levels at source is a viable and appropriate method of reducing acoustic nuisance caused by railways.

As to Amendments Nos 8 and 9, I must simply say that it is impossible for us to dictate to Member States who is to sit on supervisory bodies representing them. What is envisaged is that inspections of rolling-stock for compliance would be carried out by the national railway companies of the Member States; the technical competence to carry out these checks simply does not

exist elsewhere. Furthermore, the principles referred to in Article 8 were established by Council directive.

The fact is that the Commission does not have the power, nor does it seek the power, to tell Member States who they should appoint to committees on adaptation to technical progress. This second point covers Amendment No 9, as I say, which also refers to the committee established by Article 8.

Amendment No 11 is a technical amendment which, I fear, we are unable to accept. The reason for this is as follows: if by 'industrial railway units' are meant those units used within the confines of a factory or shipyard or other industrial installation, then these units are excluded from the field of application of the proposal.

As for the static measurement method in general, the Commission feels that it does not correspond to the problems of measurement as well as the method chosen in the proposal. This is a view shared by the International Standards Organization and the technical working group of the *Union Internationale des Chemins de Fer*, to which I have already referred.

As far as wheel-rail interaction is concerned, the Commission showed in the explanatory memorandum which accompanied the proposal that this interaction was a phenomenon not properly understood. It would therefore be unreasonable for the Commission to fly in the face of technical advice from respected international organizations and submit proposals to eliminate wheel-rail noise.

Mr Vittinghof in the course of his contribution referred to the absence of sanctions. There is a sanction, although it is not a direct financial one, in that any offending vehicle would be withdrawn from circulation. That is, in fact, an approach consistent with other directives on noise, for example, in relation to aircraft or motor vehicles. There is nothing inconsistent with that approach at all.

Mr Sherlock expressed some scepticism about the whole issue as a matter of principle and he very vividly just pushed it all aside with a wave of his hand. Well, I think that we shall have to see whether his scepticism is justified in the future. Of course, we take the view that this is a valuable approach which we should certainly proceed with, but, of course, we must take into account not only the views of Parliament but also the on-going consideration of the high-level technical group to which I referred earlier. I think it would be foolish to discard this expert opinion.

The other matter which arose during the debate was the fact that there are a large number of goods vehicles which come from third countries and that that, in itself, could diminish the effect of the directive. What I would say in response to that is, while that is certainly true, what it does is to underline the need for third countries to align their own regulations with what we

Clinton Davis

are seeking. We hope that the directive will have a powerful impact as far as that is concerned.

I thank the committees once again for the work they have invested in this and I also thank honourable Members who have participated in this debate, whether for or against the draft directive, for the contributions they have made, which we shall most certainly study.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC). — (FR) Mr President, I should like to know whether there is any rule in the Rules of Procedure which lays down that the nationality of Commissioners addressing this Parliament should be indicated next to their names. As far as I know, the Treaties state that the Commissioners represent the Community as a whole and have no particular national allegiance.

President. — That has nothing to do with the idea that the Commissioner represents first and foremost his own country. The information is given because journalists want it.

9. Indication of prices

President. — The next item is the debate on the report (Doc. A 2-6/85) by Mr Nordmann, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the proposals from the Commission 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 — Doc. 1-331/83)
- II. a directive amending Directive 79/581/EEC on consumer protection on the indication of the prices of foodstuffs (COM(84) 23 final — Doc. 1-1452/83).

Mr Nordmann (L), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, in a collection of works by Georges Courteline entitled *Les Miettes de la Table* there is a piece called *Les Bonnes Occasions* depicting a character by name of *Tir-à-Cinq* in a clothing shop. Whilst taking a closer look at the quality of a pair of trousers which he is thinking of buying, he says 'Are they good quality?' 'As strong as iron', comes the reply. 'And will they last?' 'They'll fit you like a glove.' 'What's the price?' 'Twenty two francs.' Taken aback, he replies: 'But this knife only cost me 19 centimes!' 'What has that got to do with it?' asks the salesgirl. 'The fact that I am not

going to pay 22 francs for a pair of trousers when I can have a knife for 19 centimes!' And the dialogue continues along the same lines.

I thought of this scene more than once while studying the proposals submitted to us today by the Commission for a general obligation to indicate unit prices as well as selling prices, not only for foodstuffs, but also for certain other common articles. For it is obvious that the major problem, when a consumer has to choose between two alternative products, is to have a basis for comparison, a common basis making it easier to assess and compare the products before deciding which one to buy. The compulsory indication of unit prices certainly represents a contribution towards better consumer information and will enable him to make his decision in full awareness of the facts. This is the principle behind the Commission proposal: to extend the information available to the consumer. Of course, information on unit prices, which enables comparisons to be made in respect of quantity for money, is only one of several items of consumer information, which must also cover the quality aspect. It is a well-known fact that something cheap can be expensive in the long run and that you have to pay for quality. The indication of unit prices is therefore only one of several items of consumer information. But I think that making it compulsory — as is already the case in some Member States — is an important step forward in making this information available to the consumer.

The proposed directives are good, because they are realistic. They stress the usefulness of the principle, but also admit its limits and indicate a number of categories to be exempted, which will make it possible for legislation on unit price information to be applied effectively. This seems to me to be the big advantage of this directive, i.e. it indicates a whole series of categories to be exempted, which will obviate the need to make exemptions one at a time and exclude meaningless indications, e.g. when very small quantities of certain products are involved such as in the case of perfumes, where the litre price would have little meaning and would not make essential comparisons any easier. The same applies to the possibility of replacing the unit price indication by sufficiently clear and distinct standardized ranges permitting reliable comparisons.

Finally, certain types of businesses may be exempted, in particular small retailers, in which case — and this is the sense of the amendments which we would like to introduce — a distinction between indication by labelling and indication by posters would enable the rules to be properly applied without being unduly expensive for the small trader.

Here we would have the possibility — and this is my last remark — to add to consumer information an element which, although not decisive, is not negligible either and will facilitate comparison and choice — two basic rights of both the citizen and the consumer.

(Applause)

Mr Hughes (S). — Mr President, the Commission's proposals on unit pricing of foodstuffs and nonfoodstuffs are to be welcomed in general terms from the point of view of the consumer. I think every Member present will have experienced misleading advertising and misleading and wasteful packaging. There is, therefore, a need for measures of this sort.

However, any legislation of this sort does involve both costs and benefits, and it is important in my view that we avoid passing additional costs or disbenefits on to the consumer, either directly or indirectly. We should equally, of course, seek not to confuse the consumer even further than at present. Consumer organizations have some fears along these lines, and I have raised a number of points on their behalf in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

The first — and Mr Nordmann has already mentioned a point similar to this — is the fact that by concentrating on unit pricing these proposals leave aside a number of other factors that concern the consumer, such as quality and degree of concentration. The danger here is fairly clear, that consumer interests might be damaged if this were to discourage the purchase and therefore the production of better quality products. One way out of that is to look instead at the simplification and rationalization of ranges of sizes. That is arguably an easier, cheaper and more easily understood option and one which the Council Regulation of June 1979 called for. The Commission therefore needs to make its intentions known in this respect.

Another worry arises from suggestions from consumer organizations that the Council of Ministers is under some pressure to insist on the display of the unit price on the product itself. Were that to happen, heavy costs might be passed on to the consumer, small retail businesses might need to be excluded and it could inhibit the development of new technologies such as electronic point-of-sale systems. In view of these concerns, it seems sensible to opt for clear shelf marking and poster displays for retail outlets of all sizes rather than the labelling of individual products.

My final concern relates to the proposed non-food directive and the fact that it seeks to achieve across-the-board unit pricing in this area. The sheer scope of the directive is a little frightening, and there must be serious doubts as to whether such a directive would be either understandable or enforceable. It would seem more sensible if it were to relate to a specific list of products.

These have been my major concerns, but I believe that the Nordmann report in its present form takes account of these and of equally valid points and therefore deserves support.

One final point: it strikes me that these proposals and many others which come through the Environment

Committee concerning the environment or consumer protection or health and safety have involved the Commission's scouring the Treaties to find some excuse on which to base such proposals. It seems to me that that highlights the outmoded nature of the current Treaties and the extent to which they are now out of touch with the real needs of the people of Europe.

Mrs Banotti (PPE). — Mr President, while it might be overstating the case to say that my group welcomes these proposals from the Commission for directives on prices for food and non-food products, we do recognize it as another small step along the road in the interests of the consumers. Whether the hard-pressed consumer will recognize it as such remains to be seen. Complexity and bureaucracy, already described in graphic detail by Mr Hughes, still seem to be the order of the day.

However, some recognition has been given to some of the difficulties this type of legislation can both cause and alleviate. The obvious purpose is to inform and protect the consumer at the point of sale of these items. It still remains a process for which it would be almost essential that the average consumer carry a calculator in his or her basket when visiting his or her local supermarket.

You will note from the amendments, many of which have already been discussed by Mr Hughes, that other issues surfaced during our deliberations. I fully share his scepticism about issues of this kind being brought before the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

Certain industries, however, are very concerned that these directives might result in increased and unnecessary costs for their products. This applies particularly to the chocolate industry, for instance, where consumer choice is much more likely to be made on the ingredients and the elusive experience promised if one buys a particular bar of chocolate than on the actual weight and unit pricing of the said bar.

At this point I would also like to make a totally nationalistic plea in support of Amendment No 11, tabled by my colleague, Mrs Jackson, referring to imperial sizes intended 'for use exclusively in the United Kingdom and in Ireland'. The amendment states: 'It shall be sufficient for those Member States to notify the Commission of intended exemptions from the provisions of the directive, and the agreement of the Commission and confirmation by other Member States shall not be required'.

I am making a plea, which I have no doubt will also be made by my colleague, Mrs Jackson, for the ubiquitous *pint*! It is part of our national mythology in my country! It is, as the song goes, part of what we are! It is unthinkable that should you or any other of my colleagues visit either Ireland or England, you should be

Banotti

invited down to your local pub simply to partake of 75 centilitres of Guinness! It would be impossible, as we have done for hundreds of years, to sing, to write or to dream about such a mundane measurement, whereas the *pint* has a special ring to it and a special feel to it and is very dear to the hearts of those of us who partake of such a measure, and I am asking my colleagues to support this amendment.

Equally I would say that the requirement in the Commission proposal that Member States would have to apply annually for this derogation seems to me to be a little excessive zeal on the part of the Commission.

I would finally like to compliment Mr Nordmann on his excellent and comprehensive report. There was great and long and intensive discussion within the committee on it, but at this stage I also share Mr Hughes' concern as to whether all these discussions were, in fact, necessary and the best use of the committee's time. My group will be supporting all the amendments and also voting for Mr Nordmann's report.

Mrs Jackson (ED). — Mr President, I do not think — and I am saying this on behalf of my group — that the Nordmann report deserves support and we do not think much of the Commission's proposal either. There is no point in people in this House making speeches which are, generally speaking, critical of Commission proposals if we then adopt a report which has all the force of a *crème caramel*, which is, I think, about the amount of force that the Nordmann report has.

There is no doubt that unit pricing and the selling of goods in prescribed quantities so that consumers can make comparisons — I am not sure whether Mr Nordmann was suggesting that we extend this system to trousers — can be beneficial to consumers.

My first question to the Commission when they come to answer this debate is: on what research is their proposal to extend the system of unit pricing based? I have evidence from a survey conducted by the Consumers' Association in Great Britain some 10 years ago that the public preference was actually for prescribed quantities rather than unit pricing. Prescribed quantities, for those who are ignorant of the matter, is where you actually have a prescribed range of size so that consumers can compare price across a number of goods in a range of sizes. So we need more research before we come forward with a proposal like this.

Extension of the system to non-food products and to foodstuffs already packed by manufacturers in pre-established quantities is beneficial in theory, but there are very practical difficulties which some of my colleagues have mentioned. The cost to manufacturers has not been quantified by the Commission, and I do think that is reprehensible. We know from one manu-

facturers' association, which rejoices in the acronym SNACMA — that the increased cost to the snack manufacturer, which is actually a big part of the food industry, would be 7.5%. There is absolutely no doubt that that would get passed on to the consumer. There will be difficulties with small shopkeepers and, as I think Mr Hughes was implying, there might be the difficulty of bringing in, in effect, a system of retail price maintenance.

Insofar as my own Amendment No 11 is concerned, I think that the Commissioner is probably going to say that his proposal will certainly not outlaw the *pint* because there is a procedure there whereby the imperial system would be allowed to continue. The point of my amendment is that the procedure for allowing that system to continue should be automatic. It should not be necessary to consult the other Member States of the European Community where a range of size is only going to circulate within one Member State.

Finally, I regard Mr Clinton Davis' posit on in this matter rather as that of somebody who has been forced into an arranged marriage. The bride in this case was there waiting for him when he arrived at the Commission in January. The bride was this unit pricing directive. I think we should give him a second chance and allow him to take it back and think again.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — (IT) Mr President, I cannot hope to match the eloquence with which our rapporteur presented his report. However, we will vote for this report because of what it contains, because we are convinced that what it says and the amendments made by the Commission will be a tremendous help to the consumer. Now more than ever, when many levels of society have suffered a substantial drop in income, does the consumer need to be informed. Furthermore, with our unemployment figures and with falling incomes, better information is essential if the consumer is to cope, to manage his accounts properly, to survive even. Consumer information, finally, is a part of the civil code of which we should be the guardians.

True, the Commission directive is not perfect. I would go so far as to say, Mr Clinton Davis, that even if the cause you have espoused is not entirely flawless, we think that trade may derive some benefit from it and that it will serve to inform the consumer, although we cannot conceal the suspicion that it is designed more to eliminate distortions in competition than to benefit the consumer.

We share the rapporteur's concern that greater stress should be placed on standardized ranges and I hope that the next undertaking of our Commissioner will be concerned with just that. We have had some doubts about small enterprises which should have been exempt from price fixing, but we are in favour of what was proposed by the rapporteur, because small shops

Squarcialupi

usually go hand in hand with small shopping communities and they, too, need protecting. Prices therefore need to be fixed in small shops as well so that the consumer there can be informed.

One important point which crops up in a number of the amendments is that prices should be clearly marked: ambiguities can often arise here in shops and supermarkets when prices are written virtually illegibly, or on coloured backgrounds which make them difficult to read. I believe that we need to take a much tougher line if these two Directives are really to work.

May I make a proposal to the Commission? Recently, there have been a number of directives on labelling and consumer information. Such a plethora of regulations may create confusion for national legislation, in the sectors concerned or among the more informed consumers.

The vast range of publications, which we receive with pleasure from the Commission, ought to include a very clear guide to consumer rights on a European level in shops and stores, as regards both information and labelling, giving the consumer very clear and simple guidelines for the protection of his own rights.

To come back to the small shops, in my country, for example, there are a vast number of small commercial enterprises which need to be modernized. I think, then, that a valid European Community consumer policy should also aim to modernize commercial networks and above all improve professional training for sales staff. We can issue a new directive on consumer protection every day; but without these two elements, modernization and trained personnel, they will not yield many results.

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, this has been an interesting and somewhat extraordinary debate. It has been replete with some extraordinary allusions as well as illusions. I have been told that I have entered into an arranged marriage — it might, of course, be a marriage of convenience, I am not sure — but I do make a plea to this House: please leave my wife out of these debates in the future!

Then we have had some other interesting propositions about the imperial pint being very much part of Mrs Banotti. She committed a cardinal error, if I may say so with respect. She urged us to visit Ireland and England in order to see the full impact of the point that she was making and mortally offended those who come from Scotland and Wales by her singular omission. I have always felt that the term 'imperial pint', though I am seized of the purport of what she is saying, is itself a little antiquated, because I have always thought the age of imperialism was thankfully dead. Then we had something said about *crème caramel*. I am not sure whether that is to be sold by the imperial pint in future.

As I say, it has been an extraordinary debate. May I, having said that, thank the committee, and most particularly Mr Nordmann, for the work it has undertaken concerning the proposals regarding price-marking. We welcome the comments — very constructive in the main — which have been made by the committee. I would also like to thank the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs for its favourable opinion.

Perhaps I may now make some general remarks on the two proposals by the Commission. First, the texts constitute an answer to the Council resolution of June 1979 which asks the Commission to extend the field of application of the directive adopted for foodstuffs to non-foodstuffs, and to propose criteria for exempting certain ranges of quantities for prepacked products. We are responding to that.

Secondly, it appears that both texts have caused some apprehension in industrial and commercial circles, notably by the snap, nut and crisp merchants who have asserted — and apparently have convinced Mrs Jackson — that they are in a state of appalling decline — or will be if these proposals are implemented. May I say that I have not, of course, studied the point that she has made in detail. I will most certainly look into it. But, from time to time, as I learnt when I was a minister, certain vested interests do put forward some special pleading which does not always come to fruition. I think one needs to be a little cautious.

May I also say in parenthesis that she asked me what research has been done into these matters by the Commission. What I can say in general terms is that — though I will of course reply to her in writing because I am not acquainted with the specific terms of research done in relation to this — the normal course of events is for the Commission to undertake the most detailed discussions with consumer bodies and with the industries concerned before it embarks on making proposals. I have no reason to believe that this has not occurred in this case.

It does seem to me that very often the fears expressed by such sources are grossly exaggerated. I would suggest to Mrs Jackson that she herself might examine the precedent which the Commission is entitled, I think, to invoke. It is that there has been a system similar to that proposed in force in West Germany for more than 15 years. Recently certain Member States, particularly France, have adopted the principle of general and systematic unit price marking. Moreover, the system proposed by the Commission includes three types of exemption. First, an optional exemption for certain small retail shops which may be adopted by each Member State. Secondly, a Community exemption covering products, for example, luxury goods such as perfume, where the actual unit price may be of little real importance because the buyer — particularly if it is a very generous husband or other person, or on the other hand a profligate wife or other person — is determined to buy the product virtually regardless of

Clinton Davis

cost. Thirdly, a Community exemption for prepacked products in pre-established quantities sold in simple and clear ranges, for example, soap powders. So you have those three exemptions, which I would urge the House to take into account.

Lastly, we have to be mindful of the fact that transparency of information is essential for the protection of the consumer. The goal of both texts is to make it relatively easy for the consumer to be able to compare objective data, such as price, in relation to quantity. In other words, what we are about is to try to give the buyer the chance of a really square deal in a situation where the balance is not always in his favour.

I come now to the proposed amendments. On behalf of the Commission I accept the following made by the rapporteur since they all contribute to the understanding of the two texts: Amendments Nos 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 12. I hope I have got it right in this debate. We can also accept the principles underlying Amendment No 13, but we feel that it requires some redrafting as it is somewhat too vague to be effectively enforced as it stands.

I turn to Amendment No 11, Mrs Jackson's amendment, which we would also accept insofar as it would authorize the competent national authorities in Ireland and the United Kingdom — not just England and Ireland — to determine for each product or category of products the units of mass or volume of the international system or the imperial system, as it is called, in which the indication of unit price is compulsory. Such a provision already exists for foodstuffs under Article 9 of the directive adopted in 1979.

For other national exemptions the Commission prefers to maintain a Community procedure avoiding direct or indirect technical barriers, and a special committee — may I emphasize this to Mrs Jackson — will be set up to help the Commission examine requests from Member States.

I am unable to recommend the acceptance of Amendments Nos 4 and 9, which would exempt multi-packs of units which are themselves exempted yet which, when combined, exceed minimum threshold limitations. Such a provision would make possible complete circumvention of the directive itself. May I give an example in this regard? If you have 10 small bars of chocolate, normally exempt from price indication, and they are put into a large packet, you might have a complete pack of 500 g and that would not be exempt under the draft directive.

Finally, may I thank once again those who have spoken in the debate and those who have expressed an opinion through the committees for the contribution made to these directives which I hope will be adopted by the Council of Ministers before the end of this year.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

10. Turnover taxes

President. — The next item is the debate on the second report (Doc. A 2-15/85) by Mr Beumer, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, on

- the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-446/84 — COM(84) 391 final) for a Twentieth Directive on the harmonization of the laws of the Member States relating to turnover taxes — common system of value-added tax: derogations in connection with the special aids granted to certain farmers to compensate for the dismantlement of monetary compensatory amounts applying to certain agricultural products.

Mr Beumer (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy has altered the position it adopted with regard to the first report: we are now prepared to amend the Twentieth Directive — last time we rejected it — one of the reasons being that we feel that German farmers should not be made to pay for the difficult situation created mainly by the Council. That is why we adopted the amendments. Parliament has moreover never been opposed to aid as compensation for the dismantling of monetary compensatory amounts, but it believes that aid should be subject to certain conditions.

I shall begin, Mr President, with a brief outline of the amendments. As regards the first amendment, I cannot imagine what objections the Commission would have. We are calling for a new recital in the Twentieth Directive. This recital was not affected by the application of Article 93, and the Commissioner will be able to read that very recital in the Decision adopted on the basis of Article 93. This is an important point.

I would point out with regard to Amendment No 2 that it has always been the position of both the Commission and the Council that there must be a link between the dismantling of the MCAs and the nature of the aid. We have reaffirmed this principle in Amendment No 2. In connection with Amendment No 3, we feel that the Commission has a task to carry out in the remaining fields covered by the Council Decision, because aid has been fixed at a higher rate while at the same time the principle has been established that the dismantling of MCSs must not exceed the level of aid. This places the Commission in a position to make proposals when necessary. Hence this amendment.

We are pleased that the Commission is prepared to draw up a report, but such a report is highly important

Beumer

to us. What is at stake here is the instrument of VAT, and this also affects own resources. We therefore feel that the report should meet certain conditions, that we should exercise great care and that we should make certain stipulations concerning the objectives, fiscal neutrality and its effects.

We also think it important that the Commission should maintain its position concerning the separation of aid and VAT. I would like to ask the Commissioner for his opinion concerning Paragraph 22 of the motion for a resolution, in which we repeat that this must be an absolute prerequisite which must also be accepted by the Council. This point is also made in the Commission's proposal for the Twentieth Directive.

Amendment No 5. This limitation already existed in German law and has rightly been incorporated in amendment No 5. The Commission has already said that it will agree to this. I would ask the Commission whether it intends to adopt all our amendments, and if it replies that it cannot do so under this VAT proposal, I would ask it to devote particular attention to Paragraph 25 of our motion for a resolution, in which we call upon the Commission to put forward a new proposal for granting aid as from 1 January 1986. We would also like to hear whether the Commission is prepared to support us in talks with the Council, in particular if the financial consequences which can be expected to result from an incorrect application of the law on this matter could affect own resources, and in this connection I would refer to Paragraph 27 of the motion for a resolution.

Finally, I would point out that a major problem has remained for Parliament — namely, the legal problem of the correct or incorrect application of Article 93(2) of the EEC Treaty. Parliament considers that the Council should not have acted as it did, since this will have repercussions on the basis of Articles 43 and 100 of the Treaty. We also believe that the Commission should not have accepted its instructions for the Twentieth Directive in this way. Nevertheless, we did not want to block the issuing of an opinion, mainly because, as I have said, the German farmers would be the main ones to suffer.

We think it would be a good idea if Parliament's Bureau were to instruct the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights to issue an opinion on this matter — a letter to this effect has been sent by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy to the President of Parliament. Depending on the outcome of this, the Commission might be able to put forward a new proposal.

Mr De Vries (L). — (NL) I am replacing my colleague Mr Louwes, who is unfortunately unable to be present this evening owing to other commitments.

The Committee on Budgets considers the present proposal to be questionable in its content and unacceptable

from a procedural point of view. The Committee regards the proposal for a Twentieth Directive as questionable since it will be one more step on the way to degrading VAT returns from the status of own resources to national contributions.

The proposal is also questionable since it virtually ignores Parliament's opinion that aid to the German farmers should be degressive, temporary and restricted to the volume of income lost as a result of the fall in prices due to the dismantling of monetary compensatory amounts. Aid became effective on 1 July 1984, while MCAs were not reduced until 1 January 1985. The aid moreover covers all agricultural products, even those for which there were no MCAs, and the proposed rate of 5% seems to us to be much too high.

However, the Committee on budgets regards the procedure adopted by the Council as unacceptable: it is a series of legal manipulations. First of all, regulation 855/84 on the dismantling of MCAs does not contain a trace of the Commission's original proposal on which Parliament has delivered an opinion.

Secondly, the Council has refused to consult Parliament on this essentially new text, which in every respect conflicts with the spirit of the isoglucose judgments of the Court of Justice. Thirdly, the Council bases its decision No 84/361 on aid to German agriculture on Article 93(2) of the Treaty, thereby attempting to bypass both the Commission and Parliament.

The Council has unilaterally fixed the contribution which the Community will have to make towards financing the aid. This decision is in conflict with Article 203 of the Treaty and with the interinstitutional declaration of June 1982. It ignores the fact that the Community's budgetary authority consists of the Council and Parliament together.

Finally, this whole operation seeks merely to bring about the *post facto* legalization of what Germany has been doing on its own initiative. The German law of 29 June 1984 is directly in conflict with the Treaty of Rome as long as the Twentieth VAT Directive is not approved.

Mr President, in terms of Community law this version of 'Alice in Wonderland' is, as it stands, unacceptable to the Committee on Budgets, and I therefore call upon Parliament, on behalf of the Committee, to press for its amendment.

Mr Gautier (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. The Socialist Group supports Mr Beumer's report. Since Parliament rejected the Commission's proposal for a Twentieth VAT Directive last December — by a large majority despite a few embarrassed votes in favour of the proposal from German Christian Democrats — we in the Committee on Economic and

Gautier

Monetary Affairs have had a series of discussions with the Commission, particularly Lord Cockfield. The result of these discussions is that there is no result. The Commission is of the opinion that it must implement the results of the Fontainebleau summit, although in our view it should realize that this is neither reasonable from the point of view of agricultural policy nor legally defensible, and represents a major problem for the Community's own resources into the bargain.

At this point I would like to repeat that our Group considers it completely unacceptable from the legal point of view that the Council should set aside Community legislation based on Article 93(2). I can only support Mr Beumer on this matter. We have asked the President and the Parliamentary Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights for a firm opinion and will press for the matter to be fought out to the end, as a precedent is being set.

Furthermore, Mr Commissioner, I personally consider it completely unacceptable that the Commission should fail to meet its obligations under Article 155 of the EEC Treaty, in that the Federal Republic of Germany should be allowed to introduce a law — due to enter into force on 1 July — which is obviously at variance with Community law in the form of the Sixth VAT Directive. So before you introduce a Twentieth VAT Directive you must first of all amend the Sixth VAT Directive, and it is absolutely clear that the Commission must instruct the German Government not to implement this law, which was passed in June 1984, in order to fulfil its obligations under Article 155 of the EEC Treaty. It is completely beyond my comprehension that the Commission should accept a flagrant infringement of Community law by a Member State. Even if the Ministers and Heads of Government did decide this in Fontainebleau, these gentlemen and the lady who claims to be the sole master cannot break Community law.

The second point which I would like to bring up refers to the content. Our Group made it clear last December that we cannot, under any circumstances, accept the agricultural policy aspect of aid in the form of a value-added tax. Fair enough, but if we cannot get our way in this matter there is still at least the question of the level of VAT compensation. If the Federal Republic of Germany has decided upon 5% in its law, this contradicts all the Commission's calculations of the loss incurred by German farmers as a result of the abolition of monetary compensatory amounts.

Furthermore, in our opinion it is completely out of place for this 5% aid to be granted on all agricultural products, as many are in no way affected by the new green currency rate. At this point I would like to address Mr Bocklet and his Group: when agricultural price debates are concerned with increasing the prices of pigmeat, poultrymeat and the like, you argue that it does not matter whether the Community fixes higher prices, as prices are established on the market. In this

case I assume that it does not matter if green currencies are given new values, as prices will be subsequently established on the market. We can also see from market reactions that the dismantling of monetary compensatory amounts has absolutely no effects on the market prices of eggs, poultry or pigmeat. This means that aid for these products is completely out of place.

Let me now come to the last point, the possibility of fraud. We made it clear in December that we can see a whole range of ways in which unjustified aid could be obtained by circular trade. In his report, Mr Beumer has highlighted these examples in connection with the European Community's own resources. It is also possible to pick out a systematic method for obtaining aid on false pretences. This of course then has effects on the Community's own resources, because it does not contribute towards the national accounts, such transactions being nothing more than transfers for the purpose of obtaining the 5% aid.

For this reason, if our motions for amendments are not approved, we will insist on conciliation with the Council.

Mr Bocklet (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. After this discussion of certain detailed aspects I would like to draw your attention first of all to the causes underlying this entire debate. After all, it is a fact that some degree of calm returned to the field of agricultural prices only because the Federal Republic of Germany was prepared to dismantle the positive monetary compensatory amount of — at that time — 10.8%.

But this required an enormous sacrifice from German farmers in the form of a 3% revaluation of the positive compensatory amount as from 1 April 1984 followed by a 5% dismantling this year. Nobody can deny that this has meant an enormous loss of income for the farmers concerned.

I therefore consider it rather small-minded to try to make subsequent changes when the Heads of Government agreed in Fontainebleau that German farmers need special aid, now that they have made special sacrifices to enable the Community's agricultural system to work. If it didn't work, German farmers could not be held responsible.

In its resolution on agricultural prices last year, the European Parliament explicitly stated that the dismantling of the positive compensatory amounts must not be at the expense of German farmers. In my opinion, this means that we have no right to criticize any aid to German farmers.

On the other hand, as a Member of this House, I do support the criticism that recourse to Article 93 of the EEC Treaty — in order to by-pass not only the Com-

Bocklet

mission, but also Parliament — is hard to swallow for a parliament which is striving to achieve a political role. However, this criticism must not lead to our questioning these decisions, which have been taken lawfully under Article 93.

Nevertheless, the problem is now that we have two perfectly legal pieces of legislation which are mutually exclusive, i.e. Article 93 of the EEC Treaty and the Sixth VAT Directive. From the purely legal viewpoint the question is of course whether any damage has occurred, and at this point I would like to repeat that a 5% dismantling of the compensatory amount took place on 1 January this year and that this had been preceded by a revaluation which certainly, at least on the export market, worked to the disadvantage of German agriculture.

This means at least that the 5% increase in the flat-rate tax prepayment represents an admissible form and justified level of compensation.

Furthermore, the aid to be given under this system is to be progressively reduced and is for a limited time only. This means that the three conditions laid down in Mr Beumer's report are fulfilled. I would like to emphasize this.

Mr Gautier, you said that products which do not receive compensatory amounts would also benefit from the increased flat-rate tax prepayment. But the opposite could also be argued. Such products have so far not had the protection of compensatory amounts. Why should they now suffer when a certain privilege is being dismantled, and particularly when the dismantling of this privilege, i.e. the positive compensatory amount, involves suitable compensation?

This argument is just as defensible. Therefore we should ensure that this measure, within the context of the 20th VAT Directive, is implemented in such a way that it is also practicable. In practice it is not possible to distinguish between the aid component in the flat-rate tax prepayment and the VAT component.

Furthermore, Mr Beumer, the result of not separating these two items need not be a reduction in the European Community's VAT revenue, as the approximate effect can be calculated in advance and the Federal Republic's corresponding share of VAT revenue can be sent to Brussels.

I therefore appeal to you not to support the line followed by Mr Beumer. I represent a minority opinion in my Group, because I believe that Mr Beumer's report does not support reasonable compensation for German farmers, who really have brought a special sacrifice for the benefit of the Community.

Mr Pasty (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, the second report presented to us today by Mr Beumer is excel-

lent in all respects. It is excellent, but at the same time damning for the Council and both the old and the new Commissions. It is damning for the Council because, whatever the legal quibbles put forward, the invoking of Article 93(3) of the Treaty with no other purpose than to confront the Parliament and Commission with *fait accompli*, is improper and constitutes a major breach of procedure. The basic rights of Parliament have been flouted. But this report is also damning for the Commission, which has declined to assume its role of guardian of the Treaties. The German law concerned represents an infringement of the Sixth VAT Directive, yet the Commission has not reacted and still fails to do so.

The answers given to our rapporteur show that the Commission is embarrassed. It referred to the political aspect, but what, under these circumstances, is the value of the independence of the Commission as guaranteed by the Treaties? My question is as follows: is our Community still a community in which the rule of law prevails? This question, you will agree, is particularly relevant at a time when we are about to welcome two new Member States and when the problem of institutional reform is being considered.

The second point to which I would like to draw your attention is that practically no doubt remains that the new system will lead to over-compensation for German farmers. There are at least three reasons for this. First of all, the measure has been implemented six months before the dismantling of the MCAs. Secondly, it covers a much wider field, as it includes all products, whereas the effect of the dismantling of MCA is more restricted. Finally, 5% has been adopted as the general rule, whereas it was supposed to be a maximum. The system is unacceptable because its effect will be to perpetuate, in a different form and to the benefit of a single Member State, the MCA machinery, although it was precisely this which was to be dismantled, being contrary to the basic principles of the Common Market.

Moreover, Mr Beumer's arguments — which are not disputed by the Commission — are totally relevant: the new system in this form is a threat to the Community's own resources.

Finally, I would like to make it clear to our German friends that we are not disputing the principle of aid to their farmers in order to compensate for the negative effects on their incomes of the dismantling of the MCAs but the same problem arises — and here it is equally serious — in the case of farmers who have had to contend with negative MCAs. They have been heavily penalized by the increase in production costs, which they were unable to add on to their sales prices. What we must call for, all together, is an overall study of farmers' incomes throughout the Community, taking into account the monetary distortions which in recent years have prevented the common agricultural policy from working properly.

Pasty

Our Group wants the Commission to consider this more Community-orientated approach to the problem when reviewing the working of the common agricultural policy. As the rapporteur suggested, the Commission ought to come up with a new proposal abolishing all forms of compensation through VAT channels, since this form of aid increases distortions between holdings and therefore does not appear to be the most suitable way to eliminate inequalities of income.

In the light of these considerations, our Group will give its unanimous support to the amendments and motion for a resolution tabled by the rapporteur.

Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, may I start by expressing my appreciation to Mr Beumer for the conclusion that he has expressed — namely, that as rapporteur he would suggest to the Parliament that Parliament should now given an opinion on the draft directive. Secondly, I would like to say that this report is an exceptionally comprehensive and detailed review of all the issues involved, and it contains a most able analysis of the problems, difficulties and issues of principle. Whether one agrees with what it says or not, it is a very fine piece of work indeed.

May I now go on to say that the substance of the proposal rests, of course, upon Council Regulation No 855/84 of 31 March 1984 and the Council Decision of 30 June 1984. The Commission's advice is that both the regulation and the decision were legally made and there are no grounds on which the Commission would be able to challenge them. The directive merely gives effect to the VAT consequences of the regulation and the decision, and the Commission would not think it right to use the opportunity of the directive to attempt to challenge the substance of both the regulation and the decision. As Parliament will know, the Commission played no part in making either the regulation or the decision and we therefore regard the differences of opinion which exist between Parliament and Council as a matter for them to resolve and not a matter which directly concerns the Commission itself.

The report by the committee includes on page 29 a letter written by my colleague, Vice-President Andriessen, and also on page 41 a copy of a letter which I wrote myself. Those two letters set out in great detail the Commission's views on all the major issues involved. Because of the arguments advanced in those two letters, which are on the record and which are reproduced in this document, the Commission is unable to accept Amendments Nos 1, 2 and 3, and I refer of course to the amendment paper and not to the original report itself. For the reasons set out in those letters, the Commission is unable to accept those amendments. So far as Amendments Nos 4 and 5 are concerned, these give effect to certain proposals that I myself put to the committee when I appeared before them. Despite the fact that the committee themselves

seemed to hold no very great opinion of the offer I had made, and I refer, in particular, to paragraph 23 of their motion for a resolution, I made the offer and therefore I stand by it. The Commission will accept the final two amendments, Nos 4 and 5.

Mr Beumer also raised the question of conciliation, which is dealt with in paragraph 27 of the motion for a resolution. The question of asking for conciliation is entirely a matter for the Parliament to decide, but if Parliament does ask for conciliation, the Commission would be very willing to give whatever help it could to both parties in that procedure.

Finally, Mr Beumer referred to paragraph 22 in the motion for a resolution, which requests the Commission to undertake to withdraw the proposal in certain circumstances. I am afraid I could not give such an undertaking for this reason. We do not at this stage know what the reaction of the Council will be, what amendments they may seek to make in the directive, and it would be quite wrong for the Commission to undertake to take certain action in the event of certain unknown events occurring in the future. This is a matter of general principle. We could not enter into an undertaking of that kind.

Having said this, I should like to repeat my appreciation both of the very detailed exposition that does appear in this document and of Mr Beumer's own conclusion as to the course of action we should now follow.

Mr Beumer (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to make a statement and ask a question. My statement is that the Commissioner has said that he is prepared to help Parliament with regard to a conciliation procedure, since Parliament holds the view that there are likely to be financial consequences, particularly as regards own resources.

I should also like to ask a question, Mr President. Both in Mr Andriessen's letter, to which the Commissioner referred, and in its own letter, the Commission states that it considers it essential to make a clear distinction between aid and VAT, so that it is very obvious whether own resources are involved or not. With regard to this I should like to ask a very specific question: what will the Commission's attitude be if the Council does not accept this? This is a most important point.

Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, so far as the first point is concerned, Mr Beumer said that I had said that the Commission would support Parliament in asking for the conciliation procedure. That is not exactly what I said. What I said was that it was a matter for the Parliament itself to decide whether to initiate that procedure, but if the Parliament did decide to initiate the procedure, the

Lord Cockfield

Commission would then give every assistance to both sides.

So far as the second point is concerned, the directive does itself require the aid and the VAT element to be distinguished. We do not at this stage know just what the Council's reaction to that will be. There has been some suggestion that they might themselves put forward some alternative proposal. It is quite impossible for the Commission to decide what their actions should be until such time as they see what action the Council itself takes or does not take in this matter.

Mr Patterson (ED). — I can quite understand that the Commissioner does not wish to accept exactly paragraph 22 because it envisages circumstances which have not yet taken place. But could he undertake to inform Parliament if the situation arises in Council where what is envisaged in paragraph 22 is about to take place, so that we could then have a further consultation with him as to what action the Commission should take?

Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, with respect, I think the procedures of the Council are a matter for the Council rather than for the Commission.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

(The sitting was suspended at 7.55 p.m. and resumed at 9 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

Vice-President

11. *FAO World Conference on Fisheries*

President. — The next item is the report by Mrs Ewing, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, on the follow-up to the FAO World Conference on Fisheries (Rome, 27 June to 6 July 1984) (Doc. A 2-3/85).

Mrs Ewing (RDE), rapporteur. — Mr President, when I was told in my absence, because I was chairing my Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, that I had been appointed rapporteur, I asked, 'Which part of the world?' and the answer was, 'Just the world!' The whole world and nothing but the

world! It was a bit of a shock, because that is quite a responsibility for any rapporteur.

However, I came with quite good credentials, because Mr Fich and I were the rapporteurs for the EEC, along with the representatives of Somalia and Mauritania for the Lomé countries, on the subject of ACP fisheries. So I came with quite good credentials and quite good experience, having personally visited 27 States, in 25 of which I had met the fishing interests and seen the fishermen in operation.

Before we begin, I would like to say that the FAO, whose report on their first World Fisheries Conference we are considering, and the EEC, with our very strong commitment to fishing in the ACP, are in the same business. We are in the business of winning the race against hunger through the use of fish. I do not say use of the sea, because it is not only the sea, of course, it also includes rivers, dams, artificial ponds and so on. In a way I felt very happy to have the honour of this congratulatory experience in view of the FAO's fine initiative and their grand design, which is a world fisheries policy.

It is absolutely the case, I think, that we, the EEC and the FAO, must not overlap and must not neglect our mutual interests, and my conclusions point to the fact that we must cultivate closer liaison with the FAO. But we should like to put on record our congratulations to the FAO on this initiative, in which 147 States of the world have made very constructive contributions and are trying to deal with the most complicated matter, which is the gathering of statistics. On the other hand, we do know a number of things; at least some statistics are accepted, and they are quite horrific.

The world catch is 76m tonnes. Most international maritime fishing is in the waters of the developing countries. The annual increase lately has only been about 1%-2%, whereas the population growth makes it clear that the demand for fish will by the year 2000 be 100-110m tonnes. There is therefore a shortfall, colleagues, of about 30m tonnes per annum. That is the sordid reality that we all face.

It is not that the developing countries are catching all the fish in their waters, of course, because they are catching one-tenth, and they now have an economic zone of 200 miles. Nor is it that we in the EEC are in any way in conflict with the best interests of these countries, because in the waters of the ACP countries, which constitute most of the developing coastal States, we are catching only one-hundredth. The truth is that the waters of these countries are being raped by great fleets from Japan, Korea and the Soviet Union, although there is a sign, I think, that the Soviet fleet is on the decrease. These fleets are taking the fish back for their own people to eat. There is really no lasting maritime benefit from these rapist fleets to the developing countries: they take what they can get to feed

Ewing

their own people. They do not consider conservation or the fishing of tomorrow.

Another horrific piece of statistical information is, of course, that about 30% of the world catch ends up feeding animals. That is a situation which surely cannot be tolerated in view of the known starvation problems we have.

Meantime, aquaculture is the sleeping giant, one of the great hopes. At the moment it accounts for 8.5m tonnes, but it is showing a growth at the moment of about 6% a year. I could bore you to death with examples, but I would like to tell you about Zaire, where I saw in a village area what they called 'the 52 fishponds'. They easily make a fishpond: the idea is to make 52, and every week one is drained. The fish are left — not the noble species of fish, you understand, but ordinary fish that the people can feed their old vegetables to and so on. Every week that area has a fishpond dried out and they have the fish for the people.

You could see as you passed the villages the sign of the fish, which is the same as the Christian sign on the doors, meaning they were selling fish. That, of course, is a part of Africa where there is water, where the drip, drip, drip of the water is very much like that in the Highlands of Scotland.

However, aquaculture can be arranged in less favourable geographical situations and even Ethiopia has great lakes in the desert which could have been exploited and developed and which, I am sure, will be in the future. In aquaculture China and Asia are very far ahead, while Africa, in which the EEC has a particular interest, is very far behind.

The FAO, as I have explained in my resolution, have really set out practical programmes. I have explained that their budget is never enough, but, in a certain way, I was anxious to show that with our commitment to Lomé, we were really working along the same lines. I have concluded by trying to show that we should try to work more closely with the FAO, whose people on the ground, in the countries I have visited, have been superb — brilliant people. My final conclusions, in paragraphs 11 to 14, call for more practical ways in which we can help in the FAO's quite clear desire to make fishing a priority, as indeed Lomé III made fishing a separate chapter and encouraged all the Member States to regard it as a priority.

Other points that cannot be ignored are the need to recognize that the women in developing countries are the people who can be educated about nutrition. This is something I have experienced at first hand in countries like Malawi, where children were often suffering from malnutrition unnecessarily, and the solution lies in educating the women to go back to teach other women that they do not need to have their children in this situation.

I do not think I need say very much more. We are both, the FAO and the EEC, working toward the same end, but certain things must be said. For example, regional cooperation. We would quarrel with the FAO in that they have not paid enough attention to that aspect, but both institutions have agreed that small is beautiful usually, that the promises of Russia, Senegal and Mauritania to build great freezing-plants and train the fishermen have not worked, whereas promises to show people in Malawi or Senegal how to smoke dried fish as they caught them in small kilns, burning nuts taken from their own trees, have been more practical. We are working along the same lines, but what concerns me — and I have this on record — is that we are not working together closely enough. I have tried to stress this in my resolution, and I think it means that someone from the Fisheries Sub-committee must accept the invitation of FAO, for we must work more closely together since we are both trying to win the race against world hunger.

(Applause)

Mrs Pery (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the struggle against hunger in the world is one of the constant preoccupations of our Parliament. As Mrs Ewing has very correctly stressed in her report, one of the main aims of the FAO Conference in Rome was to make numerous developing countries aware of the nutritional value of fish and fishery products. The Director-General of the FAO has said that the demand for fish for human consumption will double between now and the year 2000 and that demand will be the greatest in developing countries, as a result of their increasing populations.

But we must not forget that currently, for example in the waters off the ACP States, out of a total production of 15 million tonnes, less than one tenth is fished by the coastal states concerned. The majority is caught by large fleets from other countries, as mentioned by Mrs Ewing.

In recent years the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea has declared that coastal States have the right to a zone extending to 200 nautical miles from the coast. In this zone the Third World countries own both the living and mineral resources found in the sea. But sometimes a country has no tradition of fishing or has only a small unsophisticated fleet, and is tempted, or pressurized by budgetary considerations, to sell fishing rights to industrialized countries.

Out of the 70 million tonnes of fish caught in the world every year, 30% ends up as fishmeal for animals. In some cases the production of fishmeal, which has little commercial value, is the only economically viable way to use the available resources. However, the FAO has estimated that some 6 million tonnes of fishmeal produced in Africa alone for consumption by animals could be diverted to consumption by the local populations.

Pery

The agreements reached between developing countries and the industrialized nations must ensure that there is a balance of interests between the two parties. We, the European Community, have made fishing agreements with Senegal and Guinea Bissau for example, and a further agreement is due to be signed with Madagascar. In exchange for fishing rights we provide, in addition to payment, technical and scientific cooperation and vocational training.

We must help the developing countries to make better use of their fishery resources, to exercise control over them, to improve fish processing and marketing, to develop marine and freshwater aquaculture and to modernize their traditional fleets.

I would like to dwell for a moment on this latter aspect. Currently some 10 million small traditional Third World fishermen in their canoes sometimes have to battle against the giant trawlers of the industrialized nations. Local fishing produces 20 million tonnes of fish. Given that we talk so much about developing countries' self-sufficiency in food, we must preserve this traditional fleet by assisting modernization and closing coastal waters to outside fleets. These measures would allow annual Third World production to double.

The FAO World Conference adopted five action programmes — which I strongly support — aimed in this direction. They will require an annual budget of at least 15 million dollars.

I would also like to mention that for the first time an entire chapter has been devoted to fishing in the Third Convention of Lomé. It is to be hoped that all these measures will be coordinated as well as possible in order to maximize their efficiency. The development of fishing can then contribute to reducing distress in the developing countries by helping to relieve the world's malnutrition problems.

(Applause)

Mr Ebel (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen who are still holding out on behalf of my Group I would like to pay tribute to the FAO World Fisheries Conference which took place in Rome from 27 June to 6 July 1984. We regard the organization of this Conference as an expression of the will to put into practice the policy of redistributing marine resources in accordance with the Convention on the Law of the Sea of December 1982, in other words to create a world fishing policy.

The aim of the Conference was to make a contribution towards solving the world food problem and to identify ways of improving fishery management, developing production and changing eating habits. By the latter I mean reducing protein deficiency by eating fish.

We consider the Conference to have been a success, as the developing countries were not only informed about the benefits of fishing from the economic point of view, but also — or rather above all — from the food policy aspect. They were made to appreciate the need to develop a fishing industry geared to meeting the needs of the local population rather than to providing products for export to the industrialized nations. Furthermore, industrialized nations were encouraged to help finance the agreed measures in Third World countries, as the action programmes adopted at the Conference are mainly dependent on funds to be provided independently of the FAO budget.

In this connection it is with a certain amount of satisfaction that we can point to the contribution of the European Community towards the implementation of the action programmes in the form of financial and technical support within the framework of existing cooperation agreements, in particular Lomé III. The aid provided by the European Community in the context of Lomé III corresponds exactly to the follow-up measures envisaged by the FAO and aims to increase catches, improve the management and protection of fishing zones, develop fishprocessing and marketing and promote the training of fishermen.

Taking things a little further, Parliament must ensure that there is consistency between the initiatives of world organizations and the measures taken by the European Community. Secondly, there must be more detailed discussion, in particular with the ACP States, on the aims and results of these initiatives and measures. Finally, we must take steps to ensure that in future the Community is represented in all international bodies and institutions in which the problems arising from the establishment of a world fishing policy are discussed. In our opinion this is the only way to guarantee a permanent connection between bodies working at world level and the regional organizations responsible in the final analysis for the implementation of these recommendations.

As the principles which I have briefly described are excellently presented in the report I would like to recommend the House, on behalf of my Group, to approve the report without reservations. My compliments to the rapporteur, Mrs Ewing, on her excellent work.

(Applause)

Mr Battersby (ED). — Mr President, I had the honour to represent Parliament at the FAO World Conference last July, and I should like to congratulate Mrs Ewing on her excellent report. The conference was attended by every fishing nation in the world. Every nation agreed that we are very rapidly reaching a plateau in fish-catch potential. The time is rapidly approaching where all nations, East and West, North

Battersby

and South, must begin to farm the seas and to manage the fisheries resource rather than pillage it.

This evening I should like to concentrate on the Third World, which is facing a dramatic population explosion, especially in Africa, where the population is doubling every 20 years and where, despite the ravages of famine and disease, it may well be approaching one thousand million by the turn of the century. The question is, do we want a confident, healthy Africa capable of feeding itself or a sick Africa with a short expectation of life, short of protein, staggering from disaster to disaster and depending on others for its very survival?

One of the unexploited protein resources of the Third World is fish. Fish in the seas, fish in the lakes, aquaculture. The FAO has done much positive and effective work in this area. However, the figure the FAO is proposing to meet the present crisis — 15.6 million dollars — is pitifully inadequate and FAO must reconsider. It is not enough, Sir!

As Mrs Ewing and Mrs Pery have both pointed out, of the 15 million tonnes of fish in Third World waters, only 1.5 — that is, 10% — is landed in the Third World. Fifty million tonnes, at the rate of 10 kilograms processed product per person per year, which is what we eat in the EEC, would feed over one thousand million people.

The rapporteur and Mrs Pery have both mentioned fishmeal. The FAO and Norway have both carried out work on high-quality fishmeal as a protein additive to cereals for human consumption. I believe that we should encourage this approach and even possibly finance research in this direction. It is very relevant to tropical lowprotein diet areas where biscuits produced from fishmeal, powdered milk and cereals can save millions of lives.

We must help the Third World and especially Africa to develop its own fishery resources for its own consumption. I believe we should help in the following ways. We should provide small, simple, inexpensive steel — because wood does not work in tropical waters — fishing-boats with easily maintained engines, easily maintained winches, simple electronics and adequate spare parts. We must help in training fishermen in effective fishing techniques and catch preservation. We must help people in training the processors and the port operators. We must train people in providing refrigeration, processing and distribution equipment and give them the necessary know-how. We must help Africa to develop the untapped resources of the Great Lakes. We have to find some way of cooperating with the People's Republic of China, which has the greatest experience in the world in this direction, in developing rural aquaculture in Africa. We must cooperate to the full with FAO in its work in developing Third World fisheries.

The Commission attends all meetings of FAO in its own right as an observer. I agree with Mrs Ewing that Parliament must also participate in all these meetings to ensure that the political will of this Parliament is both fully informed, is properly expressed and, because of our duty to the Third World, is effective.

(Applause)

Mr Clinton (PPE). — Mr President, by now all the experts have spoken and what I have to say will not add much, I am quite sure. I am sorry I was not here for all of the debate, but I did not think it would start this early.

May I begin by saying that this report by Mrs Ewing provides us all with a fund of information and a very valuable reference source that all of us should keep. This is not just a report from the Fisheries Sub-committee to the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, but it should be read with interest by all those Members who are interested in aid to the Third World and, more particularly, ACP-EEC Committee members.

May I say with great conviction that the right person was chosen for this report. Mrs Ewing's well-known interest in fisheries and her commitment and wide experience as a member of the ACP-EEC delegation are reflected throughout this report. I have often wondered why the FAO had not moved much sooner to look at the fisheries sector as a main source of protein to balance the diet of under-nourished people in the Third World. Earlier this year when we were in Burundi, we visited Lake Tanganyika and we were told there that 75 000 tonnes of fish were produced there each year, but the experts assured us that if this lake were properly managed 300 000 tonnes could be produced. This is just one small indication of the enormous potential that is there. I think we should pay a tribute to the FAO for the way they prepared and organized the first World Conference on Fisheries, which was such a tremendous success.

The fact that no less than 147 countries attended this conference in Rome must, in itself, give a wonderful boost to the effort now being made to get a worthwhile fisheries development scheme under way.

This, of course, is an enormous undertaking, but one that deserves the most generous support and encouragement. I hope that it will be the aim and intention of the European Community to cooperate with the FAO to the maximum, because I believe that we have much to contribute from the experience we have had, and are still having in fact, in organizing and developing our own fisheries.

It is very encouraging to read in the report that already there have been many offers to provide training to persons from developing countries, because

Clinton

education and training in a wide variety of skills is going to be a very important element in the success of this venture.

The FAO programme, described in the report, is a very ambitious one. In fact, it may even be overambitious for a start and for those who may be called upon to provide the resources. I am a great believer in a number of small projects, well carried out, for stimulating interest and producing encouraging rewards and experience: projects that would involve the production and the handling and the marketing of fish, and of course the preparation and cooking for consumption at local level. I think this is where we have to start. We have to start providing nourishment and balance in the food of people who badly need it, rather than helping them to export and get this valuable food out of the country.

I was pleased to see the stress that was laid on small-scale fisheries and aquaculture. This is something that can be got off the ground comparatively cheaply and quickly. The longer-term overall development of the industry will require very heavy investment in things like harbour development, boats, gear, handling facilities, refrigeration and all that goes with the modern fisheries industry.

I believe there is much evidence to indicate that a lot of money is wasted in developing countries by not sending in people who have the sort of experience and skills needed to see that it is wisely invested, that there is a proper follow-through and that the native population is able to carry on the project when the experts leave.

In conclusion, Mr President, may I express the hope that the European Community will keep in very close touch with developments and that we shall always have one or two people attending fisheries meetings of the FAO in the years ahead.

(Applause)

Mr C. Beazley (ED). — Mr President, I should like to add my voice to those who have already congratulated Mrs Ewing on presenting this report and also my colleague, Mr Battersby, whose motion for a resolution promoted the report and who, as we have heard already, attended the conference in question.

I think this report is one of extreme importance. The public throughout Europe has been seized by the gravity of the famine which affects the Third World at the moment, and in particular the African continent. This is a very positive example of how the European Community, working together, not for its own internal interests but on a world scale, can have a very direct impact. I hope that the publicity which has been given to the whole question of development and the relationship between the North and South in the world

will extend to cover the fisheries question. Far too often in the past fisheries have suffered from obscurity in publicity terms, because they are dwarfed in the public's mind by agriculture. I would suggest that this is a very parochial view and that it is reports such as Mrs Ewing's which have done so much to correct the balance.

The impact that fisheries and the extension of fishing may have on combating world famine is obviously a very important consideration, but it can only affect relatively few people in the countries concerned until the infrastructure of these countries is also improved quite considerably. This is something which the European Community has already shown an interest in.

I do not wish to deflect the debate at this stage from the question of development, and particularly the Third World, but I wish briefly to refer to Mr Battersby's original motion for a resolution, and to the first paragraph, which states: 'The European Parliament believes that the European Community has an increasingly important rôle to play in the field of world fisheries development and management'. I would refer, in this connection, to Mr Provan's motion which was passed by this Parliament in connection with the Falkland Islands and to the possible interest that the Spanish fishing-fleet, shortly to join the European Community's fleets, might have in this question, which would benefit our own domestic fisheries.

However, do not let us lose sight of the major point of this report, which is a further attempt by the European Community to add its experience to the cause of fighting world hunger by cooperating bilaterally with the world institutions — the FAO in this case. It is to be widely supported, and I hope it will also get the publicity which it deserves.

(Applause)

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Thank you, Mr President, for allowing me as representative, of the Commission to be present at this evening's debate on Mrs Ewing's report. I think it is a valuable piece of work for which I would like to express my gratitude on behalf of the Commission. Mrs Ewing's introductory remarks were — I hope I may use the expression — visionary, in that she stressed the important possibilities which exist for solving the food problem in large areas of the world by means, for example, of rational development of fisheries and modern aquaculture. At the same time, there have been other speeches which also pointed to several practical possibilities and conclusions to be drawn from this point of view.

I would like to take this opportunity to express the Commission's agreement with the report we are discussing this evening, thanks to Mrs Ewing, and I

Christophersen

would like to take this opportunity of repeating, on behalf of the Commission, it is the right occasion, that the Community continues to believe, that we really should provide every conceivable financial and practical assistance for the development of this type of activity under the Lomé Convention and the other cooperation agreements.

I shall not now deal in depth with the many problems it raises, even though as a Dane I obviously now something about the problems which reliance on fishing can entail. However, I am sure that especially the experience we have in Europe — and Europe probably has the longest-standing and must highly fishing tradition in the world — can be of great benefit to the countries which are only now beginning to use these great resources on a rational basis. I assure you of the Commission's agreement and willingness to draw the conclusions from this more general point of view, because I know very well, since I am also responsible for the budget, that in the end it can very quickly be reduced to a question of funds. But we must look into this.

The Commission also agrees with the report on the more specific problem of the need for the Community to be able to participate as broadly as possible in the international negotiations dealing with fisheries issues, and first and foremost of course, the negotiations taking place in the FAO. Here we face a kind of international law problem, but it does not alter the fact that the Commission is prepared once more, using the opportunity provided by this report and debate, to study ways and means of obtaining better status for the Community than it currently has in the FAO. And this of course is particularly important because it is now the Community responsibility and only the Community which is responsible for a whole series of items within the fisheries sector, as a result of the common fisheries policy which was finally adopted in January 1983. The Community thus has sole responsibility in central areas, of fisheries policy just as it has in the field of trading policy. This in my view will be an important argument when we try to convince the FAO that the Community must have a better place at the negotiating table and a further conclusion which the Commission is prepared to draw from Mrs Ewing's report, the work which has already been completed and the speeches made this evening, for which I would like to thank you once more.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting-time.

12. Customs debt

President. — The next item is the report by Dame Shelagh Roberts, on behalf of the Committee on

External Economic Relations (Doc. 2-1590/84), on the

- proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-620/84 — COM(84) 395 final) for a regulation on customs debt.

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, this report, as you have already indicated to the House, relates to an existing directive which specifies the circumstances in which there is an obligation to pay customs debt. The purpose of the Commission proposal is to transform that directive into a regulation as part of the Commission's programme to achieve a greater uniformity of application in fiscal matters, with which I would expect the House to be broadly in agreement.

The proposal differs from the existing directive in several ways, four of which are important, although two are not contentious, or were not considered to be contentious by either the Committee on External Economic Relations or the committees which gave advice to the Committee on External Economic Relations. The two which are not thought to be contentious concern a change in the arrangements for the incurrence of a customs debt on temporary importation arrangements and provision for customs debt incurred under the inward processing arrangements, in certain circumstances, when goods are exported to an EFTA country or to a new Member State during a period of transition.

However, I must draw the attention of the House to the fact that there are two other variations to the Council directive which are clearly controversial having regard to the opinions given by the various committees and the discussions which have taken place. These two points concern, firstly, the treatment of goods in illegal circulation and, secondly, the liability to customs debt of goods consumed or used in a free zone.

Now on the first point, concerning the treatment of goods in illegal circulation, I have to say to the House that the Committee on External Economic Relations thought that this issue was, in general, outside our competence. As the final paragraph of my explanatory statement indicates, we took the view that we should defer to the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee because we did believe it to be primarily a legal matter.

In other words, we adopted the amendments to the proposal for a regulation which would exclude from customs debt goods which could be marketed legally only in exceptional circumstances. The type of goods that were envisaged in this respect would be drugs, armaments and the products which were manufactured from endangered species. We accepted the view of the Legal Affairs Committee that such matters were more appropriately dealt with through criminal rather than fiscal codes. If I may express a personal view, I

Shelagh Roberts

share that opinion. I believe that in those circumstances the matters would be more appropriately dealt with through the criminal code.

With regard to the other controversial item, concerning the liability to customs debt of goods consumed or used in the free zone, our amendment here was intended to clarify the wording relating to the circumstances under which goods in free zones would become liable to a customs debt. We had a full discussion in committee before adopting the amendments relating to this aspect. It has become apparent from subsequent amendments which have been tabled to the report which is now before the House that the mover of this proposition in the Committee on External Relations, Mr Seeler, has had further thoughts. I do not wish to pronounce one way or the other on his further thoughts. It is my view that Mr Seeler must explain his views, his change of mind, and that he must seek, if he is able, to persuade the House that his view is the better proposition.

With those introductory comments, I move the report.

(Applause)

Mr Rogalla (S), draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. At this late hour we should not forget the citizens who are here, listening to our debates and who — just like us — are unaccustomed to working at this time. I trust that they will leave us with the impression that even during the night we sometimes have to concern ourselves with very technical questions which have been submitted for our consideration.

In addition to what was said this afternoon on the subject of freedom of movement, particularly for persons — I was privileged to be the draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Legal Affairs — I would like to address the Vice-President of the Commission, who is following this work from the viewpoint of the Commission. From customs sign to customs debt — there is a play on words here which is unfortunately not possible in Vice-President Cockfield's mother tongue — we still have, as pointed out in the opinion drafted for the Committee on Legal Affairs, a whole series of conventional legal concepts, some of which have been made obsolete by developments at European level.

This is the case with customs signs in the customs union, although they still have their meaning for the purposes of customs debt. The customs debt is a legal process for anyone who obtains income in a customs territory and fixes the time when it will be received. It is therefore of great importance for the financing of the European Community, which of course receives all income from customs duties on imports from third countries.

I am saying this first, because the question which I have to put to you on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs also affects whether or not income for the Commission is legally justified. If no customs debt is incurred by certain illegal transactions such as mentioned by the rapporteur — drugs or illegally imported weapons, for example — it follows that the Community cannot claim the corresponding dues.

This means that the way this House decides when it votes on this legal dispute tomorrow is very important. In my opinion the House would do well to abide by the unanimous opinion of the Committee on Legal Affairs.

This brings me to the problem itself, which has been on the agenda of several meetings of the Committee on Legal Affairs. The question particularly concerns whether a customs debt is incurred by the illegal import of drugs — in other words, whether the Community has a right to the corresponding dues. It could be argued under certain circumstances the customs debt incurred should not be claimed.

The alternative is to say from the outset that illegal imports are not covered by Article 3(b) of the EEC Treaty. In other words drugs are not economic goods intended for processing of any kind and that, therefore, no customs debt is incurred — the legal consequence of which is that no duties are receivable on the one hand and there are no exemptions on the other.

This is the question which has to be answered. The Committee on Legal Affairs has based its opinion on judgment by the Court of Justice of the European Communities, which has been upheld in several cases in 1981, 1982 and 1984. The Court decided on the basis of the Council Directive, which was not a legal basis, that goods in illegal circulation do not incur a customs debt.

I would therefore like to ask the House to approve proposals for Amendments Nos 9 and 13 tabled by the Committee on Legal Affairs with the agreement of the rapporteur.

(Applause)

Mr Seeler (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. It is only on the surface that the regulation on customs debt is a purely technical matter with no political implications. In actual fact the workability of many free ports and free zones in the Community is at stake. For this reason I would like to follow the advice of my Chairman in order to convince those present — around 25 members of the House — that my proposals for amendments are necessary.

Free ports and free zones have up to now been treated as if they did not belong to the Community's customs territory. This means that goods can be imported into

Seeler

and exported from these places without incurring a customs debt. Illegal use and consumption there is punishable by, in some cases substantial fines. These legal provisions are very important for free ports and allow them to operate effectively.

I make no secret of the fact that this system is of vital importance for my home city of Hamburg and helps to compensate for the geographical disadvantages resulting from its position at the edge of the European Community and 120 km from the sea.

As we know, the Commission has been working on a standardized legal basis for free zones for years — so far without concrete results. Now, this draft regulation will to all intents and purposes change the status of free zones and ports, in that in future the consumption and illegal use of goods in a free zone will incur a customs debt. This means that free ports and zones are being partly drawn into the customs territory.

In this sense the regulation differs fundamentally from the previous Council Directive of 1979 on the harmonization of provisions relating to customs debt. These new provisions would cause considerable difficulties in practice. Just imagine: all goods entering and leaving a free zone or port would have to be recorded, and any differences investigated.

Anyone acquainted with the operation of a large port knows how often losses are incurred during storage, loading and transport. In future all this will have to be investigated in detail, leading to more and more bureaucracy. My previous motion for amendment, which the Committee on External Economic Relations has approved, is not sufficient to prevent this. The only way is to delete the provision concerned.

The draft regulation is also inconsistent. Article 8, paragraph 2(d) says that an existing customs debt is extinguished when goods are brought from the customs territory of the Community to a free zone. Conversely, this means — according to my way of thinking — that goods in a free zone cannot incur a customs debt.

Therefore we expect the Commission to put forward a general regulation on free zones, in which the rules on incurring and extinguishing customs debts are laid down once and for all. If the Commission does not think it is in the position to withdraw this draft, it should then at least maintain the current status of free zones. For this reason we ask for Article 2, paragraph 1(e) of the draft regulation to be deleted.

I am sorry for the often very technical and perhaps complicated nature of my remarks, but customs matters — even in Europe — are like that.

(Applause)

Mrs Van Rooy (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, the draft regulation being discussed here today seems at

first sight to be a purely technical matter, the conversion of a directive into a regulation. There are, however, a number of reasons for devoting particular attention to this subject.

In the first place, it is worth emphasizing that the method of settling customs debt is directly linked with fundamental aspects of the EEC, a properly functioning customs union and our own resources respectively. Secondly, there is more at stake than simply turning a directive into a regulation since the Commission is taking this opportunity to amend and alter sections of the 1979 text.

Before going on to discuss these additions, I would first like to comment on the legal instrument proposed by the Commission, i.e. a regulation. My Group is completely in agreement with the European Commission's desire to increase the use of regulations in defining European customs law since this offers the best guarantee of uniform application, throughout the Member States, of Community customs provisions. While on the subject, I would like to point out that EEC customs legislation is steadily developing into a patchwork of innumerable directives and regulations which are themselves amended from time to time. The legislation as a whole thus becomes extremely confusing for those using it, particularly customs authorities and, of course, industry.

My Group therefore urges the creation of a code of customs law and that this be tackled with considerable urgency. It is from that standpoint that I now put a specific question to the Commission: exactly how long does it think it will take to produce such a code of customs law? Although we are very largely in agreement with Mr Seeler's amendment on this point, we do not wish to support it completely because we are not prepared to go as far as to ask for the withdrawal of this customs regulation merely to accelerate the creation of a code. After all, the regulation we are discussing today cannot be studied in isolation from other regulations in this field, such as those concerning the persons subject to customs debt and the accountancy procedures and payment conditions applicable to this debt. It is an interlocking complex requiring simultaneous treatment and we want to avoid any delay.

I come now, Mr President, to a number of marginal notes to the Commission's proposed changes. The first concerns the additional provision that illegally imported goods should also be subject to customs debt. We are in complete agreement since the aim of import duties is the protection of the Community's economy and that therefore no distinction can be made in the application of the tariffs in favour of goods that regularly, but illegally, enter the Community. Waiving customs debt for illegal imports would, after all, mean rewarding the importation of illegal goods which is obviously not the aim of the exercise. For this reason, we see no grounds whatever for further exemptions such as those proposed by the

Van Rooy

Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights. We will therefore not support those amendments which, as they are now formulated, would lead in my own country, for example, to freedom from customs debt for illegally imported weapons; our law requires a licence for all guns. In our view, that's wrong and we therefore withhold support for the Legal Affairs Committee's amendments while fully supporting the policy adopted by the Commission.

This is not, however, the case for the Commission's proposals on free zones where I am in complete agreement with the amendment as put forward by Mr Seeler. I would like to remind Members that Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Directive on free zones stated that goods in such zones are outside the Community customs area. These goods may not be treated any differently from goods stored in third countries which in turn means that there can never be any question of a customs charge at the time of importation. The key point here is that the Commission's proposal to go ahead, after all, with the imposition under specific circumstances of a customs debt in free harbours is in fundamental conflict with the provisions of this directive and forms an equally fundamental infringement of the existing system of free ports. If the Commission wants to change that system, it should do so by changing the basis of that system, by amending the directive on free ports, and not by using the roundabout tactic of this regulation to impose fundamental changes. That is a quite unacceptable approach and one that explains our support for Mr Seeler's amendment.

Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the Commission. —

Mr President, I am grateful to Dame Shelagh Roberts, rapporteur of your Committee on External Economic Relations, both for her report and for the way she introduced the debate. Her report, if I may quote, 'endorses the proposals under consideration'. The draft regulation deals with customs debt generally as it provides that, in accordance with the practice currently adopted where goods are seized and confiscated, the customs debt should be extinguished. This is a perfectly reasonable practice. Customs duties are, in effect, a charge levied on the import of goods. If the goods are seized and confiscated, the reason for the levy of the duty disappears, and it is reasonable that the customs debt should be extinguished.

The Committee on External Economic Relations recommended that the opinion of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizen's Rights should also be sought. Mr Rogalla was draftsman of this committee's opinion, and this opinion contains a reservation which relates to prohibited drugs, where importation is illegal.

The draft directive provides that prohibited drugs which are imported illegally should be dealt with for customs debt purposes in the same way as any other imports. That is to say, that there should be a charge,

but this charge should be vacated or extinguished when the drugs are seized and confiscated. Mr Rogalla, in contrast, believes that there should simply be no customs charge in such cases.

Let me start by saying this. Trafficking in drugs is a great evil, and no right-minded person would wish to give any encouragement to it. Mr Rogalla cites decisions of the European Court in favour of the view he puts forward. If, however, one reads the cases in detail, one finds a number of interesting statements which bear upon this matter. These statements very firmly attach the freedom from customs duty to confiscation and destruction. For example, the judgment in the Horvath case refers specifically to 'drugs which have been smuggled in and destroyed as they were discovered'. In the Einberger case, the following passage appears: 'In such circumstances, no customs debt can arise when drugs are imported through illegal channels of distribution, since they must be seized and destroyed upon discovery'. In both cases therefore, the exemption from customs debt is related to seizure and destruction. The proposed regulation reflects this approach. It starts by imposing a charge, but paragraph 1b of Article 8 then provides that the customs debt is extinguished then the goods concerned are confiscated.

As a practical matter, therefore, we arrive at much the same conclusion as Mr Rogalla. While the practical effects are the same, the Commission's approach has the advantage of consistency of treatment as between all classes of goods which are smuggled. It avoids the need for defining those goods which would be subject to one regime and those which would be subject to a different regime. And it has the great merit that it could not be interpreted or misinterpreted as giving aid and comfort to drug traffickers.

I am sure that Mr Rogalla would not want that to happen and I hope, therefore, that on reflection he will agree that the Commission's approach is the right one. As a matter of interest, five Member States at present take the view that there should be no customs debt and five Member States take the view that there should be a customs debt. The Community, therefore, is equally divided. One might say it is six of one and half-dozen of the other. One has to come down on one side of the line or the other. For the reasons that I have given it is more logical and administratively simpler to come down on the side proposed in the draft regulation, and I hope that the Parliament will agree.

May I turn to the question of free zones which has excited a certain amount of interest and comment. Let me start by saying that this proposed regulation does not affect free zones prejudicially. I find it hard to understand exactly what Mr Seeler's problem is. Perhaps I might also say that the amendment he originally proposed in respect of the consumption and use of goods in a free zone would have been acceptable to

Lord Cockfield

the Commission. Unfortunately he has now changed it and the amendment, as redrafted, is not acceptable.

I may, however, say that Amendment No 8 in the names of Mrs Boot and Mrs Fontaine, which also relates to free zones, is acceptable so that it appears that the ladies have hit the target with greater accuracy than the gentlemen. Amendment No 11, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, is acceptable in principle, although it is necessary to define more precisely what is meant by the phrase 'regulations in force'.

Subject to this question of the free zones, it follows from the general comments I have made that the remainder of the amendments would not be acceptable to the Commission. I hope that after the full explanation I have given Parliament will now accept that proposed regulation.

Mrs Van Rooy (PPE). — (NL) I have just asked the Commissioner a very specific question on the situation regarding the codification of customs regulations, and I should be grateful for a reply since this matter is referred to in various amendments.

Mr Rogalla (S), draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights. — (DE) Mr President, I should like to ask the Vice-President of the Commission whether he agrees with me that I did not express my personal opinion in my speech but was obliged to put forward the majority opinion of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, which voted with 9 votes for and 5 against, with one abstention. He mentioned my name so often that I am very anxious to make this point.

Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, I am most grateful to Mr Rogalla. We do in fact have a great deal of common ground between us.

As far as Mrs Rooy's point is concerned, I have in my own country over many years been concerned with the codification of taxation. In principle, therefore, I entirely endorse her approach. Unfortunately, the amount of work involved is very great indeed and it is not really realistic to expect that such a codification could be done in a relatively brief span of time. But it is important to have the regulation that we propose at an early date. While I sympathize with her point of view in principle, as a practical matter it is a rather different issue from the present regulation.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting-time.

13. Transport

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Marshall, on behalf of the Committee on Transport (Doc. A 2-9/85), on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-167/84 — COM(84) 147 final) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 543/69 on the harmonization of certain social legislation relating to road transport and Regulation (EEC) No 1463/70 on the introduction of recording equipment in road transport.

Mr Marshall (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, when the tachograph was first introduced into our Community and our countries, it was greeted with very mixed feelings. Indeed, when our distinguished colleague, Mrs Castle, first tried to introduce the tachograph into the United Kingdom...

(Cries of 'Where is she?')

Perhaps her friends can answer for her.

... she was bitterly attacked and epithets such as 'spy in the cab' were freely thrown around. Now the situation has changed completely. The tachograph is recognized as the means of improving road safety, saving the lives of drivers, passengers and pedestrians. It is also recognized as a means of law enforcement. Only yesterday a major criminal case in the United Kingdom was determined by evidence from the tachograph. The 'spy in the cab' is now recognized as the driver's friend.

However, there are several major concerns. The first is that there are many breaches of the rules. Even in the Federal Republic of Germany, whose people are recognized as exceptionally law-abiding by others in the Community, spot-checks have indicated that as many as 40% of drivers are disobeying the regulations.

Secondly, there is a fear that enforcement is not as severe or as universal as it ought to be. Those who break the regulations are putting lives at risk. What is equally important, their anarchistic approach threatens the rule of law itself. They ought to be punished, but all too often they are not.

Thirdly, the regulations have shown themselves to be insufficiently flexible. This is a cause of much concern both to employers and employees. This inflexibility is also of concern to all, because the efficiency of the transport industry affects everyone. Efficient transport is a prerequisite of efficiency in industry and a very competitive economy. Anything which hampers the efficiency of transport puts at risk jobs and economic recovery within the Community.

Finally, the imminent accession of Spain and Portugal means that journeys within the Community may be

Marshall

even longer. Legislation which was suitable for the Community of 6 may be quite inappropriate for a Community of 12.

I believe that the changes proposed by the Commission and amendments suggested by the Committee on Transport will solve many of these problems. So far as enforcement is concerned, we are asking for a report after two years showing how these provisions have been complied with. This report will be on a country-by-country basis and should indicate where standards of enforcement are lax. I do not believe that any country will want to be known as the haven for law-breakers.

So far as flexibility is concerned, we are suggesting that the maximum period of driving should be increased to 4 1/2 hours. The Commission's proposal to monitor driving and working-time is impractical and inappropriate. Often it is only after someone has started to work that he knows that he will, in fact, be driving. Similarly, we are willing to increase the maximum daily driving time and this is only sensible. It will, in fact, allow drivers to spend evenings in the company of their families rather than in the discomfort and perhaps loneliness of some hostelry. Further, the suggestion of a 90-hour driving fortnight will help the transport industry.

The Commission has rightly recognized the need for exceptions. Particular attention has been paid both by the Commission and the committee to the needs of seasonal coach operators, who were harshly affected by the existing legislation.

Within the committee there was a tremendous consensus of opinion. I am sure we all welcome the statesmanlike approach of Mr Huckfield when he suggested that the chairman of the Committee on Transport and the rapporteur of the committee should both go to represent the views of the committee to the Council of Ministers. I am glad that he is here this evening to hear that tribute to his statesmanlike and European approach to this matter.

(Applause)

The key to our proposals is liberalization, enforcement and flexibility and with those three keys I believe that the transport industry and the Community can prosper.

(Applause)

Mr Ebel (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. As you mentioned, Mr President, the Rapporteur of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, Mr Brok, who unfortunately is unable to be here this evening, has asked me to bring the following comments to the attention of the House.

In submitting to Parliament new proposals for the amendment of the Regulation on the harmonization of certain social legislation relating to road transport, the Commission has recognized the urgent need for a revision of the Regulation, which dates from the late 1960s. Despite a number of positive effects in the field of harmonization of competition restrictions in the Community, it was not to be denied that problems were involved in winning acceptance for the Regulation from the two sides of industry on the one hand, and its enforcement by national authorities on the other.

The different viewpoints and aims of the groups involved in road transport result from the wish to reduce the excessive complexity of the Regulation, to take social considerations into account, i.e. the desire of both employers and employees for greater flexibility in order to be able to react better to market changes and traffic situations, and, finally, to intensify checks and penalize infringements more effectively. However, the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and the Committee on Transport are both of the opinion that neither the current social legislation nor the Commission's proposal gives sufficient consideration to the problems of employers and employees or is capable of fulfilling the aims of the Commission.

Following intensive discussion within the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and the Committee on Transport, a proposal which takes into account the wishes of employers and employees as well as road safety requirements and is based on the proposed amendments to the Commission's proposal can today be submitted to Parliament. For hauliers as well as drivers are demanding more leeway, in order to be able to react more flexibly to market changes and traffic situations.

Furthermore, drivers prefer to spend their longer rest periods at home and want shorter rest periods away from home, as they cannot make proper use of free time when not at home. It is therefore in the interests of social progress if, independently of a reduction of working hours and with due regard for road safety, provision is made for reducing rest periods spent away from home, providing the driver later spends the time due to him at home.

However, any welcome social improvement for long-distance drivers is meaningless if existing social legislation is disregarded. In an analysis of infringements of existing social legislation carried out by the inspectorate, it was found that 24% of offending drivers had exceeded the maximum continuous driving period by 30-60 minutes and 23% by more than 60 minutes. 47% had exceeded the maximum daily driving period by 30-120 minutes and 27% by more than 120 minutes. 36% had cut minimum breaks by 5-15 minutes, 24% by more than 15 minutes, while 26% had shortened the minimum daily rest period by 30-120 minutes, and 47% by more than 120 minutes.

Ebel

Increasingly, recording equipment is being tampered with in order to conceal infringements of social legislation. The latest statistics produced by North Rhine-Westphalia show that every third lorry exceeds speed limits on motorways. Even when the police had warned that speed checks would be carried out between 18 and 22 March of this year, 3 391 out of 10 208 lorries exceeded the maximum speed of 80 km/h.

Competition between hauliers and against dumping prices quoted by hauliers from the state-trading nations as well as the drivers' concern for their jobs in the face of the existing unemployment in the road transport sector cause both employers and employees to breach existing social and transport legislation. Deadlines, fatigue, aggression, the driver's concern for his job, and a feeling of power, which comes over drivers when they sit behind the wheel of their huge vehicles, can sometimes form a dangerous combination, as a result of which the driver is no longer capable of a realistic assessment of traffic dangers. This can lead to multiple pile-ups — which have lately been increasing in number — caused by a driver or drivers not adjusting to weather conditions or falling asleep at the wheel.

In order to improve road safety and enable the social improvements proposed to Parliament to be effective, checks and prosecutions must be intensified in all Member States. Existing differences between the quality and quantity of checks and prosecutions between the Member States must also be eliminated, so that there are no longer any financial advantages in breaching the regulations in a particular country, where checks are few and far between or where fines are smaller than the economic advantages gained through an infringement, since random studies have shown that in some Member States very few checks are carried out, whilst in other countries great importance is attached to the observance of the Regulation. If, as a result of the lack of standardized legal and/or administrative provisions, the differences in the nature and extent of checks and penalties for infringements of social legislation continue to exist between the Member States, the purpose of this Regulation, i.e. to standardize competition conditions within the Community and introduce social legislation to the benefit of employees and road safety will not be fulfilled; the effect will be exactly the opposite.

Mr Visser (S). — (NL) Mr President, this proposal concerns complex issues with major conflicts of interest. Economic interests, those of road transport in relation to other transport sectors and those of road safety are not always the same. There are also major differences between the viewpoints of transport companies, shippers and unions as well as differences between countries and between political parties. This has been quite apparent in the Economic and Social Committee, which met eighteen times over a two-year

period and yet could reach a compromise only at the last minute. The same was true of discussion within the transport committee, which took almost six months and involved in the early stages over 100 amendments to the original Marshall report. A compromise was therefore necessary and, bearing in mind the wide gap originally separating the standpoints of participants, I believe we have been quite successful in finding one. In doing so, all the parties took the compromise reached by the Economic and Social Committee as the basis for their proposals.

Among the aims of the Socialist Group were the following three issues. First, we wanted to see road transport provided with good opportunities for further development in view of the specific needs of the sector. This involves a greater degree of flexibility, one of the ways of achieving this being the adoption of a two-week assessment period to allow longer driving times. Our second aim was to improve working conditions since particularly the very many small companies involved in road transport are inclined to take a rather cavalier attitude to the driving and rest periods. To a reasonable extent, that aim is satisfied by lengthening the daily and weekly rest periods while under very specific circumstances a certain degree of flexibility remains possible. A European provision for a working period rather than a driving period is, however, quite unattainable. The third important target was an improvement in road safety, and here one must regret the frequency with which transport vehicles are involved in road accidents. The amended regulations should also improve the situation by, among other measures, providing better provisions for an overnight rest period.

My group considers that the compromise achieved is a satisfactory one. All parties have had to concede some points and their readiness to keep alive this compromise is shown by the later submission of four additional amendments.

This report, by the way, concerns only some of the issues involved in road transport. Other external factors are also responsible for determining the working environment in the transport sector, one of these being problems experienced while crossing frontiers. The impact of this regulation will be lost unless frontier formalities can be made more flexible, greater progress made in introducing the single customs document, inspections are recognized in other Member States, the 14th VAT directive is implemented and the integrated customs centres are finally built.

Moreover, road transport itself can do a great deal to change working conditions. Considerable improvement is possible even within the very efficient Dutch road transport system. For example, activities could be better planned to avoid major delays in loading and unloading and the consequent long periods drivers have to wait. You don't always have to point an accusing finger at other people. Superfluous bureaucracy at

Visser

borders has to be trimmed back and I have submitted written questions to the Commission on the use of so-called 'flying squads' entitled to carry out unannounced border checks.

There is in fact a need for a Community supervisory body to monitor the way road transport regulations are applied so as to obviate complaints about differing interpretations on the part of the Member States. That is, however, also not yet attainable. Stricter supervision and uniform sanctions are definitely required, but this is the responsibility of national governments. The resolution urges that these measures be taken.

Finally, Mr President, I would like to comment on the procedure to be taken in the future. The issues are difficult ones and the decisions in this case rest with the Community. Moreover, interests wider than those of just road transport are involved. It is vital that the Economic and Social Committee's compromise, and now also that of this Parliament, become a reality. For this reason, we urge the Commission and the transport committee to accept this compromise and in order to achieve this we consider it advisable to begin consultations between Parliament and the Council. We discussed the matter in these terms in the Transport Committee and my Group assumes that these consultations will indeed take place.

(Applause)

Mr K.-H. Hoffmann (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, first of all allow me to express my astonishment at the unfortunate way in which the Presidency has arranged today's agenda. The social legislation now being discussed directly concerns 6 million European citizens, both employers and employees. Parliament complains over and over again that the citizens of Europe take too little notice of it. We spend our time arguing about peace in Afghanistan, about Kampuchea, and so on. This is all very important, but when a subject directly concerns the interests of our citizens the debate is held under the cover of night so that nobody knows about it!

(Applause)

In this connection I would like to thank the Commission for succeeding in presenting and implementing a piece of really progressive social legislation for road transport as early as the 1960s. It was a great achievement at the time and I am pleased that the legislation has remained in force so long.

Meanwhile, traffic conditions have changed, and the social legislation requires reform. A start was made but, we have heard, there was a major conflict of interests. The unions, employers, and authorities all had different ideas. The task was therefore to find a common solution reasonably acceptable to all concerned.

Taking the resolutions of the Economic and Social Committee as a basis, Parliament has succeeded in finding this common ground. Flexibility for companies, the shortening of the weekly driving time, the lengthening of rest periods, and the improvement of road safety through increased checks, I think, are excellent proposals.

I am particularly pleased that the Committee has by a large majority come out in favour of one point, for which employees and their unions have been fighting for years: the ban on loading and unloading by long-distance lorry drivers. 18 months ago this matter was the subject of a strike. At that time it could not be forced through, and I hope that tomorrow Parliament will bring itself to approve this amendment tabled by the Committee on Transport.

I believe that the Committee on Transport has covered important ground. Despite 131 proposed amendments, the rapporteur, supported by Mr Visser and Mr Carossino and with a little help from myself, has succeeded in presenting a draft which has been largely approved by the Committee. I would like to express my thanks to Mr Marshall for this, and also for the excellent collaboration, which I hope we can continue on other occasions.

Even though as a trade unionist I would have liked to have seen different solutions to various points — given that my organization had other things in mind — we all had to settle for slightly less than we had wanted, so that other matters could be solved in perhaps a better and more sensible way. We have succeeded, and I trust that tomorrow Parliament will support this decision by the Committee on Transport.

But one thing which I do not like is that the Council of Ministers again seems to be moving in the wrong direction. In 1984, Mr Signorile, who was just about to become President of the Council, assured the Committee on Transport in Genoa that if the Economic and Social Committee and Parliament could reach a consensus on the basic questions he would try to get the Council to agree to it too. As President of the Council he repeated this in front of the Committee on Transport in Brussels — as all our colleagues can confirm. But in the last few days we have heard that the Permanent Representatives in Brussels are working on a document, the basic approach of which is completely different from the opinion of the Economic and Social Committee and Parliament. Now what about the President of the Council's word? We would like to know from him whether he is going to keep it or whether he is playing with marked cards. I hope that when the Chairman of the Committee on Transport visits Mr Signorile next week he will get a clear answer from him.

It would also be very interesting to see how the Commission reacts to Parliament's proposals for amendment. Whenever Parliament and the Commission have

K.-H. Hoffmann

worked together — as in the case of weights and measures and various other subjects — something has been achieved. Therefore I appeal to the Commission: take the plunge, pull in the same direction! Together we shall succeed!

(Applause)

Mr Turner (ED). — Mr President, I first of all want to comment on the technical aspect of tachographs. In the past, hairpins and rubber bands have been used to fix tachographs. I myself with the Suffolk constabulary have looked through microscopes at the tachograph cards to see where the cheating took place and how you can prove it. It is extremely difficult to do.

Indeed, in Suffolk, which has all the port of Felixstowe and lorries coming over from the continent, there is only one sergeant who can actually understand a tachograph. Now we have got to the much worse stage where mechanical cheating has been replaced by electronic cheating. All you have to do is fit in an electronic interrupter which will cut out every sixth second of the tachograph and, of course, completely falsify the results.

I have offered to the Commission the expertise of the Suffolk constabulary to consult with them and to deal with this question of the fraudulent use of the tachograph. I renew the invitation now that they should ask the Suffolk constabulary to come over.

Mr President, the second thing is this. I see the report of the Commission says that there has been no lessening of the infringement of the tachograph laws. Now I am quite sure that the only way you will reduce infringement of the tachograph laws is to have stiff enough fines so that those who are concerned realize it is uneconomical even to think of cheating. That is all you have to do.

I know that Mrs Oppenheim is going to say that you should not ban a driver or a firm from the road, and I agree with that. What you have to do is to have stiff enough fines so that they say it is not economically worthwhile even to consider cheating. That is my second point.

Thirdly, I am very glad that Mr Marshall has been able to get greater flexibility into the regulations. I have put before the Commission on a number of occasions proposals for special cases such as pee-viners in Lowestoft who, at a certain time of the year, have to work all through the night to get the peas in in time to have them frozen within three hours of being picked. That sort of thing...

(Laughter)

Now my learned friends laugh — or rather, my friends, they are not learned actually: I see no lawyers around me at all.

President. — Mr Turner, without interruption.

Mr Turner (ED). — Mr President, may I point out that my tachograph stood still during that time.

President. — Sorry, you must have been using the hairpin. It was working here.

(Laughter)

Mr Turner (ED). — May I say, it is most important that we have greater flexibility, because there was a time — and I hope that Mr Marshall has now cured this — when many specialist uses of lorries were made uneconomical because of the rigidity of the laws. I think the most important thing he has done actually is to introduce the two-week datum.

I very much agree with Mr Hoffmann that there are great difficulties in getting the two sides together. They are both very tough, and the Commission has to be equally tough in ensuring that it gets a proposal which is accepted by both and is then enforced.

Mr President, my last point is about enforcement. Now, inspection of tachographs, as I mentioned at the beginning — only a few moments ago, although it seems a long time...

President. — In actual fact it is almost four minutes, Mr Turner.

Mr Turner (ED). — My first point about the inspection of tachographs is that it is an exceedingly difficult thing to inspect a tachograph and see what actually happened and what the marks on the tachograph card actually mean. I really seriously do invite the Commission to talk to experts in the police forces of Britain who do understand this matter.

In different parts of the EEC inspection is carried out in a totally different kind of way, very strictly in some places and very lax in others, exactly the same as the fishing regulations and the meat processing regulations throughout the EEC.

With regard to fishing and meat, I called three years ago for inspectors to inspect the inspectors!

(Laughter, Cries of 'Hear, hear')

Mr President, I am just about to say that I now call for inspectors in this field also to inspect the operation of national inspectors who look to see whether tachograph regulations are being abused or not, so that we have a common system throughout the EEC and lorry-drivers and owners everywhere can feel equally

Turner

convinced that what is done in Suffolk is also done in Italy and that there is fairness throughout the EEC.

Mr Pearce (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President.

President. — Sorry, I am not just ready for points of order at the moment!

(Laughter)

We will have a point of order when Mr Carossino is finished! I will take your point of order then. It will give me a chance to study that one you are quoting!

(Laughter)

Mr Carossino (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, there has been a need for a revision of the regulations governing drive and rest periods for industrial vehicle drivers and monitoring by tachographs of these periods for some time now in Europe. They were introduced a long time ago and their application has created a number of problems. This has come to Parliament's attention on numerous occasions, but it has been forced to acknowledge that it is extremely difficult to combine within a single framework diverse and sometimes contradictory requirements, with a need on the one hand for more flexible legislation to allow transport companies to maintain efficiency and productivity on the road and, on the other, tougher measures and directives to improve road safety.

The union representatives are quite rightly calling for improvements in working conditions for drivers and in quality control, because the enormous number of infractions recorded in recent years has shown that Community legislation has largely failed to do what it set out to do.

We therefore approve the Commission proposals, significantly improved by the amendments introduced by the Transport Committee which has also adopted the ideas of the Economic and Social Committee, although we are aware that it is a compromise, and satisfactory solutions have not always been found for all the requirements. What is important in our view is that these amendments are introducing simpler procedures to the existing legislation, more flexible regulations and more effective measures which with a better application of the regulations will give us an improved social policy and more equal and healthy competition between the European transport firms.

Although we do not share the pessimistic view that the different situations existing in the Member States of the Community will make it virtually impossible to apply the regulations we are in the process of adopting correctly, we do accept that once we have approved

this regulation, the real problem will be the introduction of a uniform and more efficient control system in all the Member States. Sanctions should be imposed not only on drivers but also on employees who infringe these regulations and above all, I think, the fine should be increased to discourage attempts to infringe the provisions.

For these reasons, we are very much in agreement with points 15, 16, 17 and 18 of the resolution and invite both Commission and Council to reach their decisions without delay to achieve more and better results than those obtained since the old legislation came into force.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, you spotted immediately that I was referring to Rule 64(4). Thank you for responding so quickly. We had a slight comprehension problem with a couple of technical points in Mr Turner's speech. I was actually listening to the English translation. We heard the term 'pea-viner'. Now this had me rather stumped. A pea I know is a small green chap like this — a pulse, I think it is called. But a 'pea-viner' had me rather stuck. We also heard the definition of the flexibility of electronic hairpins...

President. — When are we getting to the point of order?

Mr Pearce (ED). — Under Rule 64(4), Mr President, which you immediately spotted, I was trying to put a question to the speaker to elucidate his speech so that we might all share in these particular technical points that he was putting across. I feel that everybody in the House except yourself was in some difficulty.

President. — Well, I am glad that I had no problem, and that you appreciated that, Mr Pearce.

The point is that under Rule 64(4) the speaker may be interrupted, but only by leave of the President, and that permission was not given.

(Laughter)

Mr Wijsenbeek (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, unlike Mr Ebel, who did full justice to his own statistics by somewhat exceeding the time on his tachograph, I will attempt to finish on time. Mr President, there is something very strange about this report. In a surge of institutional solidarity, the transport committee had decided to adopt the same viewpoint as the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. In itself this is highly laudable since, after all, the report concerns the harmonization of working conditions and it is consequently important that both employers and employees agree with the proposals. Even more strikingly the

Wijsenbeek

Economic and Social Committee's rapporteur, Mr Smithers, is a former British trade unionist. Nevertheless, while amazed at the nature of their political bedfellows, Christian Democratic, Socialist, Communist and Conservative members still thought it advisable that the Parliamentary report include a different viewpoint from that of the ESC — whereupon, as usual, the British Labour members submitted subsequent proposals of such a kind as to confirm their 'little islanders' mentality.

This rapporteur is, unfortunately, lacking in the necessary insight to pose the preliminary question called forth by this report. Is such legislation really necessary? Are we in Europe not in fact imposing regulations that hinder social and economic interaction rather than enhancing it? It might not be a bad idea if we in Europe also took a look at deregulation as currently practiced in a number of Member States.

You might ask, why pose that question in relation to this particular report? The proposed regulations could fairly be described as a totally undesirable straightjacket for this occupational group. By its very nature, European road transport is a field requiring freedom and a reticent approach on the part of the authorities whether these be national or European. Some people may have the intention of stemming the explosive growth of this occupational group in order to stimulate transport by rail and inland waterway. I oppose that because it is precisely road transport of freight that is the most efficient door to door method. We shouldn't lose sight of the fact that more people now work in this professional category than on the land while regulations on working conditions and similar issues have not been imposed on farmers because they simply won't accept such a straightjacket.

It has been said that Community regulations on speed limits and other restrictions are essential from a safety point of view. Of course, but what is actually happening? I have very thoroughly investigated the wishes of both drivers and employers. However surprising it might seem, meeting the drivers' wishes would mean instituting flexible working hours, indeed much more flexible than those proposed in this report, but only within the shortest possible period of time. For this reason, I did not resubmit the amendment I put before the Committee. The vital issue for both drivers and employers is, however, a reduction in the continuous rest period which is already too long — and that is the thrust of my amendment. Such a long continuous rest period is in nobody's interest. Everybody — especially such long-distance travellers as members of the European Parliament — knows that it is unfair to pass legislation forcing someone to stay too long at one of those bleak parking areas dotted along the motorways of Europe.

Rather than celebrating the enlargement of the Community by imposing overly rigid regulations on road transport, and without in any way forgetting the road

safety aspect, we would be better advised to forgo legislation entirely and leave the determination of working conditions to consultation within the individual companies concerned. This implies moreover there must be a foolproof way of checking tachographs and that we will, as Mr Turner so rightly said, consequently have to employ inspectors to supervise other inspectors who in turn monitor policemen checking truck drivers. And that is where I draw the line.

After all, what is going on now? It's common knowledge how easy it is in some countries of the Community to insert a new tachograph card in the machine. All you risk is a DM40 fine. This should, Mr President, be a clear indication that we in Europe must also deregulate. The present proposal is scarcely acceptable to my group in its present form.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — Mr President, may I thank the rapporteur. May I say it is a good report and may I say that we welcome paragraph 22 on greater flexibility and paragraph 23 on exemptions and derogations.

Could I now speak for the peripheries, representing as I do one of the peripheral regions — the one that reaches up to the Shetlands, Orkneys, the Western Isles and the Inner Hebrides. There are 82 inhabited islands, not as many as Greece has, of course. I welcome very much the letters I have received from successive Commissioners. I do not know which one to read really, as I have a variety here, but I might take the one from the Commissioner who is here tonight, Mr Stanley Clinton Davis.

I thank the Commissioner for his letter, where he says there would be no problem over governments accepting a total exemption from regulations for transport confined to islands not exceeding 2 300 square kilometres and not linked to the mainland by bridge or tunnel accessible only to motor transport.

The question, as the Commissioner has very fairly put it, remains: is this an automatic exemption or a question for the Member States? I think the Commissioner has put his finger on the problem we face. Well, I think that is very fair of the Commissioner, not shameful. I would suggest that the Greeks...

(Laughter)

Everyone seems to find this quite amusing, but I assure you, if you live on an island, be it a Greek island or a Corsican island or a Mediterranean island or the Island of Texel or any island off Ireland or Scotland, it is not funny to have rules applied to you which make no sense because of ferries, because of single-track roads, because of passing places, because of flocks of sheep and cattle who regularly stop your path. Therefore, it is wise, I think, that the Commission has recognized this and I would just like to put this on record in this Parliament — though no one seems to

Ewing

be very interested and Mr Huckfield seems to think it is quite funny, which I think is quite deplorable. I would just say this. If you live on an island and you are about to become a desert, it is not funny at all. And if you think that there are 17 people left on an island and that island is to be written off, that is not funny either. Or if you think Lewis and Harris do not quite come under the umbrella of Commissioner Stanley Clinton Davis and his predecessor, that is not funny either for them, because they have the same problems that I have tried to highlight.

And, if we are a Community — with Mr Huckfield turning his back to me — which wears a human face — then I do not think anyone should be disinclined to listen to these areas that are about to be depopulated, where man is the endangered species. So I welcome flexibility, I welcome the frank statements from the Commission. And if it comes to this that it is up to my Member State to rise to the Commission's generous attitude, then I do trust that the Member State I come from will indeed recognize that islands do require these special conditions.

Mr Welsh (ED). — Mr President, as the Member for Lancashire Central which ajoins the constituency of Merseyside West, I think I should point out to the honourable lady that the remarks she addressed to Mr Huckfield are not fair. She is actually talking about Mr Wijsenbeek, and although I do not often say good things about Mr Huckfield, I think it is very unfair to compare him with Mr Wijsenbeek and I think she should withdraw that statement.

(Laughter and applause)

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — I withdraw the statement.

Mr Van der Waal (NI). — *(NL)* Within Europe, Mr President, road transport is an extremely significant mode of transport. The economy is largely dependent on it and it is quite vital in terms of employment, offering work to approximately 6 million Community residents. There is every justification, therefore, to study this branch attentively and to ensure that the regulations on driving and rest periods reflect due consideration for all the issues involved such as the use of equipment, working conditions for drivers and, not least, road safety.

Whether on the employers' or on the employees' side, all concerned agree that the present regulation is rigid and inflexible as is made abundantly obvious by the number of contraventions.

For that reason, we regard the Commission's proposal, aiming at greater flexibility in a number of areas, as an improvement. The Marshall report, issued on behalf of the Transport Committee, has managed to find a balanced approach to a controversial topic while going a

step further with a number of amendments and it also enjoys our support.

Nevertheless, we continue to object to one part of it, the requirement for a minimum daily rest period of 12 hours which has already been commented on by Mr Wijsenbeek.

Discussions we have recently had with people active in the transport world indicate that this period of time is too long and impractical for long-distance drivers, both in social terms and from the road safety point of view. Drivers sent to foreign destinations want to return home as soon as possible since it is there that they find the surroundings conducive to relaxation. An excessive forced stay somewhere invites a use of that time which in no way enhances road safety. We therefore urge that the total rest period be set at 10 hours including an uninterrupted period of 8 hours and allocation of the remaining time to be at the drivers discretion. This kind of more flexible arrangement would improve the lot of truck drivers and, in our opinion, also be safer.

This conclusion would seem to be confirmed by the preliminary results of government-funded research conducted in the Netherlands by one of the national universities. The extent to which the regulations on driving and rest periods were in fact observed was studied and an analysis made of all contraventions. The results I mentioned are still provisional ones, but they do indicate that more flexible regulations would encourage safer driving and would certainly improve the working conditions of the drivers. Therefore, Mr President, we again urge that the minimal daily rest period be reduced from 12 to 8 hours as outlined in the relevant amendment.

Mr Stevenson (S). — Mr President, this report is the result of many years of operating the present regulations, pressure to revise them from the employers, the operators who obviously want to maximize the flexibility which will maximize their profitability, trade unions who recognize the changed situation but quite rightly are seeking to protect and enhance the conditions and social provisions of their members, and the absolute necessity to promote safety for the public and the interests of those who work in transport.

The Commission has tried to produce proposals that would cater for all those aspects. This is very difficult — if not impossible — to achieve, as I think we all recognize. However, the only chance is if the social partners support the basic changes. So, in many ways, it was very sad when the original report produced by Mr Marshall chose to insist that this could not be achieved and a decision should be imposed. Mr President, that type of authoritarian talk is a recipe for disaster, and will certainly not promote the object that we all seek. Although the present report still talks of unbending attitudes, I am pleased to say that any talk

Stevenson

of imposition has now been dropped. I am sure Mr Marshall has listened to wiser counsel. After long deliberation, a basic compromise has been established. We ought to be grateful to the Economic and Social Committee, and I think it is right of us to extend our thanks to Mr Larry Smith, from the Transport and General Workers' Union, for his help and his guidance, because this resulted, quite clearly, as many speakers have said, in the present document that we have in front of us.

Many important aspects from completely different points of view were contained in the first document that we had. There was much disquiet over the original attempts by Mr Marshall, reflected in what I thought were 92 amendments, but Mr Hutton says there were over 100 originally. Now, owing to further invaluable consultations, the report that we have in front of us reflects in important respects that hard-won compromise. I am pleased to say that that was certainly the aim of the Transport Committee.

I speak too as a trade unionist, a trade unionist who has worked in the industry for 20 years. I thought I knew all the wrinkles about tachographs, but I have heard one or two more tonight.

There are many important matters of detail that remain and demand the consideration of this House. Why? Well, many of us were sceptical, and still are, of the whole idea of the EEC, but I must accept that Regulation 543/69 was one of the best things that ever happened to the transport industry. I am quite happy to admit that. Let me make it quite clear that when I hear talk from the likes of Mr Wijsenbeek about what the workers need — more freedom in road transport and fewer rest periods — I hope this House will reject that type of talk in its totality. It is based on no experience and a prejudiced approach to this type of problem.

It is absolutely vital that any further changes will not impair the progress that has been made. Pressure to maximize profitability and compromise the improvements must be firmly rejected. Therefore, an increase in the daily and weekly rest periods is to be welcomed. Rejection of a Commission proposal to remove the ban on bonuses for mileage and loads carried should be welcomed. There are some increases in the maximum daily driving-time. Many of us are concerned about that, but it does introduce a degree of flexibility. Above all, we must try to be consistent. There are many of us who believe that there really is no logic at all in improving rest periods for regular drivers and then significantly reducing them for drivers on irregular international services in the summertime, an area that has been subject to many accidents and is, in fact, an object of major public concern.

The problem of enforcement, finally, is a cause of clear dissatisfaction. Enforcement in some States is non-existent, in other States it is better. We must sup-

port any initiative by the Commission to increase enforcement and make sure that cowboy operators see that there is no future for them. The basic compromise in this report is something we should support, but it is vital to consider, even at this late stage, further improvements in this report.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Cornelissen (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, it is now 11.15 p.m. which means that we have already been in harness for more than 14 hours. One could ask whether in fact we should not do something about our own working and rest periods since that might also be in the interest of Europe as a whole.

I of course understand that decisions on traffic and transport have road safety implications and therefore heartily endorse action by the authorities, in this case European ones, to guarantee traffic safety for drivers and other road users. Road safety remains a major problem in Europe with 50 000 deaths and 1 million injured being an unacceptably high annual road toll. Incidentally, I could in all honesty imagine a way of handling this issue rather more fitting for the tragedy of inadequate road safety and for the interests of both employees and employers in the road transport sector.

I have my doubts, Mr President, about detailed government regulations covering all kinds of matters of little or no relevance to road safety. I feel this is best done within joint labour agreements where the primary responsibility rests with employers' associations and trade unions. After long and difficult consultation, the Economic and Social Committee was able to reach a compromise.

I would have preferred it if our Transport Committee had not deviated in one important aspect from this hard fought compromise in setting four weeks as the reference period for driving and rest periods. This does nothing for the flexibility so vitally needed and I fear that this change will also, and that's the cardinal issue, be detrimental to day-to-day compliance with the regulation. I would refer Members to disquieting signs emerging from the Dutch transport industry. I am referring to the letter sent this week to the Netherlands Government by the Consultation Committee on Freight Transport. For this reason, I believe that it is essential that there be proper monitoring of the observance of the new regulation and that this should be uniform in all Member States and for all kinds of freight transport, irrespective of the driver's nationality: what's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

I do not believe that the detailed nature of some amendments contributes to observance of the regulation. For example, amendment 14 closes with the provision that a chauffeur may not stay in his vehicle overnight, even if it is properly equipped for the purpose, if there is a hotel available in the vicinity. Isn't it

Cornelissen

going too far to compel a driver, who receives a lump sum accommodation payment under the terms of his joint labour agreement and who is responsible for his vehicle and his cargo, to leave his vehicle at night on what is often an unpatrolled parking area?

Notwithstanding my criticism, however, I consider it very important that the Economic and Social Committee has now issued its opinion and also that we will, I trust, tomorrow have that of the European Parliament with the two in agreement on a number of major points. I hope that this will then encourage rapid agreement within the Council of Ministers in the interests of the 6 million people active in the Community road transport system as well as in those of all road users.

I would like to close, Mr President, by calling on the Council of Ministers and also the social partners in the transport industry to agree on sound and practicable regulations before the 1st of January, which marks the beginning of Road Safety Year.

(Applause)

Mrs Oppenheim (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, I am afraid I cannot share the enthusiasm about this report. Of course I do not disagree with the very fundamental aspects such as the social considerations, road safety and a whole range of other points — 1986 is road safety year, incidentally — but I think the directive underlying this report is so involved and complicated that we cannot really see what consequences these rules may have.

I am sure a good deal of preparatory work was done, which I have obviously not been able to familiarize myself with, but I think, as this is probably yet another case of rules being drawn up not by practitioners but by theoreticians, who do not know the background or what the consequences may be — and I also believe that my suspicions are borne out by the fact that, as the report says, the Commission is to report in two years' time on the actual outcome of the rules. We do not know the exact consequences and I am extremely uneasy about the fact the new rules are much more complicated than the old ones.

It is also evident from the Commission's papers and documents that very grave difficulties were encountered at an earlier stage and I do not feel that these proposals are much better for them, although perhaps they are in some areas — I should not be too critical, either. A very important question I would like to stress here, and one which I do not believe other speakers have considered well enough, is the system of sanctions — for cases where the rules are not adhered to. I am of course absolutely in favour of there not being different sanctions according to whether a rule is contravened in Italy, Northern Germany or anywhere else. There have been clear cases in which it was found

that when a rule was violated, a penalty of x ECU was imposed in one place and y ECU somewhere else. Harmonization is evidently necessary here. I have the feeling that harmonization of the penal code is being called for, and therefore I would like very much to take the opportunity to ask both the Commission and the rapporteur to assure me that no harmonization of penal codes is involved here, but that it is an attempt to achieve uniform rules from an economic point of view and not from the point of view of penal codes. I do not believe that the Treaty of Rome, Roman law, canon law or whatever other kind of law which the Member States have based their legislation on, gives any authority at all to harmonize the provisions of penal codes by way of a report.

(Applause)

Mr McMillan-Scott (ED). — Mr President, I have not had time to write a long speech! I rise, as so often will be the case in this House, on a narrow matter relating to tourism because I think it is important to remember the effect of tourism on the economies of Europe and the effect of this report and its recommendations on tourism.

It is a fact that at this moment thousands of people are being transported by coach throughout the Community, and I speak as someone who has had 7 years' experience. I bow to Mr Stevenson's 20 years on the road, I spent only 7 as a tour guide. I will not dwell on the problems that I encountered myself; suffice it to say that in the time that I was working on the road, the sense of responsibility among some drivers was very much lacking. But as time went on the matter improved, because governments began to enforce their safety rules and their rest periods were much more clearly defined. The behaviour of the drivers, their social behaviour regarding their own drinking problems from time to time, etc., were tidied up.

I think it is worth remembering, as Mr Cornelissen reminded us, that next year is European Road Safety Year, and the two key elements of this report, which are flexibility and enforcement, deserve to be supported. Flexibility because in tourism it is important to allow the driver to be responsible for his own working-time within, for example, a two-week tour, and enforcement because, at the end of that time, he must be very clear about how much time he has worked.

I, too, have seen the sort of fiddles, if I can call them that, which Mr Turner has referred to, and these must be clamped down very severely. This takes us on to enforcement. It is a fact that in those countries where enforcement is rigorously applied, the drivers respect the law. May I make a point here on Mr Wijsenbeek's speech about Spain and Portugal, that in fact in Spain the police are particularly rigorous. I think we should have no fear about the proposals being adopted there too.

McMillan-Scott

I do support this report and I commend it to the House. I think we should always bear in mind that those people who put their trust in their coach drivers should do so with some faith not only in the driver, not only in the country in which they are travelling, but also in the European Community itself.

(Applause)

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, this debate, it has been said, has come at a difficult hour, and I do think in many ways it is a pity that we should be debating a matter of this importance, complexity and significance to so many people at the tail end of a day in which of course other important debates have taken place. However, it is not for me to carry that argument further. I merely put down that marker.

The fixing of drivers' hours in the road transport sector certainly raises tremendously important issues of social as well as transport policy, and that has been reflected in a number of the speeches that have been made tonight. We are concerning ourselves here not only with road safety but also with social questions related to the length of the working week. They are extremely complex and serious issues, and the consequences of drivers falling asleep, whether it be at the wheel of a coach or at the wheel of a heavy lorry, are matters of grave and tragic consequences that we witness too frequently.

Experience has shown that it is difficult to find agreement on the subject of drivers' hours since many, sometimes conflicting, interests have to be reconciled. Mr Stevenson, in my view, absolutely rightly stated in what I thought was a very authoritative speech coming from somebody with 20 years' experience in this business, that the prime requisite for the ... Somebody said, 'He is a Socialist'. I have not commented upon Mr Stevenson's politics in this respect, but upon his experience and, in fact, this was supported by Mr McMillan-Scott just a few moments ago. I think the important point is that an effective regime can only come about if it is supported by both sides of the industry. The trouble is that we are not dealing with one industry. We are dealing with an amalgam of industries. There are vast differences between the coach drivers' operations and the long-haul lorry drivers' operations. One man is the custodian — perhaps there are two drivers — of fifty or so people, riding in the coach which he is controlling. The other man, to a very large extent, during the period of the operation, whether he is employed or self-employed, largely guides his own destiny. It is a pity, I think, that within the course of these deliberations none of us has achieved the sort of differentiation between the various types of operation in these industries. I will come back to that in relation to one amendment later on.

The present regulation was adopted in 1969, as Mr Marshall reminded us, only after long and arduous

negotiations. Preparations of the proposal which we are at present discussing lasted for no less than three years before its adoption by the Commission in 1984. A measure of the complexity of these negotiations can be gleaned from the fact that the Commission consultations before 1984 included no less than 15 meetings with the social partners.

Why has the Commission proposed amendments to the 1969 regulation? The last 15 years have shown that legislation in this area must be simple and flexible if it is to be effective. Regrettably, in a number of respects, the 1969 regulation has proved to be defective. The Commission's object in the present proposal is to adapt the 1969 regulation to the needs of today's road transport, as a number of speakers have said.

What we want to do is to ensure that social progress — the promotion of road safety, not least because of the road safety year that we are contemplating for 1986 — and the fundamental principles of harmonization of competition are not threatened. We consider that our proposal represents the right balance. We believe it represents, too, a fair compromise between the various interests and objectives.

The Committee on Transport of this Parliament has achieved, in my view, a great deal in producing a generally agreed report on so complex a question. I know all its members: the rapporteur, Mr Marshall, the committee's chairman, Mr Georgios Anastassopoulos, with whom I have had great pleasure in dealing since I became Commissioner, and he is also a new incumbent in this important office. They have all put a lot of hard work and serious discussion into this field of policy.

These efforts have been paralleled by the hard and productive work in the Economic and Social Committee and in particular by its rapporteur, Mr Larry Smith, to whom I think the House — some Members at least — have paid tribute. I do know that the chairman of the Committee on Transport himself, from discussions that I have had with him, holds in high regard the work that Mr Larry Smith has done on behalf of the Economic and Social Committee.

I think it is a pity that in this debate one Member should have chosen to question that. I therefore pay my unstinting tribute to the members of both committees.

The Commission welcomes the fact that the Committee on Transport's report generally supports our proposals, and I hope that all the employers' organizations and the trade unions will be able to follow this lead. Indeed, the best way to ensure that a regulation on a topic such as drivers' hours is properly implemented is, as I said before, for the industry itself to accept it.

It is the intention of the Commission to press for agreement in the Council on 23 May on a new regula-

Clinton Davis

tion. Your report, therefore, arrives at a most timely moment.

It might now help the House if I briefly indicate which amendments are acceptable to us. I think it would be very difficult now, because time hardly permits, to go into a long discussion on each of the amendments, indicating why we accept some and why we cannot accept others. I will try to deal in my concluding remarks with some of the major issues that I think have to be dealt with and where you are entitled to know where the Commission stands.

Now, we can accept — either as they are drafted or subject to some drafting changes — Nos 4, 8, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29 to 33 and 35. We also agree in principle, but with some conditions, to Amendments Nos 1, 12 and 16. We do, however, have objection to Amendments Nos 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 22, 26, 28, 34, 36 and 37. That is a very interesting part of the speech.

I simply do not propose to go into a detailed analysis of our reasons for making those proposals. What I do want to say is that a number of your amendments are not acceptable because they are virtually impossible to enforce. A number of honourable Members have been saying during the course of this debate that a pivotal point of all this is the feasibility of effective enforcement.

Other amendments we object to on the grounds of questions of social progress or road safety.

Now we must not, in a matter of this kind, lose sight of the fact that we are aiming to achieve a correct balance between the need for flexibility on the one hand and proper working conditions on the other. We also have to bear in mind the implications of any agreement for road safety.

The Council has been examining our proposal. I think it might be helpful if I were to summarize for you the present state of discussions. It seems that the Commission's proposal on daily driving is acceptable, while for weekly driving the Member States are talking of a maximum of 47 to 48 hours on the basis of a maximum of 90 hours over two weeks.

It is on weekly and daily rest-periods that the views of the Council differ most sharply from the Commission's proposal and Mr Marshall's report. The Commission proposed a minimum weekly rest-period of 48 hours, reduceable to 36 hours at home, or to 24 hours away, as long as compensation is taken *en bloc* by the end of the following week. The Council, on the other hand, is suggesting 42 hours, reduceable to 36 hours at home, 24 hours away to be compensated within three weeks. I want to say this absolutely clearly, that it is my belief and the belief of the Commission that a weekly minimum rest-period of 42 hours is quite inadequate for reasons of safety and of social progress. We

strongly favour 48 hours, but for the sake of flexibility we are prepared to allow the reductions to be compensated within three weeks. I think that is a fair compromise. Certainly I will fight hard to resist the views of some members at least of the Council that we have been able to glean so far.

On the daily rest-period, our proposal is 12 hours reduceable to 9 hours three times a week, the lost rest-time to be compensated by the end of the following week. What the Council is suggesting is a shorter rest-period of 11 hours. Our proposal remains at 12 hours.

Apart from the reduction of the rest-period to 9 hours three times a week, the Council has put forward an alternative, which is to split the daily rest-period into two parts on the basis of an 11-hour rest-period. This could result in a minimum rest of 8 hours with a shorter period of 3 hours the same day. The Commission believes that such a system could lead to abuse with clear social and safety consequences. Such a system would definitely need added safeguards.

I come to a point I was alluding to before in this regard because of the very great difference between goods and passenger transport, which leads to varying needs which, regrettably, have not been fully examined in the case of passenger transport. For daily rest-periods, if Member States strongly pressed for a split, my view is that it should only be for passenger transport and limited to three times a week on alternate days.

It must also be understood that the two options, reduced rest-periods three times a week and the split, are mutually exclusive.

Finally, may I say that I note with pleasure that this House has positively welcomed the Commission's efforts to improve implementation and enforcement of the regulations — in particular, by means of the proposed Council recommendation but also by introducing certain stricter provisions in the regulations themselves and by removing unenforceable ones. Certainly, we attach very great importance indeed to obtaining a better application of the regulations throughout the Community, an anxiety which has been expressed by more than one Member during the course of this debate. But we do have to recognize that even a new and better regulation will need a permanent system of efficient checks and adequate sanctions if it is to achieve its objects.

During the course of the debate, a number of Members have made different suggestions that we should consult with a particular police force. May I say that there have been very widespread consultations not limited to those that I have been indicating before. We have been in touch with the police, and this has been done very carefully indeed.

Clinton Davis

The important and overwhelmingly accepted view during the course of this debate has been that we do have to achieve a compromise which is acceptable to both sides of the industry. We have moved far closer to that in recent weeks than was imagined possible just a few months ago. I think that for us, as a Commission, for this Parliament or for the Council, collectively or individually, not to pay sufficient tribute to the work of those who have been engaged in these discussions would be unfair. But more than that, it welcomes the possibility towards effective progress in a matter which has beleaguered this industry for far too

long. I am delighted that we seem, at least in this House and with the Commission, not in every respect but very largely, to have achieved a consensus. Let us hope that we can move forward from that.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken tomorrow at the next voting-time.

*(The sitting closed at 11.45 p.m.)*¹

¹ For the next sitting's agenda: see Minutes.

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 19 APRIL 1985

Contents

1. <i>Approval of the Minutes:</i> <i>Mrs Boot; Mr Tomlinson</i>	301	<i>Mrs Nielsen; Mr Marshall; Mrs Ewing; Mr Falconer; Mr Bombard; Mr Arndt; Mr Peters; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mr Elliott; Mr Gautier; Mr Pearce</i>	301
2. <i>Votes:</i> <i>Mr Kuijpers; Mr Beumer; Mrs Boot; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Wijsenbeek; Mrs Ewing;</i>		3. <i>Adjournment of the session</i>	305

IN THE CHAIR: MR NORD

Vice-President

(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)

1. *Approval of the Minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

Mrs Boot (PPE). — Mr President, I should like to ask whether Dutch was taken as the language of departure for the text, as adopted, of Article 13 of the Commission's proposal on the easing of frontier problems (Rogalla report), since in the French, English and German versions the expression 'collega van bijstand' is translated as though it were 'collega van advies'. I should like to see that corrected.

President. — Mrs Boot, we shall see that it is put right.

*(Parliament approved the Minutes)*¹

¹ For items relating to membership of committees, petitions, written declarations under Rule 49 and procedure without report, see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Mr President, on Monday I raised with the President of Parliament the question that I have now raised three times about alleged irregularities in the voting on the agricultural price-fixing. The President promised on Monday that he would write to Members concerned asking for a declaration from those Members who were not present but whose names appeared in the roll-call vote. Can we have a confirmation that that letter has been sent? And can we have a confirmation that a report will be made to us on the first day of the next part-session as to the replies that have been received to that correspondence? It is fundamentally important that this be cleared up before we deal with the letter of amendment concerning the 1985 budget.

President. — I am informed, Mr Tomlinson, that the President has written the letters promised. He has not yet received a reply. As soon as the reply has been received, information will be given.

2. *Votes*

Report by Mr Bonaccini, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(83) 706 final — Doc. 1-1241/83) for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the

President

Member States relating to the noise emission of rail-mounted vehicles (Doc. A 2-11/85): adopted¹

*
* *

Report by Mr Nordmann, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection (Doc. A 2-6/85), on the proposals from the Commission 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 — Doc. 1-1331/83), and

II. a directive amending Directive 79/581/EEC on consumer protection in the indication of the prices of foodstuffs (COM(84) 23 final — Doc. 1-1452/83)

Explanation of vote

Mr Kuijpers (ARC), in writing. — (NL) I shall be voting for the report, which is a logical consequence of the EEC directive of 1983 on the labelling of foodstuffs.

I wish to touch upon two problems, first of all the clarity of price indications for the short-sighted. The question of legibility often arises with old and with short-sighted people. Hence our amendment calling for clear and generally legible indications of price on the packet or wrapper and in advertisements.

The second problem concerns advertisements based on comparative prices. In our country, this is forbidden because comparisons made by the retailers themselves do not hold water. In principle there is something to be said for comparative indications of price, but it needs to be well regulated in the consumer's interests. It is a pity that these problems could not be dealt with in the directive.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)²

*
* *

Second report by Mr Beumer, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 391 final — Doc. 2-446/84) for a twentieth directive on the harmonization of the laws of the Member States relating to turnover taxes

— common system of value-added tax: derogations in connection with the special aids granted to certain farmers to compensate for the dismantlement of monetary compensatory amounts applying to certain agricultural products (Doc. A 2-15/85)

After the approval of the draft directive

Mr Beumer (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, in view of the observations made yesterday by the competent Commissioner, I would point out that, pursuant to Article 149 of the EEC Treaty, a proposal different from that which the Parliament actually wanted is to be laid before the Council — at least, that is what we can assume. The Council can only depart from this by a unanimous decision, but if the Council's decision should result in the Commission's submitting an amended proposal — that is, one differing from what it is willing to submit — I assume that it will consult the Parliament once more.

President. — Is the Commission prepared to respond to this question?

The Commission is not required to say anything on this point at the moment, Mr Beumer. Consultations are still going on.

Mr Beumer (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) If that is the case, Mr President, perhaps I may make one further remark. I think it is useful to have noted the point, even though the Commission, it would seem, can scarcely have any objections. As far as I am concerned, therefore, we can leave it at that. I note that the Commission has raised no objections.

Explanation of vote

Mr Beumer (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) I should like to make four comments. Firstly, I find that while the Commission announced that it was going to adopt a more independent position *vis-à-vis* the Council, this unfortunately did not come to pass when the proposal was being dealt with. I regret that. It was Parliament in particular that defended the Commission's original positions.

I should like to illustrate this by means of a second comment. The Commission did not even see fit to take on board an amendment that was already embodied in the Council provisions and thus does not come under Article 93 of the Treaty, which is being invoked by the Commission and which expressly links the level of aid with the dismantlement of the compensatory amounts. In this particular matter the Commission could, precisely at this time, have continued to carry out its role as an initiator. Parliament has afforded the Commission an opportunity of doing so.

¹ The rapporteur spoke
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1 to 6; and
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 7 to 11.

² The rapporteur spoke
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1 to 10; and
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 11 to 13.

Beumer

Thirdly, from the fact that the Commission has not taken on board a number of Parliament's amendments, even though this is a proposal with financial consequences, it follows that Parliament must ask for the consultation procedure to be initiated. I hope that it will decide on that when we come to vote shortly on this motion for a resolution, which contains a paragraph to this effect.

Fourthly, Parliament has expressly stated that its agreement to the 20th Directive will be dependent on the validity of Article 93(2). If it turns out that there are good grounds for contesting this validity, then I assume — and this is also stated in the motion for a resolution — that the Commission will come up with a new proposal. I felt that it would be useful to make these few further comments.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Report by Mrs Ewing, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, on the follow-up to the FAO World Conference on Fisheries (Rome, 27 June — 6 July 1984) (Doc. A 2-3/85): adopted

*
* *

Report by Dame Shelagh Roberts, on behalf of the Committee on External and Economic Relations, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 395 final — Doc. 2-620/84) for a regulation on customs debt (Doc. 2-1590/84/rev. II)

Explanation of vote

Mrs Boot (PPE). — (NL) Now there is no way of our voting in favour. I shall be voting against the resolution to bring home my view that the Commission's proposal has been too severely tampered with. This is because a number of amendments of the Committee on External Economic Relations have been adopted which originally came from the Legal Affairs Committee. In my view, this means that a blow has been dealt at the Community's own resources and a very broad interpretation is being given to the notion of 'fraud' so as to obviate customs debt. I particularly

regret that my only means of giving expression to these views is by voting against the motion.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Report by Mr Marshall, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 147 final — Doc. 1-167/84) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 543/69 on the harmonization of certain social legislation relating to road transport and Regulation (EEC) No 1463/70 on the introduction of recording equipment in road transport (Doc. A 2-9/85)

Explanation of vote

Mr Newton Dunn (ED). — I want to speak specifically on sub-paragraph 6 of paragraph 10 of the motion for a resolution, on which we voted separately. I regret to say that my group will be voting in favour of this. We cannot accept the position that Mr Stevenson and other British Labour members have put forward. They did not put forward such an amendment in committee. When the committee's report was put to the vote, they did not vote against the proposal either. Since they have not taken up that position in committee, we cannot possibly sympathize with them. We shall, therefore, be voting in favour.

Mr Wijsenbeek (L). — (NL) Mr President, first of all I should like to say that I regret that last night the Commissioner in my opinion rightly found it necessary to reject half of the Transport Committee's amendments. The unfortunate thing, in my view, is not that he did so but that the debate on such an important subject took place at such a late hour and that we could not be told the reasons for the Commission's objections. You will have noticed, however, Mr President, as well as the rapporteur that my group, for the most part, shares the Commission's view and rejects a number of the Transport Committee's amendments. As we see it, the modifications now introduced by the Transport Committee have transformed this report into a strait-jacket for a branch of the economy that is in full development, and I recommend my group to vote against it.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)²

¹ The rapporteur spoke
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1 to 5, 9, 22, 23 and 25; and
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 6 to 8, 10, 12 to 20 and 26.

¹ The rapporteur spoke
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 4 and 9 to 13.
² The rapporteur spoke
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1 to 33 and 35, and
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 34, 36 and 37.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — Mr President, I rise on a point of order to put this matter on record. I have heard that during the Reagan visit there is to be a virtual exclusion of the public from the gallery of this Chamber. I regard the presence of the public as an essential feature of any democratic Parliament, and certainly, as one who was once in the House of Commons, I can say that they certainly would never dare to exclude the public from that House. They would certainly not dare to do so in the American Congress. My information is — and I can be corrected if I am wrong — that 15 token members of the public are to be allowed in distributed among the groups. I am not questioning the fairness of the distribution among the groups, but I think we do ourselves a great injustice if we do this because of a visit from a distinguished foreign politician.

(Applause)

President. — Mrs Ewing, I can tell you that there have been many stories about the visit of President Reagan during this week. In order to separate the true from the less true, the President will call a meeting of the enlarged Bureau next week to inform them exactly how things are being prepared. After that Members will be informed of the precise situation so that if they raise objections they at least know what they are raising objections to. I think there is a need for precise information before we can start discussing this matter, and that information will be forthcoming next week.

Mrs Tove Nielsen (L). — *(DA)* Mr President, I should like to take issue with what Mrs Ewing said at the end of her speech, namely, that certain measures would be taken because an American is coming here. They are not being taken because an American is coming; it should not be turned into a political issue. The measures have nothing to do with the part of the world a visitor comes from. It is a security and not a political matter.

Mr Marshall (ED). — Mr President, you did say the enlarged Bureau was meeting next week. I hope you will take account when you meet of the very clear expression of agreement in this House with Mrs Ewing's basic philosophy.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — I absolutely object to Mrs Nielsen's remark. I have no objection to any president coming to this Parliament. That is one of the great things about it — it is open. But I positively object to what Mrs Nielsen said and she should retract it!

Mr Falconer (S). — Mr President, I completely associate myself with the remarks made by Mrs Ewing. You stated, however, that Members will be advised of the decisions of the enlarged Bureau and can make

objections then. When? On the Monday? Do you mean that it will be possible on the Monday evening to make objections to the arrangements for the President's visit the following Wednesday? It seems a rather short period of time to alter the arrangements if this Assembly rejects them.

President. — Mr Falconer, all I said was that it seems to me rather senseless to have a debate here based only on rumours and not on facts, and I advised Members to wait until they know the facts before they start raising objections. That is all I said. It seems to me a rather sensible way of looking at things.

Mr Bombard (S). — *(FR)* I wonder what would be the reaction of those protesting against the arrival of Mr Reagan if Mr Gorbachev asked to come here.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, I see little sense in continuing a discussion on the order of business when the discussion has no real basis. No one knows yet precisely what the arrangements are to be, and I propose that we wait until we know something more about the matter.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, to prevent further rumours, may I offer the assurance that the enlarged Bureau at any rate is in favour of allowing Members to attend the sitting.

(Laughter)

Mr Peters (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, I should like to prevent the Bureau from making a mistake. If the Bureau decides next week to allow the Members and all journalists and diplomats but only fifteen other visitors to attend, this will certainly not meet with Parliament's approval in May. The Bureau should therefore make provision straight away for the attendance of at least as many visitors as Members — one per Member.

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC). — *(DE)* The last speaker has said exactly what I wanted to say.

Mr Elliott (S). — Mr President, I hope that the Bureau, when they consider this matter, will bear in mind that whilst security is important, there are some politicians who seem to be over-obsessed with the idea of security and that if we allow considerations of security to reach the point where open, democratic governmental and parliamentary procedures cannot be properly carried out, then we defeat the whole object of open democracy. That is what many of us are concerned about.

If it is suggested that anybody who comes to speak to this Assembly requires a degree of security that will

Elliott

prevent open democratic participation in our proceedings by the public, then I think that is something that we cannot possibly accept.

Mr Gautier (S). — (*DE*) Mr President, I wish to put to you a request which you could perhaps forward to the appropriate quarters. When the American President comes, it would be a good thing to give priority to the journalists who are always here that is, to those who are also here when President Reagan is not and not to the many American and other journalists. That would be at least a gesture of courtesy towards the journalists accredited here.

(Applause)

President. — All the observations made here will be forwarded in good time to the Bureau.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, while the enlarged Bureau is considering the matter, could it also please

consider how photographers who will be in the Chamber at that moment should be marshalled? You will recall that on previous occasions there has been something of a scrummage down there, and it would be helpful if instructions could be given so as to prevent any unseemly behaviour.

President. — I will pass on your highly pertinent remarks to the Bureau, Mr Pearce.

3. Adjournment of the session

President. — I declare adjourned the session of the European Parliament.

(The sitting closed at 10.15 a.m.)¹

¹ For items relating to Declarations entered in the register under Rule 49, forwarding of resolutions adopted during the sitting, and dates of the next part-session, see Minutes.

**Salg og abonnement · Verkauf und Abonnement · Πωλήσεις και συνδρομές · Sales and subscriptions
Vente et abonnements · Vendita e abbonamenti · Verkoop en abonnementen**

BELGIQUE / BELGIË

Moniteur belge / Belgisch Staatsblad
Rue de Louvain 40-42 / Leuvensestraat 40-42
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel
Tél. 512 00 26
CCP/Postrekening 000-2005502-27

Sous-dépôts / Agentschappen:

**Librairie européenne /
Europese Boekhandel**
Rue de la Loi 244 / Wetstraat 244
1040 Bruxelles / 1040 Brussel

CREDOC

Rue de la Montagne 34 / Bergstraat 34
Bte 11 / Bus 11
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel

DANMARK

Schultz Forlag
Møntergade 21
1116 København K
Tlf: (01) 12 11 95
Girokonto 200 11 95

BR DEUTSCHLAND

Verlag Bundesanzeiger
Breite Straße
Postfach 10 80 06
5000 Köln 1
Tel. (02 21) 20 29-0
Fernschreiber:
ANZEIGER BONN 8 882 595

GREECE

G.C. Eleftheroudakis SA

International Bookstore
4 Nikis Street
Athens (126)
Tel. 322 63 23
Telex 219410 ELEF

Sub-agent for Northern Greece:

Molho's Bookstore
The Business Bookshop
10 Tsimiski Street
Thessaloniki
Tel. 275 271
Telex 412885 LIMO

FRANCE

**Service de vente en France des publications
des Communautés européennes**
Journal officiel
26, rue Desaix
75732 Paris Cedex 15
Tél. (1) 578 61 39

IRELAND

Government Publications Sales Office
Sun Alliance House
Molesworth Street
Dublin 2
Tel. 71 03 09

or by post

Stationery Office
St Martin's House
Waterloo Road
Dublin 4
Tel. 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 3935

Sub-agent:
Alan Armstrong & Associates Ltd
72 Park Road
London NW1 4SH
Tel. 01-723 3902
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 (Mall)
Ottawa
Ontario K1P 5A6
Tel. Toll Free 1 (800) 267 4164
Ottawa Region (613) 238 8985-6

JAPAN

Kinokuniya Company Ltd
17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome
Shinjuku-ku
Tokyo 160-91
Tel. (03) 354 0131

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprise:

- report of proceedings,
- annual indexes.

Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg:

Annual subscription 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 1 000

IRL 16

UKL 13

USD 20



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

