

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 2-330

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1985-1986 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 7 to 11 October 1985

Europe House, Strasbourg

General contents

| | |
|---|------------|
| Monday, 7 October 1985 | 1 |
| Resumption of the session, p. 1 — Agenda, p. 1 — Welcome, p. 3 — Waiving of the immunity of a Member, p. 3 — Cinema and television co-productions, p. 5 | |
| Tuesday, 8 October 1985 | 16 |
| Approval of the minutes, p. 17 — Membership of Parliament, p. 17 — Research and technology, p. 18 — European space policy — transport, p. 52 — Action taken on the opinions of Parliament, p. 64 — Question Time, p. 66 — Reference to committee of the Nordmann report, p. 77 — Votes, p. 77 — Annex, p. 87 | |
| Wednesday, 9 October 1985 | 90 |
| Approval of the minutes, p. 91 — European space policy — transport (continuation), p. 92 — New technologies, p. 96 — Welcome, p. 111 — New technologies (continuation), p. 111 — Draft general budget for 1986, p. 117 — Topical and urgent debate (motions), p. 124 — Draft general budget for 1986 (continuation), p. 125 — Question Time, p. 132 — Votes, p. 146 | |
| Annex 'Question-time' of Wednesday, 9 October 1985 | 148 |
| Thursday, 10 October 1985 | 173 |
| Topical and urgent debate, p. 174 — Common market for broadcasting, p. 197 — Dairy quotas, p. 209 — Votes, p. 220 — Dairy quotas (continuation), p. 224 — Jamming stations in Europe, p. 229 — Substances having hormonal or thyrostatic action, p. 232 | |
| Friday, 11 October 1985 | 244 |
| Votes, p. 244 — Adjournment of the session, p. 247 | |

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, 7 OCTOBER 1985

Contents

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| 1. <i>Resumption of the session:</i> <i>Mr Fitzgerald</i> | 1 | 5. <i>Cinema and television co-productions —</i> <i>Report by Mr Fajardie (Doc. A 2-93/85):</i> <i>Mr Baget Bozzo; Mr Beumer; Mr Brok; Mr</i> <i>Cassidy; Mr Papapietro; Mrs Larive-</i> <i>Groenendaal; Mr Härlin; Mr Tripodi; Mr</i> <i>Marshall; Mr Alavanos; Mr Ripa di Meana</i> <i>(Commission); Mr Beumer; Mr Ripa di</i> <i>Meana</i> | 5 |
| 2. <i>Order of business:</i> <i>Mr Arndt; Mr von Wogau; Mr Arndt; Mr C.</i> <i>Jackson; Mr Nordmann; Mr Collins, Mrs</i> <i>Veil</i> | 1 | | |
| 3. <i>Welcome</i> | 3 | | |
| 4. <i>Waiving the immunity of a Member —</i> <i>Report by Mr Donnez (Doc. A 2-105/85):</i> <i>Mr Donnez; Mr Ciccimessere</i> | 3 | | |

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

(The sitting opened at 6 p.m.)

1. *Resumption of the session*

President. — I declare opened the session of the European Parliament which was adjourned on 13 September 1885.¹

Mr Fitzgerald (RDE). — Mr President, I want to raise a point of order under Rule 8 of the Rules of Procedure, regarding the free movement of Members. I am lucky to be here to raise this point of order. On 23 September, on my way through Glasgow Airport, although I produced my identification from this Parliament, I was threatened with arrest and imprisonment. My alleged crime was that I had refused to sign

a red card giving details of my movement under the British Prevention of Terrorism Act.

I fully accept the need for identification on request, and I willingly produced my identity documents on that occasion; but I protest in this Parliament and I ask you, Mr President, to protest on my behalf and on our behalf for a number of reasons. First of all, it is discriminatory and it is only on flights into Glasgow from Dublin that all passengers are requested to sign. The practice has been discontinued at Heathrow as a result of protests from this Parliament. Secondly, having identified myself as a Member of this House, I was not cleared until a senior official was called who then accepted my objection in principle.

I would ask you, Mr President, on Parliament's behalf to make the strongest possible protest to the United Kingdom Government.

President. — Your statements have been noted. They will be examined by the Bureau, and we will see how your complaints can be followed up.

2. *Order of business*

President. — At its meeting of 10 September 1985, the enlarged Bureau drew up a draft order of business, and this has now been distributed.

¹ For items relating to approval of the Minutes, membership of Parliament, membership of committees, petitions, authorization to draw up reports, changes in committees referred to, written declarations under Rule 49, documents received and texts of treaties forwarded by the Council, see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

President

At this morning's meeting, the chairmen of the political groups authorized me to propose the following changes:

With regard to Monday, the three reports by Mr Donnez on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, on requests to waive a Member's immunity, only one, Doc. A2-105/85, has been tabled. The other two are therefore withdrawn from the agenda.

The Socialist Group proposes deferring to a later part-session Mr Fajardie's report (Doc. A2-93/85).

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, in the first place Mr Fajardie is not here and has therefore asked that the debate be deferred. That in itself is not an absolutely compelling reason, but the second point is that our amendments have not yet all been tabled, so that they cannot be dealt with. For this reason we propose that the debate on this report be deferred to the second October part-session.

(Parliament rejected the request)

President. — As regards Tuesday and Wednesday, we have two decisions to take, the first on the request to send the Toksvig report (Doc. A 2-108/85) back to committee, and the second on the request to defer the Metten report (Doc. A 2-99/85).

We shall now vote on the proposal, by Mr Arndt and others of the Socialist Group, to send the Toksvig report back to committee.

(Parliament adopted the request)

We shall now consider the request to defer to a later part-session the report by Mr Metten; this has been proposed by the Group of the European People's Party.

Mr von Wogau (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, we request that the Metten report be withdrawn for the following reason. This report deals with technology transfers, but this title is somewhat misleading inasmuch as the report deals exclusively with transfers of technology between the United States and Europe, on which the Committee on External Economic Relations is also preparing a report, the Roberts report. We take the view that it would be better to deal with this subject, which is extremely delicate, within the framework of our trade relations with the United States and that we should refrain from referring subjects of this kind to different committees and then debating them twice over. For that reason we are in favour of sending this report back.

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, the House decided to make the reports on technology the main

subject of the first October part-session, and these undoubtedly include the Metten report. This report deals not only with the question of transfers to and relations with America, but with transfers as a matter of principle.

It would be wrong, and would do less than justice to the subject as a whole, to withdraw a report simply because it, admittedly, touches in part on the subject of another report. This overlapping should be accepted, because it should be borne in mind that if the question of relations with the United States of America and the report of the Committee on External Economic Relations are sufficient reason for withdrawing the Metten report, then a number of other reports on technology which have to be debated should also be withdrawn, for they also concern these relations and, in addition, the report of the Committee on External Economic Relations.

It is therefore not quite clear to me why this, of all committees, should want to withdraw this one report but not the others which, after all, also touch upon this committee's report. Consequently, I am in favour of allowing the debate to stand. We assume in any case that the Metten report will take up relatively little time on Wednesday, in accordance with the proposal you are to make later.

(Parliament adopted the request. The President read out the changes to be made to the agendas of Thursday and Friday)¹

Mr C. Jackson (ED). — Mr President, pursuant to Rule 85 (1), I wish to move that the Nordmann report, which is the last item on this week's agenda, be sent back to committee. One would normally raise this during the debate, but it may be more convenient to the House to consider it now.

The Nordmann report relates to a directive on cocoa, a matter of great importance to the ACP countries which export cocoa. I understand from what the Commission said just now that discussions with the ACP countries are to commence this Thursday and will continue for some weeks. Mrs Rabbethge's opinion, adopted unanimously by the Committee on Development and Cooperation, asks that no further action be taken on the directive until consultations have taken place with our ACP partners. It would be quite inappropriate for Parliament to discuss this report just as discussions are going forward, because it makes a travesty of consultations with the ACP. Indeed, I am quite sure that the Committee on the Environment would wish to consider the results.

It is for that reason that I move that this be sent back to committee, and I hope this House will accept the motions.

¹ See Minutes.

President. — Mr Jackson, there is a difficulty with the Rules of Procedure. You are requesting that this be sent back to committee, and you are doing so at the moment when we are fixing the order of business. Changes to the order of business can only be proposed by a political group or by 21 Members of the Parliament.

(More than 21 Members rose in support of Mr Jackson's request)

Mr Nordmann (L), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, the fact of the matter is that this is a report that has been subjected to prolonged study by the Committee on the Environment. The impact it might have on the ACP countries was taken into account while the report was being drawn up and, above all, in the excellent opinion submitted by the Committee on Development.

The arguments we have just heard were submitted to the Environment Committee but were not accepted by this committee, and in my view a consultation with the ACP countries could hardly modify the report's conclusions. There remains, of course, the question whether or not this report will be adopted, but there are, I think, no new elements to justify sending it back to committee.

Mr Collins (S). — Mr President, I want to speak in favour very briefly. It is certainly true that the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection gave a great deal of consideration to this, and it is also true that the Committee on Development and Cooperation did so as well. But the fact of the matter is that consultations are going on and I think it is a little presumptuous of the rapporteur to suggest that we do not need to have regard to these. The fact of the matter is that if these consultations are taking place, we cannot not know the result, and it would be entirely inappropriate for this Parliament to come to a decision without being aware of the result.

It may well be that in the end we shall come to the same decision, but it is also quite possible that we come to a different decision. Therefore I think it would be appropriate for us to postpone this matter.

(Parliament adopted the request)

Mrs Veil (L). — (FR) Mr President, I am afraid you have committed a breach of the Rules. It has been done and voted on, but normally a request for a change in the order of business must be submitted in writing. This violation of the Rules I find unfortunate.

President. — Madam, it was not a change to the order of business but a request for sending a report back to committee.

Mrs Veil (L). — (FR) But yes, it was a change to the order of business, Mr President!

President. — Madam, if I have made a mistake, I offer my humble apologies to you and to the House.

(Parliament adopted the order of business with these modifications)¹

3. Welcome

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, I have the pleasure of welcoming the presence in the official gallery of Mr Zeng Tao, Chairman of the Committee on the Promotion of Relations between China and the European Parliament within the National People's Assembly of the People's Republic of China.

(Loud applause)

4. Waiving the immunity of a Member

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Donnez, on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, on the request to waive Mr Roberto CiccioMessere's parliamentary immunity (Doc. A 2-105/85).

Mr Donnez (L), rapporteur. — (FR) Ladies and gentlemen, the Italian Minister of Justice placed before us, or, more precisely, before the President of our Parliament, on 5 December 1984, a request to waive the immunity of Mr CiccioMessere on the following grounds.

On 15 October 1981, a uniformed police patrol noticed that a car was being driven with number-plates which did not seem to match back and front. Ordered to stop, the driver of the car, ignoring police siren and flashing lights, drove on and was finally boxed in, in one of the small streets around the Italian Chamber of Deputies. After refusing to state his identity, he abused the policemen, calling them hooligans.

These are the charges that have been made. I do not say they are accurate, I need hardly tell you — this is a matter for the judge, if it should come to that. Our task, whether the facts are established or not, is to decide whether they merit the waiving of the immunity of Mr CiccioMessere, as provided for in Article 10 of the protocol appended to the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community. I would simply point out that Article 10 provides that European

¹ For items relating to the time-limit for tabling amendments and speaking-time, see Minutes.

Donnez

Members shall enjoy in the territory of their own Member State the immunities accorded to members of the national parliament. By virtue of this text, Mr Cicciomessere is entitled in Italy to parliamentary immunity as set out in Article 68 of the Italian Constitution.

On the basis of previous cases, we have worked out a number of general principles which, once again, we have to apply. In particular, I pointed out that it was essential that we have a jurisprudence of our own so as to avoid any abuse of a political or national character. It was incumbent on us to consider each of the cases submitted to us taking account of the actual charges made and indeed of those general principles which I shall continue to term — no doubt improperly, but the meaning is very clear — our own jurisprudence and which I shall now quickly summarize in the form of three points.

First, parliamentary immunity as we understand it is not a privilege, but a guarantee given to our institution, the European Parliament. It is a guarantee of independence from all authorities, whoever they may be. The first consequence of this principle is that the renunciation of parliamentary immunity by the accused Member can have no legal effects.

In the present case, Mr Cicciomessere wished his parliamentary immunity to be waived. He is of course entitled to do so, and it is indeed our task to consider certain wishes, always bearing in mind the essential point that parliamentary immunity is intended to protect the Institution and, whatever the wish, sometimes legitimate, that some of us may have to request the waiving of their parliamentary immunity, that request can have no legal effects. This is an important matter of principle.

We also decided that immunity covered Members of our Parliament throughout their term of office, even if the charges made pre-date their election, as in the case of Mr Cicciomessere. This flows from the general principle that parliamentary immunity protects the institution and that it would not be fitting to use any other principle than the one I have just enunciated concerning the date of entry into effect in relation to the date of election. It is essential that we maintain this principle.

We further decided that parliamentary immunity as we understand it is quite distinct from the various practices of our national parliaments. In the present case, the Italian Chamber of Deputies decided to waive Mr Cicciomessere's immunity. We are not bound to follow them. We have our principles, they have theirs.

In truth, there must be no confusing cause and effect in this matter, any more than in others. The effects of parliamentary immunity are identical for an Italian deputy and a European Member. But the cause of immunity may be entirely different. In the present case, we need to ask ourselves the straightforward

question whether, by virtue of the basic criterion we have established and which I summarized in one sentence, the charges levelled against Mr Cicciomessere by the Italian judicial authority fall directly or indirectly within the framework of his political activity. Obviously they do not. Unless there is some new development, the facts, as set out by the Italian prosecuting authority, obviously cannot be brought under the heading of political activity. Calling a police officer a hooligan has never been a political offence. This seems to me perfectly clear, just as it is clear that there is no case for saying, after an examination of the file, that the charges made against Mr Cicciomessere were made with the aim of damaging his political life. This is another principle which we have decided always to respect. In the present case there seems to me no doubt — and no one disputes this — that the charges against Mr Cicciomessere can in no way affect his political activity.

On the basis of these basic criteria, the Legal Affairs Committee asks you to recognize that there is cause to waive Mr Cicciomessere's immunity, as requested by the Italian Minister of Justice. This I ask you to do.

Mr Cicciomessere (NI). — *(IT)* Mr President, I should like first of all to express my complete agreement with the conclusions reached by the rapporteur — conclusions which, moreover, I urged upon him — and at the same time I wish to make a number of reservations, Mr President, regarding the general explanation given in the report.

The rapporteur starts from an objective need — the need to create the European Parliament's own caselaw, which he justifies on the basis of our obligation not to create differences between one Member and another of the same parliament, the European Parliament, depending on their nationalities. The creation of caselaw is always difficult, and the enumeration of precedents is more so. But in this case it is necessary to establish which are the general criteria that we have to follow.

Well, we are in a special situation, a situation, that is, where we have some Members covered by parliamentary immunity whereas other Members are not — for this institution is completely unknown in the Anglo-Saxon countries. The creation of a special European caselaw must therefore, in my view, take account of this special situation, and hence restrict as far as possible the scope of application of this immunity.

It does not seem to me that this factor has been taken into account in the case-history put forward by the rapporteur, which is too broad. The rapporteur states that immunity cannot be revoked in all cases where the acts of which a Member of the European Parliament is accused are part of that Member's political activities. This is a somewhat far-reaching statement, and I would therefore ask the rapporteur how, for example,

Cicciomessere

embezzlement of public funds for the purpose of financing the political party, or other illegal activities intended to support the political party — which, clearly, come under the heading of political activities — should be regarded.

I think therefore that, whilst on the one hand it is dangerous to lay down general principles, on the other, when such principles are being established, they should be defined very clearly and precisely, making it clear that these acts must very strictly form part of the political activity — indeed, the parliamentary activity — of the Member, so as to avoid creating a situation of privilege for Members, which is something that is certainly inadmissible. Moreover, this is something that is perfectly possible, for example, under Article 68 of the Italian Constitution, which has been referred to explicitly: Article 68 is an open rule that does not lay down the criteria by which Members of the Italian parliament must be guided where the granting or refusal of permission to bring proceedings is concerned.

Therefore, Mr President, I think that, on the one hand the decision — for which I have pressed — to authorize the bringing of proceedings should now be confirmed; on the other hand, however, very restrictive criteria should be laid down that take account both of traditions in all the countries to which Members belong and of the need not to create privileges or dangerous precedents. This seems to me to be a priority matter for the Parliament, to avoid falling into a situation — as unfortunately has happened in the Italian parliament — where, through this immunity, the result has been the creation of situations of privilege.

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

Vice-President

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the decision)

5. Cinema and television co-productions

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-93/85) by Mr Fajardie, on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. C 2-28/85 — COM(85) 174 final) for a regulation on a Community aid scheme for non-documentary cinema and television co-productions.

Mr Baget Bozzo (S), deputy rapporteur. — *(IT)* Mr President, this subject is of great interest and was dis-

cussed by the last European Parliament on a number of occasions. The report, on the other hand, is based on a document presented by the Commission, accompanied by a valuable study that emphasizes the importance of the matter. I must say that this is a question that is of great importance in itself, because it concerns not only the question of European culture, but that of culture in general.

We are in fact facing a great crisis where the means of expression, both in the cinema and on television, are concerned. We must remember that, in Europe, and in continuity with the great artistic traditions of Europe, the cinema, starting with the French cinema of the thirties, has produced real works of great cultural value, on the lines of other great figurative arts such as painting, sculpture, architecture and literature. That is to say, it had the task of transfiguring reality, present and contemporary. We have only to think of directors such as Bergman, Antonioni, Fellini and Pasolini to understand that, over a long period, the cinema genuinely had these two great and important characteristics — it accustomed people in Europe and all over the world to reflect on the reality that surrounded them, and at the same time it transfigured that reality metaphorically — that is to say, it created works of art.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have known the artistic cinema, but it has become increasingly rarer. It is a privilege, for Europe, to have been the home of the artistic cinema, the *ambiance* in which the rôle of the cinema, as a medium, was seen as a perfect extension of the great rôle of art, which is to express reality metaphorically and convert it into a message — and thus into culture — expressing everyday things in a language that is not everyday, so presenting the humdrum daily round in a new light.

The cinema, ladies and gentlemen, has succeeded in doing this in Europe. We must, however, say that there has been a dramatic interruption. In this sense, television has had an adverse effect, having, as it were, broken a continuity: from the cinema which sought to transfigure reality, looking at it critically, encouraging us to see our daily lives in terms of beauty, television has pulled, as it were, the rug from beneath our feet, with its pursuit of pure escapism.

In the age of drugs, when escapism is so easy, the small screen has very often been the forerunner of the drug, of passivity as a way of life, and, as the bond between the cinema and television has been broken, so the creative capacity of the world of images has diminished.

The fundamental problem, therefore, is that the stream of great art which has found expression in the language of the cinema has slowly, gradually been on the decline in Europe. And this is the remarkable fact: being on the decline in Europe, it is on the decline in the world. I am not saying that the two things are one and the same, but undoubtedly the fall of the artistic

Baget Bozzo

cinema in Europe meant the fall of the artistic cinema in the world.

The Commission's proposal and, now, our own intervention tend fundamentally to recognize these realities, since, finally, we can only truly raise the level of our own lives if we can regain those standards and restore the language of art to the language of the screen. It has to be said that 'escapist' television, the television of pure fantasy, has been to some extent replaced — as has the cinema, to the consequent detriment of the great educational power of the artistic cinema — by a cinema that presents reality in a distorted way: the cinema and television of violence and pornography have become a medium of barbarization.

Do these problems concern the European Parliament? I think they undoubtedly do. They concern us directly, not least because, in reality, we are not talking here about a specifically European fact, we are talking about a function that Europe has taken on as the reflection of a worldwide culture.

At this point, however, we are faced with the fact that the market, as such, is no longer sufficient to support the artistic cinema, nor to raise the visual medium to that status. At this point the intervention of the public institutions is in one way or another inevitable. I am well aware that, in reality, at present in Europe, and obviously outside Europe as well, public-sector intervention is not very highly thought of. And yet, in this field, public intervention is necessary, because we are faced with a radical inadequacy of the laws of the market. Oddly enough, it is on the cultural plane that the ineffectualness of market forces is most apparent — and perhaps that was only to be expected. Quite apart from any ideological question regarding the State and the market, in this case, obviously, the relationship between the State and the market as an institution is undeniable, and therefore intervention is necessary.

The Commission's proposal considers that this task is the concern of the European institutions. This is a fact that must be emphasized. In reality, when the artistic cinema existed, it was a European fact. What I mean is that, in practice, there was no Italian, French, English or Swedish cinema, it was a European cinema, the quality of which could be transmitted, with a message in response to another message. If there really was a time when language differences did not constitute cultural differences, it was undoubtedly in the great era of the cinema. If there was a *koiné*, a common European language, from the '30s up to the '70s, this was expressed through the audio-visual medium.

This is another reason why the problem that we are facing is specifically a European one. That language and that artistic level that we expressed in the past is in fact still an open possibility.

The intervention by the Commission tends, as it were, to have a symbolic character; that is to say, it seeks to

encourage European co-production in the cinema and television sector. Why co-production? For the reason already given. There is no question here of wanting to suppress specific national characteristics, because in this sector, in this field, they are long established and fully integrated and, in practice, they have merged. From this standpoint we have to stimulate a possibility that previously existed and has only been removed as the result of economic conditions.

Compared with the vastness of the American market, which only rarely produced artistic cinema, but invented the highway of the commercial cinema and then, obviously, all of the cinema with which it was linked — with realistic, violent and even brutal dimensions — compared with the commercial dimensions of this type of audio-visual, the European artistic cinema could only be unequal in stature.

Consequently, at this point, we are faced with the specifically European problem of restoring a language of artistic expression that is of fundamental importance because of the identity that already exists and, hence, its transnational character: when there was an artistic cinema, it transcended all frontiers.

In this sense the producers in the different countries are asked to collaborate, and this is because we believe that the integration of the different cultural talents of the various countries is a fruitful integration. We think of Europe as a place where differences are complementary and, in the cultural field, this ought to be a definite, accepted fact. Our whole effort here, therefore, is aimed at making the various productions of Member States complementary, and hence creating a common language.

If, when dealing with questions of European unity, we come up against the stumbling-block — which is legitimate, even — of national differences, here on the other hand it is possible, in this broader language, to see how 'complementarity' is possible. And that is why the proposal and reports all tend to favour and facilitate, in an exemplary manner — which I would almost call symbolical, in view of the smallness of the budget — this integration of the producers from different countries so as to produce, for both the cinema and the television markets, works of a higher quality.

Your rapporteur has formally introduced, in the amendments, this reference to quality. We are obviously not thinking now about a European nationalism in the picture world. Instead, we seek to set the example of an improvement in quality — of restoring to the cinema, that is, its artistic dimension. If we look at the audio-visual cinema as it is today and as it was in the past, the great cultural difference is at once apparent to our eyes. The cinema of the great European era was the Greek theatre, in which everyday reality was transfigured by symbolism. What came after it, the era of violence and sex, reminds us instead of the Roman theatre, the dramatic exploits of the gla-

Baget Bozzo

diators, which can only be remembered as an error in the story of mankind. In the same way the pornographic cinema, the cinema of violence, the cinema of barbarization, is truly a negative dimension of our culture.

Here, I think we really also get to the roots of the common feelings of our peoples. What is exactly called for here is a return to the great state of the artistic cinema, to artistic television in Europe, not simply at the service of the people of Europe but at the service of the culture of all the world. We believe, in other words, that our old continent, whose stature is certainly open to discussion every time we express ourselves critically in this Parliament, still retains this capacity, and that therefore in this case, intervention by the public sector, far from suppressing freedom, stimulates it. The conditions of the European and American markets are such that the market forces help to stultify the creative power of our European creative artists. Public-sector intervention in this case is not called for to protect a privilege. It is called for, in this case, to promote the creative freedom of the individual.

The Commission's proposal, which we second in our report, is an exemplary one. It calls for public action, and European action, to restore dignity and quality to a medium so important to the life of our people and our youth — to the life, in fact, of every European citizen. The fight against barbarism — pictorial barbarism — is a fundamental duty in our age. I think it is right that the European Community should be concerned about it, and that the Parliament should approve this effort by the Commission along these lines.

Mr. Beumer (PPE), draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy. — (NL) It would be rather a pity if the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, which is expressed at some length in the Fajardie report, were not discussed here, because I believe it adds something significant to the Fajardie report itself. We think this is a very good report. The pity is — if I may say this generally — that committees do not take full advantage of the opportunities they have to coordinate their approaches with a view to including various aspects in a joint statement, and that is what has happened here. The opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy was completed as long ago as 18 June and approved by the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport on 19 September, but the report unfortunately shows little sign of the opinion being received so early. This means that we now have to make amendments in the Assembly, and I think there is a better way of going about these things.

As for the subject of the report, there is no doubt that, where the cultural aspects are concerned, a market will

emerge that will be far more important for Europe than we often assume. The Commission's interim report in response to the first Hahn report pointed out that we have 125 000 hours a year to fill with this kind of production and that we have yet to develop anything at all to meet this need.

The result is that 49% of all the productions of this type seen on our television screens are American, that we have no more than 30 co-productions in Europe, that exchanges between the European countries are very limited, that our exports are hardly worth mentioning, and certainly bear no comparison with the United States' exports, and that our costs are very much higher. The three largest television companies in the United States alone have, for example, already produced 110 special feature films starring the best actors for the coming television season. This means that we shall doubtless be seeing them in Europe. That is not a bad thing: it is a good thing, but there is too little being done here. The Commission's initiative is therefore to be welcomed. We approve of this initiative, but the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy has this to say about Mr Fajardie's resolution.

Firstly, the committee would like it to refer in particular to the poor organization of distribution. This is where we begin to lose ground in competition with the United States, and we want to see a great deal of emphasis placed on this, at least as much as is placed on aid to production.

Secondly, a great deal can be achieved if we complete the common market. We therefore call for a detailed analysis of the obstacles to a better developed programme industry. We also want an inventory of national subsidies so that we know how a Community system would work by comparison with national aid schemes.

Finally, we say that European aid must be decisive if it is to have any significance. We have pointed this out in a number of amendments. We feel it would be useful to reconsider the subject every three years so that we can be sure that we have not created institutions of which it might be said later: they could have been better.

Mr Brok (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my group is very grateful to the Commission for presenting this proposal for a regulation on a Community aid scheme for cinema and television co-productions. The European Parliament itself called for this in the first Hahn report on European television.

We must remember that the film is the particular art-form of the 20th century. This art-form is a product of the 20th century, and there is an urgent need to ensure that Europe and the Member States of the European

Brok

Community are represented where this art-form is concerned and find their own specific form of expression within it. We must also bear in mind that because of the development of electronic media there will be an enormous increase in the need for programmes over the next few years. We note, as Mr Beumer has already pointed out, that by the end of the 1980s, 125 000 hours of topical entertainment programmes will be needed in the European Community as a whole and that in France, for example, it currently costs 3 to 4 million francs to produce one hour of fiction whereas an episode of 'Dallas' can be purchased for FF 70,000. This is what gives rise to dumping prices which make it very difficult in Europe to provide sufficient high-quality productions for the cinema and television.

We must also bear in mind in this connection that the Motion Picture Export Association, which comprises the 'majors' United Pictures International, Warner, Columbia and 20th Century Fox, largely dominates the European market as regards both films and television.

Official statistics indicate that in 1981 in the Federal Republic of Germany these three film distributors accounted for 5.6% of all such undertakings with 11.4% of the royalty rights and 44% of the distribution turnover. By 1983, they accounted for 60% of the distribution market and 58% of all cinema-goers. In the European Community, 49% and in some Member States as much as 80% of the distribution market has been captured by these major distributors.

For this reason the question whether we can compete is essentially a matter of international and European identity. I believe that the draft regulation offers a suitable means and a suitable instrument for making progress here. We therefore call on the Council of Ministers to bear in mind in the face of the reservations which often emerge precisely in the cultural field regarding European decisions, that it is a question of preserving something of their own identity and that in addition to the classical solution of co-productions we should also have recourse to a European Community fund.

This fund can act as a small counterweight to the financial power of the US film industry, and if administered by experts from organizations concerned with the cinema and appointed by them — they could also be appointed by the Commission, as proposed in our group's amendment — it would certainly help to promote the production of films which were both box-office successes and of a high quality.

It must also be pointed out that a European film production fund should not hamper national promotion efforts. Mr Beumer, I am certainly not opposed to the inventory called for with regard to similar national aid schemes, but the view put forward earlier by the Commission to the effect that films should be regarded

above all as economic goods, something to be bought and sold, is clearly unacceptable. We should rather be insisting that for films, as vehicles of culture, distinctions should be allowable in contrast to other sectors of the internal market subject to harmonization.

At the same time, this should not become a call for a homogeneous European film: it should not lead to the elimination of the specific character of, say, Italian, French or German films. The special characteristics which these films show and which are expressed in word and picture — whether it be a De Sica or a Chabrol film — should not disappear in the future. We must bear in mind that the richness of this cultural sector lies in its variety.

However, I would again like to ask the Commission to consider whether it would not make sense — and this was something which was proposed on Saturday at the European Film Forum in Lille — to make part of this fund into a type of revolving fund, for the money paid back should not flow back into the general Community budget and thereby run the risk of being cancelled in the annual budgetary tug-of-war, but rather produce new and better possibilities for intermediate and pre-financing, etc. It should thereby have the possibility of growing and forming a special economic factor for the promotion of a cultural product.

I wish to thank Mr Beumer expressly for stressing the importance of the internal market in this connection. Perhaps we should therefore consider whether we should not include the promotion of dubbing, subtitling, etc., with a view to providing better access for individual national films to the European internal market.

The question of distribution undertakings also arises in this connection. Better cooperation between existing distribution undertakings and perhaps also a European distribution organization would clearly provide a decisive counterweight to the major distributors. It would not only promote better penetration of the European internal market by European films but also improve European films' export potential.

Finally, I should like to deal with the relationship between films and television. I should like to stress that it is not films which benefit from television but rather television benefits from films, sometimes indeed is an exploiter and parasite where films are concerned. When I think of the fact that 40 to 50% of all films broadcast by the two public television organizations in the Federal Republic of Germany are American films, I wonder how these organizations live up to their specific contract where programmes are concerned.

I am also obliged to state that television organizations in Europe pay too little for films. In the USA, 43% of the profits from films comes from the cinemas, 36% from the television and video industry and 21% from export. In the European Community, 75% of the

Brok

income is from the cinemas; in France it is even 86.5%. When we remember that in France, for example, in 1982, 4.5 million viewers watched the 470 films broadcast on television and that television paid FF 250 million for the broadcasting rights, whereas the cinemas had to pay FF 1.6 billion for the same 470 films, which were seen by 200 million spectators, one has to recognize that there is an imbalance and that television organizations must make a larger contribution to financing the European film industry.

This view can also be justified by the fact that the growth of television has led to a dramatic fall in the number of cinema-goers because these films can also be shown on television. In the Federal Republic of Germany, 818 million people still went to the cinema in 1955, whereas by 1982 the number had fallen to 125 million. The figures for the United Kingdom are even more striking. Cinema-goers dropped from one thousand two hundred million in 1955 to 60 million in 1982. I believe that the small number of cinemas and their patrons should not finance the films if later cheap films from the USA using dumping prices create difficulties for the European film industry.

The Commission's proposed directive is an important initial step. It should certainly not be the only step and, indeed, we shall have to discuss European television in the future. I should like once again to appeal to certain national governments which still have reservations in this regard to cast off their misgivings in the interests of an independent European film industry which is the expression of our identity so that we can take one step forward.

(Mr Cassidy asked for the floor)

President. — Mr Cassidy, will you be speaking on behalf of the European Democratic Group?

Mr Cassidy (ED). — No Mr President, I am not, more's the pity. Regrettably, I missed our group meeting last week. Otherwise, perhaps our group's position might be rather different on this.

My view, very simply, is that this proposal from the Commission is complete nonsense. We have in front of us the European Parliament briefing for this week, which contains the following sentence in the English version:

It is much cheaper for European television channels to import American TV series such as 'Dallas' than buy a domestic product.

Mr Fajardie's report makes the same point. Is Mr Fajardie seriously suggesting to this House that the Community should put money into the production of a series of Euro-Dallases and Euro-Dynastys? Are we going to be paying for a series telling an everyday

story of Frankfurt folk? Are we going to suggest that we have the ordinary life of the Parisian commune? No, this proposal, as phrased, makes no sense at all.

The accusation has been made by a number of speakers — including, I regret to say, my good friend Mr Brok — that there is somehow something reprehensible about the fact that the Americans sell an instalment of 'Dallas' for much less than the cost of production. He used the word 'dumping'.

Anyone who knows anything about the television industry realizes that we are all dumping. Television stations throughout the Community have bought, for example, British television programmes like 'Brideshead Revisited', which cost over \$ 100 000 per hour to make. You can depend upon it that not one television station in Europe or, indeed, in the United States has paid \$ 100 000 for an instalment of 'Brideshead Revisited'. We are all dumpers when it comes to television material.

Someone will no doubt make the point that this proposal applies to films and not just to television. However, it is again a fact of the entertainment world that something over 70% of feature films that are made in Europe each year are bought not for cinema distribution but for television showing. Had this proposal been for Commission support for non-documentary films, I might perhaps have felt differently about it, but support Euro-Dallases and Euro-Dynastys I never will!

Mr Papapietro (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I congratulate the rapporteur, Mr Fajardie, and his deputy, Mr Baget Bozzo, on this report.

We Europeans find ourselves in a subordinate position as regards both the cinema proper and the cinema on television. The cinema market is dominated, as we know, by regulations and *de facto* situations that establish complete domination by the Americans. We find ourselves in a situation of contractual *diktat*, which is absolutely incomprehensible from many points of view. Cinema and television productions from the United States reach us with their production costs already covered by the domestic market, and therefore at prices that cannot be competed with. It is not a question, therefore, Mr Cassidy, of making criticisms but of tackling this situation, since no cinema or television industry can overcome such a disadvantage without aid from the public sector.

As far as the future is concerned, with cable television, *via* satellite, and with the transmitting power, and the increase in transmissions and the number of programmes, that are expected to multiply 25 times over in relation to present levels, European cinema and television would be as earthenware crocks unable to resist the impact of the iron pot of American competition. The dangers, therefore — the report makes this clear

Papapietro

— are economic: the balance of payments. They are also social: intellectual unemployment — paradoxically enough, just when there is an increase in programme production. There is above all the cultural danger which we have often discussed here: the danger of invasion by cultural patterns that are not ours.

We are not afraid in any way of the cultural comparison, we are afraid that this cultural invasion is not due only to cultural reasons but to economic ones. Unlike Mr Baget Bozzo, I do not at all believe that the American cinema is at times a creative cinema. I do not believe this at all, if Mr Baget Bozzo will allow me to inject a little European arrogance into this statement.

Furthermore, this state of affairs is not only true of Europe in relation to the United States of America: it occurs also inside Europe, amongst countries whose audio-visual industry is structurally weaker, or whose language is less well-known than that of other countries that are linguistically stronger.

Mr President, since my time is running out I will cut short my speech and say only that the view that the Treaty does not deal with this subject is a view that wrongs the Treaty and is unacceptable. Europe cannot disregard a subject such as this, and therefore we ask that the Community budget provide Community aid for the television industry, and that is something for which we shall fight.

Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L). — (NL) Mr President, I shall be speaking on behalf of my group, unlike Mr Cassidy, it would seem.

In many European cities you see American words of abuse daubed on walls, American rock and disco music booms from car radios and fast-food restaurants have become part of the European street scene. The 'American way of life' is beginning to impose itself on Europe, and if we are not careful, our centuries-old continent with its many age-old refinements will become not only an economic but also a cultural colony of the United States.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, am I now making an anti-American speech? Not at all. Let me make it quite clear from the outset that every European and every Member of this European Parliament, wherever they are and even if they are not in the Chamber, that we all have reason to be grateful for the fact that the United States is our ally and friend. Abraham Lincoln referred to 'the liberal party throughout the world'. I am proud that as a European Liberal I am able to appreciate the stimulating rôle the United States plays in our development.

But the health of American civilization and the strength of European culture stand or fall with the realization that they are different. We can appreciate Californian wines as long as we refrain from calling

them bordeaux or champagne. We can enjoy Hollywood productions as long as we do not allow them to supplant our legendary works of art. The best Western stems from, but cannot replace, *Le Chanson de Roland*.

The application of new technologies such as satellite, video and cable television will increase the need for films. In the past — as someone has already said — the Member States have supplied only a fraction of the total number of non-documentary television and film productions. Are European actors, composers, writers, television directors and film producers unable to make programmes which appeal to Europeans — and Americans too, for that matter? Of course they are. But what they need is a modern, strong and competitive structure in which they can coordinate their efforts.

There is no point denying the attraction of popular American series like 'Dallas' and 'Dynasty'. But quality, Mr Cassidy, cannot and must not be determined by a small cultural élitist club. There are good European series, like the Dutch 'Herenstraat 10' and 'De Weg', which have just as high ratings in my country as the American series. Everyone is familiar with the high-quality films produced in Italy, France and Germany. But even small language areas like my country have made good films, such as 'De Soldaat van Oranje' and 'De Lift', and I would advise you to go and see them. They have been successful in other countries as well.

But the European film and television industries can only stand up to the flood of American productions by joining forces, adopting a joint approach and establishing a well-organized distribution system. And by not imitating the United States, of course. No, they must take advantage of our fantastic European cultural variety to turn out characteristically European productions. They must combine the best from the various European cultures rather than offering the lowest common denominator of popular entertainment. And, to be honest, that is what many American productions are.

Co-production and co-financing are, of course, no guarantee of success, certainly not if the combination consisted — and let us try to avoid this — of striking British film technicians, depressive German directors, French financiers intent on introducing chauvinistic elements and Italian producers yearning for the profits that spaghetti Westerns can produce. But the European television and film industry can be given a new change if practical financial aid is provided, as the Fajardie resolution requests.

And let us also think of the late and great actress Simone Signoret, born in Germany, of French nationality, and winner of the first prize awarded by the British film academy for her part in a French film *Casque d'or*.

To conclude, Mr President, I should like to say that, apart from the legitimate economic and commercial

Larive-Groenendaal

arguments for European film and television productions, the creative possibilities and the cultural ambience they radiate are, in our eyes, the real justification for Mr Fajardie's recommendations. They have our support because we believe it is a good thing for some weight to be placed on the European side of the transatlantic cultural scales again.

Mr Härlin (ARC). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. Western culture is under threat. We are to be showered from space with more American trash. Europe has gone into labour and given birth to a new aid pot. 5 million ECU — 10 non-documentary films — are to alleviate the great need. Mr Fajardie writes about a twenty-to twenty-five-fold increase in the need for entertainment — note, entertainment, not information, if I have read it correctly. We have taken our courage in our hands and are countering this with ten films per year. Congratulations!

The first thing I would like to ask Mr Fajardie is how he arrived at this estimate. Would he please tell us whose need is being forecast? Is he talking about a 20-25 fold increase in the need for entertainment on the part of the citizens of Europe? How should they cope with it? Or is it perhaps the need of certain media firms who have sent a few thousand million into orbit and are now becoming concerned about the yield? Whose need, then? That is my first question.

On the amendments, I wanted to say this. Mr Fajardie and the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport have been careful to accentuate the tendency of the draft aid programme, which was already closely tailored to the large producers. It is planned that not 20% but 30% of the financing could come from third countries. From a business point of view, this would be more than a blocking minority. It is also possible and indeed very probable that in the case of many productions of this sort third-country partners — as, for example, the US partner — will retain the majority holding in the film without preventing the film being promoted as a particularly 'European' and high-quality film.

However, to come to the real question, why is it, as Mr Fajardie has remarked, that 30% to 80% of the entertainment material currently being broadcast is American? Mrs Larive-Groenendaal has already put her finger on it: American productions have a particular attraction which cannot be matched in Europe. I mean by that that the material from which these screen daydreams originating in America are made is essentially the American Dream, and this cannot be conjured up for Europe by subsidies — not with 5 or even 50 million ECU. To what I would call this indecent mixture of the simple glorification of success and easy living, of brutality and rapid oblivion, which can build on a readiness, much more in evidence in America, to confuse the ideal and the dream on the one hand and reality on the other, and which has a long tradition of

reducing a cultural diversity which is much more dominant in America than here in Europe to a tasteless lowest common denominator; to this powerful dream production — or, perhaps better, dream expropriation — business which controls the *clichés* of the world, we have nothing we can oppose — certainly not with 5 million ECU.

You should not, I believe, worry how the TV giants who are now seeking partners in Europe and who in the last analysis will probably again be the first to benefit from these subsidies can have themselves subsidized with up to 10% of the production funds from Parliament or the EEC. If you really want to put money into the mass media, you should rather be concerned to promote small producers; local film and television producers, the people who are concerned with the needs of the citizen and not those of the media giants. You should be concerned with promoting non-commercial productions, where 5 million ECU could indeed make a difference. To give 5 million to the largest would be nothing more than the usual method followed in this House — namely, to give more to those who already have a lot.

Mr Tripodi (DR). — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of the European Right considers it essential to safeguard European cinema and television production. This is also the demand of innumerable workers in the cultural field who see these industries as a medium for artistic creativity and a means of communication and education.

It is undoubtedly a difficult moment for our directors, actors, scenario-writers, and so on, down to the humblest worker in those industries. There is little money, few resources and, often, very little conviction. There is a distribution crisis, a capital crisis, and there is a crisis as far as audiences and the viewing public are concerned.

And it is precisely on our public that I should like to dwell for a moment; a public that now passively accepts and submits to what are no longer messages but bare pictures of any kind that are offered, even if they are second rate, not to say downright barbaric. This post-war public, which is increasingly steeped in foreign ways and customs, accepts and swallows everything without distinction, and without either historical or psychological reactions.

In this noisy confusion the European cinema no longer has a voice of its own. It is unable to make itself different, to give itself character, to fight back as a single cultural entity bearing values that are ingrained with its ancient civilization. Whose fault is it? It is certainly not the fault of the masses, of the anonymous, passive spectator. The great majority submits to a choice that is certainly not wished for but is imposed by calculations and interests that are anything but moral ones. Responsibility goes back to the distributors, who are

Tripodi

motivated by purely economic calculations, and who senselessly permit the invasion by non-European products to an entirely disproportionate degree. But those most responsible are our rulers, who have neither defended nor done the best for the European cinema, with appropriate laws.

It is clear, therefore, that we have to remove these causes and these misunderstandings, as well as implementing measures, such as those proposed by the rapporteur, for relaunching our cinema and television production.

Is this protectionism on our part? Let us be protectionist *vis-à-vis* those who are protectionist where we are concerned! Let us in the first place help our distribution system, let us support it with whatever pressure the situation seems to call for, as circumstances demand. It is no secret — and I am not guilty of anti-Americanism — it is no secret that the American distributors reject European films with the excuse that American audiences and viewers do not like dubbing. We could reply that the European public has made the necessary effort, has stomachached it, and has accustomed itself to the dubbing of American films.

Let us realize that the seventh art is a boundless source of gain and wealth that no-one is prepared to relinquish gratuitously to others. May I remind you that, at the time of Italian neo-realism, the American cinema was quite worried about it. The reality that flowed from the films of De Sica destroyed the *papier-maché* structures of Hollywood. Then followed Italian comedy, and this again put affected Americanism right out of contention. Then it was that the American industry decided to give itself a new look, and block our own industry.

Let us try, therefore, to have confidence in the creativity of our language, our culture, our imagination and intelligence. We shall then relaunch a sector that is of vital importance to the cultural and educational life of the peoples of Europe, as well as to their economic interests.

Mr Marshall (ED). — Mr President, the film industry of Europe will prosper only if it produces films which appeal to the consumer. The authors of this report adopt a different philosophy towards a prosperous film industry. They seem to believe that the film industry will prosper only if public money is thrown at its problems. But they fail to look at those two Community film industries which are already in receipt of large dollops of public money, namely, those of France and Italy, which individually are given something like £ 70 or 80 million per annum as a subsidy from public funds. That has not stopped them being weak, ineffectual industries unable to compete. I believe that the evil stench of subsidy which is about this report all too often results in extravagance. We have seen in our own country how the British Broad-

casting Corporation, because it is able to tap the public funds, is accused of gross extravagance from time to time. It is significant that those who have practical experience of the industry are very wary about the proposals in this report.

First of all, the sum of money involved is relatively little, so we produce very, very few films and we are probably causing more chaos by arguing about who should or should not receive the 5 m ECU, which is to be the original size of the fund, than actually helping the production industry.

One has to remember that the broadcasters already have a voluntary system to help in co-production. I believe, as do most broadcasters in the United Kingdom, that that system is preferable to this particular proposal. I suppose it is significant that the British Screen Advisory Council, whose chairman is that old trouser Harold Wilson, no opponent of government intervention in industry, is not enamoured of this proposal either. If the broadcasters are not enamoured of it, if Harold Wilson is not enamoured of it, then surely one must ask whether it is really sensible.

I do not believe that the nature of the fund really makes it terribly attractive. If the object is to help Europe's culture, this money could be much more usefully employed helping to save Venice than producing on a co-production basis *The Merchant of Venice*. I believe we have got our priorities wrong and that this puny little fund will not do anything for the culture of Europe. It may create one or two bureaucratic jobs, but it will not do our industry one whit of good.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, yesterday evening at the Salonica film festival, the film *The Rocky Years* by Pantelis Voulgaris, was awarded a prize — a film that had already received universal critical acclaim at the Venice film festival earlier this year.

However, I now ask, what future can be expected for this film outside Greece itself? How will it be able to meet the enormous publicity costs entailed if it is to make its way to the other EEC countries, or break into the distribution circuits largely controlled by the American entertainment corporations, especially when we consider that an average American film, costing 12 million dollars to make, will spend as much again on publicity and distribution? How can a Greek creative artist of that calibre spread his wings beyond the frontiers of our country? How can the young and the working people in the EEC's Member States, overwhelmed as they are by the 'Made in the USA' subculture, recognize any other proposal either in the sector of art or in that of life itself?

From this standpoint, I believe that for national film industries such as those of Greece and other EEC countries, the problems of distribution, publicity and financial support are truly dramatic. One need only

Alavanos

recall that 35%-80% of the purchases by Member States of films and entertainment in general are of American products. The Commission's concern with the problem would be a positive factor were it not for one major risk, and one major limitation.

The risk is that these measures may offer only slight assistance to certain minor co-productions, though we fear that that is not the real issue. The main problem is that if such measures are combined with the common policy for a unitary radio and television market, those who will benefit are the multinational conglomerates. Thus, alongside the threat posed by the American entertainment industry, there will exist a menace from a West-European entertainment industry. Not, of course, in the form of a Fellini or a Wim Wenders; but alongside 'Dallas' and 'Dynasty', we shall have problems from a Euro-'Dallas' and a Euro-'Dynasty'.

The limitation I referred to is that the Commission's proposals, with regard to the sums involved, the number of co-productions to be financed and also the conditions, viz., that this would be loan capital, often indeed subject to interest, are entirely inadequate to deal with so acute a problem.

From this point of view, we believe there should be substantial supportive measures for the national film industries, and above all without conditions linked to common cultural integration.

Mr Ripa di Meana, Member of the Commission. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I do not think I can be accused of parliamentary formalism if I emphasize the importance of this subject. Moreover, it is confirmed by this debate, so explicit and rich in ideas and also in contrasts. The resolution prepared by Mr Fajardie, on the proposal for a regulation submitted by the Commission to the Council and designed to introduce an aid scheme for cinema and television co-production, concerns — as has been recognized by almost all the speakers — a sector of the life of our Community that is central and very delicate, both from the cultural and the socio-economic standpoints and, I would add, from the political standpoint also.

First of all, I should like to express the Commission's gratitude for the support given by the Fajardie resolution to the proposed action. In particular, I value the amendment introduced by the rapporteur himself, whereby the Parliament calls on the Council to initiate the conciliation procedure provided for in the Agreement of 4 March 1975 between Parliament, the Council and the Commission, if the Council intends to depart from Parliament's opinion.

It is no secret that the Commission's proposal is resisted in some quarters within the Council. This resistance is clearly minoritaire and, moreover, in no way concerns the merits of the question. There is recognition, in fact, within the Council, of the accuracy of the

diagnosis made by the Commission, of the reasonableness and legitimacy of the aims indicated, and of the need to do something to achieve these aims. They also recognize the urgent need for action. However, whilst admitting and recognizing all that, they prefer to state that the remedies must be generated spontaneously by the energies of that very same market and that very same industry whose ills and structural malfunctions they have only a moment before recognized. So the doctor, having examined the patient and seen the gravity of the illness, raises his eyes to Heaven and calls on Providence. There is certainly nothing wrong in this, but why not also try administering some medicine, if we have some available?

Parliament and the Commission have proceeded jointly on this subject, and the proposal, which finally gives shape to part of their thinking, is well-founded and considered. It has taken careful account, on the one hand, of the serious risks, and, on the other hand, the great possibilities that the situation we envisage demands.

Your rapporteur, Mr Fajardie, has analysed the Commission's proposal in depth and with great skill. Mr Baget Bozzo, who presented the report, also introduced some very interesting elements that enhance the report. This makes it unnecessary for me to go over the structural lines and explanatory details of the report again.

I shall take advantage, therefore, of this relatively free hand that this allows me, to draw your attention to some points that seem to me essential for a final assessment. In the first place — and on this point the verdict of almost all the speakers backed our analysis — we want to emphasize the interdependence of the cinema and television. From some quarters in the Council, there have come criticisms of the fact that television and the cinema are dealt with jointly under the scheme proposed by the Commission. There was talk of the serious crisis in the cinema, as against the flourishing situation of television — and there was a reference along these lines also in the speech by Mr Cassidy. In reality, the cinema and television are now two inter-communicating vessels.

As we have said in the explanatory memorandum of the proposal for a regulation, any aid granted to the cinema amounts sooner or later to aid for television, just as any aid for television productions nourishes the same industrial and artistic sectors from which both the cinema and television spring. And if it is true, as it is, that the cinema in Europe is at present going through a grave economic crisis, it is nevertheless television that will have to face an enormous increase in the demand for programmes. We have been reminded of the figures quoted in the Green Paper on television, presented by the Commission itself.

It will not be possible, then, to meet that increased demand without some degree of extraordinary, addi-

Ripa di Meana

tional aid. If this aid is not forthcoming, there is the clear and serious danger that tens of thousands of hours of transmission will be filled by programmes conceived and produced outside Europe. At this point I should like to say to Mr Cassidy and Mr Alavanos that there is no question of 'pumping in' money to a Euro-Dallas or a Euro-Dynasty. We are talking about enabling the European industry to face the challenge of the enormous increase in programme demand, before death overtakes our industry. This is the central point of our thinking; and if any observation is to be made on the quality and the destination of this aid, it is in the direction mentioned by Mr Baget Bozzo, who presented the Fajardie report — that is to say, towards the restoration of the artistic cinema and television.

Moreover, new, extraordinary possibilities will open up if a fair proportion of those thousands of hours are filled by the European industry. It will not matter very much that these programmes are called films or telefilms, 'mini-series' or 'large series', with all the appropriate nomenclature and so on. They will be conceived and produced by the same creators, the same actors, the same technicians.

Having acknowledged this interdependence of the cinema and television, we had to take into account the differences that nonetheless exist in the respective economic structures and the production and broadcasting organizations. These differences necessitate different financial techniques in the provision of aid.

This is the second point to which I would draw your attention. The Fajardie report gives an exhaustive explanation of the reasons. I do not need, therefore, to repeat them; I would simply commend them to the attention of anyone who still has doubts as to the need for different forms of credit, for different purposes, to cinema producers and television respectively.

There is one third, essential point, and that is the 'pilot' character of the aid scheme, if only because of the smallness of the financial resources, which has also been recognized here during the debate. It is no cause for discouragement, but it emphasizes the 'pilot' character of the proposed scheme. The smallness of these resources would not make it fanciful to expect that such a proposal should be able to get things moving on the way to a complete solution of the problems in question, but it is not an experimental period of action on a reduced scale: it will be valuable to us for gathering the reactions of the environment concerned, and for checking the initial assumption and the validity of the criteria adopted.

I should like here to emphasize — and the explicit, highly favourable reactions that have reached us from the two great festivals at Cannes and Venice this year confirm this — that the mere announcement that the Community is examining the possibility of implementing the proposed scheme has already raised expectations, amongst cinema and television authors and

producers, which certainly go beyond what, with our present resources, we shall be able to offer. The intensity of these expectations is, however, a valuable indicator of how real and great the need is.

It is — I say again — an experiment. Its duration can be fixed in advance, as is called for by the amendment put forward by Mr Beumer, the draftsman of the excellent opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. The three-year limit proposed seems to me, however, to be really too short to give the experiment real significance. If the limit were extended to five years, the proposed amendment would be acceptable to the Commission.

There is also a fourth point suggested to me by the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and by Amendments Nos 10 and 12 put forward by Mr Beumer. This concerns the primary importance to be attached to the question of distribution. Here I express total agreement — reasoned, active agreement — with the opinion that Mr Beumer, Mr Brok, Mr Papapietro, Mrs Larive-Groenendaal and Mr Tripodi have offered on this point. The problem of distribution mainly concerns films intended in the first place for the cinema circuits, since the broadcasting of television productions is almost always assured from the outset. I repeat, I am fully in agreement as to the primary importance of distribution. Indeed, I consider that, like the question of loans to the cinema at European level, it is a question which should be the subject of urgent study, which I personally intend to promote with proposals from the Commission.

Mr Beumer's Amendments Nos 10 and 12 are, therefore, acceptable to the Commission. Amendments Nos 13 and 14, on the other hand, do not appear to be acceptable: the first introduces a call for action to be postponed until after the inventory has been prepared. The initiative of making an inventory is undoubtedly very interesting, provided it does not slow down the implementation of the scheme we propose. I should in fact consider that postponing the start of the scheme would be dangerous, and would compromise the effect of the proposal.

In the same way, Amendment No 14 seems to me too hesitant and critical, and in effect it does not seem to convey any real determination to approve the proposal for a regulation.

I should like now very briefly to comment on two points that have come up in the debate, and which I consider very interesting.

The first was raised by Mr Härlin, and the other, coming after Mr Cassidy's speech, was taken up again by Mr Marshall. Mr Härlin pointed out the danger of majority participation by American companies in the co-production projects.

Ripa di Meana

I should like to assure Mr Härlin that the Commission is aware of this, and the proposal for a regulation therefore provides for a ceiling of 30% for participation by co-producers from countries outside the Community. But, if I may anticipate his objection, I will add that, in the case of companies that are legally European but are controlled by outside capital, the implementing regulation that will follow the present regulation will contain the technical provisions to cover this aspect.

In addition, Mr Härlin raised the problem of the draft regulation for minor co-productions. I should like to draw his attention to the fact that the proposal that we are presenting offers especially favourable conditions to co-producers in countries whose audio-visual production is small. I do not think, therefore, that in the text as it is drawn up so far there is any danger of squeezing out the lesser producers and groups.

I have nothing special further to add, except to express my gratitude for the work of the Committee on Culture, for the work of Mr Fajardie, and for the great freedom and originality of the debate that we have had this evening.

I am sure that, in view of the Council's early deadlines — the 'Culture' Council will meet towards the middle of December — I can count on the solidarity and support of Parliament, for which, on behalf of the Commission, I now express my thanks.

(Applause)

Mr Beumer (PPE), *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy.* — (NL) I should just like to comment on what the Commissioner has just said, because he has misinterpreted my amendment No 13, and that

might have an adverse effect on the assessment of this amendment. It does not say that nothing can be done before national subsidies are introduced. All it says is that things can be assessed better where they already exist. That does not mean that you have to wait but that you must ensure we obtain a clear overall picture so that you can make a better appraisal — in other words, give a different interpretation.

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy would much prefer three years to five, but if the Commission is itself prepared to propose five years, I do not think we shall have much difficulty in giving our approval. The most important thing is that there should be some kind of time-limit and an agreed time for evaluation.

Mr Ripa di Meana, *Member of the Commission.* — (IT) Mr President, just a word to Mr Beumer. First of all, I thank him for his clarification regarding the inventory. After his statement, which will naturally go on record the Commission would appear no longer to have grounds for concern, and I therefore modify the Commission's point of view.

Secondly, I thank him for his personal understanding in accepting the point of view of the Commission regarding the time that is necessary, which we have put at five years. On the other hand, I understand his obligations as rapporteur for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. I therefore maintain the Commission's point of view.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting-time.

*(The sitting closed at 8 p.m.)*¹

¹ For the next sitting's agenda, see Minutes.

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 8 OCTOBER 1985

Contents

| | | | |
|--|----|---|----|
| 1. <i>Approval of the minutes:</i> <i>Mr Nordmann; Mr Pearce</i> | 17 | <i>Varfis; Mr Wijsenbeek; Mr Varfis; Mr McCartin</i> | 64 |
| 2. <i>Membership of Parliament</i> | 17 | 6. <i>Question Time (Doc. B 2-960/85):</i> | |
| 3. <i>Research and technology — Reports (Doc. A 2-109/85) by Mr Poniatowski and (Doc. A 2-110/85) by Mr Ciancaglini and oral ques- tions with debate (Doc. B 2-912/85) by Mr De Gucht and Mr Ducarme, to the Commis- sion; (Doc. B 2-913/85) by Mr Klepsch and Mr von Wogau, to the Council and (Doc. B 2-914/85), to the Commission; (Doc. B 2-915/85) by Mrs Scrivener and Mrs Veil, to the Commission; (Doc. B 2-968/85) by Mr Turner, to the Commission; (Doc. B 2-969/ 85) by Mr Seligman, to the Commission:</i> <i>Mr Poniatowski; Mr Ciancaglini; Mr Boden (Council); Mr Linkohr; Mr Sälzer; Mr Tur- ner; Mr Ippolito; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Fitzsi- mons; Mr Christensen; Mr Bachy; Mr Petronio; Mr Baudis; Mr Seligman; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Staes; Mr Metten; Mr Rinsche; Mr Toksvig; Mr Alavanos; Mrs Lie- nemann; Mr Estgen; Mrs Daly; Mr Bonac- cini; Mrs Salisch; Mr Croux; Miss Brookes; Mr Hutton; Mr Naries (Commission); Mr Cassidy</i> | 18 | • <i>Questions to the Commission:</i> <i>Question No 1, by Mr MacSharry: EEC aid for pigs:</i> <i>Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Mac- Sharry; Mr Andriessen; Mr McCartin; Mr Andriessen</i> | 66 |
| 4. <i>European space policy — transport — Reports (Doc. A 2-89/85) by Mr Münch; (Doc. A 2-106/85) by Mr Longuet; (Doc. A 2-104/85) by Mr Wijsenbeek and Interim report (Doc. A 2-107/85) by Mrs Barbarella:</i> <i>Mr Münch; Mr Wijsenbeek; Mrs Barbarella; Mr Longuet; Mr Kolokotronis; Mr von Wogau; Mr Seligman; Mr Filinis; Mrs Scriv- ener; Mr Pasty; Mr Härlin; Sir Peter Van- neck; Mr Adam; Mr Mallet; Mr Marshall; Mr Mattina; Mr Raftery</i> | 51 | • <i>Question No 2, by Mr Christodoulou: Delays in the collection of VAT revenue:</i> <i>Mr Christophersen (Commission); Mr Stavrou; Mr Christophersen; Mr Mac- Sharry; Mr Christophersen; Mr Alavanos; Mr Christophersen; Mr Wolff; Mr Chris- tophersen</i> | 67 |
| 5. <i>Action taken on the opinions of Parliament — Statement by the Commission:</i> <i>Mrs Seibel-Emmerling; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission); Mrs Thome-Patenôtre; Mrs Castle; Mr Clinton Davis; Sir Jack Stewart- Clark; Mr Clinton Davis; Mr Cryer; Mr Varfis (Commission); Mr Tomlinson; Mr</i> | | • <i>Question No 5, by Mr Van der Lek: 'European Network of Women':</i> <i>Mr Pfeiffer (Commission); Mr Van der Lek; Mr Pfeiffer; Mr Wijsenbeek</i> | 69 |
| | | • <i>Question No 7, by Mr Hutton: Infec- tious diseases:</i> <i>Mr Sutherland (Commission); Mr Hut- ton; Mr Sutherland; Sir James Scott- Hopkins; Mr Sutherland; Mr Cryer; Mr Sutherland</i> | 70 |
| | | • <i>Question No 8, by Mr Boutos: Looting and destruction of archaeological trea- sures in the occupied territories of Cyprus:</i> <i>Mr De Clercq (Commission); Mr Bou- tos; Mr De Clercq; Mr Stavrou; Mr De Clercq; Mr Wijsenbeek</i> | 71 |
| | | • <i>Question No 9, by Mr Ford: Dumping of South Korean and Japanese batteries in Europe:</i> <i>Mr De Clercq; Mr Ford; Mr De Clercq; Mr Cryer; Mr De Clercq</i> | 72 |
| | | • <i>Question No 10, by Mrs Ewing: The Assisted Development Programme in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland:</i> <i>Mr Varfis (Commission); Mrs Ewing; Mr Hutton; Mr Varfis; Mr McMahon; Mr Varfis</i> | 73 |

| | |
|---|----|
| • Question No 12, by Mr Habsburg: <i>Stabex</i> : Mr Sutherland; Mr Habsburg; Mr Elliott; Mr Sutherland | 74 |
| • Question No 14, by Mr von Wogau: <i>Turnover tax on books imported for public libraries</i> : Lord Cockfield (Commission); Mr von Wogau; Lord Cockfield | 75 |
| • Question No 15, by Mr Fitzsimons: <i>EEC support for designing and building a low-energy hospital</i> : Mr Mosar (Commission); Mr Fitzsimons; Mr Mosar; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Marshall | 76 |
| 7. Referral back to committee of Nordmann report | 77 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 8. Votes Mr Griffiths; Mr Fajardie; Mr Kuijpers; Mr Arndt; Mr Klepsch; Mrs Veil; Mr Arndt; Mr Prag; Mr Ford; Mrs Fullet; Mr Rothley; Mrs Veil; Mr Arndt; Mr Härlin; Mr Stirbois; Mr Luster; Mr P. Beazley; Mr Arndt; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Alavanos; Mr Ippolito; Mr Ford; Mr Tomlinson; Mrs Lizin; Mr Rogalla; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr Hughes; Mr Filinis; Mrs Gredal; Mr Kolokotronis; Mrs Pery; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Alavanos; Mr Ford; Mr Tomlinson; Mr de la Malène; Mr Klepsch; Mrs Viehoff; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mr Filinis; Sir Peter Vanneck | 77 |
| Annex | 87 |

IN THE CHAIR: MR ALBER

Vice-President

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

1. Approval of the minutes

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

Are there any objections?

Mr Nordmann (L). — (FR) There is, I believe, an error on page 25 of the minutes for yesterday's sitting, on the subject of the discussion which took place concerning the report that I was to present during this part-session. The minutes speak of a referral back to committee, where they should have said an adjournment. The procedure followed yesterday was not the Rule 85 procedure, but the Rule 56 procedure. Moreover, when Mr Jackson made his request, President Pflimlin told him that if he was calling for a referral back to committee, this request could be made at the beginning of the debate proper. In fact, though, he followed the Rule 56 procedure by asking for the support of 21 Members, which was duly obtained, but would not have been necessary for a referral back to committee. I do realize that these terms are often used indiscriminately, without specifying exactly what is meant, but I feel that there could be an amendment in this case, in view of the procedure adopted yesterday, which was the Rule 56 procedure.

President. — Mr Nordmann, what was requested was a referral back to committee. The procedure that was then applied was admittedly not entirely correct since the relevant documents should have been submitted at the latest an hour before the beginning of the sitting. To that extent you are right. Might I suggest we proceed as follows? The Bureau is meeting at the moment. From 10 a.m. I shall be taking part in that meeting and I shall again raise the procedure for discussion.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, if the Bureau concludes that what happened yesterday was not correct, can I have your assurance that you will allow time for those 21 signatures to be collected on paper, something which I would be very happy to arrange. Will you give us that possibility. Mr President, if the decision goes that way?

President. — Before we get involved in a long and unnecessary debate, may I repeat that the Bureau will be dealing with the question later. You will then be informed of the outcome.

(Parliament approved the minutes)¹

2. Membership of Parliament

President. — In accordance with Article 12(2), second subparagraph, of the Act concerning the election of the representatives of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage, I wish the House to know that our colleague,

¹ Documents received: see minutes.

President

Miss Flesch, has notified in writing her resignation as a Member of the European Parliament. The House notes this and will inform the Member State concerned accordingly. I should like to thank Miss Flesch for her valuable work.¹

(Applause)

3. Research and technology

President. — The next item is the joint debate on

- the report (Doc. A 2-109/85) by Mr Poniatowski, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on Europe's response to the modern technological challenge
- the report (Doc. A 2-110/85) by Mr Ciancaglini, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the consequences of the new technologies for European society.²

Mr Poniatowski (L), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, several of our colleagues have asked me why this debate on new technologies, and why in this Chamber?

In fact, the only place where we can have a debate on new European technologies is here in our European Parliament. Secondly, it is necessary for us to do so because the problem confronting us is a problem of political action, of political will, and it is therefore one which deserves to be discussed in a political forum.

¹ *Topical and urgent debate (announcement of motions for resolutions tabled): see minutes.*

² Included in the joint debate were the following oral questions with debate:

- by Mr De Gucht and Mr Ducarme, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, to the Commission, on the outcome of the meeting of the *ad hoc* Committee on Technological Europe (Paris, 17 and 18 July 1985) (Doc. B 2-912/85)
- by Mr Klepsch and Mr von Wogau, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, to the Council (Doc. B 913/85) and to the Commission (Doc. B 2-914/85), on the Eureka project and on the research policy of the European Community (Technological Community)
- by Mrs Scrivener and Mrs Veil, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, to the Commission (Doc. B 2-915/85), on the development of research programmes in the field of aerospace remote-sensing
- by Mr Turner, on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, to the Commission (Doc. B 2-968/85) on RACE (the Community's R and E Programme in the field of advanced communications technologies)
- by Mr Seligman, on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, to the Commission (Doc. B 2-969/85), on support for the creation of small undertakings in the field of high technology and technological innovation.

The third reason is that discussion of this topic of new technologies is often confined to the initiated, a limited circle of experts.

Despite this, the developments taking place are having a profound impact on public opinion in Europe and on the lives of all our peoples. We are going through a period of rapid and radical change. Two centuries ago, when the transition was being made from farming to industry, the social and technological changes took five or six generations to work their way through. The current process will be much faster, taking only a couple of generations. It is going to have profound effects on all aspects of our way of life, on all production methods, on our attitudes of mind, our outlook on the world. It is having sudden and far-reaching effects on employment, it is affecting production conditions, farming and industry, teaching methods and our outlook on the world.

Public opinion is still very largely unaware of all this. It is also unaware of another threat: the extent to which we have fallen behind in various sectors. Europe is up with the leaders in the nuclear industry and almost as well placed in the fields of space and telecommunications, but in a matter of a few years we have fallen a very long way behind in biotechnology and data processing, and data processing is the core, the pivot of all new technologies. During this period the United States and Japan have maintained a very rapid rate of progress and we are becoming increasingly dependent on their technological power in these sectors. We are becoming increasingly dependent, to the extent that we are in danger of economic colonization and its corollary, political colonization, if we do not bestir ourselves.

And we have what it will take to do so. We have the largest internal market, with a population of 320 million, the richest market. We have research institutes, universities, which are among the most advanced in the world. We have a presence in high-technology sectors. And when we show an ability to co-operate, then we also show that we can be successful; witness nuclear energy or space. Let me mention some very tangible examples: CERN, the Airbus, ESPRIT, the JET.

As well as these assets and strengths, however, we have our weaknesses.

Lack of funding is not the problem. Let me just give you three figures. Combined public and private expenditure on research and development in the United States amounts to 108 billion dollars, in Japan to 25 billion dollars, and Europe collectively to 52 billion dollars. So the money is there, and the human and material resources too. Where, then, are the weaknesses? The first lies in the fact that we do not have a unified market. Each country has its own standards, each country has its own rules in the interests of health and safety, or for other purposes. Each country has its

Poniatowski

public contracts to which all the other European States are refused access.

The second weakness is undoubtedly the lack of continuity in the progression from one stage to the next, with nothing to ease the transition from research to innovation, or from innovation to commercial production. Social contributions and taxes are too high. Our companies cannot bear the burden imposed on them. The European average for social contributions and taxes combined is between 45% and 51%. In the United States it is 38%, and in Japan 22%. This state of affairs explains the lethargy, the lack of energy found in European companies, their inability to expand, or indeed the frequent cases in which companies do not even get as far as being formed. If you go to the United States, you can file an application to form a company on a Wednesday and start operating your business on the Thursday morning. In Europe there are some countries where there is a wait of between 6 and 8 months between applying to form a company and reaching the point at which it can be launched.

There is also a lack of a coordinated European strategy in a good number of sectors where our efforts are too fragmented. European high-technology companies are carrying out the same research, fighting for the same markets, and spurning all co-ordination, even of research. This is therefore an area where we need to make a very considerable effort. The Commission has an exceptional role to play in this field.

With these various difficulties, we are now confronted by another: the SDI. The SDI is not such an enormous programme in financial terms. It involves funding of 26 billion dollars over five years. Bearing in mind the figure that I just quoted — annual expenditure of 108 billion dollars on research and development in the United States — the SDI amounts to 26 billion out of 550 billion dollars over a five-year period. It is not the amount which is important, but the purpose to which this money is to be put: support for research in the most advanced sectors developing the most sophisticated technology. That is what we shall be lacking. That is what we shall be lacking and, if there is no European response, it will inevitably lead to a 'brain drain' and a migration of companies towards the United States and, to a lesser extent, Japan.

Because if we do not give them the research facilities in Europe, researchers will inevitably go where they can put their skills to use. And the threat confronting us, if a big effort is not made, is that we will find ourselves not only being colonized economically but undergoing a sort of decline into Third World status. I am weighing my words, and it is in just such terms that the Americans have spoken to us on the subject of Europe. They have said to us: 'In our eyes, you are not seen as the part of the world which represents a challenge to us, you are a vast consumer market, and it is as such that you are of interest to us'. And if this vast

consumer market does not have advanced technology to stimulate its economy, then it is bound to lapse slowly into Third World status, with economic decline, increased unemployment and a loss of political independence.

It is therefore essential, ladies and gentlemen, for us to adopt a European strategy to cover the key sectors: biotechnology, which is going to revolutionize production conditions in agriculture and industry, space, and once again, electronics, which is central to all the new technologies.

It is necessary for us to have a number of major programmes to provide motive force, not to appeal to the imagination, as some people have suggested, but simply to lend impetus and dynamism to our economy, a number of major projects in space, in highspeed transport, in data processing, and especially in the field of super-computers, which are essential not only to the universities and the education system as a whole but above all to industry. To the SDI we must bring a direct collective response and at the same time an indirect response, by which I mean a Community technology programme which will enable us to keep those European brains I was referring to at home and to stimulate European companies.

We must also avoid debating on false premisses. Throughout these discussions we have heard talk in committees of military technology and civil technology. There is no difference. It is a false distinction to talk of military technology on the one hand and civil technology on the other. There is technology, and it has both civil and military spin-offs.

Finally, this response must necessarily involve a large-scale programme. This could be EUREKA or it could be some other Community technological programme. I believe that the time has come to set about the development of a technological Europe. Given the fundamental changes taking place in our industrial society and the Community's lack of the legal and institutional machinery to cope with them, the adoption of new provisions in the Treaty of Rome is called for. There should be an additional title devoted to policy on technology and research, to match those on agricultural policy and transport policy. The Commission should be vested with the same powers as those available to the High Authority under the ECSC Treaty, and above all majority voting should be re-established if the agricultural policy is not to be paralyzed before it is brought into the world.

We probably have four or five years left in which to demonstrate and express our European will. After that, it will be too late. We have everything that we need to succeed. We know the remedies. As yet, we still lack the will. It is that will, ladies and gentlemen, that we must find, or otherwise we shall become the continent of lost opportunities.

(Applause)

Mr Ciancaglini (PPE), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report that I have the honour to present on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology deals with the consequences of new technology for European society. It is a report that fully recognises both the richness and the disruptive effects of scientific and technological innovation. It sets out, on the threshold of the twenty-first century of our civilization, to outline our responsibilities, and it traces, in general terms, a picture of the positive and negative consequences of innovation, whilst other reports are concerned to define consequences of a specific type.

As we know, for almost thirty years, philosophers, sociologists and scientists have described the society of the technological era as a post-industrial society, characterized by deep social and cultural changes. The reference to these considerations is justified by the extraordinary evolution of techniques, and their foreseeable consequences for the individual and on society and its social and productive systems. It therefore seems to us essential to get away from the two diametrically opposite views of the future towards which we are constantly being driven — the technological future as one of either total happiness or total alienation for the individual. That will enable us to try to assess the effects of innovation on the production system and hence on our way of life, and to consider the social usefulness of technological development in relation to employment and the updating of the training and cultural systems.

One of the main consequences of this great wave of technical innovation is undoubtedly the change wrought in the system of production of goods and services, breaking down all barriers between the different economic sectors with a radical change in the structure of industry and in industrial relations, and a strengthening of the need for collective bargaining, that is to say negotiation between both sides. Here we immediately have a repercussion on employment, and it is on this very subject that a false question is asked — that is, whether the new technologies create or destroy jobs. The most recent analyses show that the impact of new technology on employment differs depending on the level at which it is introduced. In reality we find an increase in employment when the new technology leads to new products and increased demand. Conversely, when new technology merely improves productivity, the impact is more uncertain, and, for a certain period at least, employment undoubtedly falls.

All of this means as well that a new division of labour internationally is necessary, and an in-depth restructuring of the available labour. In-depth changes of this kind however make almost permanent changes in vocational training necessary, and considerable adaptation of the workforce to the new systems of production. In Europe, that must lead also to a speeding up of the unrestricted recognition of equivalent professional qualifications, academic qualifications and

vocational training systems, which all follows from the concept of one great market without frontiers, and a society that guarantees the standards of living reached within our Community.

Let us look at the effects on the way of life, the social structures and the social ethic. This is perhaps the most interesting aspect from an intellectual standpoint, but it is also the most difficult to forecast completely. Our technologies, our new technologies, may be expected to develop in accordance with one of three patterns, which differ from one another in their terms of reference. An integrative model, in harmony with the established social evolutionary trends, where the new technologies meet a social need and help the population to construct a society that is more in line with the people's aspirations. In contrast, the second pattern is one in which the new technologies would not correspond to any social demand, and would be imposed by the State or the large private concerns. In this case the most culturally and financially disadvantaged social groups would be placed in a position of increased dependence, that would be dangerous. In the third pattern the distinction is more subtle, because society would accept technological innovation generally with mistrust, and would only use it marginally.

With regard to the future social ethic, which is also affected by new technology, we have to bear in mind that the mass application of new technology and the development also of biotechnology has for a number of years been presenting problems of an ethical nature, notably with regard to genetic manipulation, to which many scientists have moreover drawn attention. We have therefore to keep a close watch, not least from the political standpoint, to ensure that the integrity of human life shall at all times be fully respected.

However, although this is not strictly in the domain of ethics, we must keep a close watch on the health aspects of the new technology, both as regards the general problem of stress in man/machine situations, or the use of VDUs, or the use of dangerous substances in industry. Comprehensive preventive measures are necessary, therefore, to avoid technological disasters that are unfortunately becoming increasingly frequent, both in nuclear power stations and in manufacturing industry. By way of example, may we recall the cases of Seveso and Bhopal. It is of course impossible to list all the effects of new technology, but it can certainly be said that there is a widespread fear that development of new technology, and its widespread application, lead to a caste system and, let it be said, social injustice, both nationally and internationally. The question obviously arises, therefore, of the democratic control of technological decisions: and for this reason the European Parliament must use all its powers and ability to promote and constantly control the development of new technology in all fields of European society.

As part of this political strategy, therefore, technological innovation can only be seen not as the subject but

Ciancaglino

as the object of the third industrial revolution, in the hands of individuals and political democracy — as a formidable instrument, that is, for a better quality of life in Europe and in the world. We have confidence in Europe's future because we have faith in the creative capacity of our generation, which is called to accept the technological challenge as a condition for the initiation of a new *renaissance* of our continent. A new *renaissance* that must be the fruits of our determination, and must spring from the synthesis of the research and development of scientific truth, allied to Christian humanism and humanism in general. By this spirit we show our political commitment to the realization of a genuine technological European Community capable of restoring international prestige to Europe, and the ability to compete.

For these reasons the final part of the motion for a resolution raises questions that concern the Commission and the Council, starting from the assumption that the Eureka project cannot provide and does not provide an answer, as far as this objective is concerned. We have to work for a technological Community in the full sense of the term, as a fundamental element in the political construction of Europe, and in this connection we must also express a hope that the Community will also show the maximum interest in the Italian IRIS project, since this constitutes the first European initiative to take into account the social effects of new technology.

We consider that there is great awareness, now, of the importance of technological innovation, and that European backwardness in this field will quickly be eliminated. Greater courage, greater determination, greater collaboration will probably be needed for this change in direction, this 'qualitative leap', which calls for the collaboration of everyone, since no-one can be excluded from this historic process. I think that, by combining our concern over technological innovation with our commitment to it and with our concern regarding employment, regarding the jobs to be found for the young generations, it will be possible to achieve this civilised objective, which is Europe's primary role.

(Applause)

Mr Boden *President-in-Office of the Council.* — (FR) With your leave, Mr President, I shall devote the first part of my speech to the Council's formal reply to the oral question (Doc. B 2-913/85) received from Mr Klepsch and Mr von Wogau on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party.

At the Summit Meeting held in Milan on 28 and 29 June 1985, the European Council had already simultaneously approved and adopted the Commission's report on strengthening technological cooperation in Europe and supported the French Eureka project aimed at creating a technological Europe.

Following the conference on European technology attended by 17 European countries and the Commission in Paris on 17 July last, the Foreign Affairs Council of 22 July stressed the need to ensure that there was coordination and coherence between, on the one hand, the work of the *ad hoc* committee on Eureka and, on the other, the work to be carried out at Community level to strengthen technological coordination in Europe. It was with this in view that the Council invited the Commission to make proposals to it for the measures to be taken in a Community context, so as to ensure that the technological Community develops in a manner coherent and coordinated with the Eureka project.

The Commission's communication on this was submitted to the General Affairs Council on 1 October 1985. This communication deals *inter alia* with the links between the Community development and Eureka and discusses the possibility of Community participation in the Eureka Project. It has been agreed that this communication should be examined initially by the Ministers for Research towards the end of October. At the same time, while it was established in Paris that there was substantial convergence on the objectives of Eureka, more detailed work will be necessary to define the content of Eureka and the basis on which it is to be implemented. Arrangements have been made for a series of preparatory meetings on this subject during the course of October. With regard to the projects which could be launched under this scheme, the final communiqué issued after the Paris meeting indicates that the programme will cover a range of selected civil projects in the various fields of high technology and that special emphasis will be put on encouraging and stimulating the development of concrete projects by industry and research centres in various countries. However, pending finalization of the technological priorities and the criteria for participation and evaluation of the resources needed, no specific project has yet been adopted to date.

The next Eureka meeting, scheduled for 5 and 6 November 1985 in Hanover in the Federal Republic of Germany, and the examination of the communication recently submitted by the Commission to the Council should help to clarify the situation regarding possible common objectives, the respective organizational frameworks and the resources needed for the setting up of projects through Eureka and the technological Community.

It is at all events to be hoped that these two initiatives will contribute substantially to the modernization of Europe's economic structures and the international competitiveness of her industry. That is what is at stake in the technological challenge that we have to meet.

Mr President, the Council's reply to the oral question from Mr Klepsch and Mr von Wogau provides a clear demonstration, were it needed, that the decision to

Boden

devote a part-session of the European Parliament to the problems of the technological challenge confronting Europe over the period to the end of the century was wholly appropriate. That the elected representatives of the peoples of Europe are addressing themselves to a thorough examination of the implications of this challenge and making a collective effort to point to the possible components of the European response is much more than a good augury, it is an important step in the right direction. The timing of this appraisal of the situation is also especially appropriate, since it is becoming increasingly clear in all our minds that we have reached a phase which is particularly critical to the shaping of our economic and social future and that now is the time when decisive policy decisions are taken which will have a profound impact over the coming decades.

That this is the case is merely confirmed by the intensification during recent months of the debate on economic and industrial strategies, and, most important of all, the broad lines of scientific and technological policy to provide the background for these strategies.

In this context, whatever views one may hold on its objectives, the American Strategic Defence Initiative must be given credit for having helped to heighten awareness of the scale of the technological challenge and to prompt a renewal in Europe of fruitful developments at the heart of which we now find the Eureka project and the Commission's recent communication to the Council on implementation of its memorandum 'Towards a European Technology Community'.

As far as the Eureka project is concerned, the Council's answer to the oral question from Mr Klepsch and Mr von Wogau, which I have just given you, takes stock of the current position. With the preparations that are in progress, there is reason to hope that the meeting in Hanover on 5 and 6 November will produce a consensus on the objectives, the priority fields of research, the criteria for selecting and organizing projects, the principles to govern coordination and relations between Eureka, the European Community and other existing forms of cooperation in Europe.

As for the communication from the Commission of the European Communities on implementation of its memorandum 'Towards a European Technology Community', this document will receive an initial thorough examination on 23 October in Luxembourg at an informal meeting of the Ministers for Research which was arranged at the Presidency's suggestion during the recent General Affairs Council.

It is my strong hope, Mr President, that the meetings to which I have referred will lead to an agreement on a coherent and effective policy and strategy to attain our shared objective, the European Technology Community.

In addition, this European Technology Community will be the subject of further discussion at the meeting

of the European Council in Luxembourg on 2 and 3 December next. Needless to say in the context as I have described it, I can but congratulate the European Parliament on having made the technological challenge the centrepiece of its proceedings during this part-session. The wealth of contributions that we have been seeing, both yesterday during the symposium and today in plenary, testify to the importance that the European Parliament rightly attaches to analysis of the implications of the technological challenge and solutions which will enable us to meet it.

I would mention in particular the pertinent analysis in Mr Poniatowski's report of the scale of the challenges facing us from the United States and Japan, the current state of the European response and the progress that we have yet to make. I am also thinking of the report by Mr Münch, which brings home to us how important it is for a central body to be established at Community level to coordinate European scientific and technical activities, and Mr Longuet's report, which provides an extremely clear explanation of how Community Europe is in fact facing two technological challenges, one created by the dominance of the Americans and Japanese, the other being its own lack of internal coherence created by the economic imbalance and its inevitable repercussions on scientific and technical research.

These contributions, Mr President, and all the others bear witness to the vitality of your institution and will help to persuade public opinion of the validity of your demand for an increasing role in the Community decision-making process. In fact, it is no coincidence that issues connected with institutional reform of the Community and the strengthening of Europe's technological base should have become so closely bound up with each other in our current debates. It is becoming increasingly obvious that a technological renaissance of Europe also calls for appropriate institutional instruments, extension of Community areas of competence and more efficient decision-making machinery.

I should therefore like to take this opportunity to express the hope that these two aspects of community regeneration, which are currently under discussion at the institutional conference in Luxembourg, will soon be the subject of conclusions which satisfactorily meet Europe's interests. At all events, you may rest assured that Luxembourg will be directing all its efforts to this end during its presidency.

Mr President, European policy in the field of science and technology is going through a transitional period which, I am convinced, will be decisive from various points of view. We need to establish a sound, lasting basis for the economic recovery that our countries are currently endeavouring to promote. We need to broaden and consolidate European cooperation so as to achieve ever closer economic integration. We need to meet the scientific and technological challenges of the 1980s and 1990s if Europe is to be able to continue

Boden

playing its proper role in the world and secure the well-being of its citizens.

Over the past few years, as we have faced economic crisis, we have become more aware that scientific and technical research is one of the essential components of our campaign to achieve new prosperity. If we really intend to overcome our present difficulties and measure up to our hopes for the future, it will be necessary for us to broaden the technological base, to foster industrial innovation, to improve the competitiveness of our business, to promote economic redeployment into the sectors with the most advanced technology and the highest added value, to create new investment opportunities and new jobs, and to progress as quickly as possible towards the creation of a real common market.

At the same time we are increasingly aware that the greater our ability to lend a European dimension to our efforts and coordinate them at Community level, the more effective they will be. Not only this, but this need for coordination extends beyond the Community context, since coordination is also required between Community initiatives and any national or international initiatives with potential for advancing the attainment of the objectives that we are pursuing.

From this viewpoint, we have in the Eureka project, and the question of how it can be tied in with Community policies, an important test of our ability to pursue a coherent Community policy while at the same time remaining open to outside initiatives, keeping our structures flexible, and taking decisions and acting upon them speedily.

Over the months and years ahead we must work to overcome the obstacles and tackle the problem of the fragmentation of research in Europe. I am thinking in particular of the very recent incentive programme, with its objective of promoting mobility among researchers and exchanges of experience between laboratories. We must work together to break down the barriers between the academic world and industry, and here I am thinking in particular of the recent Comett proposal which has been brought forward with a view to lending a Community dimension to cooperation between universities and industry on advanced training.

Such cooperation is of great importance, both to vocational training and to research and development, and the Presidency will be bringing forward the Comett proposal for consideration by the Council, so that the anticipated decision can be implemented by 1986.

We must coordinate initiatives to avoid duplication, thereby reducing the waste of resources. I am thinking for example of the benefits offered by the whole range of cooperation under COST. Efforts must be concentrated on strategic programmes of common interest. I

am thinking of information technology certainly, but also biotechnology, telecommunications, materials.

In other words, we must work towards the creation of a genuine European scientific area, as called for in the report by Mr Münch, so as to enhance the effectiveness of every initiative launched in the research field. Moreover, it is this continental dimension which will help us to meet the challenge that we face from the United States and Japan, our competitors who have hitherto managed more successfully than ourselves to use research and technology as key instruments of modernization and economic regeneration.

That we are fully aware of the extent of the problems and the complexity of the tasks facing us most certainly does not mean that we accept a pessimistic view of the situation or that we despair of achieving results. On the contrary, I believe that we have made progress these past few years and that it is legitimate to turn this progress to account, because it has been very significant and has taken us in the right direction. This is demonstrated by the examples that I have just quoted; witness the impressive range of developments achieved under the following acronyms: JET, RACE, Brite, Esprit. I also believe, however, that we still have a long way to go and that we cannot afford to mark time. Let me explain this. While it is true that Community expenditure in the field of research and development has virtually doubled over the past five years, it is equally true that it still represents too small a proportion — about 3% — of our budget and, while on the one hand we can take satisfaction at having managed to sustain and increase the Community commitment to this sector at a time when the Community's budget resources have been exceptionally limited, on the other hand there is no gainsaying the fact that the figure of ± 600 m ECU allocated to research in the 1985 budget is still far short of the annual appropriation of 1 000 million set as a target in the framework programme. It is still far short of 6% of the Community budget, the level indicated in Mr Münch's motion for a resolution as the proportion of the Community budget which needs to be allocated to research by 1989 and in Mr Poniowski's motion for a resolution as the minimum target for 1988. This, Mr President, is perhaps where we face our greatest challenge. Even though the Stuttgart European Council and, more recently, the Council on Research stated that it was a target to make provision for a gradual increase in expenditure on Community research and development activities, we all know in advance that the Community's resources are going to be contained within certain limits. This limitation presents us with a two-fold political task. First, as Mr Longuet indicates in his report, we have to get away from the persistent tendency to spread resources too thinly and concentrate them on carefully selected priorities in sectors offering realistic prospects of ensuring that the products of research rapidly reach the market.

Secondly, however, if we mean to make research and development an absolute priority over the years ahead

Boden

— and this is our intention — we are going to have the difficult task of convincing our colleagues in other ministries and other parliamentary committees, who will also have their priority projects, that if the proportion of our overall financial resources allocated to research is going to increase, their share will perhaps have to be reduced in consequence.

That, Mr President, is a real political challenge.

If I now add a few words about the framework programme, Mr President, it is not only because I am convinced that the adoption of this programme marked a very important turning-point for the Community's scientific policy, but primarily because during the next few months we are going to be hard at work on defining a new framework programme for the five years ahead, a programme which will have to take account of our new outlook on the issues confronting us.

To my mind, this will give us the opportunity to reaffirm the central role that the Community should be playing in promoting and coordinating scientific and technological research in Europe. It will provide the opportunity for tangible confirmation and real progress towards the objective to which I was just referring: a gradual increase in expenditure on Community research and development activities.

Before concluding, Mr President, a final comment on the report by Mr Ciancaglini, which demonstrates to us how important it is to remain vigilant so as to ensure real control over technologies and their impact on European society. An initiative which is under consideration and promises to bear fruit is this socially strategic field, is the proposal which has been given the name IRIS, which is specifically concerned with the application of information technology to all these fields, from health to town planning, from working conditions to the environment, in other words all those areas where the quality of our lives and therefore the very substance of our well-being stand to be affected. If I quote this proposal by way of conclusion to my speech, it is because I am convinced that, far beyond the implications of any individual programme, we are dealing here with a concrete example of an essential principle which we should always keep at the forefront of our minds, the principle that technological progress and social progress should always go hand in hand, each a function of the other, each strengthening the other.

Mr President, this debate in the European Parliament and the accompanying activities, the broad range of the discussions, covering the technological challenge and all related aspects — from the scientific and technical considerations to the political implications of the social impact, from the impact on employment to the ethical and cultural problems — and the quality of contributions are such that this special part-session will

be of invaluable assistance when it comes to making the difficult choices facing us.

Thank you, Mr President, and I hope that we also, the Council, will show ourselves equal to the challenge when the time comes.

(Applause)

Mr Linkohr (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, I should like to begin with what we in this House can agree about. We want Europe to hold onto its technological freedom. Only those who are technologically independent can retain their political freedom of manoeuvre. Only those who are in the top league of technical performance can master modern technology.

If Europe were compelled to sell its technical know-how exclusively in Japan or the USA, then it would naturally be condemned to assume the values and production methods of those countries. It would squander its cultural and social autonomy. But mastering technology also means creating jobs. Most job losses have happened not because we have concentrated too hard on new technologies, but because heads of undertaking have failed to wake up to the future. The clock and watch-making industry, the photographic industry, mechanical engineering, and leisure electronics are just some of the unhappy examples.

While jobs were being lost in Europe, new ones were being created in Japan. Continuing with that kind of policy will not be in our best interests. But one reason why jobs were being lost in Europe was that we failed to grasp the potential of the huge internal market. The internal market does not just serve the interests of capital, it can also help workers.

But as this debate in the European Parliament has already shown, it is here that the common ground between right and left in this House comes to an end. The Socialist Group does not accept that technology and innovation should be reduced to a mere marketing strategy. Technology means more than just cleverness at producing commodities. Technology — as the link between human beings and nature — can give expression to the ways we interact with each other and with nature. It is a part of our culture, especially if we define culture as a strategy for survival.

And so the right question is not: 'Are we for or against technology?', any more than it makes sense to ask: 'Are we for or against the weather?' The question we should be asking is: 'What kind of technology do we want?'. In philosophy we distinguish between a culture of simple action and a culture of purposeful activity. By 'action' we understand the capability of mastering situations or producing commodities; with 'activity' on the other hand, value-oriented behaviour is assumed. 'Action' implies the primary of industry and economics

Linkohr

over politics. 'Activity' gives the priority — as in the original unity of politics and ethics — to politics.

Unfortunately 'action' has gained the upper hand over 'activity' over the last few centuries, and we all know how capitalism is based on precisely this priority. But Karl Marx was not the first to realize that commodities have not only a price but also a value. I still remember from my school days reading Plato's dialogue 'Protagoras'. There we read how Prometheus had not only brought the gift of fire to humankind, but went to Hephaestus and Athene — and there too he also had another duty to perform — and took from them wisdom and gave it to humanity. Unfortunately we are not displaying any of that wisdom in our technology today.

Those who destroy nature and use technology to build up their own power know nothing of this wisdom. Yet the task of committing technology to self-discipline, to self-restraint with a sense of human purpose, is a major cultural challenge, a fundamental cultural necessity of our time. It seems to me essential for us to launch a renewed appeal for this as a vital requirement of our European culture. What after all distinguishes Europe from the USA, from Japan, or from the USSR? Certainly not any ability for particular intellectual achievements, or any particular skill in developing new technology. Yet in its cultural answer to technology it has — at least until now — gone its own way for a considerable distance — an achievement to which the European labour movement, in which freedom of the individual manages to coexist with a sense of responsibility to all — bears eloquent witness. The question however remains as to whether this will continue to be so in the future.

The third industrial revolution is basically taking place in Japan and the USA. We Europeans are much too preoccupied with yesterday's industry. In Europe the fear of tomorrow is often stronger than the hope of being able to do good with new technology. We are on the defensive, while our challengers are taking the offensive. But — to oversimplify, though not to distort — it is those who are now building the fifth generation of computers who will set the terms of future relations of production. Leadership in technology and social or ecological mastery thus go hand in hand. Only those who have mastered technology will be in a position to choose.

Those who have no option but to buy will have no choice but to take what is on offer. In that sense what we most lack is a new understanding of nature, together with a conception or idea to give our pursuit of science and research a sense of purpose.

There are three well-understood reasons for engaging in research: to be better than the competition; out of sheer instinct for gratification; and, not least, in order to understand something. The ancients called this third reason political wisdom. It has however been

suppressed in our commodity-exchanging society in favour of balance sheets and the pursuit of profit — the acquisition of new values and insights is not a priority in our society. We know that is what keeps capitalism going, but the question is whether that is also the goal that we in Europe want to pursue. It will be decisive for European culture whether or not it can succeed in securing freedom for value-oriented decisions.

I believe it will be worthwhile to think carefully in these terms.

I can see no progress in for example introducing either Sunday working or night-work — just so that capital-intensive machinery can be used to capacity. That is the kind of attitude than I call subjugation of human beings to the dictates of profit and technology.

As profits soar, family life disintegrates. Why, we should be asking, are there now so many drug addicts, people suffering from depression, so many alcoholics? Why are there so many divorces in the United States? Why are there 5 million cases of depression in Japan? This too is the result of the wrong kind of development. The major task therefore that faces European culture is humanization of technological society. It will have to be saved from physical destruction, from dehumanization, and from lunacy. We need revolutionary change in the economy, in social life, in politics and culture, and we must recognize that the commodity has not only a price but also a value.

I believe we need a change in production and consumption patterns so as to ensure that future economic activity will be directed only at securing human development and growth, instead of distorting human values to the point where technical productivity is all that counts. Human beings are capable of much more than improving the rate of technological efficiency. Nor do I want technology to become a form of religious worship for the nation or for the European Community. Our personal happiness cannot be realized in the markets of South-East Asia, but only in a new relationship with each other and with nature.

We need people as citizens and participants in social life. They should not be passive, bureaucratized objects, but active, eager for responsibility, and critical. The political bureaucracy must be subjected to effective control by the people, and the decision-making of private firms should be shared by all those who use their goods and services. Joint decision-making by workers on the introduction of new technologies will therefore be essential, and parliamentary control of Eureka will be the touchstone for the seriousness of our intentions for democratic control of technology.

We also need a cultural revolution that will attempt to reform the spirit of alienation and passivity that is so characteristic of technological society, in order that a new human personality can come to the fore, one

Linkohr

whose objective in life is being, and not having or consuming. We want neither technology as the all-embracing mother of industrial society, nor yet subjugation to the State as the father-figure promising stability and order. Rather we want a technology that will give us the ability to tackle the major problems of our time, we want a synthesis of freedom and organization, of sympathy and equity, of intellect and feeling.

None of this is much in evidence now. Our picture of humanity — of its values and dignity — has fallen on bad times, and in our industrial states ethics has become little more than a subdivision of cosmetics. If human beings become nothing more than test tubes for forces and fluids that can be manipulated according to natural laws by business-oriented medical practitioners, biologists and other bio-engineering specialists, then death will have no more significance than an interrupted experiment. In the last analysis it is all down to statistics: the failed experiment is ticked off; the page is turned in the laboratory log-book of human and animal experiments. It is truly a pity that in research today so much intelligence is accompanied by so little depth of understanding, and so much effort by so little insight. But that is the price we are having to pay for putting the struggle for market shares above the search for understanding.

But there are also signs that values in society are changing. They include the growing commitment to a cleaner environment and a self-conscious women's movement. The peace movement too is the only source of light in an age of total confrontation. Here and there hierarchies are being dismantled and replaced by cooperation and joint decision-making. The European Parliament should take steps to encourage and confirm this process of rejuvenation in Europe, so that Europe once again can hold its head above water.

To all these wayside warning-signs a new addition now has to be made. It is the one warning-against the militarization of research. Already today some 30% of all scientists and engineers are in the service of the arms build-up. The tendency is increasing. The American SDI research programme is an important milestone on this sorry road. But we simply cannot allow secret services and defence-establishment bureaucracies to divert science into the pathways of destructiveness. Ultimately, science cannot be allowed to have struggled for centuries against the claims to dominance of the church and subsequently of totalitarian regimes, only to throw itself today with open arms into the hands of the military. Research today must not be allowed to prostitute itself to Mars, the god of war.

We Socialists therefore say no to the SDI research programme. In doing so we express the views of a majority of Europeans: in reply to the question polled in some of the bigger countries of the Community as

to whether the SDI initiative would make war or peace more likely, the majority thought it would be war. This poll is serious food for thought for those who still believe in SDI.

But we also have a second reason for saying no to the SDI research programme. It will not improve the defence of Europe. Europe today is faced with the emergence of new security policy dangers, the militarization of space helps to consolidate the hegemony of the superpowers, and Europe risks becoming degraded to a mere object in the interests of the two centres of power. We consider that the mutual survival of East and West can only be secured by political means, that there is no technological solution. Total security is a deadly utopian illusion.

I have before me the report of the American World-watch Institute on the situation of our world in 1984. The book headlines the main problems that the human race faces today: over-population, petroleum-dependency, soil erosion, deforestation, the world food problem. Is it not high time that these problems were also brought to the fore in Europe? Why do we not mobilize our know-how, our money, our imaginations, in short ourselves, to rise up and meet these challenges?

The people of Europe are waiting for a signal for a new departure. They are eager to show that this continent still has enough vitality to secure a breakthrough for sanity. At all events, any effort to combat world hunger will require forms of *higher* technology, because it calls for compassion and understanding, higher qualities than are needed for SDI. Eureka is in that sense a disappointment — not that we do not desire cooperation between European undertakings, although they do not need Eureka money to achieve that. What disturbs us, rather, is the lack of specific, problem-solving objectives that can enable us to mobilize new forces. But as things now appear to us, Eureka is more a form of cooperation between big companies from the highly industrialized countries. The small countries and small firms are left behind, fulfilling the prophecy of Luke's gospel:

Unto every one which hath shall be given; and from him that hath not, even that he hath shall be taken away from him. (*Luke, 19, 26*)

Eureka is thus a slap in the face for the Commission and for the European Parliament. For while leading politicians preach European political Union on Sundays between ten and twelve, they spend the rest of the week destroying such political union as exists. Eureka will come into being by bypassing the EEC, because Brussels is seen as being too bureaucratic. But the attack on bureaucracy is only a cover. The real target is the idea of a parliamentary form of political union. 'Back to the traditional relations between the nation states', is the underlying slogan. 'Give industry the money, it can make better use of it than parliamentarians!'. Let Parliament and parliamentary democracy in Europe go to the dogs.

Linkohr

Let industry hold the power, and let Parliament hold the trappings — that is a division of labour to which this House cannot possibly agree. We will not allow ourselves to be saddled with cumbersome and unattractive policies for steel and agriculture, while the Council of Ministers proclaims in favour of modern technology. Eureka must therefore be made subject to parliamentary control.

Let me conclude by pointing out that it is the political argument over technology and its application that will ultimately determine whether or not Europe can sustain an independent cultural identity in the third industrial revolution. It is precisely because technological development is directed by our system of values that we need a politically effective public discussion that will establish rational connections between technical ability and practical needs. Technology must not be confined to laboratories and workshops, it belongs on the public platform provided by parliaments. Nor must we forget that technology lost its innocence a long time ago.

We take our cue therefore not from Parsival, but from Galileo — and our Italian colleagues will know what I mean. It is not simple-minded trust that we require, but bold projections. Technology can then become a force not for repression but for liberation. That is the kind of third cultural revolution I look forward to.

(Applause from the left)

IN THE CHAIR: MRS PERY*Vice-President*

Mr Sälzer (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, none of the things that we as Christian Democrats acknowledge to be indispensable components of a life worthy of human dignity, from social security to a high standard of health care, from kindergarten through school to university, from aid for the Third World to the care of the old and the handicapped, can be picked up as a free gift. We first have to come up with the necessary money before social policy, environment policy, development aid and all the rest of it can be paid for.

The other road — and it has been tried repeatedly in recent decades — has, to answer the spokesman for the Socialist Group, been well travelled by the Left, as it still is today. It assumes that we can begin by making hand-outs, and only afterwards need we start to think about how to make good what has been handed out. The result of such policies is, as we are only too well aware from bitter experience, high public-sector debt, a precipitous rise in unemployment, and a high inflation rate. In other words, the welfare state can only go on being a welfare state as long as it can go on being financed.

But where are we to find the money with which to provide a dignified human life in accordance with our Western concepts and the system of values of our Western culture? What is this wealth of the EEC actually based on? It is based on the fact that we are able to produce and deliver high-quality goods of known reliability and with a high added value at competitive prices. We still sell no less than a quarter of these goods on world markets outside the Community. But we can only go on doing so if we do it better than others, and doing it better than others means, above all, being able to offer goods that people today and tomorrow will find attractive. And that in turn means that we must be at the top of today's and tomorrow's world league in technology. Only then will we be able to sustain a free, socially-caring and constitutional European Community into the future.

It is therefore nothing but an imponderable piece of sophistry to seek — as the spokesman for the Socialist Group has just done — to establish some kind of subliminal contradiction between humanity and technology. Technology today and tomorrow is the basis for our humanity in the sense of European cultural values. Those who propagate this sophistry delude themselves that they are laying down some kind of seed-bed on which the cultural revolution, with its imponderable consequences for humankind, can flourish.

Technology for tomorrow however also means an unprecedented level of technological development. And there can be no escaping the fact that that technological development too has to be paid for! We must promote research and technology in specific ways, and we must recognize — and here as in so many other respects the European People's Party agrees with Mr Poniatowski's report — that national states continue to record major achievements, that the European Community is still the Number One world trading power, that it can still guarantee its peoples high standards of living and social security, but that there are important signals, which some of us have already acknowledged, urging us to consider whether the national states will long remain in a position to secure all our future research and technology needs.

I am grateful to the Council of Ministers for clearly demonstrating how necessary it will be to develop a viable European Technology Community, and I trust, as a matter of European public interest, that the Council of Ministers will actually translate these words into deeds by embarking on a joint scheme with the Commission and the European Parliament to pool our resources in situations where our common interests are at stake, and where the national states are no longer in a position to come up with the right answers to today's and tomorrow's questions — the more especially when a decision will have to be taken in the next few months on the question of the concrete measures to be adopted to secure a real internal market as the indispensable precondition for a functioning technology community within the EEC framework.

Sälzer

Making use of Europe's opportunities will mean taking advantage of the particular possibilities that have been handed down to us from our cultural heritage, from the development by us of cultural values that are unique in the world, or that at least owe their origins entirely to Europe. The spokesman for the Socialist Group has just said that technology must not become a form of religious worship for Europeans. I do not know a single serious-minded Member of this House who can be said ever to have given a moment's thought to any such proposition. The significant thing however is the way he has used the words '*religious worship*', because that was in fact how the necessary contacts and sense of community were established, for it was after all the formative power of Christianity that transformed European cultural values, first and foremost the recognition of human dignity, from a cause for hope into a living reality culminating in a codified system of law under our constitutions.

That is the real basis of our European ethics and culture, not the doctrines of earthly salvation preached by those who have repeatedly tried to delude humanity with promises of paradise here on earth. For all those who have tried this have, as we know from our history, succeeded only in leading humanity into the abyss.

We must use our European culture in order to shape our future, and in concrete terms that means that we must exploit our diversity. We must take best advantage of the diversity of our different attitudes and methods. We must use the creativity that distinguishes us from the cultures of other regions, in particular the Asiatic, and we must use the most important raw material that we as Europeans possess, namely the ability and know-how that can be found in every one of us.

In the matter of research it is therefore particularly important for us to help the scientists who make our future secure by motivating them, by sharing an optimistic outlook with them, and not impeding their work with carping pessimism. We must encourage them, not slander them, and we must not react to their every activity by wondering whether it may or may not somehow constitute a research contribution to the development of defence systems.

Where would we all end up if we were not in a position to defend our peoples from a possible aggressor against the free states of Europe? Freedom is one of a number of major values having their basis in human dignity and their origins in European culture that have spread throughout the entire world. Freedom will always be at risk as long as there are peoples who are oppressed. It is not the weaponry of free peoples that is a danger to those who fall victim to oppression. Rather, it is freedom itself that is at risk, for the oppressors live in constant fear that the desire of human beings to live in freedom can survive even under their oppressive system, and that is why we run

the constant danger that our freedom will be threatened from without.

To that extent we must make our contribution to ensuring that we are in a position to mount an appropriate defence of this freedom, and are not expected to reply with bows and arrows to SS-20 missiles. We therefore have no right to slander those who have dedicated themselves to serving that cause. What will become of us if such researchers can rise to prominent positions in society under totalitarian regimes, where they are upheld as national heroes and patriots, while they are slandered among us as they have just been by the previous speaker from the Socialist Group?

We know from experience that every new technological development entails both opportunities and risks, because human beings are not capable of thinking comprehensively outside the range of their experience. When we break new ground we can still think consistently but not comprehensively. That is why when some new achievement is made possible by technology there will always be unwanted side-effects. Yet we must also take care, knowing as we do about the possible dangers and being willing to open them up to discussion, that we do not let the opportunities offered by the new developments slip from our grasp. And if the discussion is conducted emotionally and ideologically, the result will be some form of hostility to technology or technophobia, whatever the professed approval of technological development.

The information specialist Professor Karl Steinbuch is surely right to state that some such technophobia could well become a stupid steamroller that could destroy the very basis of our existence. For Karl Marx there were no computers or telematics, biotechnics or aerospace, but there was exploitation of the labourer by the owners of the means of production. So for the disciples of Karl Marx, every instance of new technology comes under suspicion of being an improved mechanism for exploitation by capitalists. This position is especially dangerous when we acknowledge that when it comes to anticipating the risks associated with the new technologies we must clearly recognize the limitations of our forecasting ability.

Let us imagine that this discussion were taking place in 1765 when James Watt invented the steam engine. As we all know, this discovery led the transition from the agricultural to the industrial revolution — the biggest cultural revolution that has taken place in history. If there had been the slightest hint at the time of the revolutionary changes that would result from this new invention, the steam engine would certainly have been banned, and an overwhelming majority of people would certainly have welcomed the ban.

But what has this transition brought us? A longer life-span for all of us, release from hard physical labour, better health care, old-age pensions, social security and more leisure time — and that also means more

Sälzer

freedom. In a purely agricultural society none of these things would have been possible.

Technology brings change and technology exerts an enduring influence also on cultural development. But we must be sure to ask the right questions. Those who are still asking yesterday's questions can only expect to hear yesterday's answers.

None of this is new, as those who know some European intellectual history will be aware. Jean-Jacques Rousseau was already bemoaning the fact that farming was a revolution against the natural order in his *Discourse on Origins*. Here is what Voltaire said in reply:

On reading your book one is most tempted to revert to crawling on all fours. Since I abandoned this practice more than 60 years ago however, I must to my deep regret acknowledge that I am unable to resume it.

Only those who are prepared to run risks will also be able to seize opportunities. Those who believe that life without risks is possible fundamentally misapprehend the nature of human beings and the basis of their existence. The greatest risk is run by those who do nothing. With the introduction of new technologies there must be a high degree of consensus among all the parties concerned. We need the cooperation of the employee representatives and of the employees themselves. We need information, discussion, willingness to compromise, because a social consensus is the basis for social security.

We need a social dialogue, but any such dialogue must not be allowed to become a one-sided diktat. It is on this basis that we have tabled our amendments to paragraph 25 of the Poniatoski report.

This discussion will take a particularly dangerous turn if we begin on the one hand to acknowledge verbally that we are for new technology, but then set the hurdles so high that in practice the new technology can no longer be introduced.

This covert technophobia is more dangerous than overt technophobia. We now have a significant chance of creating new opportunities for Europe. We must be ready to act accordingly.

What in particular are the big opportunities that the new technologies can create for the European public? Production in future will use fewer dangerous substances and will consume less energy than we can envisage today. We shall be able to grow more and better food on less land. New developments will enable us to care much more effectively for the soil than can now be imagined. We shall also be able to do more for preventive medicine, so avoiding illnesses through healthier nutrition. We shall be better able to counteract the susceptibility of different individuals to particular diseases, likewise through healthier nutrition.

Distances will continue to play a shrinking role for us in Europe. We shall be able to make work much more worthy of human beings by using the new facilities made possible by telematics and telecommunications. We shall open up new sources of energy that will safeguard nature more effectively than before, and we shall be able to help the peoples of the Third World, the poorest of the poor, more enduringly to find solutions to their worst problems of hunger, sickness, and fuel shortage. And not least we shall be in a position to exercise greater freedom, because we shall have more free time.

It will be up to ourselves to take advantage of these opportunities. They can only be grasped if we have a viable European Technology Community that feels seriously committed to authentic European cultural values. We have been dealt a good hand of cards in the European Community. Our partners in the rest of the world know that for a fact. We must play our hand wisely.

(Applause from the centre and right)

Mr Turner (ED). — Madam President, first of all I want to congratulate Mr Poniatoski on his drive and determination to get this treated as the chief subject of a plenary session and to make technology the spearhead of European unity.

Secondly, I congratulate the staff of the committee on being the first committee of the European Parliament to have persuaded 12 000 members of the public to come and see something they have done.

Thirdly, I congratulate the Commission — a very small staff who have to fight with dedication against the myrmidons of the national authorities and try and get a little something for Europe in the way of high technology.

Madam President, may I first of all deal with telecommunications as I am the rapporteur on RACE. The supply industry of telecommunications is being strangled by divisions and standards and regulations which are different in every country. They are the prisoners of their PTTs who kill them with what I might call contemptuous kindness. They must have an open market. They cannot organize themselves broadly enough to develop the next generation of telecommunications broadband which is in the RACE programme. But, broadband would give us the opportunity for a green field approach to standards in telecommunications, will give us the opportunity at last to have an open market. May I ask the Commission to answer my oral question on this?

Now our response to SDI. It must be a European response. I ask that we do not prejudge our conclusions on SDI today. We have a rapporteur on the subject, Mr Ford, who has not yet started his work. All I

Turner

wanted to say today is that regardless of the military side of things and whether it is advisable militarily or will be successful militarily — although I myself agree with what Mr Sälzer said on this — regardless of that, the effect of SDI in the United States on their civil industry, i.e. that \$ 26 billion is going to be poured down the throats of civil industry, will be absolutely immense. It will be the moonshot all over again. Now when they had the moonshot 20 years ago, none of us thought it would hit us. But it did and we discovered years later that we were the ones who suffered from their moonshot because our technology was put behind.

So this time we must be wiser. How pathetic it is to see companies and universities and countries of Europe all going one by one to try and get a little money to be paid value for work done and no more, selling in fact our seedcorn technology for nothing at all. This is no way for Europe to get together and fight the threat of SDI to our civil industry in the future. It is lasers, optical work, materials and computers. If we are to have a European response I think it should be like this. Every project in SDI we should look at. The Americans may ask us to do this, that or the other with one company or another, with a university or even a country, and we say we wish to take part in that because it is of interest to our civil industry in Europe. We wish to take part as Europeans. We do not wish to go one by one to the back door and try and get a little more than our nextdoor neighbour in Europe. We wish to go as Europeans and have a European bargaining position with the United States office of the SDI. If we have a European bargaining position, then, Madam President, I believe we can prevent the damage that will otherwise occur to us through SDI.

May I now come to Eureka. As I have said before, Eureka is a 'watch this space thing' at the present time. I was glad the Council in their representative's speech seemed to be filling in the space a little bit. But it is still very much an open problem. I say three things. One, Eureka must be by the Community. Two, it must be done with the Commission. I next say that funding is vital in Eureka. I know that some governments say that we do not need money in Eureka, all we need is organization and bringing companies together. Now the theory of funding of technology which applies to national authorities does not apply in Eureka because Europe is not in the same advanced position as national technology is. I have no doubt at all that to get Eureka going we have got to have money. It has got to be done with money. We know that universities need it and I believe that companies will need the inducement of funding also if they are to make something really good of Eureka.

Thirdly, there is the question of the projects. What projects should we have in Eureka? We must not revive old, failed suggestions of the last few years. I am afraid that has happened quite a lot. Everybody has seized the opportunity to bring up their old sugges-

tions and try to get them through in Eureka. We need new ventures, and it must be in some respects a sort of SDI for civilian purposes. It must channel into technology in Europe the funds and the concentration of effort which the Americans managed with their moonshot and now look as if they will manage with their SDI. Therefore, it must be concentrated.

Some people say it does not, in fact, matter what one does as long as one adopts *some* proposal. It has been said, of course, that one might adopt real-time translation, which is certainly something Europe could do with. When one looks at real-time translation, one sees that it involves almost every aspect of computer technology and would give us the super-computers which Mr Poniowski referred to. It would give us intelligent computers and also, of course, translation. Some people suggest that we might study the development of laser technology and its application to the matter of road safety. You need lasers in order to keep vehicles a certain distance apart on the road. It may not matter what you do, as long as you adopt something which is sufficiently strong, cohesive and large to form a new basis for technology in Europe.

SDI will create a whole generation of technologists in America, a whole new raft of laboratories in companies and universities. From them they will then advance further, and we must do something of the same nature. Of course, Europe is very much smaller in its thinking than the Americans and Eureka will be minute compared with what the Americans would have done if they were having a Eureka. But at least we must do something big for Europe, however small it may look to other people.

Finally, I would like to say something about small companies in high technology. When some members of the committee were taken with Mr Poniowski to the United States, I was very impressed by the attitude of the Americans to small companies. They positively discriminate in favour of small companies. They show favoritism to small companies. You might even think that that was wrong in law or principle, but they do it. For instance, small companies get quicker payment on contracts than large companies. Small companies get paid interest if the payment on a contract is held up. Government contracts are broken down to sizes which are practical for small companies to take up. I believe we must do all these things and many more. For instance, I think the EEC must have a new look at subcontractors in Esprit and our other programmes, so that subcontractors have a new status, more rights and a closer relationship with the Commission than they have under present circumstances.

Lastly, small companies must be able to raise capital in Europe as a whole. I was talking to an American company which wanted to raise capital for a small company in Europe and it gave up in the end because it found it could only raise it in one country or another. There was no such thing as an across-the-board mar-

Turner

ket for venture capital. So we must break down the financial barriers which prevent us having a European-wide venture capital market.

I am afraid that Europe is very old. Being old, our enterprises are normally bigger, slower, less forward-looking and less full of initiative and more complacent than small ones. Therefore, if we are to save ourselves, we have to encourage small new companies if only to make the large older ones think a bit and wake themselves up.

I call upon this Parliament today to vote for every measure in Mr Poniatowski's report which furthers unity in our technological market and our technological effort, so as to make sure that we rise to all the challenges which are coming to us not only from Japan, which he referred to, but from the United States. The greatest of those, I believe, is the threat of SDI, if we do not take up the challenge as Europeans. I am told that that is impossible, that governments will not allow it, that they will go by themselves to try and get what they can. I am quite certain that in so doing they are simply doing what they have done in all other spheres of the EEC: putting themselves first each time and Europe last. This time the result will be fatal.

As Mr Poniatowski said, in five years' time it will be too late ever to recover. I think that he was rather generous when he said five years. I believe we have got to rise to the occasion now. Indeed, I think we have got to rise to it before Christmas. I was most impressed by the number of meetings the representative of the Council referred to as taking place before Christmas. I hope that in one of them at least they will at last remember that they are not just national governments competing with one another but that they are part of Europe.

(Applause)

Mr Ippolito (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is no mere rhetorical ploy to state that the discussion taking place in our Parliament today is one that will go down in history. Europe, as our founding fathers envisaged it — from Monnet to De Gasperi, and from Schuman to Spaak — has reached a turning-point. It faces the challenge of new technology, the challenge of the year 2000, and it will either beat this challenge so as to maintain the position that is its right in the civil development of our planet, or it will be reduced to the rank of an underdeveloped area, at the level of the Third World.

The challenge — albeit a peaceful one — thrown out by the United States with its programme of research and development for new technologies, known as the SDI, can, if it is lost, weaken Europe in just the same way as happened at the end of the Second World War. We must respond to this challenge without allowing ourselves to be diverted by the offers of collaboration

that are made to us from the other side of the Ocean — offers that are designed to increase the already existing technological gap between the opposite sides of the Atlantic, to reduce our technologically advanced industries to the status of 'sub-contractors' of the same American industries, and to take away our ideas, researchers, and scientists.

Europe can only answer this challenge with a single voice. Only if they are united, and if they gather around themselves without exclusion of any kind all those other European countries who wish to take part in this race, can the twelve countries of the EEC hope for technological survival. Let us remember, ladies and gentlemen, that Europe has only achieved scientific and technological results comparable with those of the United States, Japan and Russia, in those fields of research where it has worked on a united basis — in the field of physical and high energy research and the study of sub-nuclear particles, with CERN; in the field of nuclear fusion, with the JET joint undertaking; in the field of fast, self-seeding reactors, with the construction of the Super-Phénix I at Creys-Malville, which had already become critical by the first week in September last; and, finally, in the field covered by other Community initiatives such as Esprit, IRIS; RACE and Brite.

These outstanding results must prompt us to state forcibly, in this Parliament, that the launch of the Eureka project alone is not sufficient to beat this challenge if it is not developed and organised in close collaboration with all those who are concerned — the governments, industry, scientific and research institutions and trade unions of the greatest number of European countries, acting as one and under one management.

If Eureka is split up and fragmented into a series of disconnected, uncoordinated research initiatives, it will be impossible to avoid duplication of work, overlapping of programmes and further waste of manpower and financial resources.

I cannot tell you what is the best form in my opinion, to give this united collaboration in the field of advanced technology — whether to proceed, as Mr Ciancaglini has just proposed, towards a new technological Community, or whether, on the other hand, it would not be better to proceed by setting up one or more joint undertakings in accordance with the rules of Chapter V of the Euratom Treaty, as some authoritative members of the EEC Commission seem to prefer; or whether, finally, it would not be better to use the supplementary expenditure provided for under Article 4 of the decision of 7 May 1985 on new own resources, as proposed by Mrs Barbarella on behalf of the Committee on Budgets.

What seems to me essential, however, is that, as President Delors stated yesterday at the Symposium, the Community should take a direct part in these initiatives, even by means of special, varying contributions

Ippolito

from all participating European countries, and that — as the Italian Minister for Research, Mr Granelli emphasized yesterday, the proportion of EEC budget expenditure on research should be substantially increased well over the present 3%, hopefully in part through a drastic reform of the common agricultural policy, which everyone has called for, and which at present devours over 70% of the Community budget.

It is not, in fact, the CAP that will decide the future of Europe; only this technological challenge allows us to look confidently to the future of our continent, in the field of agricultural technology as well.

Finally, Mr President, may I be allowed to refer again to a serious episode in the recent history of our Community — the failure of Euratom. Joint research presupposes joint industrial objectives. Euratom failed in fact when European industrial development in the field of nuclear energy ceased to be united along the lines indicated as far back as 1957, in the famous report of the 'Three Wise Men'. The various countries in the Community developed different and often divergent nuclear policies, which is something that the speaker foresaw from the first year in operation of the European Atomic Energy Community, and has recalled today as a severe warning. Let us not repeat the errors of the past! Let us start, as the reports by Messrs. Poniowski and Ciancaglini — which our political group will vote in favour of — both proposed, with the Eureka proposal, and plan the united, co-ordinated development of European research in the field of new technology, along the broadest lines.

(Applause)

Mrs Scrivener (L). — *(FR)* Madam President, my motive in raising the matter of remote-sensing is an awareness that we as politicians do not attach enough importance to it. Today, as we address our minds to the technological revolution, remote-sensing, a field in which Europe is engaged in advanced research, deserves our attention. In practice, what is required now is a transition from the pilot project phase to a more operational phase, since it is only right for us to concern ourselves with practical applications of research. Remote-sensing has the potential to make a considerable contribution to the rational use of land. The time would therefore seem to have come for the Commission to put its project for an agricultural forecasting information system into practice. With consideration being given to reform of the common agricultural policy, how can we ignore the benefits which not only our States but our farmers too would derive from the introduction of such a system? Improved knowledge of the factors influencing crop yields would make for improvements in farming conditions themselves and provide farmers with a better basis for decisions on productive investments.

In addition, remote-sensing is a technique which could make a very telling contribution in the developing

countries. The work being done by the Joint Research Centre in Mali and Guinea is expected to lead to forecasts of those countries' rice crops, so that they will then be better placed to plan their imports of cereals.

In human terms, this would be a help in dealing with the problems of hunger. In political terms, the credibility of the European Community would be enhanced. Scientifically, these operations have proved successful, but it still remains to demonstrate the feasibility of remote-sensing techniques in the field and to convince a sufficient number of users.

The Joint Research Centre has no mandate for that type of exercise. However, the onus is now on us, the politicians, to call upon the Commission to broaden the JRC's range of activities so that it will be in a position to move on to practical applications of its research, of which the African countries stand in such great need. Stress should also be laid on the useful applications of remote-sensing in environmental protection, where it can be used to warn of certain types of catastrophe, such as forest fires or earthquakes, or to trace pollutants at sea.

Now is the time for a decision to be taken. We call upon the Commission to step up support for research on remote-sensing and to give the JRC the means with which to carry this research over into practical reality by means of specific demonstration projects.

(Applause)

Mr Fitzsimons (RDE). — Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of my group I should like to congratulate Mr Poniowski on his comprehensive report. It provides an excellent introduction to the debates which follow on new technologies.

I share the rapporteur's concern that Europe is lagging too far behind the technological progress already made by the United States and Japan. I also share his desire that the Council should agree on clear priorities for European research and on the increase in resources necessary to carry out these objectives. When we talk of the technological challenge, the real challenge is one within the Community itself: the need to encourage a joint effort. Europe must become a single strong competitor. At present, there is a tremendous gap between the larger Member States and the smaller, less-developed regions. National priorities are different. For the larger countries nuclear energy and space technology are important areas of research, whereas in Ireland, being a nuclear-free zone, we put greater emphasis on non-nuclear research and practical demonstration projects.

We must, as a matter of urgency, do everything possible to narrow the technology gap. The Community should recognize explicitly the scientific and technological need of the less-developed Member States such

Fitzsimons

as Ireland and Greece. Every successful effort to coordinate and integrate national policies, to improve cooperation between Member States and to foster good working relations between scientists and technologists is an important step in improving the world competitiveness of Europe. The creation of the European research area is essential to capitalize on the excellent scientific expertise that exists throughout the Community. There is plenty of scope for improvement.

Within the Community, programmes such as Esprit, Race and Comett are creating the framework for an interchange of ideas and resources. The Esprit programme, for example, ensures optimum results from combined research. My own country of Ireland has so far participated very successfully in several Esprit projects. This pre-competitive stage cooperation is very useful and mutually beneficial for small companies which cannot finance independent research on their own. Also, under the Esprit programme, we have the first computer conferencing system, known as Euracom, at University College, Dublin.

Participation in contract research programmes has enabled Irish scientists to be involved at the forefront of research. In the view of the majority, of Irish contractors, technology has been transferred into Ireland as a result of Community contracts. Another example of Community-assisted programmes which benefit Ireland are energy demonstration programmes which have been particularly effective in commercial terms. Of the 28 Irish contractors who have secured EEC funding since 1979, 24 have been commercial companies. In general, the impact on Ireland of EEC contract research is very valuable. In addition, it contributes 8 million ECU, or 6 million Irish pounds, per annum to Irish research. This is approximately 5% of our national research and development effort.

Although our participation in these programmes is important and should be continued, what the Community needs is a more highly integrated package of regional, social and technological programmes to assist the less-developed regions. Increased expenditure on agricultural research would also be welcome. In Ireland, which is an agricultural-based economy, it is vital for us to devote far more funds to research and development in the agri-food sector with substantial Community aid.

Agricultural surpluses continue to be one of our main problems. Research could contribute usefully, particularly in relation to ethanol. Oil exploration off the Irish coast also needs new techniques to bring about its commercialization. The most striking aspect of new technologies in Ireland in recent years has been in the electronics field. This year alone, 35 new electronic and computer-related companies have been set up. The majority of these are small and medium-sized companies spread over a wide area of the country. The impact on local employment opportunities is signifi-

cant. For example, one company in my own Euro-constituency in County Wicklow, Advanced Microdevices, will employ 1 000 people over the next six years. This is seen as a major growth area for Irish industry. It is an area in which we have great confidence and in which we are investing for the future.

Ireland fully recognizes the value of Community programmes, and it is always willing to play its part in new developments. My group accepts the technological challenge facing Europe and we intend to meet it. My group is pleased to give its support to Mr Ponia-towski's report.

(Applause)

Mr Christensen (ARC). — *(DA)* Madam President, it is characteristic of international research and technology that it is pursued by different and varying groups of countries. In the European Community and EFTA alone, for example, there are 14 major research programmes, 13 of which — the Esprit programme is the only exception — involve changing groups of countries in and outside the Community, depending on the particular fields the individual countries are interested in. And that is how it should be. There is absolutely no reason to involve the ponderous monolith of EEC bureaucracy in the development of research and technology — on the contrary. Nor is there any reason whatsoever for all the Community countries to finance and participate in all types of research and technology. Eureka seems to me to be a big prestige and propaganda number — at most a label to be stuck on projects which have already been approved or are underway.

In my opinion it is ridiculous to think that a European Union should be a precondition for participation in the development of advanced research and technology. A consequence of restricting programmes to the countries of the Community would be that my country, Denmark, would have to cooperate more closely in research and technology with Portugal than, for example, with Sweden, more closely with Spain than with Switzerland. It is foolish of the Community to exclude nations such as the Nordic countries from cooperation in these fields. It seems to me that the Community has once again tried to get itself involved in something it has neither the authority nor the ability for and in which it cannot achieve anything meaningful.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

Mr Bachy (S). — *(FR)* Ladies and Gentlemen, the need to make a success of technological change is a

Bachy

considerable challenge to Europe, and vital if we are to remain in the race for economic growth. Community-wide mobilization of all resources for research, innovation and investment in new technologies is also essential in order to secure our independence.

The Socialists are therefore strongly in favour of technological progress. But they hope to see the right answers given to a couple of very simple questions: who benefits from technological changes and what purpose do they serve? How are technological changes controlled and who takes the decisions?

The answers to these questions matter, and I will give three examples. Nuclear energy can be formidable power for growth, development and European independence if it is used primarily for peaceful purposes. But it can also be a weapon of destruction if it is used in the context of military programmes such as the American SDI. The use of the computer, in commerce and industry, can be a formidable means of distributing information, decentralizing decision-making, and democratizing management. If this is to be the case, however, there must be the political will to train and inform personnel, to prepare employees, both men and women, for the use of computer facilities. If this is not done, if the use of the computer is restricted to a few specialists and a technocracy of experts who monopolize information for the benefit of management alone, it is clear that the computer will not be an instrument of democratization, but an instrument of manipulation, used for the benefit of some and to the detriment of others.

My third example: automation and mechanization, which can be a formidable influence in the improvement of working conditions, elimination of the most arduous and most degrading manual tasks, and reduction of occupational accidents and working hours. But mechanization can also be a cause of redundancies, de-skilling, and increasing job insecurity. Technological progress is bringing appreciable productivity gains, running at about 5% each year in European industry. But how should the benefits of these productivity gains be shared? In our view, employees should be given a say in this matter.

It is for this reason that the Socialists are so strongly in favour of the development of negotiation, between the employer and the trade-union representation in the company, on the introduction of new technologies. It is for this reason that we welcome all positive initiatives taken along these lines. An example has been provided very recently by a French industrial group, Thomson, which, as you know, was included in the nationalization programme by the Socialists in 1981. The management of this group has just negotiated an outline agreement with the European Trade Union Confederation on consultation of employees throughout the Thomson group on the subjects of investment

options and the introduction of new technologies. This is an example worth following.

We welcome the fact that, in this general debate, a number of amendments, calling for the development of these procedures for consultation of employees among other things, have been added to Mr Ponia-towski's report. We hope that Parliament will vote for all these amendments, which were adopted by the competent committee. On the other hand, we are disturbed that certain States, in Europe, are still blocking all efforts to develop legislation aimed at strengthening collective bargaining in the Community. We are especially disturbed at the persistent blocking of a number of texts, such as the Vredeling circular, which we would like to see become a directive. We are also disturbed that the same blocking methods are being used at every meeting concerned with the debate on a Community-wide reduction in working time. We, the Socialists, are in favour of rallying the people of Europe behind the idea of the enlarged market. We Socialists are in favour of rallying the people of Europe behind a large-scale technological project. But we are also in favour of breaking out from the inertia which is preventing progress on the plans for translating the European social area into reality. It would be misguided and foolish to attempt to create the Europe of new technologies without involving the world of work. For us, the only realistic way is to bring the world of work, employees and employers, into the process of building the Europe of new technologies. That is the course that we want to see adopted and affirmed with more conviction in this Chamber for the future.

(Applause)

Mr Petronio (DR). — *(IT)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, today is not the first time that in Europe, in the various universities, at political meetings and in the more-or-less refined clubs, the problems that we are speaking about today are being discussed.

The technological gap — the abyss, almost — that separates Europe from the United States and Japan is now something of which public opinion everywhere is aware. This gap is reflected in concrete terms in Europe's constant loss of markets, and in the increase in unemployment, especially youth unemployment, in our continent.

Thanks to the efforts made by the United States and Japan in this sector, those countries have seen their own rate of employment rise. We, on the other hand, with every day that passes, have to raise still further the percentage — now in double figures — that indicates the rate of unemployment in Europe.

New technology is a problem that is linked with science, with knowledge, with the generation of wealth,

Petronio

with keeping jobs in existence and making new jobs, and with distribution, especially of wealth.

New technology is something that affects economic sectors, but it also affects social, moral and ethical sectors, especially if we consider biotechnology in particular — that is to say, the other way of creating life, that immense pretension of modern man. The problem of new technology is also a legal one. It is a problem with many aspects, and one that is split up into many parts.

It is perhaps useless to ask why Europe is so far behind Japan and the United States. The simplest answer as far as the United States is concerned is that, from the Second World War onwards, for reasons of war or for civil reasons, they have never stopped creating new technology. From the Second World War, from the explosion of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, to the conquest of the moon and subsequently to the defence system that is now proposed and that some call 'Star Wars' and other 'Star Peace', the United States has never ceased to press on in the scientific and technological sector. Europe stopped to lick its wounds in 1945; thereafter, it has not played a leading part in virtually anything on the world scene. The world has become polarized between the United States and Soviet Russia; the armaments race has been decisive, and the fall-out has been important and decisive from the civil standpoint. The Japanese empire, with its sub-empires Korea, Taiwan, Singapore and other parts of south-east Asia, limited itself at first to copying, then subsequently it started inventing, and now it is racing towards the fifth generation of robots, the fifth generation in the sphere of the electronic revolution.

We therefore have the problem of protecting ourselves both from the danger of a new wave of inflation and from an increase in unemployment; and we also have the problem of getting on level terms with the United States and Japan, and with the other parts of the world that devote themselves in the main to the technological revolution.

They are technological waves that conquer and acquire a strip of beach each time they flow in, and that beach can no longer be reconquered by anyone else. It is useless to tell ourselves again and again that we are the biggest market in the world, with 320 million inhabitants, if there is such a gap between the per head incomes of Portugal and Germany. It is useless to tell ourselves that we are the leading commercial power in the world with 30% of world trade, if the products that we are selling originate technologically elsewhere.

We must, therefore — and this is the merit of this debate — stop moving forward a small step at a time; since we have got to make a jump, we must take a good run at it. We must therefore consider — because we always make plans on too long-term a basis — the

absolute need for the internal market to be really consolidated before 1992. Our great market of 320 million persons is in fact hindered, divided up into compartments and split up by frontiers, red tape and bureaucratic interests that see, in every relaxation of any kind of restriction, a decrease in their administrative, bureaucratic or political power. We have to make this Europe united physically, a Europe in which the trains all run on the same voltage, and in which an electric iron works just as well in Paris as it does in Bonn; a place free from standards and regulations that differ totally from one country to the next, and where you do not need 70 documents in order to cross from one frontier to the next, and one is sufficient. In short, a place in which that monetary union that is important and fundamental is given body and made real. Our ECU, to which everyone, especially the governments, pays lip service, saying that they absolutely want it. A united market — otherwise, a disunited market is only open to commercial aggression by others. A united market, a common currency, integration and cooperation. An insistent demand, an appeal for cooperation between research centres, can be heard from the professors, the universities, the researchers and scientists — all of these people who go to some extent their own way, or the official bodies, each working for its own account, which never succeed in achieving that impressive critical mass that is necessary to initiate the scientific and technological explosion in Europe.

The United States of America allocates 100 000 million dollars to research and development. The European Community allocates 1 000 million. I think that this figure speaks for itself. We have to stop carrying on like this; we must provide our budget with adequate resources, increase the allocation to scientific research from 3% to 8%, mobilize the EIB, mobilize the NCI, and initiate a policy of projects to avoid European capital returning and continuing to go to the United States to finance other people's projects.

President. — Mr Petronio, I'm sorry to have to cut you here, but you have exceeded your speaking time.

Mr Baudis (PPE). — (*FR*) Ladies and Gentlemen, it was necessary for us to hold this debate. If we were in any doubt about this, we shall have been convinced by the excellent work produced by the Commission and Mr Poniatowski's remarkable report. As we know, the choice is not between different modes of development. It is quite simply between modernization and decline. In other words, we no longer have any choice and we no longer have the leisure to indulge in hesitation or uncertainty.

The conclusions presented by the rapporteurs are clear. What we have to deal with is not so much a problem of resources as a question of resolve. In this connection, I hope that Parliament will have the earliest possible opportunity to examine the adjourned

Baudis

report on Europe's policy on space. This is one area where we are lucky enough to have a presence. Whereas, in other sectors, we have an enormous amount of ground to make up, all we have to do in the space sector, if I can put it that way, is to intensify and coordinate efforts in an enterprise in which the Europeans have been operating successfully for several years.

What is required is therefore intensification and coordination. Intensification first, bearing in mind that there can be no pause in the conquest of space, where project lead times are exceptionally long. This is one of the activities where we have an extraordinary lead on the Japanese, for instance, but if we mark time we will soon be caught up and then overtaken. In this connection, I would stress the importance of launching manned space missions. If we are not physically present in space by the end of the millennium, fifteen years hence, Europe's role in space will be reduced, perhaps for ever, to that of subcontractor to the big powers. The priority objective is therefore the Hermes programme of European shuttles. This is fully in line with the conclusions adopted by the Ministers for Scientific Research of the European Community meeting in Rome early in 1985.

The second objective: coordination of our efforts. The Community institution is not involved closely enough in the definition and implementation of space policy. Clearly, we must pay tribute to the extraordinary achievements of the European Space Agency. But it is regrettable that the Community does not play a fuller role.

Alongside all the programmes of aid, support and protection for regions or industries in decline, Europe must also support the activities on which its future will be built, or otherwise it will be seen merely as an ailing patient receiving palliative treatment.

The adventure in space, which combines the wildest fantasies with the most reasonable realities, is a project which captures the imagination, especially among young Europeans.

(Applause)

Mr Seligman (ED). — Madam President, it is difficult to follow such an authoritative person as the Mayor of Toulouse, Toulouse being the leading centre of high technology in Europe these days.

Europe cannot afford to be dependent on imported technology, either for defence or for the economy. And you cannot separate defence from the economy as far as high technology is concerned. They both need the same basic technology. That is why we must cooperate in SDI. SDI is necessary if the West is to catch up in anti-nuclear defence. Russia has been developing anti-missile defence for 18 years and is probably capable of preventing a missile falling on Moscow now.

Russia is years ahead of American in laser technology. The dangerous thing is that Russia may get the impression she can win a nuclear war mainly because the West has no adequate anti-nuclear defence. So SDI is essential to balance things up and Europe must cooperate, firstly in order to have technology to defend herself, but secondly to compete in civil technology in the future. So much for SDI.

There is no need to tell Parliament what Europe's high technology problem is. On the one hand our largest companies, like ICI and Unilever, are moving their research out of Europe into America because that is where the market is expanding fastest — 14% in three years, whereas Europe has only expanded 6% in those years. On the other hand, American giants like AT&T and IBM are moving into Europe to dominate and colonize the European market, with Fujitsu and others not far behind. We have to go to tackle this problem at both ends — the large company end and the small company end.

In the USA there are only two or three real giants in this field whereas in Europe we have 10 or 12 mini-giants not big enough to be effective. We have to make our large firms larger and fewer so that they can reach critical mass, as other speakers have said. At the other end, we have to encourage small firms to start up and innovate because they are the big creators of employment. As you may know, in America 80% of the 15 million new jobs that have been created in the last 10 years are constituted by companies employing less than 20 people. It is the small firms that really matter.

In America small industrial estates, called incubators, are springing up around university campuses where young scientists can convert the results of their own research into useful high technology products for the market. These young scientists are assisted by their former professors. They are assisted with start-up help, finance, administration and even laboratory facilities. The help given by universities to industry in America is one of the most striking things we saw on our recent visit.

We should also seek to emulate America's National Science Foundation which pours \$ 1 500 million into university/industry cooperation every year. Many large companies like Marconi in England are finding it pays to spin off small companies under one of their own executives, a young entrepreneur. They find that is a more effective way of developing certain types of product. They flourish better away from the parent company. So much for small companies.

As far as large companies are concerned, IBM, as you know, has a turnover of over \$ 33 000 million and AT&T \$ 30 000 million, and they concentrate on computers and telecommunications. Our nearest electronic giant is GEC in Britain, which has a turnover of \$ 26 000 million, but most of that is spent on heavy

Seligman

electric power and not on high technology. The same applies in a way to Siemens and Thomson.

So in Europe we must have one or two giants specializing in information technology and telecommunications. There are only two ways to do this: either we have cross-frontier mergers between national champions or we have consortia on the Japanese basis. Unfortunately most national governments resist trans-frontier mergers for reasons of national pride and protectionism. This must stop. If we do not reduce our 12 national champions to about three, the European market will be taken over by the giants from America. In high technology we have got to hang together or we shall hang separately and Eureka, without those mergers, will be a waste of time and a waste of money because we shall not have the infrastructure to follow up competitively.

The alternative to mergers, as I said, is consortia for research and development as organized by Miti in Japan, or possibly a setup like Wilmotts ESS II, European Silicon Strategy II, which is a new consortium. But we have no Miti in Europe and I suggest we need one. We need a European ministry of trade and industry as part of the Commission, not just to administer and propose new rules, but a Miti to coordinate and drive Europe's trade and industry, to pick up the work that Esprit has so well started.

I suggest that Mr Delors creates a department of trade and industry to meet American and Japanese challenge in high technology. Let this European Miti coordinate our enormous resources of scientific genius and skilled manpower into a dynamic and competitive world giant called Europe Incorporated.

(Applause)

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — *(FR)* Madam President, in the face of a plethora of challenges (military, commercial, financial, technological, industrial), in the face of the offensives being mounted by American and Japanese multinationals, in the face of President Reagan's Star Wars Initiative, Europe must needs react. This is why it was necessary for this Parliament to hold a debate on advanced technologies. At the same time, however, it raises a number of questions in my mind. How can we in Europe develop productive activities incorporating high technology which will meet the needs of our internal market? How do we develop forms of production which make the best of our assets in the form of real industrial capacity and the availability of skilled manpower, know-how and research, the quality of which is beyond doubt?

Attainment of these objectives will entail substantial development of technological, industrial, regional cooperation, between European partners. I would remind the House that the Communist and Allies Group took the initiative in March 1984 for a debate

in this Chamber, on the basis of an oral question concerned with industrial cooperation among the countries of the Community. On that occasion we stressed the need to increase the number of programmes such as Esprit, or even extra-Community programmes like Ariane or Airbus.

Clearly, such cooperation programmes need a legal framework, clearly defined and mutually advantageous forms. They should be extended to other partners in Europe, to the Socialist countries and, above all, outside Europe, to the developing countries. It would be appropriate in my view for the Community to give active consideration to the incorporation of a section on technology and advanced research into the Lomé Convention.

That said, I should like if I may to draw attention to two pitfalls to be avoided. We have heard speakers in this debate whose inclination is to move European research in the direction of participating in the American Strategic Defence Initiative. I would remind the House that on 13 June last our colleague Mr Poniatowski tabled and won a vote on an amendment containing the following passage: 'The European Parliament considers that cooperation and coordination with American projects are necessary so as to ensure that Europe is appropriately involved in policy-making and management and has access to technical information'. This, fortunately, is not the position adopted by the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology. I would also stress in this connection that any coordination with the SDI, any European project organized for military or potentially military purposes, would be contrary to the provisions of the Treaty of Rome. With apologies to Mr Poniatowski, I am going to quote him again: there are weeks when a particular topic or person seems to crop up time and again, and this appears to be Poniatowski week in Strasbourg. He said this morning that there was no civil or military technology, only applications. It is precisely these applications that need to be kept under firm scrutiny to ensure that no military bias develops, since the projects about which we are talking do not end with research, as was the case with Esprit, but must lead on within a fairly short space of time to industrial applications.

The second pitfall would be to believe or give to understand that Europeans could benefit from the fruits of American technological research, as long as they take part in the Star Wars project. In fact, quite the contrary is the case. As we know, the Americans all too readily confer extraterritoriality on their domestic laws and impose their own conditions on European firms, as they demonstrated in the case of the Soviet gas pipeline. Similarly, they use the instrument called Cocom to deter exports of high-technology products to the Community itself, this without any consultation with the Europeans. This attitude has, incidentally, been rightly deplored in Mr Metten's report on technological transfer. This report has disappeared from

Chambeiron

our agenda at the request of the EPP group. It seems to be axiomatic in this House that when Washington catches a cold, the EPP sneezes. I therefore urge the Commission to display greater firmness in regard to American protectionism and to defend European commercial and financial interests more effectively, in particular by establishing Community preference in the technological and industrial sphere.

Finally, it is necessary to define the content and form of desirable cooperation schemes, since there is a very real danger that the inequalities between regions, between sectors, between workers themselves, will be accentuated. I would add, in passing, that it is deplorable that the Ministers for Labour and Employment should have admitted defeat at their meeting of 26 September last, having failed to reach any agreement on a European social area, on consultation of workers, or on the Community plan for employment. It is for this reason, and this will be my final point, Madam President, we are determined to reaffirm that the defeat of the crisis and the introduction of new technologies cannot be achieved on the backs of the workers, but on the contrary must necessarily entail close consultation with them. Technological progress is the business of all workers concerned. Similarly, the Community must adopt criteria for employment and training of workers to finance constructive projects. These things are prerequisites for the creation of technological Europe.

Mr Staes (ARC). — (NL) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, modern technologies can be used to improve democracy and information, to stimulate democracy in firms, to replace inhuman work, to contribute to progress in the areas of alternative energies, the conservation of raw materials and energy and the protection of the environment, to reduce the power wielded by superpowers and multinationals, to give medical science a new chance, to support self-employed work, autonomy at local level and labour-intensive firms, to improve education and to encourage the citizen to be more democratically minded and to participate in society more.

But it can also be used to sustain destructive militarization. Yesterday evening Professor Teller said here that the development of a European spacelab would certainly be very useful for SDI but that no one could guarantee that such initiatives would be used solely for civil purposes. Power can be further concentrated in the world, society reduced to something like a second, technological medieval era, in which the people are kept happy with electronic pastimes, the Third and Fourth Worlds exploited by giving those who pull the strings in the wealthy North even more opportunities, Europe can be developed into a third power bloc, automated and programmed human beings can be bred, privacy threatened, large-scale agriculture and factory farming supported, workers obliged to submit to lengthy retraining and the mass of untrained work-

ers driven even deeper into unemployment. The world can be allowed to suffocate even more effectively in a murderous welter of competition, performance and consumption.

It simply depends on what civilization stands for today. The basic choice as regards what use is made of what technologies for what purpose is the real challenge of the technological revolution, far more than the eternal competition with the USA and Japan. The choice was in fact made long ago, and this debate is therefore completely superfluous. Commercial interests have already forced their choice on society and completely brushed democracy aside: hunger is spreading in the world, the arms race is becoming increasingly insane, human rights are violated with increasing intensity, the destruction of the environment is becoming increasingly dramatic, and more and more energy and raw materials are being wasted. We have gone a good deal further down the road towards excessive commercialization, growing consumption, increasingly cut-throat competition and an even more bitter trade war.

What democratic body — and I include the Community — has ever put the fundamental questions raised by the new technologies to the people and then based its political choices on their views? Where social consequences are concerned, the only question to have been asked is: how do we get irrational, primitive human beings to adjust to the requirements of economic interests? Human beings have thus been subordinated to technological evolution, and not the other way round. Real social needs have never been a yardstick.

Welfare has never really been the issue. The strengthening of the power structures and the more subtle extension of injustice and dependence have been the only determining factors in the options available.

Democracy and the basic urge for greater justice have so far had to give way to the dominant forces in our society. How could it be otherwise? My group clearly cannot endorse a choice of this nature and must therefore firmly reject the present trend in the new technologies.

Mr Metten (S). — (NL) Madam President, the technological challenge we face is largely a social one. Awareness of this is clearly what distinguishes the American and Japanese approach to technology from the European approach. My colleagues will be saying what this social challenge is. I myself will be talking about the economic challenge.

The debate on Western European research and development policy is taking place against the economic backdrop of competition with, specifically, Japan and the United States. Although Western Europe leads the field in a few areas, such as chemicals and aircraft

Metten

construction, it compares badly on the whole when its performance in high technology is considered. This is remarkable because Western Europe's level of scientific achievement is certainly no lower than that of its leading competitors, even though it spends less money on research and development. This paradoxical situation is due to four factors.

Firstly, there is a great deal more partial or even complete duplication of research in Western Europe. A glaring example of this is the telecommunications sector, where nine Western European companies are each developing a digital telephone exchange system at costs which cannot be covered in the fragmented Western European market. Cooperation in two or three consortia and specialization are therefore needed if costs are to be reduced and research potential is to be better exploited. Europe would then be in a better position to compete with the United States and Japan, where only two or three companies share the market, and improve the slight edge it still has in this field. But because the European manufacturers are primarily competing with one another, what is emerging is a pattern of cooperation with US companies, with the European companies in danger of taking the back seat.

Secondly, the lack of coordination in research is giving rise to more and more unharmonized standards. Embarrassing examples of this are the different television and radio systems in the European Community. Coordination of research should lead to common standards from the very conception of a product.

Thirdly, basic inventions are not converted into commercial products quickly enough in Europe. Sad to say, the examples of European inventions being first marketed successfully in Europe by Japanese firms are legion. In microelectronics particularly the time-lag between invention and commercialization must be drastically reduced because of the revolutionary speed at which developments occur in this sector. European companies must also adjust to the permanent product innovation that these revolutionary developments require and not content themselves with innovations only when a new product generation comes along.

Fourthly, research in Western Europe is excessively geared to the government and large companies. The lack of innovative drive in small and medium-sized firms is a major shortcoming of Western Europe's technological infrastructure. As they supply large companies, this situation is also a threat to the large European companies themselves. Community programmes like Esprit are trying to do something about this, but they are still too modest. Programmes which stimulate research in small and medium-sized firms are urgently needed. As labour costs are often the largest cost item, labour cost subsidies for research and development are to be recommended, and they may also have a favourable effect on employment.

Fifthly, preference has traditionally been given in Western Europe to expensive and heroic projects, like

particle accelerators and nuclear fusion, which will take more than a lifetime to become economically viable. The plans for a European manned space station must also be placed in this category. A better balance between basic research and applied research and development is therefore needed. The level of unemployment in Europe indicates the need for less exotic and more bread-and-butter projects, projects like those included in the Commission's Bride programme, which are aimed at modernizing the traditional industries in the Community and may have a direct and favourable effect on European competitiveness and on living and working conditions. Projects must be judged by economic and social criteria: thoughts of prestige — the 'we can do it too' effect — should play no part.

That the application of new technologies in traditional sectors can be successful is evident from the textile and clothing industry, which is able to manufacture all but the cheapest mass-produced goods competitively again.

One of Europe's responses to the technological challenge, Madam President, is known as Eureka, which is what I want to talk about now. Although it is far from certain what Eureka will eventually comprise, one of the most important aspects being discussed is the coordination of the programme. My group believes the Commission should take on this task.

Firstly, the Commission is the link with the common market. Eureka projects must result in common standards throughout the Community. Otherwise a great deal of the potential effect will be lost. Secondly, the Commission can prevent excessive dominance by large countries, the emergence of cliques, and allow the small countries to play their part. Thirdly, coordination by the Commission will make democratic control through this Parliament possible. Fourthly, the Community's involvement will offer a reasonable guarantee that military projects do not slip into the Eureka programme. Fifthly, coordination by the Commission will prevent Eureka from competing with Community research programmes. There is a real danger that existing framework programmes will be undermined, while the continuation of the Esprit programme, whose financial resources are almost exhausted even now, in Esprit II will become uncertain. In view of these convincing arguments for coordination of Eureka by the Commission, the Commission's reluctance to assume this role is completely inexplicable. I should therefore like the Commission to explain its hesitancy.

Another factor that has made the Commission's actions look disappointing was the European Council's decision in Milan to give it the green light to establish a technological Community. What happened to the Commission's defence of the Community dimension? What happened to the Commission's ambition to convert the consensus on the higher prior-

Metten

ity to be given to technology into new multiannual programmes and more budgetary resources? The technology policy was writ large in the Commission's programme when it took office. This Parliament thinks it is about time deeds followed words.

Mr Rinsche (PPE). — (DE) Madam President, honourable Members, research and technology are the key words when it comes down to making Europe's future secure. The Group of the European People's Party says yes to the new technologies. We approve of responsible and controlled technological progress. In our view technology is the use of natural laws by human beings for human beings.

The European Community now confronts major difficulties in the social and economic spheres. Many of the problems affecting us can be resolved by raising the productivity of human labour. Modern technology can raise the productivity and alleviate the arduousness of work. In a competitive world economy the alternatives are higher labour productivity or unemployment. The promotion of research and technology will require a commitment of financial resources by the European Community.

But throwing money at the problem is not enough. Researchers and technicians do not just need money, they need appreciation. Appreciation and recognition in a social context where effort is rewarded and not slandered. We need creativity in European research and technology.

Creativity arises from the interaction between logic and imagination. The first condition for creativity is the unimpeded exchange of ideas and information. Anything that smacks of walling-off seriously inhibits creative possibilities. We therefore say yes to cooperation with the United States of America — and this to include SDI research.

Any interference with European-American cooperation would only result in the emigration of highly qualified European researchers and technicians. The problems of *brain drain*, that is of people with creative potential removing from Europe to America were not confined to the forties and fifties. The same danger still exists today. Nor is the danger of social erosion in Europe reduced by the anti-Americanism sometimes demonstrated in this House, rather it is aggravated by it.

If we sought to replace European-American cooperation with an ideologically induced confrontation, the damage to Europe would be greater than to America. A good many expressions of anti-Americanism result from a mixture of jealousy and displeasure at the fact that millions of people from all corners of the globe would dearly like to go and live in the United States, whereas scarcely a single US citizen would care to emigrate to the countries of so-called actually-existing socialism.

The preconditions for successful technology promotion are subsidiarity, flexibility and rationality. Here subsidiarity means the lowest possible level of centralization and bureaucracy, flexibility means the ability to react quickly to change, and rationality means avoiding irrational pursuit of prestige. Rationality however also means taking account of the practical value and usability of innovations as means of improving the quality of human life. These must include the requirements of economic viability and competitiveness. To pose the problem in terms of an apparent choice between social utility and competitiveness merely inhibits creative thinking. There is no contradiction between the simple arithmetic of cost calculations and a realistic policy for human needs. A properly understood European technology policy will widen the opportunities open to Europeans. A common technology policy will however also exert a potent force for European unification, because if there is one lesson we can learn from history it is that working together to solve common problems promotes the integration of a community.

2 400 years ago the philosophers Aristotle and Plato saw progress as a development towards higher levels of human intellectual and moral power. We shall make every effort to ensure that the promotion of scientific and technical research in Europe continues to be committed to these objectives.

(Applause)

Mr Toksvig (ED). — (DA) In every report put before Parliament there is — or should be — a logical theme, a skeleton on which the report is fleshed out, in which the individual points are logically connected and follow one from one another until you get to the conclusions. The technique we use in Parliament, going over a topic in committee point by point, means that we are often left with reports that lack coherence. When you read the Poniatowski report you get the impression that a fierce struggle is going on between the Commission and Parliament. Under one point we say that we would like the Commission to take on the Eureka programme, and two points later we say that the responsibility should rest with Parliament. Coherence has been lost, and a number of the new ideas which had actually been in the original draft have also been lost.

In Mr Poniatowski's original report there was a list of major projects, which has now become point 15; in sub-point i) it says that the European Community should support a number of major projects to supplement existing projects. This is a sentence which is so broad and general that it is virtually meaningless. What major projects? To supplement what other projects? The original point was detailed and listed projects which could actually fire the imagination. The compromise we are left with today is hardly something which could inspire anyone.

Toksvig

The initiative taken by the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology is in many ways one of the most positive I have witnessed in my short time in Parliament. The whole project, the symposium, the big exhibition over there, which is attracting so many people, and this debate today show that this is a road we can travel, a field in which we can draw attention to what we are doing. It is therefore disappointing to see that, to begin with, we have so many compromises in our reports and that, secondly, we are back here in this chamber, i.e., that the members of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology are talking to one another again as we do in the Committee every time we meet. Where are the new ideas, the new concepts, the inspirations? After 6½ years Parliament still only has the powers it started with. In other words we are still a Parliament which is in reality one of the world's most prestigious talking shops. We are free from responsibility, and freedom from responsibility means that we should be able to put forward some visions, some far-sighted notions, which could inspire those who have to give practical effect to ideas. What is happening here is a first attempt to use the entire apparatus — exhibition, debate, symposium — to best possible effect, and I congratulate the chairmanship of the Committee for the way in which it has been done. I think it is excellent; it is an inspiration to us all — or at least it should be.

But there are so many critical weaknesses in our reports because they are so full of compromises, having been revised point by point. We could have done it better. It is not a question of an initiative which has slipped away from us, it is a debate which failed to take on the quality it should have had. Perhaps therefore there are grounds for considering once again whether the procedure we adopt, of revising reports point by point and ending up with compromises in them, might not be replaced by a more viable method, for example, majority and minority reports which would then be presented to Parliament for debate.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Madam President, under today's conditions of scientific and technological revolution, the matter of research, development and the application of new technologies is certainly critical if our countries are to emerge from the crisis and develop a sure position for the future. On the other hand, for a capitalist country such as Greece, which at the time when Western Europe's urban communities had achieved the first steps of the industrial revolution, was still struggling for its nationhood and for independence from the Turkish yoke and from an unequal collaboration, there is always the danger of technological dependence. Thus, considering the programmes for technological development and collaboration within the EEC from the standpoint of our country's interests and perspectives, we have fundamental reservations and questions.

Firstly, we wonder whether this effort might not benefit mainly the giant multinationals which rule the

EEC's territories, to help them face the competition from Japan and the United States. I think that the argument, the guiding logic, the measures and the aims presented in the Commission's text justify our concern.

Secondly, we wonder whether, in reality, the EEC is not largely becoming a subcontractor for American economic conglomerates. Indeed, we see the flower of the EEC's manufacturing industries, such as Siemens, Dornier and dozens of other companies with the most highly advanced technologies, becoming subcontractors in the Star Wars effort.

Thirdly, we fear the risk that the programmes proposed may be applied for military purposes. I think that this was in fact stated by the rapporteur Mr Poniatowski, and was in any case confirmed by Mr Andreotti when he was Chairman of the Council of Ministers, in response to related questions of ours.

And fourthly, and very importantly, we wonder whether the effort to develop new technologies might not be related to the plans for European Union, the plans for opening up the internal market, which are particularly disadvantageous for the economy of a country such as Greece.

I believe that in Greece's case the problems are entirely different in nature. We hear talk of high-speed trains, when in Greece there is but a single main line, which conforms to the conditions existing in many European countries last century. We speak of space technology, of putting solar energy to good use, when in our country there are inexcusable delays in the construction of hydroelectric stations, in the development of native energy sources, etc. We think that our country should not undertake certain marginal subcontracted involvements, such as the Airbus project, at the cost of abandoning its own technological development. What should we do? First of all, we believe that there should be a movement in the direction of developing native technologies and producing, adapting and introducing new technologies. In this connection of course, in the present phase of unrestrained internationalization of the productive forces, the possibilities for collaboration with the international framework, both with the EEC and with its Member States in various ways — either bipartite programmes, or participation in multipartite programmes, etc., are extremely important. However, collaboration should not be limited to the Community countries, and there should be no special concessions as in the matter of the internal market; any international collaboration must be based on mutual benefit and equal relations.

Mrs Lienemann (S). — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, Parliament must support the Eureka project. This is because Eureka must become the platform for the construction and development of a real technological Community. It would be churlish in this

Lienemann

connection not to pay tribute to the decisive role played by the Esprit programme, followed by COST, RACE and Brite. But the originality of the Eureka project lies in the mobilization of the research and business world to achieve largescale, concrete industrial objectives, in other words objectives capable of making an impact on public opinion. Consider, in this connection, the success of Airbus and Ariane, which have meaning for young people in particular.

Eureka is positive because it is a tangible expression of Europe's political will to overcome its handicaps, to make up the ground lost, to avert the dangers of decline, to take up the challenges thrown down by the USA and Japan. It is also positive in its affirmation that it is by pooling our research capabilities, by synergy therefore, that we shall win through.

Eureka was essential before the SDI was heard of. It has become even more urgent since the announcement of this initiative. However, Eureka is not enough in itself to constitute the Community's policy on technology. Community action in this sphere must be comprehensive, combining, on the one hand, support for research and development, for targeted projects and, on the other hand, improvement of the financial, economic and human environment to make it more conducive to innovation, development and the spread of these technologies.

But we would be failing in our duty as parliamentarians if we did not proclaim loud and clear in this Chamber that EUREKA must be a Community venture, that the European Parliament and the Commission must be genuinely involved, not just formally associated. One cannot affirm the will to create the European Union and at the same time leave wealth-creating Europe, the Europe of the future to develop outside the ambit of the Community. There are two things that we have to do: we must make a success of Eureka in technological terms, and we must make a success of Eureka in terms of the progress of the Community. Can it be said that these two requirements are incompatible? I am familiar with the arguments advanced in favour of keeping cooperation strictly to the intergovernmental level, which are based on the need for efficiency, speed of decision-making, and flexibility.

The Community institutions and the Commission have demonstrated their ability to display these qualities, for instance with COST or Esprit. But there is doubtless a need to go further. The Commission will have to devise new arrangements for bringing in third countries and new and more efficient methods for cooperation with companies, which will be the important partners in the case of Eureka. Consequently, the Commission cannot adopt a defensive attitude, but must set the pace. It has the support of the European Parliament. The Council must heed this affirmation from Members of this House that there can be no question of Eureka operating outside the ambit of our institutions.

There remains the whole problem of the Community's decision-making machinery, which is a far from theoretical matter. We hear this time and again outside these walls. We can see it for ourselves here. The bottlenecks that we are now seeing are delaying practical implementation of the guidelines laid down at the Fontainebleau Summit but, for the application of a common policy on technology, we should at least ensure that we have operational decision-making procedures. By operational I mean that they must provide a basis not only for reaching agreement among the Twelve but also for involving smaller numbers of our twelve countries, in association with third countries, in specific projects, more limited programmes.

The problem that we have to deal with is therefore not only technological but also institutional at the same time. For my part, I consider it absolutely necessary to draw up a specific treaty enabling Europe to equip itself with efficient Community decision-making tools, tools which would thus be operational for the Europe of new technologies.

(Applause)

Mr Estgen (PPE). — *(FR)* Madam President, Mr President of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, the great French philosopher Descartes founded a complete system and his entire policy on the notion of the obvious. Now it has to be said that the facts of the situation confronting us are obvious. We all know that, when it comes to new technologies, we are far behind the Americans and Japanese and will soon be overtaken by other Asian countries. We are also all aware, only too keenly, that our economic survival is indissolubly bound up with our innovative genius in the field of new technologies. We have known these things for quite some time now and have been saying so at every opportunity. We do not need symposiums or great debates to realize the obvious. While we have been talking, the others have been getting on with the job. Nevertheless, since this awareness has now reached such an acute pitch in the political world, this sharp reminder that we are giving ourselves today may have a salutary effect.

There are times when Europe is slow to awaken but then has all its wits about it. Let us therefore begin by eliminating the irresponsible squandering of our efforts and financial and intellectual resources. We can organize the most spectacular exhibitions, hold the most impressive symposiums, make speeches all day long, but the time is now past for thinking about the problem, we must act and act quickly. In plain language, we must have the political will to cooperate loyally and honestly, and we must have the necessary money. A much greater proportion of the Community budget must be devoted to appropriations for research and investment. This is what was said to us yesterday by the President of the Council, the Minister Fernand Boden — in recognition of which he was rechristened

Estgen

Victor Boden, *nomen sic hominem* — and I hope that he and his colleagues with responsibilities in other areas will be victorious in the key battle to secure the right decisions.

I should also like to say a few words about the effects of new technologies on our society, which we are going to experience come what may, whether we put ourselves at the forefront of progress or we have progress imposed on us. The problem facing us is not only a matter of rejoining the vanguard developing advanced technologies but also of making these technologies work for us, which is not a technical problem but a moral problem, and that is where the shoe pinches. While we have fallen a long way behind our competitors technically, we have fallen an enormous distance behind in coming to terms with our own know-how. First of all, we must eschew all pessimism. We must resolutely say yes to new technologies. Clearly, the technological future will not automatically enhance well-being in the world but — of this I am firmly convinced — it is also incapable of leading to total alienation of the individual, as long as we fall back on the ethical values handed down to us by our Graeco-Roman tradition and our Judao-Christian civilization. There is perhaps a greater need to organize a symposium and a debate on values and education in a technological society.

At all events, I do not share the misgivings of those who view new technologies with apprehension because of their implications for the employment market and social structures. On the contrary, I am firmly convinced that it is only by means of new technologies, the wealth that they are capable of generating for us and the beneficial effects that they can have on other sectors that we shall be able simultaneously to create jobs, meet the costs of unemployment, protect the environment and maintain or indeed develop our social security systems.

Instead of clinging to industrial structures which will anyway be made obsolete by new technologies, let us show resolution in investing in new technologies and thus lay the foundations for the true era of small and medium-sized businesses, for that is the level at which we shall derive the real benefits of advanced technologies. Let us use new technologies to make the world more human.

In conclusion, Madam President, I should like to underscore what was said to us yesterday by the President of the Commission, and I must add that it is always an event for me, a rare intellectual pleasure, to enjoy a speech given by Jacques Delors. The message that he delivered to us yesterday on the educational challenge implied by new technologies was of the utmost importance.

Jacques Delors reminded us, very appositely, that if our educational systems are going through a crisis, it is not so much because of technologies but in fact a crisis

of values. In future there will be no substitute, no conceivable substitute, for a good human and moral education in which the emphasis, in vocational training especially, is laid on adaptability and flexibility rather than a narrowly-based apprenticeship.

Making better preparations for the Europe of tomorrow — that is the task before us. No, putting computers in the schools is not enough in order to be in tune with the technological demands of the modern era. We would be better employed putting our ideas and our school curricula in order, so as to combat moral laxity. Naturally, we must also coordinate, systematize and optimize our research efforts and the industrialization process. We must create a large internal market, develop and pursue a common external policy and strengthen the framework of our decision-making, including the powers of this Parliament. Only if we pursue action along these lines, with this coherence and convergence of strategies, will we take Europe into a future which really holds out worthwhile prospects for the next generation.

(Applause from the Right)

Mrs Daly (ED). — Madam President, in his report Mr Poniatoski says that Europe is at its strongest when our countries cooperate as they have in the Esprit programme. I maintain close contacts with Westlands in Somerset who are involved in an Esprit programme and, having seen this work, I believe we in Europe must seek to gain the maximum benefit from Esprit. We need a plan to inform potential users of the fruits of Esprit research. I want to see positive promotional activity to ensure that this research gets out of the laboratory into the hands of the users. In this way Esprit would become a showcase for Eurotech and would serve to raise the sights of the manufacturing industry. All of us need to understand the scope of Esprit.

Technology is the 'change-agent' of our generation. We believe that the next few years will see changes resulting from technology equivalent to those experienced in the period we call the industrial revolution. But the impact of new technology will only benefit our Community economically and in the quality of our lives if we understand its scope and scale and hence prepare for it. Only by being informed can we prepare, and only by being prepared can we benefit. So I believe that Esprit and subsequent programmes have an educational responsibility. They should seek to inform us of the way life and work could change by our adoption of information technology.

I would like to hear the Commission's views on this wider dissemination issue and, indeed, if the size of the taskforce requires to be increased to cope with it, I would support the Commission in any request so to do.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mr Bonaccini (COM). — (IT) Mr President, Mr Poniatoski did well to start this debate by asking us not to make it an 'intimist' debate — hoping, that is, that it would not be solely a debate between experts, but one which would embrace the political question that the subject raises. He is right, and I think that so far the debate has gone along these lines.

I should like to say with all respect to Mr Sälzer — whose culture I admire — that in reality, when Karl Marx deals with the question of man's exploitation of his own kind he is not talking about the relationship between new and old technology, but is analysing the legal relationship between those who possess the means of production and those who do not — which is something that has certain consequences. In no way, therefore, can we talk about a conflict between technology and the demands of humanization; but there are conflicts between the use of technology — whether new or old, it matters not — and all of our society's need for democratic participation. This is the point, and this seems to me to be the sense of the observations that have been made, which have been adopted because we want this praiseworthy initiative and the political need that it proclaims to be victorious in our society, and not to be tripped up, which history can always do.

From this standpoint, therefore, general approval is forthcoming from the Committee on Energy on the points in question — though I think it is forthcoming also, generally speaking, from our Parliament — general approval, that is, not the approval of this or that group. Nothing is barred where the new technology is concerned; if anything, as Mr Linkhor said, there is regret for certain delays that have been apparent in industry — and not only in industry — in the implementation of a policy of continuous innovation. When I think back to the debate on this subject that took place in our Community at the end of the '60s and the beginning of the '70s, and think of the decisions that never came to anything — the Esprit project, about which the honourable lady has just spoken, is in reality only a few years old — I see what a time it has taken to achieve results that are, in short, very modest and very limited.

I think, therefore, that the Commission and the Council of Ministers can count on wide support for this proposal. And it would be out of place for us to get too frustrated over the delay — what counts is having the determination to act, bearing in mind that tackling these problems only with the spirit of competition — which was referred to by certain colleagues on a number of occasions during the symposium yesterday, and is moreover a spirit with which we are in agreement — means closing one's eyes to a whole series of other questions that face us. We are aware — as President Delors pointed out yesterday — of all the difference there is between the other industrial revolutions and this one. That is why we cannot rely simply on *laissez-faire*, in the belief that things will go right of their own

accord. Where this question is concerned, nothing goes right of its own accord.

That is why I emphasize that this new technology will disturb the balance of things, as is always the case where great leaps are concerned. The balance of power will be disturbed, and territorial balance, which must be protected. Mr Poniatoski deals at length in his report with the question of the new power of the multinationals, to which we have so far perhaps not shown too much attention. There will also be territorial imbalances, already mentioned by various members. And Mrs Lienemann was right to emphasize the importance of Eureka, which is the past tense of a Greek inchoative verb, that is to say, a verb that incites one to action. Instead, if I am to go by what the Minister-in-Office has said, it seems to me that we are still doing nothing, and that there is the danger that the decision will pass from one city of Europe to another without our coming to a conclusion, which we must do. Let the voice of our Parliament therefore be the voice of the will to define properly, and properly control, this process.

As Mr Ippolito has already said, we support the reports of Messrs. Poniatoski and Ciancaglini, which moreover had a very large majority in committee. An essential point for us is para 25 of the Poniatoski resolution, which, uncomfortable though it may be, is a decisive one for the strategy that I have just outlined.

(Applause from the extreme Left)

Mrs Salisch (S). — (DE) Madam President, honourable Members, I don't know if you will agree, but I cannot help thinking that this debate on new technologies in Europe has sometimes been extremely dishonest. I had this feeling yesterday during the symposium. It struck me that for long periods the debate was imbued with very masculine forms of thinking and attitudes of male domination.

I can only repeat what I said yesterday. There was talk all the time of 'the enemy', of how we must move on to new horizons, going ever higher and further and defeating others. But that kind of talk, dear colleagues, is a recipe for catastrophe. Male-oriented technology in this sense — I have said this already and I want to repeat it now — is what history shows us has led to catastrophe. Hiroshima is the symbol of that kind of catastrophe. When we are talking about new technologies, the question we need to keep asking is *cui bono*, who will benefit?

I would go so far as to say that this form of understanding of technology and these ways of applying technology will never bring any benefits to women. Women have, historically, always been tools, the victims of that technological form of understanding, and at the end of the day they are the ones who have had to pick up the pieces. If we want to prevent that from

Salisch

happening again, then I think we have to be honest with each other.

If I say that the debate has sometimes been dishonest, that is because in my view there has been no significant parallel between what we postulate here as a challenge and the facilities we are actually prepared to provide to protect the workers who will have to work with these new technologies. There is no real parallel between this mood of anticipation and existing social reality in Europe.

We are not prepared to say plainly whether or not we intend to fashion the relationship between people and machines in such a way that human beings really do get something out of it, that the technology really does help to enhance our humanity.

For how does the situation of women actually appear on the labour market today where the great wave of technological innovation can be seen to be in the ascendant? Women in the labour market have the worst deal. More of them are unemployed, they are worse paid, and when it comes to occupational training, women and girls are always bringing up the rear.

And what is the point of extra job qualifications if at the end of the day women and girls have only a remote prospect of a job? Girls are offered fewer job-training places than boys. What happens to girls who qualify for so-called men's occupations when they have completed their training? They become unemployed! Why should we expect things to be any different when the new technologies arrive?

In fact I am quite certain that things will be different — they will be even worse for women, precisely because the job skills that are required in those areas where the new technologies are being installed in a big way are a women's preserve. Women's jobs are at risk here, and women's functions on the production line can be very vulnerable to rationalization.

Or is it being suggested that one consequence of the new technology will be to put women in a stronger position to advance their interests? I don't believe so. We shall be incapable of being honest with each other until we can agree on concurrent progress in technological innovation and social protection measures. That is where the dividing line in this House lies, as my colleague Mr Linkohr said this morning.

Where the rights of those affected are concerned, the Community spirit on matters of technological innovation suddenly dries up. But it is here that the vital question arises. Politics, unlike science, cannot say what should happen, but it must find the means whereby the different processes can be guided and regulated. That is the pre-eminent task of a democracy. Of course it's cumbersome, but if we cannot reach agreement at this level we are not going to achieve any technological breakthrough, and then we shall run the

risk of turning into a divided society that will obstruct its own development regardless of the competition.

This is my basic concern. That is why I have tried to draw attention to the fact that male thought-patterns so deeply imbue this debate. If we were to talk really honestly to each other we would have to admit that technological innovation will, if it is implemented in the way that has been indicated here, be achieved largely on the backs of the workers, and especially on the backs of women workers.

That is why I am appealing for us to reach agreement on mechanisms with which we can control technological development.

Let me conclude with a biblical quotation, also from the gospel according to Luke. As my colleague Mr Linkohr pointed out this morning, Luke is very instructive for a debate on technology:

For which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first and counteth the cost, whether he hath sufficient to finish it? (*Luke, 14, 28*)

To that, honourable members, there is nothing at all to add.

(Applause from the Left)

IN THE CHAIR: MR DIDÒ

Vice-President

Mr Croux (PPE). — (*NL*) Mr President, I should like to begin by congratulating Minister Boden. He has responded admirably to the reports and the debates. He has rightly said that we are at a crucial stage. He has rightly emphasized the close links between the various problems, and I hope the Luxembourg Presidency will succeed in making a major contribution to the solution of these problems.

I want to discuss four points very briefly, because my colleagues have already said a great deal about the substance of the matter. Firstly, the relationship between new technologies and what I will call the humanization of the world. This applies not only to the relationship in our own society between work and employment, work and unemployment, the work of men and women but also to the Third World and specifically the opportunities, the tremendous opportunities provided by biotechnology for ensuring, among other things, peace and security in the world. After all, it is partly due to new technological ideas on defence in space that the Geneva negotiations have begun again, that new initiatives were proposed last week, that there are great hopes of fresh progress being

Croux

made at the coming negotiations at the highest level in the world.

The second point I want to make concerns the political connection. Many speakers have pointed out that new technology must not be seen in isolation from the completion of the internal market because of the economies of scale, the standards, harmonization in every field, with new social models, innovation in education and training, external trade policy and also in view of the ethical and legal problems, where we regard the integrity of human beings as central, genetic engineering being a case in point. The months ahead, before the European Council in Luxembourg, will therefore be crucial. Not everything can be done at once, but a major step in the right direction must be taken in the crucial period before the European Council in Luxembourg.

Calling for intergovernmental action, someone has said here that this form of action, Eureka being the key word, will ensure greater speed and greater flexibility.

Mr President, I have my doubts about this.

Intergovernmental cooperation is no guarantee of speed and flexibility. I feel, for example, that the veto, an unfortunate intergovernmental practice, has proved to be inefficient since it prevents decisions from being taken. Cooperation must therefore be at Community rather than intergovernmental level. It must take place at the level of a different, political authority, that of the European Community, the European Union.

There is also the democratic aspect to be considered. When we hear what is said here and read what has been written in the reports, it is surely obvious that there must be a democratic body representing the people and equipped with real powers to share in decision-making and to exercise control over such vital issues. Where else will democratic control be exercised in Europe? Not in the Member States, only here. This is a new argument in Parliament's efforts to make progress towards the Union.

As for financing, you have rightly referred, Minister, to the disagreement between the Finance Ministers and the Research Ministers. We can only overcome this difficulty by adopting a substitute policy, cooperating more closely by pursuing a technology policy at European level. Then resources can be transferred from national to European level to better effect and without forcing the European tax-payer to pay more.

Finally, the relationship between civil and strategic, civil and military. My group has tabled an amendment urging that a decision not be taken on this today and thus that paragraph 17 of the Poniowski report be deleted. Why? We must remain credible, in this Parliament as elsewhere. What do we find? We find that the Political Affairs Committee is drawing up a report on

security, including the Strategic Defence Initiative. Last week the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology decided to draw up a report on Eureka and SDI. Before this research and study work is completed, we can already express our views. Because only last week new aspects came to light. I feel we must consider these aspects carefully in our committees so that we can talk about them in a judicious and reasoned manner. That is the purpose of our amendment.

To conclude, the future is being viewed from a different angle, what might almost be termed a fourth dimension, in our strategy for the future. The values by which we judge technology remain essential. We endorse what Mr Delors said about this. We must engage in greater cooperation in this respect. We cannot find salvation in ideological antitheses, which are often gainsaid by the facts and science. The time has come for closer cooperation, even in this Parliament.

Miss Brookes (ED). — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the masters of modern economic technology, the Japanese, were offered the whole of Europe in which to introduce their industry. Single out the largest concentration of Japanese manufacturing investment and you will find it in the north of Wales which I represent. They came with their videos, their hi-fi companies, their ophthalmic lenses, using the new technologies to replace the old, over-manned and non-profit-making industries.

Then in November 1984 the European Regional Development Fund created a business improvement services scheme with finance of £ 100 million for Wales and the rest of the United Kingdom. It was meant to foster local initiative, speeding up the adaptation of old industries to the new technological requirements. The introduction of these new systems means the creation of new jobs which are not necessarily produced by large companies but rather by small businesses. These abound in Wales, Mr President. In the past four years 7 000 new businesses have been set up in Wales and 3 000 starter enquiries were registered last year alone. Because these firms can only gain from new technologies, I ask that the business improvement scheme, already over-subscribed, receive greater finance and encouragement from the EEC.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mr Hutton (ED). — Mr President, people have always feared change. While optimists have pressed forward the frontiers of knowledge to the benefit of mankind, there have always been harbingers of doom. When the railways were introduced, there were dire predictions of what would happen to people if they were to travel at the heady speed of 30 miles per hour — about 50 kilometres an hour.

It is reasonable to be aware of the potential of modern technology, and I think we here must be equipped to

Hutton

keep a democratic check on its use and its progress. We, of all people, must not get stuck in a corner out of fear and ignorance. The American Madison said that democracy without knowledge is a farce or a tragedy or both.

Yesterday some of us had the enormous privilege of hearing one of the world's great scientific minds, Dr Edward Teller, here in this very building. He warned us against excessive and obsessive secrecy. As a demonstration, before our very ears, he cut clean through the fog of rubbish which has surrounded so many discussions on the Strategic Defence Initiative.

We here should heed Dr Teller's warning and open up information about the potential of new technology to the people we represent. The symposium which is being held here in this building and this debate have a major part to play in doing just that.

Mr Ciancaglini was right: we should not forget the moral and religious beliefs which have been our guiding light through so much of European history. There has been a tendency to lightly dismiss these values, but I believe that they will stand us in good stead in making the sort of judgments that we have to make about the new technologies to the benefit of all the people we represent.

Mr Narjes, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DE) Mr President, I should like to begin with a very special word of thanks to the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, and in particular its chairman, Mr Poniatowski, for it was he who succeeded in arranging this major debate on vital aspects of European research and technology policy at this time, ahead of the more important decisions that will be taken this winter.

The themes are wide-ranging, inter-disciplinary and complex. I am therefore certain that tomorrow when we look back on this discussion we shall all agree that, extensive though it was, there still was not enough time for a complete debate on everything that should have gone into a public discussion. I certainly shall not, I regret so say, be able to reply to all the points that have been raised.

The Community now stands at a crossroads that will be vitally important to the progress of the unification process. It all comes down to our response to the challenge of American and Japanese technology on all world markets. It comes down to the development of the European Community as a Technology community. It comes down to the correct location of the Eureka project in the context of European research and development efforts as a whole. Both initiatives, incidentally, were approved by the Milan summit.

What is the situation in which we now find ourselves? I can to a large extent refer you to the relevant des-

cription in the important reports that we are now discussing, on which I should like to congratulate the authors and their committees. To state the problem succinctly, I would say that, as a consequence of the extraordinary scientific and technological upheavals that have just begun and which will probably last for decades to come, the world economy is and will remain characterized by an unusually harsh, sometimes quite merciless, competition at the level of national potential for innovation. In terms of this competition, which applies to all top-flight technologies and their areas of application, the European Community can scarcely be said any longer to occupy an economically or politically commanding position, although some Member States hold respectable places in certain branches.

With few exceptions we have lost market shares, insofar as we still have a presence at all in major markets. Only by trading effectively as a unit and with a cohesive research and technology policy — which must be understood as part of a comprehensive overall economic-policy strategy — will the Community stand a chance of restoring its technological and industrial autonomy and its ability to be widely competitive on world markets.

For each Member State to go its own way will be futile — and I have good reasons for saying so. Going our own way could, with the attendant waste of time and resources, in certain circumstances embark all of us on a process of well-nigh irreversible decline.

In this situation there is general agreement between all the Member States and the Commission that a qualitative leap forward for European research, development and technology policy must be ushered in very promptly.

The Eureka initiative, as it has developed over the last six months, has come up with some interesting results, but it has also raised some doubts. It has given a major impetus to public debate and public awareness of the need for a joint European technology effort, even if its impact in the different Member States has been mixed.

It has ensured that a new awareness of the advantages of cooperation has taken an enduring hold among our EFTA partners, that is outside the frontiers of the Community. But it has also revealed the determination of certain Member States to find a joint approach to research and development policy projects outside the European Community framework, because the Community's decision-making and budgetary procedures clearly seem unlikely to make for ideal solutions.

In that connection the Eureka project has unmistakably and unambiguously sent some valuable signals concerning the scope for improvement and the need to take action in relation to Community procedures. The significance of this will perhaps become clearer if I remind the House that the Commission's proposals, as

Narjes

submitted to the Milan summit in Document No 350, are about 80% or 90% identical to the proposals put forward by the French government on the possible content of the Eureka programme.

Yet the Eureka initiative does, insofar as it will have to be implemented outside the Community, also entail a number of risks, some of them major. These arise for example from a possible institutional split as between political responsibility for the internal market on the one hand and responsibility for industrial research projects outside the Community on the other. A number of governments have pointed this out, and in this debate too a number of contributors have rightly stressed that a fully operational internal market, including completely liberalized public sector contracts, is inseparably bound up with the establishment of a Technology Community and its viability.

Ultimately however it will be the Member States and their big multinational undertakings that will come into consideration in the great majority of branches as the principal if not the only customers for high-technology products. The basic internal market for these products will only be big enough to provide adequate economies of scale to depreciate the initial investment if public-sector tendering is liberalized in all the Member States.

This can be illustrated from any of the many branches of transport, communications-technology, defence, pharmaceuticals, energy or environment protection, to name only those sectors. The Member States today find it difficult to terminate what is in effect a privileged status of national suppliers in this area, even if the latter no longer hold a commanding market position outside their own borders, because it is precisely those same suppliers that continue to provide the Member States with their information, ensuring them a very limited access to the high-technology facilities that are available on world markets.

They also continue to put themselves forward as partners in supply agreements or assembly work. In the military sphere I can point to the typical case of the construction of the F-16 fighter in the Benelux countries and in Scandinavia.

These Member States will only seek to liberalize their contracting if the Community can offer better access to high technology in all branches. But such expectations will scarcely be met, if at all, by the establishment of a Eureka scheme outside the Community, because it would leave it up to the participating industries to determine what partnerships should be established for what projects.

I can therefore already anticipate serious economic objections on the part of those who would not see that kind of configuration as safeguarding their interests. Another consequence of this situation might also be that if there were a displacement of the centre of tech-

nological development away from the Community as such then the objective of securing liberalization of public-sector contracts as quickly as possible might well be jeopardized, and with it the goal of an internal market itself.

A wide range of institutional reservations — some of them were heard this morning in this debate — can be expected in response to that or any other form of restriction on opportunities for Community expansion, and these would also be likely to be voiced in response to the consideration that any Community participation in Eureka projects will have to be decided in accordance with the Community's budgetary regulations, and would thus give Parliament and all the Member States ample opportunities to influence its development.

The solution to these and other difficulties, which I do not have time to spell out, clearly lies, in the view of the Commission, in the development of the European Community as a European Technology Community.

The timing of such an initiative and the conditions for its success are set out very fully in Document No 350 issued last week by the Commission. This document, together with the way in which we interpreted the memorandum submitted for the Milan summit, also gives the lie to Mr Metten's fears that the Commission might be asleep.

The Commission assumes that the European Technology Community will be able to set to work immediately — that it will get off to a standing start, so to speak — if the weaknesses in joint research and technology procedures and in decision-making procedures that were raised in the Eureka debate, and again just now by me, can be overcome at once.

There are two aspects to these weaknesses. Firstly, the unanimity principle for the framework programme has burdened the joint decision-making process with a completely unacceptable handicap of uncertainty. The timing of decision-making cannot be calculated.

It simply cannot be expected that undertakings will be prepared to commit their resources — and, in particular, their best researchers — to projects of indeterminate material content for unspecified periods of time, and then meekly forego any activity of their own in the area concerned while waiting for the existing Community budgetary and decision-making procedures to be concluded.

Here, the Commission has incorporated the institutional proposals already drawn up by President Delors into the work of the Inter-Governmental Conference. In broad outlines what they amount to is that with the full involvement of the European Parliament, there can be majority decision-making on framework programmes if Parliament and Commission agree. Such a procedure would prevent the abuse of veto positions,

Narjes

would be a force for compromise, and, where Community undertakings and possible partners outside the Community are concerned, would help to build confidence and create quantifiable situations.

The other weakness in the present decision-making procedure lies in the uncertainties and insecurities of financial planning for research and technology policy. If we want — and this is what we must aim for — Community undertakings to commit their costly resources and the elite of their researchers to Community projects, then we must ensure that they can rely on continuity of planning over a number of years. That will only be possible if the Community itself can create long-term certainty of financial planning, which will include making resources available on a sufficiently calculable footing and eradicating the stop-go approach from one year to the next in this area.

For this reason the Commission not only calls for a significant increase in the budgetary appropriations allocated to expenditure on research and technology, but wants to see them consolidated as a definite percentage of the General Budget of the Community. In implementation of the decision of the March 1985 Stuttgart summit, we have proposed a doubling of the amount to 1989, and we already recognize that a further increase will be necessary in 1990 if all the requirements that will certainly materialize in the relevant areas of the natural sciences and engineering are to be met in full.

The approach that I have outlined here for the Community will also enable the Commission to continue with the policies that have stood the test of the ESPRIT and BRITE programmes, and to give small and medium-sized undertakings and research centres a fair share in the joint programmes and projects, as well as to offer those Member States that have not yet completed development of leading technologies a fair opportunity progressively to catch up. That is the subject of the report by Mr Longuet.

The Commission will of course also be prepared to enlarge and strengthen on a long-term basis the existing arrangements that already enable our EFTA partners to participate, and to negotiate constructively with them on the collaboration they seek in all projects.

In this connection a word on the requirement of a so-called 'variable geometry'. This has now been Commission practice for some years. If you count all the projects from the Esprit and Brite programmes together, then there are already some 400 projects in the Community, but not every Member State has a share in every project. We therefore use a fair procedure to ensure that those who are interested in particular projects can also participate in them without thereby disrupting the balance of overall development or of policy as a whole.

The continuation and strengthening of methods of cooperation already developed by us between the Community, industry and the research institutes also ensures that, under such a procedure, the basic material initiative lies with industry and the institutes, against whose interests it would be impossible to act, because without their financial participation no project can come into being, just as, conversely, participation by the Community ensures that, in the sense of Mr Linkohr's distinction between 'action' and 'activity', decisions not only get taken, they get taken responsibly.

Such a policy will also enable the Eureka association to be concentrated on all kinds of major civil infrastructural projects of economic, social and scientific interest, and will allow it make an early start with the first project.

It is sometimes overlooked in this connection that we have already had extensive experience of cooperation with the EFTA states under the COST programme. Some 55 projects have already been started in this connection and the majority of these have already been concluded.

As regards the objectives of the Technology Community, it will not be a simple matter of realizing specific European research and development goals — we shall discuss this further next year — but also of ensuring that we cover all the areas where we need to ensure that we can operate competitively to meet the challenge of particular achievements by our American and Japanese competitors.

Here I am thinking not merely of such things as the Japanese programme to develop a fifth-generation computer, but more particularly of the American SDI programme. I should like to make some specific distinctions here.

I cannot speak as if this debate were a discussion of the political or strategic aspects of, say, the impact of this programme on East-West relations or on disarmament negotiations. I must confine myself to its technological and industrial-policy aspects, and they are highly significant.

To assess this challenge correctly it is necessary to remember that the SDI programme will account for only a small portion of the American government's total research and development commitments as they appear in the budgets of NASA, the Energy Department and the Pentagon.

The current expenditure of some \$ 48 billion annually goes to finance production methods, components, electrical engineering and electronic products, sensor technology, new materials and a good deal else besides, much of it also increasingly suited to civilian applications.

Narjes

This increasing prominence of dual-use product developments in military space budgets will mean not only a far-ranging and constantly widening blurring and overlapping of traditional distinctions between military and civilian applications, but also, and more fundamentally, a constantly growing share of developments with civilian applications, a civilian spin-off that can be directly converted into a competitive advantage.

I should like to illustrate just how far this blurring of distinctions can lead with a simple question to Mr Linkohr, who is unfortunately not in the Chamber.

(Interruption from Mr Linkohr)

Mr Linkohr, how would you react, in the light of your speech, to the knowledge that in the Middle-East war Russian anti-aircraft missiles are now being used that contain American electronics products that can be bought on the open market as civilian components? Who do you think should stop production, who is the one should restrict output in such a case?

These competitive advantages, which can only appear to the European undertakings as distortions of competition because they depend overwhelmingly on state financing cannot as a general rule be offset by European undertakings from their own resources, certainly not within the necessary timescale.

We therefore need our own European programme to enable them to recover a competitive position — and it must be a civilian programme. The distortion is made even worse by the fact that the provisions relating to technology transfers are now to be tightened up, so that European firms can no longer rely on gaining access to the results of American research on market terms, or knowing what the economies of scale are in a particular case.

The European Community thus confronts an urgent need to act. It must also act immediately to prevent identifiable or probable areas of backwardness from deteriorating into insuperable disadvantages. The same will also apply if, for political reasons, or because not all the technological breakthroughs necessary to the success of the SDI project are successful, the SDI project itself cannot be completed, because there will still be a massive spin-off effect from the enormous concentration of research effort over a period of years, and that in itself will unleash the distortion of competition to which I have referred.

But the results of research and development alone will not be sufficient to secure the competitiveness of European suppliers in the long term. That will require European policy on technological innovation to be strengthened on a lasting basis, a policy that can bring Europe's full potential for innovation to complete fruition and eliminate all bottlenecks and obstacles as soon as they begin to be identified.

That will range from the quality of school and university education, in particular the neglected further education sector, to the need for close contacts between the universities and the economy, and that in turn will depend primarily on the capacity of the undertakings for innovation.

Since innovations are regularly bound up with high-risk investments, they occupy a key role in relation to the provision of capital equipment for research-and-development-intensive undertakings, from the the problem of finding starting capital to that of reasonable access to venture capital on acceptable terms.

I cannot here go into all the different issues that have been raised in this connection. I can however state that the work of our DG XIII has provided us with a wealth of experience in this area. If we make a courageous approach to all these tasks, knowing them to be vital to the survival of the European Community, I am moreover convinced that we shall complete them all successfully and satisfactorily, and that we can indeed secure the place near the top of the world league in scientific and technological development to which our cultural and political heritage entitles us.

To doubters I would reply by pointing to the Community's experience in energy research and in developing leading technologies to secure energy economies. The activity of EURATOM, which was referred to this morning, and which admittedly is not as good as it might be, has nevertheless decisively demonstrated that there is today no major world development in top-flight energy-economizing technologies in which Europe does not have a leading part to play. The fast-breeder reactor, the high-temperature reactor, JET, reactor safety, enrichment technology, reprocessing technology, renewable energy sources, and not least CERN and Daisy can all go to justify that assertion. There can be no reasonable doubt that these successes will be repeated in other fields. Rather, they can serve to encourage a realistic view of the ambitious and assertive strategies that Mr Poniatowski's excellent report calls on the Community to implement. There I may say that we have made large parts of the report our own, and that we share all the basic thinking and guidelines of the motion for a resolution.

I may also say on behalf of the Commission that our statement so far has effectively answered the oral questions by Mr Klepsch and Mr von Wogau on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group), by Mr de Gucht and Mr Ducarme on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, and the question by Mrs Lienemann. We take a serious interest in the Eureka initiative, as I have described it, insofar as there is the assurance that the Eureka project and the Community initiative will complement each other. A principle task for the Community will be to draw up and implement comprehensive economic and technological programmes to meet jointly determined objectives and criteria.

Narjes

It will however be necessary — and I want to make this point again — for clear positions to be taken before the end of the year on the decision-making and budgetary procedures in the Council of Ministers to which I have referred.

The Commission will also propose measures on the general lines of Mr Poniatowski's report to improve the mobility and status of researchers. The current action plan for 1985-1988 on the stimulation of cooperation and exchanges in the scientific and technical field will need to be strengthened. It will however not be so easy to make as much progress with this matter as would be desirable, because we shall be encroaching — especially in relation to social security — on a decidedly national enclave.

In their oral question on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Mrs Veil and Mrs Scrivener rightly refer to current work in the area of remote sensing. The Commission will expand its activities. I can also say that we expect a start to be made in a few months with the Spot satellite, and that with the successful operation of this satellite we shall be able to process a considerably increased amount of European data. Additionally, we shall also seek to enlarge the areas of application of the knowledge gained from remote sensing methods.

I have a lot of sympathy with the question by Mr Seligman. As regards Community initiatives and possibilities, I should like to point out that the Community has hitherto been prevented from undertaking direct promotional measures for this kind of small undertaking engaged in intensive research and scientific activity. The Council decision on the transnational development of the Commission's innovation infrastructure only gives it authority to act on a transnational basis. It thus has at present no margin of manoeuvre for direct actions to assist this kind of firm.

I should like to say in response to Mr Turner's question on the present status of the RACE project that I shall be obliged to submit a written answer, which will be somewhat complex, to him and to this House. I can however say that we are now firmly on schedule for part II of the definition phase, that we have difficulties with part I, and that we expect clarification in the course of this week as to whether these difficulties will be temporary or not. If not, we shall have to consider what political action will be necessary to reintegrate this part into the overall development.

Mr Poniatowski proposes in paragraph 45 of the motion for a resolution that the institutions of the European Community should commit themselves to making up, in the next ten years, the loss in industrial competitiveness in high-technology goods. After what I have said hitherto, I can only reply with a qualified yes. We can only achieve this objective if the Community itself creates the conditions, within the shortest possible time, for actually realizing it in practice, and

that would mean improving decision-making procedures and clarifying budgetary development and financial planning mechanisms.

The interaction of technology and society is clearly to the fore in Mr Ciancaglini's report, as are the impact of technology on production and employment and the standard of living, together with the ethical problems of biotechnology, as well as the impact of the new technologies on Europe's relations with the Third World. The discriminating approach of the rapporteur has avoided the two worst and most misleading clichés. Neither the picture of technology as the great liberator of humanity, nor that of technology as a dehumanizing tyranny is appropriate. The responsible application of technology by human beings and human contact with technology are what determine technology's merits and demerits. In that sense Mr Ciancaglini's report is an appeal for a responsible interaction with the new technologies, an appeal that we accept unreservedly. We have the opportunity to liberate the forces for an ethically and socially responsible scientific and technological breakthrough in the service of humanity. Europe also runs the danger, however, of making what could well be irreparable mistakes. Let us therefore opt in the winter of 1985-86 for the European Technology Community as our response to the unique challenges we confront.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will take place at the next voting time.

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

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

Vice-President

Mr Cassidy (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President. As you know, at the beginning of each session we are all provided by the Council of Ministers with what is supposed to be a very helpful list of those representatives of Member States' governments who usually attend Council meetings. As far as the United Kingdom is concerned, the list is now at least two months out of date. I am raising this point of order in the hope that it may assist Parliament's Secretariat in putting a bomb under the Council of Ministers' Secretariat in order to make it give up-to-date information.

President. — Mr Cassidy, I think you have got across the message for the Council. I do not think this is the week for planting bombs, but we do hope that that

President

suggestion will get through to the Council. However, this is the information as the Parliament's Secretariat gets it from the Council.

4. *European space policy — transport*

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

- the report (Doc. A2-89/85) by Mr Münch, on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the creation of a European research area
- the report (Doc. A2-106/85) by Mr Longuet, on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the differences in technological development between the Member States of the European Community
- the report (Doc. A2-104/85) by Mr Wijsenbeek, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the role and the use of advanced and new technologies in the field of transport
- the interim report (Doc. A2-107/85) by Mrs Barbarella, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on Article 4 of the decision of 7 May 1985 on new own resources concerning the financing of supplementary research programmes.

Mr Münch (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honour for me as rapporteur of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology of this Parliament to begin the debate on this very important question of technology. Monday's symposium and the various speeches this morning in this House served to illustrate the growing importance of new technologies both for industrial production and the lives of our people. By way of an introduction, I should like to make two general remarks.

First, discussion of technological developments, their social acceptability and how we can control them cannot be divorced from a discussion of the requirements of such research. To this extent, the theme of this report, the creation of a European research area, is of fundamental importance to the whole technology debate.

Second, the European Parliament has always been very active in the discussion of research and technology. The completion of the framework programme, which is shortly to be reviewed, has been a milestone in this progress. We are under the impression that there is every likelihood of a new boom in Community research policy and strategy in Europe. This Parliament has always been, and I am sure will continue to be, a driving force in the promotion of such a policy.

I shall now analyse briefly the present situation of technological research in the Community.

First, there are at present approximately 350 000 people actively engaged in research in the European Community, almost twice as many as in Japan and 25% fewer than in the United States. In spite of this, our realization that scientific productivity in the EEC has fallen behind that of these two countries, particularly where new technologies are concerned, should not force us into a no holds barred anti-American policy, but rather, it follows that we should desist from seeking to promote Europe where it is not wanted, and use the available potential to our best advantage.

Second, there have been obvious European successes which have altogether been undermined by too great a lack of coherence in research, too much uncoordinated expenditure on R and D, and too much waste of the means at our disposal; too much dispersal of national research and competition which have led to research being designed to produce competitive advantages. The existing scientific and technological area in the Community is not being used to its full potential. Third, Europe has no other alternative — it must accept this enormous challenge which we shall be discussing today and tomorrow. If we are to solve the problem, we must rid ourselves of this hostility towards effort, motivation and technology; only determined utilization of all the intellectual resources at our disposal in Europe together with an ethical responsibility towards society and our fellow man will solve the problem.

I should like to mention some challenges and goals which I consider to be of particular relevance to the debate on the creation of a European research area.

First, scientific progress and research can only prosper if ideas, methods and subjects can be discussed in an atmosphere of freedom, because without freedom research loses its legitimacy and effectiveness. Second, if the research worker is to be given greater freedom he must be all the more conscious of his responsibility. Scientific and technical progress and humanitarian values and ideals defy any attempt to make them contradictory if the research worker is prepared to take the basic ethical principle into consideration that the chief goal must be to utilize the possibilities and findings of research for the benefit of man. Doubt, not belief, is the life force of research and therefore research must be above all, self-critical.

Third, research makes demands on our society and takes responsibilities upon itself, and the reverse is also true. Permanent dialogue is therefore urgently needed. We should be aware that research can only develop in a positive social environment. Every responsible scientist takes it for granted that in this development opportunities and risks must be given careful consideration.

I shall now deal with several concrete demands and goals which I consider to be important. As the report

Münch

states, we must provide the framework conditions which are best suited to the implementation of a common research policy which, along with other Community policies, is designed to increase the competitiveness of the Community and thereby ensure economic and social progress in Europe. Those who attempt to separate these two objectives are really acting out of purely ideological motives.

Of course, this requires the Community to abandon its all too defensive positions in favour of an offensive research and industrial policy. This has several practical implications: first, systematic exchange of information. Second, the setting-up of a Community coordinating and planning body. Third, an increase in the proportion of the Community budget allocated to research from the present 3% to 6% by 1989. Fourth, the implementation of new joint research projects. Fifth, the encouragement and support of all measures which bring about the speedy absorption of findings of research into the economic cycle, that is the removal of barriers to the transfer of technology in the fields of basic research, applied research and market-orientated development, requiring also especially even greater cooperation between industry and universities and other state-financed R & D establishments. Sixth, included in this is the encouragement of private research and research undertaken by medium-sized, undertakings; seventh, the further development and the encouragement of basic research, which has always been a source of new knowledge and will continue to be so. It is never directed towards desirable goals or desired results as is continually being asserted, although the assertion is no more correct for its being constantly repeated.

Eighth, the improvement of the social status of research workers, and here I am referring to the report on the stimulation programme. Ninth, a technology transfer within the Community designed specifically to eliminate or narrow the gap between the technologically highly developed and less developed countries of the Community.

Rational use should therefore be made of all the research and innovation capacity throughout the Community, and more emphasis should be placed on the European dimension in its constructive efforts. More attention must be focused in Europe on intellectual and material resources. The common effort and, above all, the political will of the Member States is necessary to bring about the optimal utilization of European research potential and that of its research workers.

I believe that this debate shows the European Parliament's continued willingness to give priority to the pursuit of effective action at Community level, rather than to complaints about our inferior position with regard to the USA or Japan, which in turn give rise to negative attitudes towards these countries, as expressed by a minority in this House.

People will not be encouraged to trust in science and technology by propaganda campaigns directed against it, but only when they are made to realize that scientists can deal responsibly with the tasks and methods at their disposal. Of course, science and ethics go hand in hand, and we know from Kant that ethics is always, to some extent, there to serve mankind.

Research is always innovative and forward-looking, and it is also a prerequisite of economic growth. However, research is also a prerequisite for the solution of problems which cannot be solved by economic growth and in some cases even ensue from it. We in Europe possess the research resources necessary to meet the challenge of the third industrial revolution. The only question that remains is our ability to use these resources.

The European Parliament has identified and also taken up these challenges. The task is now that of the Council of Ministers who, to quote the words of Max Weber, I hope will act with enthusiasm, a sense of responsibility and of proportion in its leap out of the shadow of national politics. The adoption of the decision on this report is the way towards a new research policy and research strategy, which are those of the future. We must avail ourselves of this unique opportunity.

Mr Wijsenbeek (L), rapporteur. — Mr President, I am most glad that I can look face to face at you now but, unluckily, I do not have the time as well.

Mr President, let me begin by making it clear that the Europeans should not always be so pessimistic. Sometimes we are further ahead, further advanced than other continents. This is to some extent true of the field covered by the report I have the honour of presenting to you today on behalf of the Committee on Transport: the application of new technologies in transport. In many respects we have a lead over other continents and other communities in this field.

Mr President, our continent is particularly suitable for the extremely varied and intensive use of all the various means of transport, and I should just like to enumerate what the new applications are. In road transport European vehicles, for the transport of both passengers and freight, are technically advanced, stylistically almost perfect and economical in fuel consumption. Our transport infrastructure is very progressive, largely as a result of the development of traffic control systems. I would remind you in this context of our exhibition in the Orangerie park opposite, where, for example, the Karin system developed by Philips is on show.

In shipping there have also been a number of advances: tugs pushing six barges and sail power. That may sound like a step back to the old days but, strange to say, the most advanced ship, Commander Cousteau's, is equipped with wind turbines and special sails.

Wijsenbeek

In air transport there are two good examples of how cooperation in Europe can give us an edge. On the one hand, we have the Concorde project, which may have cost a pile of money, but it has had an enormous spin-off in technological applications, on the other, the Airbus project, a good example of transfrontier cooperation, of a product that is not particularly advanced technologically being a commercial success.

In the field of telecommunications we have a denser network of cable television than anywhere else. The pictures are consequently better. In America, the land of the television, the colours are sometimes atrocious. In this respect, the Americans can learn something from us, Mr President.

And in Europe we also have a very dense network of pipelines, which are used for a wide variety of purposes. Finally, I come to rail transport, where we have two technically advanced train systems already in operation: the TGV and the APT. And here I agree with the general rapporteur, Mr Poniatowski, whom I should like to congratulate on the organization of this debate, as many speakers have done before me, but I feel I have a special reason to do so in view of our political affinity.

In his presentation he too said that, unless we Europeans cooperate, we run the danger of falling behind. In rail transport we have two systems that work. Despite this, some of our Member States feel they cannot adopt a system which, although already in operation, was designed in another Member State. Such nationalism, such protection of national markets, of national government spending will have a retrograde effect. If we think this is the way to save jobs, we are completely wrong. In this of all areas of technology we must join forces and so apply the results together. Then we shall undoubtedly make progress.

Mr President, the TGV network works very well. But we should not forget the need to introduce a number of new developments for shorter distances in urban areas, like the Flyda monorail system. Finally, Mr President, I should like to point out that it would do every Member of Parliament and everybody else in Europe good to go back from time to time to using one of the oldest means of transport, the bicycle, which I myself use and can highly recommend.

Mr President, allow me to comment very briefly on the proceedings in this Parliament. I am speaking on behalf of the Committee on Transport, and I have the honour to say that the committee adopted this report unanimously. Nonetheless, two members of the committee, who did not attend its meetings for one second, who had three months during the summer recess to table amendments, have deemed it necessary to table 25 amendments concerning technical aspects and the wording of the resolution. Mr President, as rapporteur I feel obliged not only to express regret at this course of action but also, on behalf of the Com-

mittee on Transport, to deplore it and therefore to reject these amendments.

(Applause from the Left)

Mrs Barbarella (COM), rapporteur. — *(IT)* Mr President, may I first of all make a preliminary statement regarding the report for which, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, I am the rapporteur. I should like to emphasize that the content of this report in no way opposes or obstructs the eventual implementation of that technological Community, even in the terms in which the Commission has proposed it to us, or, more exactly, to the Dondelinger Group.

I should in fact like to emphasize the fact that the requirement which was our starting point in the Committee on Budgets was precisely the need to establish a stepping-stone between a future technological Community — which we may hope will be achieved in the very near future, but which nonetheless is for the future — and the present reality, the daily reality in which co-operation in the technological sector is having difficulty not only in developing but in getting off the ground even.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on Budgets asked itself a question that is in its opinion central to the whole matter; that is, how to find a legal and financial instrument that will allow a number of concrete initiatives for co-operation in the field of technological innovation to be got under way — if it is true that, as was stated yesterday and today, we want to make good as soon as possible the delay that has built up in these fields, at the same time obviously bearing in mind the aim of wider technological co-operation that we agreed should be built up as quickly as possible.

During its search, the Committee on Budgets decided that Article 4 of the new decision on own resources was, in its view, the instrument that could be adapted — I repeat — for getting a number of initiatives under way in this field. This article — which, I should like in passing to remind you, was inserted at the express wish of the Council of Ministers — offers, from 1 January 1986 — and please note that date, because it is important — a supplementary means of financing research by combining the use of own resources with the use of national contributions by Member States. This Article not only makes further research possible; it makes it possible, which is even more important, to integrate and co-ordinate the research efforts which, as everyone has reminded us today, are undertaken at various levels by the Community, by various Member States, by industry, by the universities, by small and medium-sized undertakings and by so many other possible partners. I was saying, therefore, that this Article could make it possible to co-ordinate this work, which is today dispersed, with the work that is carried out at Community level, through an instru-

Barbarella

ment for complementary programmes, as it is called — the implementation, in other words, of programmes that would be complementary to work that would be carried out on a more properly Community basis.

If you will allow me I should like to emphasize a further aspect of this complementary action. The complementary character of these programmes could bring consistency to the sum of those efforts or activities which, as I said before, are carried out at various levels, and would meet that basic requirement to which the Council of Ministers referred in July.

Permit me very briefly and more specifically to make a few more precise points regarding the requirements that this legal and financial instrument could satisfy. The first requirement is the fact that the response to the technological challenge — and this seems obvious today, but I think it as well to repeat it — cannot stop at encouraging some initiative — even a transnational one — which cannot fail to meet the requirements of the individuals that promote it; in reality, what has to be organized is a joint reaction, a concerted reaction of all Europe, that will express Europe's collective interest in seeing its overall innovative capacity increased. It is in this context of joint general policy that it is possible to co-ordinate and develop the research work undertaken at the different levels, and it is in this context that it would be possible to put into practice that concept of 'complementarity' that I referred to earlier, and that would really make it possible to link national or industrial programmes with activity of a more specifically Community character.

The second requirement that I wanted to emphasize is the following: it is necessary — and this, too, is a point emphasised by a great many Members — to introduce, in this field of new technology, new forms of co-operation, forms of co-operation that are sufficiently flexible to satisfy the requirements of competitiveness and efficiency in industry.

In this sense, too, I would draw Members' attention to the fact that 'complementarity' would indeed make possible these new formulae for technological collaboration and co-operation. With 'complementarity' as a starting point it would be possible to launch a wide range of formulae for co-operation that could include different forms of Community participation, or different forms of participation by the same Member States and the same industrial groups: in the context of the provision in Article 4, therefore, the requirement for different, more flexible action, more suited to the needs of the sector, which everyone hopes for, would also certainly be satisfied.

The third requirement more specifically concerns the financial aspect. By combining national resources or the resources of the private sector with those of the Community — it is obvious, even without saying so — these resources could be used to best advantage, and not wastefully, as they are today. In this connection,

moreover, the combined effort that is possible through the supplementary programmes could achieve this objective, and could above all make possible that Community presence within projects which, even though they involved only a few States, would be such as to guarantee a Community presence as such. This is not something to be taken lightly; indeed, as we have been reminded on many occasions these last two days, both yesterday and today, having a constant Community presence within these initiatives is a factor of great importance.

If the instrument of Article 4 satisfies those requirements that I referred to earlier — and the Committee on Budgets considers that they are thus satisfied — that is not to say that this Article provides a suitable framework for achieving convergence and consistency between the Community's activities and the initiatives, for example, of the so-called EUREKA Group that we are considering today.

This, of course, implies that the Council shall undertake to define an overall programme, a joint plan defining objectives and priorities, under which it would be possible to set in motion the machinery of 'complementarity' (by 'complementarity' I mean consistency, and not so much the degree, or extent, of each partner's presence as the fact that the work that is jointly done by them should have convergent aims). But it also implies, and I am speaking directly to the Commission — a series of decisions, or, rather, the definition of a series of implementing procedures for applying this Article which, as I said before, was inserted at the wish of the Council, and also accepted by the Commission.

These definitions are, however, important. We have fully to understand how far this complementary status must go, just as it is necessary to define the different degrees of participation by the Community, depending on the different stages of the research to be undertaken; it is also essential to decide the different degrees of participation of Member States.

This, Mr President, is a concrete proposal that we on the Committee on Budgets have presented to the Council; and I repeat, especially to the Commission, and in the conviction that something must be done soon, that it must be done in the best way possible, and that the best way is undoubtedly the creation of a technological Community. In the meantime, however, whilst waiting for this Community to become a reality, we can have no excuse for wasting time and not doing something immediately. I should like to finish with an appeal to Commissioner Narjes, who is present. This morning he said that 'it is necessary to insert EUREKA in the Community context'. I should like to know exactly what the Commissioner proposes in reply to a request by the Committee on Budgets that seems to me to be very concrete and very operative.

Mr Longuet (L), rapporteur. — (FR) I shall try to concentrate on three essential points in this report.

Longuet

First, it is necessary to establish whether this subject is important, warranting the sustained attention of the House. On the face of it, it is not. This is because the volumes of finance involved appear small, bearing in mind the modest contributions by these two new countries, Spain and Portugal, to the European research effort.

These two countries may appear to be of minor importance in terms of their capacity to contribute, and particularly in terms of the immediate execution of European research programmes. In fact, although this minor aspect of the problem seems to have dominated the negotiations, since the subject of the differences in technological development between Spain and Portugal received only very cursory examination during the discussions preparatory to the two countries' accession to the European Community, there is underlying this problem the much more serious problem of the risks to which our Community would be exposed if unduly marked technology gaps continued to develop between Member States and especially if some of these Member States felt that they were being excluded, barred from participation in key research programmes which Europe collectively, either through the Community or through other structures, was carrying out and would be carrying out in the future with success. There is therefore a problem of coherence. We believe that the Community can function only if there is a community of aspirations and a community of expectations, even in the technological field.

A second risk which would arise if the Community failed to tackle this problem of differences in technological development would be that certain countries, if they were left out, would look elsewhere for support, notably to help them to make up the technological leeway. The preparatory work carried out for this report established that this risk is not to be discounted, that some countries, such as Spain and Portugal, and to a lesser degree Greece, play a sort of Trojan horse role for the penetration of other countries' technology, acting as a kind of interface between the European Community and non-European foreign technologies, so that the latter can be spread in Europe, largely from bases provided by subsidiaries of multinationals established in these countries. The matter of this risk was raised in committee. We felt that it was something which should not be overlooked.

I would add finally that this technological gap could be narrowed to some extent if we Europeans were able to make the best possible use of the talents of the diaspora, so to speak, from these two countries — Spain and Portugal — to which I would naturally enough add Greece.

Why diaspora? Because experience shows that it is traditional in these smaller countries for their researchers and scientists to go to live and work abroad, and very many people from Spain, Portugal and especially Greece have undergone higher educa-

tion abroad, in the United States in particular, and they represent exceptional pools of talent for these countries.

The Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, chaired by Mr Michel Poniatowski, was able to see this at first hand recently when a meeting was held in Greece; we found that one Greek university was operating at exceptionally advanced levels in technologies which we would not, on the face of it, have associated with this country, laser technology and biogenetics, with researchers who had studied in the United States and were maintaining a constant interchange between the expatriate research community, mainly in the United States, and the research community in Greece.

Thus, if this problem is not seemingly an essential one, it is nonetheless real and it would be dangerous to underestimate it.

My second point is concerned with the difficulties, the first of which, and my colleagues who were associated with the preparation of this report share my feeling, is the difficulty of obtaining statistics. We are faced with a lack of information about the scale of the contribution to the scientific research effort in these two countries, and this is a very severe handicap when it comes to assessing the potential contribution of each of these countries.

The second difficulty stems from the relatively extremely low level of expenditure on research in these two countries. The figures speak for themselves. As a percentage of gross domestic product it is about 0.35%, on average roughly a third of the minimum level of expenditure in the ten countries of the Community, which is in the range 1% to 1.2% in the least prosperous countries, while the figure rises to some 2.5% in the most advanced Member States. On a mathematical average, therefore, their expenditure on research expressed as a proportion of GDP — if the figures have any significance, which is far from certain — is about one sixth of the overall level in the Ten. Last but not least, there is the difficulty entailed in the fact that research in these two countries, Spain and Portugal, is not based on a powerful private sector, but on the contrary is very closely linked to the university world, an often very traditional university world inherited from a prestigious past. I am thinking of the Portuguese or Spanish universities which, because they are widely scattered, are to some degree ill-equipped to undertake the fundamental research which would be necessary to keep these countries up to the desired level.

Your Committee on Energy, Research and Technology has looked for solutions in four areas.

The first involves making arrangements to enable the Commission to carry on an effort, in concert with these two countries, to improve the gathering of statis-

Longuet

tics. In particular we suggest that a report be submitted every two years on the research and development effort in these two countries, a statistical document to be prepared jointly by the Commission and the two national administrations. Incidentally, I would add in this connection that the people with whom we were in contact, in both Spain and Portugal, are very keen to be associated with the Community effort and are fully aware of some of their weaknesses, particularly organizational shortcomings.

This brings me on to the committee's second proposed solution, calling for the provision of financial aid, where appropriate, for any measures to rationalize the research effort in these two countries. Initially, this would involve supporting the efforts being made by both Portugal and Spain, but more especially by Spain currently, to establish a research and development policy organized around or geared to clear and specific objectives.

Spain has made a great deal of progress in this direction over the past two years. These efforts deserve to be supported; the Commission should play its part. The same applies, to a lesser degree, in the case of Portugal.

The third area involves finance in the form of aid, to be provided under the integrated Mediterranean programmes in particular, for what could be described as structuring efforts, the development of infrastructures for research in these two countries during a second phase, once the prerequisite rationalization of research policy had been clearly pursued and put into practice.

The fourth and final area, over which your committee found itself engaged in quite a philosophical debate, or at least a semantic debate, is the problem of participation by these two countries in Community programmes. A semantic debate because some of us were talking in terms of equal participation and others of fair participation. My own view is that it would be honest to make arrangements for fair participation by these two countries in Community programmes, since one cannot be sure, at this stage, that equal participation, based on such criteria as population or wealth, would not in fact bring the organization of these Community programmes to a standstill if the principle of equal participation were insisted upon but could not be put into practice. Your committee accordingly favoured the more reasonable option of fair participation, so that these two countries could be involved without it being made a condition that they would have to contribute exactly in proportion to their size in the new Community of Twelve, thus avoiding the risk that the system would be brought to a standstill.

These are the four main areas in which your committee considered action to be appropriate.

I would point out in conclusion that, in examining this specific problem, your committee came to the conclu-

sion that a closer look should be taken at the more general problem of the widening gap in the ability to finance research and development between the most advanced countries in the Community and those which are less advanced and are in danger of falling steadily further and further behind.

It would be wrong — and this is the last thing that I have to say — for the Community to leave by the wayside countries which are willing to contribute and have the necessary skills to do so, as long as their resources are put to better use.

(Applause from the Centre and the Right)

Mr Colocotronis (S). — *(GR)* Mr President, all the Community's bodies have repeatedly expressed their concern about Europe's technological future and about the decreasing competitiveness of European manufacturing industry. There is no doubt that this is common ground, and it is a challenge that has been apparent for a long time. It seems, however, that we are only now managing to overcome our fears, anxieties and wishful thinking, and making progress towards a specific answer. New technology, and the new applications that stem from it, have penetrated deep into every level of our economic and social life.

However, the first question raised by these first proposals is: What kind of technological Europe do we want to create? This certainly requires a political decision, and the will to implement it. The answer we give to that question will largely determine the procedures that follow, and in particular our strategy. In this connection, I believe that if Europe wishes to secure economic and hence political independence, with a social and cultural identity of its own, it must first set its own house in order and develop its own technology, according to its own pattern and mainly based on its own potential. There must be a double aim: in parallel with economic growth, we must pay due regard to social improvement and cultural elevation. The development we seek should take place within the context of an overall realisation of all Europe's potentials, in which the criteria will not be solely economic, but where social factors that take account of national characteristics and potentials play a decisive part. Here, we must emphasise the European character that our technological development should possess. A very important matter of particular interest to the less well developed countries in connection with new technology, is the decentralization of research and new technology, and the possibility of joint and full participation by all the Member States in the common effort towards development. This will entail very great expenditure, and the increased appropriations for research, amounting to 6% of the Common budget, will contribute decisively. It is clear, however, that this will have to be combined with increased contributions from the Member States in addition to the sum already set aside, to avoid any threat to the financing of other common policies such as the regional policy.

Colocotronis

We believe that it is unacceptable to protract the technological isolation of the peripheral regions, and to leave untapped their special and demonstrably important scientific potential, such as that of Greece, but also the natural resources that the Member States can offer. We consider that technological development should not just involve the Community's technologically developed countries. We believe that those countries are under an obligation, in this effort, to contribute towards the realisation of every potential in any of the Member States, especially the less well developed ones in Southern Europe. All the Community's research programmes should have the chance to participate, and this should be a rule and a principle for the Community and not a policy of selective participation by the less well developed countries, a policy which would leave us, in the South, at risk of being left out. A substantial contribution to the effort towards an overall upgrading of the European Community would be for Parliament to adopt a policy of encouraging free and unimpeded transfer of technology, participation by all the Member States in any common research programme, and full exploitation, as I said earlier, of the particular natural features of each Member State.

The less well favoured parts of Europe, including my own country Greece, and from January 1986 Spain and Portugal as well, can offer a great deal of potential. The last visit of the Committee on Research and Technology to the University of Crete and our research centres there persuaded everyone of the part that the peripheral regions can play in research. The Community's obligation is to organise specific financial aid aimed at the creation of infrastructures for research leading to the development of new technologies. Research whose aim will be to use new technology to exploit the natural potential available especially in Greece, such as aeolian, solar, hydroelectric and geothermal energy. Its aim should also be to develop already existing industrial potential.

As regards the active centres of research and technological development in Europe, I believe that we should not restrict ourselves to the few, technologically advanced large European companies. The founding and development of small technological units, such as research centres in universities, companies, etc., and the upgrading and support of those already existing, will contribute decisively to autonomous regional development. This will reduce the potential danger of a broadening rift, with the introduction of new technologies, between the richer countries in the North and the poor ones in the South.

For this reason, colleagues, regional policy and technological policy should be seen as complementary.

Mr von Wogau (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. What we are debating today is Europe's answer to the technological challenge of these decades. I should like to congratulate all those

involved in the preparation of today's debate and who helped make it possible. We are debating the very basic requirements for taking up the challenge of this technological revolution. Some interpret it as a necessity to make provision in the budget for the research already being carried out today in Europe and to ensure its proper coordination. Others tend more towards the provision of the appropriate conditions in order to release all the latent energy in the small and medium-sized undertakings and institutions of Europe. There is another very important question: could it be that Eureka is just the right instrument to deal with this challenge?

I should like to make a few observations in relation to these questions. First, I should like to remind you of one fact that is often forgotten in debates of this nature, and this is that more than half of the innovative discoveries of past decades were made, not in large research establishments, but rather in small and medium-sized undertakings. This is precisely the question asked by the Münch report: what can be done exactly to release all this latent energy? The small and medium-sized undertakings are at a distinct disadvantage in relation to the larger undertakings in two particular fields: one, access to capital and the other, access to markets. First, the question of capital: we must adopt initiatives to ensure that firms can apply for tax concessions on risk capital with which they are provided, and that money which was spent in many different ways in the past, will be diverted to R & D. This is one aspect of the problem. The other is access to markets. This concerns the proposed completion by 1992 of the common internal market with special emphasis on new technology. Common European standards, the mutual recognition of diplomas, the further development of the European patent, the European brand are all instruments which will effectively allow small and medium-sized firms to have access right from the start to a market of continental dimensions.

I am convinced of one thing: the speedy completion of the Commission white paper on the realization of the common internal market is the most powerful instrument at the disposal of the Community in its attempt to win back and increase its competitiveness in the field of high technology. We must not forget either that there are areas not open to smaller and medium-sized undertakings, larger-scale projects which even large national undertakings cannot tackle alone because they require a pooling of energies at European level. I am thinking of past examples such as AIRBUS, ARIANE and JET, which were only made possible through cooperation at European level. If we are to take further decisions on such matters within a reasonable period of time, we must direct ourselves towards such large-scale joint projects.

(Applause from centre and right)

Mr Seligman (ED). — Mr President, my group fully supports the very informative Longuet report and also

Seligman

the Munch and Wijsenbeek reports. The convergence of the economies of all member nations is a prime aim of the Community and research and technology are very important factors in achieving convergence where the prosperity of member nations, particularly the small ones, is concerned. With Britain depending on the EEC for 44% of our exports, it is vitally important to us that every member of the Community is prosperous and therefore has proper research programmes.

Mr Longuet quite rightly said that we were very impressed with the Heraklian University research station in Crete. They concentrate on research which is suitable for small member nations — that is lasers, biotechnology, semiconductors, things like that which don't need a heavy industry and don't need a big infrastructure. That is where these small countries should be concentrating their research. We have no doubt that the same effort must be made by Spain and Portugal to catch up with these other countries. Spain has to multiply its research by five times in order to catch up with Belgium and Italy. They must do this and this is the way we must go forward.

Mr Filinis (COM). — (GR) Mr President, the inequalities in the technical development of various Member States among the Twelve are highlighted by the effort we must make to banish Europe's technology in the sector of new technology.

In fact, we are called upon to accomplish two different aims: to improve the Community's technology as a whole, and to reduce the great inequalities between our countries. Failure in the first would result in our absolute dependence on extra-Community centres, mainly the United States. Failure in the second would substantially set back the efforts to arrive at a united Europe.

In my brief intervention, I shall refer only to the second aim. We believe in the need to work out a broad range of differentiated technological development programmes, such as are adapted to the potentials and needs of the smaller countries, because exclusive attention to a few major programmes results in a downgrading of the less highly developed companies, and a widening of the gap.

In contrast, programmes with a differentiated content would make it possible to develop the scientific and technical potential of all Community countries, big and small. In the very remarkable report he presented today, Mr Longuet very rightly referred to the potential of small countries, such as Greece, thanks to a good number of exceptional scientists.

We must also create a flexible form of cooperation, both in the collection of data, and in terms of access to data banks. The existing cooperation must expand to a much larger scale and include all the European countries of the Twelve. As for the Community, we think

that it should play a part by economic or other assistance in eliminating obstacles and overcoming areas of weakness. And we must certainly ensure the transfer of basic technological knowledge that will enable the less well developed countries to acquire the requisite basic technological infrastructure within a reasonable period of time. It might indeed be possible, by virtue of the Commission's intervention, to make coordinated entrepreneurial efforts involving more Member States of the Community, to ensure the transfer of technological know-how and methods.

Mrs Scrivener (L). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, since I have only a short time at my disposal, I shall come straight to what I consider to be the essential question in this debate: should the fact that its own resources are limited mean that the European Community should take no interest in all the activities which it is not in a position to finance, while the Member States are at complete liberty to do what they see fit, or should it try, despite this lack of finance, to keep a link between Community activities as such and those carried out by Member States?

The report drawn up by Mrs Barbarella on behalf of the Committee on Budgets is one which I would describe as essential, because it attempts to offer a solution between these two approaches.

We have opted for the link between activities at the two levels. Research activities should be able to be funded by national financial contributions, while at the same time being regarded as complementary to Community activities funded out of own resources. They should be entered in the budget so that expenditure can be controlled.

As the report stresses, it is in Europe's most vital interest to improve its industrial and technological cooperation as quickly as possible, so that such an approach will be justified. We are nevertheless well aware that such a system is not above criticism. This concept of complementarity, which is dictated by circumstance, could in some cases be difficult to apply. It could lead to delays in the process of bringing a given initiative to fruition and this, it has to be admitted, is the most serious risk. But we also understand the misgivings which may be voiced in certain quarters in the Commission. It is not easy for an institution which is the guardian of the Treaties to accept a system which departs from the arrangements which have been in operation for over thirty years.

However, the time for soul-searching is past. We know all too well that if we do not agree to the Council's solution, the solution contained in Article 4 of the Decision of 7 May 1985, on which the report by the Committee on Budgets is based, we shall be heading for far more radical initiatives, along the lines of specialized agencies, which will threaten to bring about the disintegration of the Community edifice.

Scrivener

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as these comments indicate, the Liberal and Democratic Group will be voting in favour of the report presented by the Committee on Budgets.

Mr Pasty (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this debate points up how necessary and urgent it is for the Community to take up the challenge of the third industrial revolution being brought about by new technologies.

On the one hand, we find that Europe is lagging behind in the technological race against its main industrialized competitors, a situation explained by a number of factors, not least the wide differences between Member States in the resources that they devote to research and the lack of coordination of resources and objectives, and on the other hand our aspiration to establish a European research policy is very often thwarted in practice by budgetary difficulties.

The fact is that the Community budget cannot and I would actually say *should not* cover everything. Without anticipating the budget debate, we already know the limitations of the new own resources.

Does this mean that we must abandon all ambition of creating a large technological community? Far from it. But the real problem is the problem of working out how this objective, which is crucial to the future of Europe, can be achieved realistically, with appropriate means and without delay.

Mrs Barbarella's report offers a budgetary solution to this problem and has the merit of having identified the appropriate financial instrument offered by the new own resources. It is impossible for all research to be funded out of the Community budget. National contributions alone are not enough in today's conditions, despite the undoubted success achieved by specialized agencies. Cooperation between Member States is indispensable, but needs to be enhanced by the addition of a Community dimension.

An opportunity to do precisely this is afforded by Article 4 of the Decision of 7 May 1985 on new own resources, which makes provision for entry in the budget of the Communities of expenditure relating to supplementary research programmes which could be funded according to flexible arrangements by contributions from the Member States, each of which would be free to decide whether or not to participate.

This Community involvement must not be allowed to lead to the introduction of excessive bureaucratic constraints, which would be thoroughly prejudicial to the aims envisaged. The system must be kept as flexible as possible, with regard both to funding and to administrative procedures.

The advantage of this mechanism, however, is that it opens up the possibility of financing all manner of research programmes with a combination of funding from the Community budget and complementary funding from the Member States.

Such arrangements for complementarity meet with our unreserved approval; in our opinion, they bring the Community to the centre of cooperation among Member States and its objectives.

There is nevertheless a need for a definition, embodied in a regulation, of the concept of 'supplementary programmes', and indeed the rapporteur has called for this in her motion for a resolution.

We have every confidence, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, that this new mechanism for funding research in the Community will yield positive results. In the form in which it has been proposed, we find it realistic and balanced. Our Group will therefore be voting in favour of Mrs Barbarella's report.

(Applause from the Group of the European Democratic Alliance)

Mr Härlin (ARC). — (DE) Ladies and gentlemen, I regret very much having to speak personally because the President refused to give the floor to a robot instead. This would not only have been for me a question of cheap laughs, which you all enjoyed a little while ago, but also it would have meant actually giving sufficient expression to the breakthrough of new technology to our material world.

There is a very close connection between the apparent atmosphere of fear of technology in this Parliament and the enthusiastic speeches we have been hearing. I am under the impression that there is an undercurrent of fear running through this debate — on the one hand, a personal fear of new technology and on the other, much greater fear of competition, fear of the tougher opponent, fear of the more cunning swindler, and fear of the incalculable ways and means of somebody who is cleverer than oneself! I was not struck by any sense of desire, Utopian dreams, or fantasies in any of the speeches or, above all, in the reports. I was not aware of any reference to the possible uses to which we could put these new technologies. It was a question of how we should pursue the fastest and most efficient adaptation of these new technologies. There is another fear in evidence here, as expressed by Mr Teller on behalf of the American government and at the invitation of the European People's Party: fear of the Russians, of the opponent, fear of the 'SDI gap'. Mr Teller is experienced in these matters, as he helped to fill the non-existent atom-bomb gap. He invented the hydrogen bomb for this express purpose. He is today concerning himself with SDI at the invitation of the EPP Group. There could be no better proof than that offered by Mr Teller that military ends are at the

Härlin

root of the European struggle to catch up on technological development. Mr Teller stated yesterday in his press conference: Eureka will help our defence whether the scientists like it or not. Mr Teller said: Eureka will help the SDI whether the European people like it or not. In this respect, I thank the EPP for inviting him.

However, I must admit that we are confronted by a strange set of circumstances, on the one hand, there is talk of the peaceful utilization of new technology while votes will be cast probably today or tomorrow to eliminate sentences of this nature from texts, and on the other hand, there is the invitation to the worst kind of scientific militarists after the Second World War to sell us SDI and new technologies. I have refrained from making other statements on these new technologies in order to point out the very real danger for my concepts. People like Mr Teller give me proof of the precarious nature of the situation. He is flying the flag of new technologies in the same way that the EPP will force through its amendments later and the Conservatives have staged this whole technology show.

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President, reference was made by the previous speaker to the presence outside this Chamber of Professor Teller, a very eminent physicist from California. There is no question of his pushing his views on the House and I think it is entirely out of order for his motives to be questioned, since they have no relevance to the debate and, in fact, his press conference is to be held later this afternoon.

President. — I am sorry, Sir Peter, I am not too sure whether that intervention was in order.

Mr Adam (S). — Mr President, I wish to concentrate a few remarks this afternoon on the financial aspects of the report before the House. There is no point in passing resolutions which call for a financial commitment or for an increased financial commitment if we are unable to give effect to them during the budgetary procedure. Several of the reports point out the need to link our research with the Third World, and yet when we come to that item in the budget in a month's time, I predict that it will be extremely difficult to keep our financial commitment in line with our statements during the debate and in the report, even though relatively small sums of money are involved.

There is also a clear need to link our research with the space research that is going on. I know, for instance, that Newcastle University, in my own constituency, is very well placed for linking with weightless research, which is of interest to the space agency, and with many other problems. There is no financial arrangement for that, and that is a gap the Community could fill.

The report by Mr Linkohr on a technology assessment centre for Members clearly meets a need. How do we assess the savings that are made by the economies of scale that we talk about? How can we assess the progress that is being made by ESPRIT or RACE or BRITE? It is very difficult for Members to do that, and therefore such a centre would be of enormous help in our work. We really must make a commitment that the 1986 budget will establish this office for us within the Parliament.

Then there is the Research Framework Programme. We talk about increasing the research finance to 6% of the budget by 1988. Let us be quite clear that with the present financial arrangements in the Community we have no hope of reaching that target. Parliament will approve the reports, but we shall not be in a position to approve the increased funding. The Council, despite the fine words about the framework programme — and I pay tribute to the President-in-Office of the Council for at least mentioning it — when adopting the programme did not adopt a financial commitment to go with it. We link it to a percentage. I think this is totally misconceived. How can the framework programme of the Community be linked to a percentage of 1.4% of VAT? Still less, how can it relate to a percentage of expenditure on agricultural surplus? That is the logic of what we are in effect saying. If we really want a framework programme, properly financed, we should set out the research requirements, assess the finance that is needed, and let that be the basis from which we should work, and not conjure up a double-the-number-you-first-thought-of figure such as is contained in two reports we have been discussing this week.

Then there is the question of finance for the EUREKA project, covered in Mrs Barbarella's report. EUREKA is concerned with developments at the competitive stage. There is not the finance in the Community budget. It is not clear that a legal basis exists for complementary programmes. Also lacking is the commitment to joint action on the part of Member States and on the part of large industries. Nevertheless, it is essential that EUREKA links with the framework programme and has a Community impact. Otherwise, in my view, it would be quite contrary to the objectives of the Community. As a first stage, we ought perhaps to consider establishing a technology chapter in the budget which would include a small team of people whose job it was to link in with the EUREKA project. That might be our easiest way forward in the immediate future.

Ultimately, our object must be to bring the competitive research stage which EUREKA represents firmly into the Community budget and we must link it with the FAST programme and with the framework programme. Surely that is what is implied by the idea of a scientific and technological community.

Mr Mallet (PPE). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, there was a time when we used to say in

Mallet

France: 'We may have no oil, but we have ideas'. We have to have ideas, yes, but research and development cost money. Without new money, the best ideas will remain pipe-dreams. If the establishment of a European technology community is a vital necessity for our countries, is it not surprising, offensive even, that the proportion of the budget of the Communities allocated to research should still be so derisory, although it has admittedly increased, at about 2.5% to 3%? We therefore approve of the target which the Commission has set itself in keeping with the guidelines of the European Council, which is to raise this percentage to 6% as from 1988. However, as Mr Adam has just pointed out, there is no scope for making progress towards this target in the 1986 budget. It will be necessary to step up a gear in 1987 and 1988.

If our governments intend to translate their words into action, it will not be long before an increase in own resources will be necessary. However, the scale of the effort needed is such that it will be too much for the Community alone, even with increased resources, even making the fullest possible use of the European Investment Bank and the machinery for borrowing and lending. And yet, speed is of the essence. This is why we should not, in my view, waste our time horse-trading. Realism dictates that we use all available means, as long as they lead to the same end.

The report by Mrs Barbarella recently adopted by the Committee on Budgets, which has yet to be put into its final form, suggests a solution which is both attractive and debatable. Article 4 of the Decision of 7 May 1985 on new own resources does indeed offer an additional channel for funding: entry in the budget of the Communities of expenditure relating to supplementary variable-geometry research programmes funded by contributions from Member States, which could provide a framework for certain commercially-oriented projects of the EUREKA type. However, such a method would leave all the initiative in government hands. It looks acceptable only if two conditions are met: first, if it fits into a common strategy set out in a framework programme which will have to be drawn up in advance; secondly, if a financial contribution is made by the Community, even a minority contribution, so that the Commission and the European Parliament will be able to take a hand so as to monitor these activities and ensure that they are coherent. Moreover, this is only one possibility among others. I am thinking for instance of flexible formulas for joint Community/industry funding, with the proportions varying according to the nature of the research and the stage that it has reached, along the lines of the tried and tested ESPRIT programme.

I now come to my conclusion. We must set aside the theoretical arguments about the respective merits of public and private funding and show the pragmatism to recognize what must be done if any policy is to be effective. Substantial long-term financial commitments, drawing in all available resources from the

Community, from industry and the Member States, appear essential if there is to be multi-annual planning of research activities, after the example of what is being done in the United States and Japan. This is what is required, I am convinced, ladies and gentlemen, if Europe is going to start catching up.

(Applause from the Centre)

Mr Marshall (ED). — Mr President, the Bureau is to be congratulated upon holding this series of debates because technology provides the key to the Community's future. The tragedy of recent history is that it is littered with examples of developments where Europe once led but where it has been overtaken by its competitors. We can think, for example, of photocopiers. Ninety percent of the photocopiers in the European Community are in fact imported from Japan. We can think of cameras, machine tools, motorcycles, motor cars — in all of these areas we have lost our lead.

The reason for this decline is all too often a failure to adopt a pan-European approach. If we look at examples of success like Airbus — which, Mr President, a number of us, including I think yourself, were privileged to see a few months ago — we can see that this tremendous development, using a European approach, is in fact able to outsell Boeing in every market except the United States.

Just as the European aircraft industry has been able to cooperate, I believe that other industries in Europe could cooperate and could be world-beaters. The success of the German, French, Spanish and British aircraft industries should be mirrored elsewhere in the Community.

All of us are anxious to give hope to the unemployed. Some people see technology as the enemy of the unemployed, but it is in fact the only hope for them. The only hope for our unemployed is that we as a Community adapt to the new technologies. The first industrial revolution was possible on a national basis. However, if we are to succeed today, then we need to adopt an international, a European, approach to the problems of the future. Only in that way will we as a Community prosper and will we be able to give hope to those millions of unemployed who desire a job and are currently unable to obtain one.

Mr Mattina (S). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have seen the extent and the nature of the European Community's backwardness where technology is concerned. However, as we have seen from the debate, the old continent is not at a standstill, — it moves, albeit in a casual, unco-ordinated manner. It is precisely this casualness that causes the greatest concern, because it brings in its train the unequal involvement of men, territories and economic spheres, in the

Mattina

processes of change that are set off by data processing technology. People are not all involved to the same extent. Few know what is happening, very few decide, and many just submit. All of this generates fear and, hence, acute social tension. Territories are involved unequally, the more disadvantaged regions being in fact excluded. We have only to look at the results of ESPRIT, and we find that Greece and Ireland are marginally involved, whilst the South of Italy, both its firms and its universities, is completely absent. The economic sectors are involved unequally, and agriculture seems to be almost totally excluded, whilst the small firms are involved only in the introduction of new processes, and far fewer are involved with product innovation.

We can leave it to time to smooth out these inequalities of knowledge, power and possession. We must however be aware that in this case we will have to reckon with strong resistance. On the other hand, a European policy founded on the synergetic effect of knowledge and material and human resources can make it possible to exploit the positive potential of technology to the maximum, whilst minimizing its negative effects. The setting up of one or more programmes of research and co-operation is undoubtedly the problem. It is necessary, however, to identify certain strategical options before getting down to specific programmes, and Europe should back them to the hilt in the short and medium term. I will try to outline three such options. In the first place, the management of the change in professional skill requirements. It is a complex operation, of enormous size, which makes it essential — today and not tomorrow — to revise to its very roots the vocational training policies of individual countries and of the Community. At the same time new labour laws will be necessary, if we want flexibility and change to be seen by the labour force as opportunities and not traumatic impositions.

Secondly, there is the management of the over-abundance of manpower. Here again the challenge is great, and it is not a question of producing abstract work plans at a desk, but of identifying, one by one, new job opportunities stimulated by real requirements and demands, and of increasing these requirements and demands without waiting for that to be done by a hypothetical market.

Thirdly, there is the reduction of regional inequality. Information technology can cancel out the handicap of remoteness. That being the case, we have to find the courage to forego the building of a few country roads in order to set up, in the disadvantaged regions, the first information motorways in Europe. This IRIS programme put before the Research Council in Rome on 25 April seems to me to be a step in this direction. I will remind you of its salient points: to improve the quality of life, taking steps to protect the environment, organising civil protection, improving working conditions — above all in agriculture — and finding a solution to the problem of the elderly and the handi-

capped; to contribute to employment policies — directly, by introducing new services, and indirectly — encouraging economic initiatives that produce jobs. Finally, to place European industry in a position to face up to competition from third countries.

I hope that, in the seminar that the Commission should be holding in Venice before the end of the year, this programme can be formally adopted, because I think that we should find in it the reference points for these strategical options into which the individual initiatives can be slotted.

In conclusion, I do not think that the technological revolution is a bad thing, provided we have the determination to control it. We react to it, unfortunately, in a negative manner because it penetrates our lives, our work and our culture apparently at random, and it appears to us unfortunately as a source of instability and insecurity. We have to rid it of this connotation.

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

Vice-President

Mr Raftery (PPE). — Mr President, I believe that the best prospects for economic growth and reduction of unemployment in Europe lie in the development of high technology. The developing countries, particularly those on the Pacific rim, are defeating us in the market-place for labour-intensive, low technology, low-valued products, such as clothing, footwear and shipbuilding. The emergence of China will put further pressure on us in these markets. On the other hand, of course, such developments in these countries will open up considerable prospects for lucrative markets in high technology products. For unless we in Europe develop our strategy in relation to high technology, we will end up seeing America and Japan taking the lucrative markets which are developing. In addition to the overall contribution which high technology can make to the creation of European wealth, it would do much more, I believe, for the development of the more remote and poorer regions such as Ireland, Greece and Southern Italy. It is evident that the burden of transport costs from these more remote regions could be more easily absorbed by the high-value, low-volume products of these industries rather than by the more traditional low-value, high-volume products from these regions.

Our relative failure to date *vis-à-vis* the United States and Japan in the field of high technology is not, as many people seem to think, due to low expenditure in research and development. In fact, Europe spends 50% more than Japan on research. The failure, I believe, is due to fragmentation of effort, a lack of strategy, excessive security of tenure and little mea-

Raftery

surement of performance of research workers, whether in universities or research institutes.

Finally, unlike the United States and Japan, we have an environment which is at best lukewarm and at worst hostile to science and technology and the commercialization of innovations. Until we get more coordination of research strategy and more cooperation between scientists, as well as more accountability to the ordinary taxpayers in terms of work output, we will not get the innovation we so urgently need. Likewise, until we raise the status of science and restore adequate reward for good work and investment as well as respect for profit, we will continue to see not only our best scientists going abroad but also our capital and research findings being exploited elsewhere.

President. — We now have to interrupt the debate at this point. It will continue tomorrow morning.

5. Action taken on the opinions of Parliament

President. — The next item is the statement by the Commission on the action taken on the opinions and resolutions of the European Parliament.¹

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling (S). — (DE) Mr President, we have been given assurance by the Commission on various occasions — in the Chamber, in its answer to written questions and also in a letter to me in my capacity as Chairman of the interparliamentary delegation on animal protection — that it was working on a proposal for a directive on animal experimentation which it would forward to Parliament. We remain very grateful to the Commission for this statement and its proposed deadline of the beginning of May or June 1985. However, even if the present climatic conditions would have us believe that the deadline was still approaching, one look at the calendar would be enough to convince us that it is in fact now October 1985. I ask the Commission, therefore, when are we going to see the proposal for a directive which we have been so eagerly awaiting?

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — I would like to make clear the present state of affairs within the Commission concerning the proposed directive on animal experimentation. The honourable Member who raised this issue will remember that there was an exchange of letters earlier this year, to which she alluded, between the President of the Commission and herself. I want to assure her that we have been working with very considerable speed to try to fulfil the undertakings which were given.

However, she will recognize that this is a complicated issue which touches on a variety of different areas of policy and that it is essential that we get the answers right. One of the undertakings, it is true, was that we would propose a directive before the summer recess. We were unable to comply with that undertaking for the reason that I have just given, which I am sure, the honourable Member appreciates. Perhaps it was a little unwise to give an undertaking limited to that time. But whatever the position is, we are going to present the document shortly and I hope that will satisfy the honourable Member.

Mrs Thome-Patenôtre (RDE). — (FR) I should like to support what Mrs Seibel-Emmerling has said, because I too am amazed that we still have no directive from the Commission on animal experimentation despite the commitments given on several occasions, notably in May 1984 at the time of the debate on the Schleicher report and in March 1985, in a letter from Mr Jacques Delors, President of the Commission, to Mrs Seibel-Emmerling.

I should like to say, as honorary president of the SPA, the *Société protectrice des animaux* in France, that the lack of this directive is keenly felt in my country and is depriving the *Comité national de protection animale* of an effective instrument to support its campaign.

I therefore urge the Commission to bring forward this directive without further delay.

Mr Castle (S). — Mr President, I am afraid I do not find the Commission's answer at all satisfactory. It may be a complex question, but it was in May 1984 that this Parliament adopted the Schleicher report with enthusiasm. So the Commission has had 18 months to consider the difficulties. Surely it is not beyond their wit to find a solution in a period like that! Yet we have been given the same general and rather evasive reply: 'We'll do it shortly'. How shortly is shortly? Can we be given a date, and an early one?

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — When I say shortly, I mean shortly. The honourable lady has not only had the benefit of letters from the President of the Commission and myself but also the benefit — I hope it is a benefit — of the statement I have just made. The only equivocal area is, in fact, the specific timing and the implementation of the undertaking. It has proved to be rather more difficult to deal with the matter with the limited resources that the honourable lady knows well about.

If we have fallen behind in the timetable, I accept the responsibility as the Commissioner responsible for this area. However, I have made it quite clear, as I do to the other honourable lady who intervened, that it is our intention to bring forward the proposal as quickly as possible. But surely the right thing is to get the pro-

¹ See Annex.

Davis

posal right. The honourable lady complains about the length of the delay, but I do think that the important thing, notwithstanding that, is to get the position absolutely right. A satisfactory resolution of the matter is surely the aim that we all share.

Sir Jack Stewart-Clark (ED). — I do not want to flog a dead horse, but I do have in front of me evidence in the form of an answer given to a written question on 17 July, in which the Commission confirmed that it was now in the process of preparing a draft directive. I understand that that draft directive has now been prepared and Lord Cockfield, who is sitting here, told me when I got up about a month-and-a-half ago that the Commission were waiting for the Council of Europe directive and that once that could be signed — as I now understand will soon be the case — there would be nothing at all to prevent a directive coming forward.

So, if I understand Mr Clinton Davis correctly, he is saying that a directive is coming forward and will be available as soon as the Commission get the proposal right. But if there is a draft proposal, why is it not possible for the Commissioner to say the draft proposal can be forwarded to the European Parliament within a month or, at the most, six weeks? I would dearly like to hear from him some time-scale here and now.

President. — Mr Clinton Davis, could you make that commitment?

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Having regard to the experience we have already had with timetables, I am not able or willing to tie myself down in that way. This is a matter on which various colleagues of mine who have an interest in this matter are entitled to be fully consulted. We are very anxious to get the situation right, as I say, and I assure the honourable Member that the Commission is well aware of the interest and concern the House has displayed on this matter and will most certainly act upon it. I cannot go any further than that: I think it would be most unwise to tie oneself down to timetables at this stage.

Mr Cryer (S). — Could the Commission comment on the 500 000 ECU given towards relief of the Mexico earthquake disaster and say whether that is a final figure or whether the Commission is prepared to advance more if there is an indication, as seems likely, that more will be needed?

Secondly, on page 6 I notice that only 5 000 tonnes of cereals have been given to Ethiopia, which will not make much of a dent in the increasing food mountains. On a previous occasion, the Commission indicated that they had redirected some monies towards improving the transport infrastructure in drought-affected countries such as Ethiopia and the Sudan.

Could the Commissioner tell us what effect that expenditure has had? Can more significant quantities of food now be moved because of the improved transport infrastructure, or has that money still to be spent?

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) Mr President, there are two questions here: First, there is no specified sum set aside for tragic situations such as Mexico. The Commission always makes an individual decision. We are conscious of the fact that in most cases this aid is only of symbolic worth when compared with the magnitude of the disaster. Yet, I would like to say that there is the possibility of some supplementary aid, though no relevant proposal has yet been tabled. The second question has been asked many times by Parliament, though I would like to distinguish two aspects of it. One relates to the quantity of wheat given to Ethiopia this time, compared to the mountains of food that we have in store, but the Commission has to operate within the framework of regulations laid down at the beginning, and always within the framework of the budget. We are nearing the end of the year, and I believe that in February important decisions will be taken about aid during the coming year.

The matter of infrastructure in the countries receiving aid is indeed very serious, and as we all know, transport is at the heart of it. In that sector every effort is being made, but the main problem is not in fact the decision to grant aid within the scope of the regulations and the budget, but the distribution of the aid in the countries themselves.

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Mr President, I would like to raise the matter of Miss Benazir Bhutto. During the September part-session Parliament adopted by a large majority a resolution tabled by Mrs Lizin, on behalf of the Socialist Group, which called upon the Pakistan Government to order Miss Bhutto's unconditional release as a matter of urgency. Miss Bhutto continues to be held under house arrest and, according to representatives of the Pakistan People's Party, has no telephone, may not receive visits even from members of her family and has no access to doctors. Miss Bhutto while in London had to undergo two operations for serious ear and eye conditions. She is now in need of a further operation and fears have been expressed about the present state of her health.

Can I therefore ask the Commission in the light of all this evidence — evidence that was reproduced in a *Times* article as recently as 5 October — whether it will therefore make immediate representations to the Pakistan Government for the release of Miss Bhutto who is the acknowledged leader of the Pakistan People's Party, Pakistan's main democratic opposition, in order to enable her to receive the much-needed medical attention?

President. — Mr Tomlinson, I am not entirely sure that this falls within the ambit of the Commission's report, but I will, as you have put the question, allow the Commission to answer if indeed it can.

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) Mr President, as you have pointed out, the matter does not fall within the ambit of the present debate. All the Commissioners present have of course listened very carefully to what Mr Tomlinson said, but I can give no answer to a matter unrelated to this debate.

President. — You have heard the answer, Mr Tomlinson. I suggest that you tackle the Council when they are here tomorrow for Question Time.

Mr Wijsenbeek (L). — (NL) Mr President, during the July part-session I had the honour to present, on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, a report concerning adjustments, or at least modifications, in connection with two articles of the ECSC Treaty.

The Commissioner who replied at that time, Mr Clinton Davis, assured us that the Commission had taken note of the one amendment Parliament had explicitly proposed, concerning the retroactive effect of the proposal in question, and said that, although it could not use the words suggested by Parliament, it would find legally acceptable wording which would reflect Parliament's wishes, and make a recommendation regarding Articles 48 and 50 of the ECSC Treaty.

The Commission's June/July communication on the action it had taken on Parliament's opinions made no mention of this report. Nor does the communication now before us. I wonder, Mr President, and through you I put this question to Mr Clinton Davis, when we can expect to receive from the Commission a proposal, however simple it may be, relating to one article or the other.

Secondly, Mr President, now that he is here, I have another point to raise: in the same debate I asked Mr Clinton Davis if it was not time the Commission gave some thought to the possible harmonization of the system that governs creditors and preferential creditors where bankruptcies occur. Mr Clinton Davis replied that this was more a matter for his colleague Mr Christophersen, to whom I then wrote a letter. I have not yet had an answer. Perhaps Mr Christophersen can give me some more information on this.

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) Mr President, it is true that the document we distributed makes no reference to the matter mentioned by the Honourable Member. That is what happens when the Commission has not yet reached a decision, and as shown by the introduction to the text, we often pro-

vide answers on subjects examined 3 or 4 months ago. In this case there is a specific reason why the Commission has not yet acted, namely that we still await the relevant opinion from Council.

Mr McCartin (PPE). — Mr President, I want to refer to a resolution which was passed at the September past-session under Rule 48 on aid for Irish agriculture arising out of the bad weather conditions in Ireland. Since then an announcement has been made of a certain amount of aid being given to Irish farmers.

I want to put it to the Commission that the spirit of the resolution passed in this Parliament has been ignored in that the amount of aid offered has been a mere token gesture and has not even been aid. We pointed out at the last session that Irish farmers had suffered a loss of 200 million pounds. There has been a serious reduction in agricultural production in Ireland: a reduction in production of milk — but as we are here subject to a quota I won't make too much of that — but there has certainly been a reduction in beef and cereal production.

This means that the European Community will save a considerable amount of money. Now the Community has merely made available to Irish farmers 1 200 tonnes of grain at a reduced price, i.e. the sort of price at which the Community would anyway have to sell this grain to third countries. So they are merely waiving for Irish farmers the profit they would have made on the extra grain which these farmers will have to buy as a result of bad weather conditions. I want to put it to the Commission that it is merely ceding to Irish farmers a fraction of the money that is being saved as a result of bad weather conditions in Ireland and that this makes a mockery of the resolution we passed and ignores entirely the request that this Parliament made for genuine assistance, particularly for farmers in the west of Ireland who have suffered grave and serious losses of income.

President. — Mr McCartin, your question does not fall within the framework of the statement on Commission action on European Parliament opinions on Commission proposals. The Commission have obviously had the opportunity to note your comments, but it should be taken up in the appropriate committees of Parliament.

6. Question Time

President. — The next item is the first part of Question Time (Doc. B 2-960/85).

We begin with questions to the Commission.

Question No 1, by Mr MacSharry (H-74/85):

President

Subject: EEC aid for pigs

In view of depressed pig prices and the difficulty faced by many producers in Ireland in disposing of their pigs, will the Commission agree to the introduction of aids to private storage as well as an increase in export refunds as a matter of urgency?

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) With effect from 6 May 1985 the Commission decided to grant aid to the private storage of pigmeat in the Community with a view to preventing the collapse in prices in the market which would have occurred if the supply of pigs for slaughter had been higher than predicted. Under this scheme, which remained in force until 19 July 1985, contracts relating to about 35 000 tonnes of pigmeat were concluded. In view of the substantial and unexpected increase in exports of pigmeat from the Community, largely due to the strong dollar, the export refunds for a number of products, whether frozen or processed, were reduced across the board and then varied according to destination. This was done to make a further reduction in refunds on exports to the United States and Canada possible. Another reason was that we wanted to maintain some kind of limit on the export of pigmeat from the Community. I would add that the difference of about 20 ECU per 100 kg between the price in Ireland and the average price in the Community should in itself enable Irish pigmeat to be marketed in the Community. I would also point out that the situation in the pig sector has been much better for some time now, partly as a result of the low cost of feed, and that the situation in Ireland has also greatly improved since the summer.

Mr MacSharry (RDE). — I should like to thank the Commissioner for his very extensive reply and welcome the action taken by him and the Commission in May. My question was first put down in March, but I think that action as well as the reduction in the value of the dollar did have an impact and did help.

However, I think that the industry is now returning to a downward trend and I would like to ask the Commissioner if he would consider sooner rather than later the reintroduction of some measures to help to ensure the maintenance of confidence of pig producers, particularly in Ireland?

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) As you say, the question was put in March and is now being answered in September. The Commission has reacted in the meantime, as I have said. I think that this in itself is reason to assume that the Commission is prepared to consider possible new measures if the situation in the market requires. I cannot anticipate future action at the moment, nor do I want to, but in general terms I am willing to say on

the Commission's behalf that it is willing to consider new measures.

Mr McCartin (PPE). — I want to ask the Commissioner if he is aware that a well-known expert in the Irish pigs and bacon industry recently said that the industry is not just in trouble; it is at death's door! This, in spite of the fact that Irish pig farmers are, according to a number of reports which I could quote, the most efficient, certainly in the Community and probably in the world. But because of serious disadvantages which we suffer — distance from market and a bad processing sector — the Irish pig industry is in need of aid. I would ask the Commission to please investigate it again since prices have fallen recently and pig production, even on the most efficient farms, is not now profitable.

I would ask the Commissioner if he would please undertake to have another look at the Irish pig industry.

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) I will try to answer this question. When we ask whether and, if so, what measures should be taken, I feel we must make a distinction between a general situation in the market, calling for general measures, and specific circumstances possibly affecting in a specific area of production in the Community. I also feel that this distinction should result in different ideas and possibly different measures. I am quite prepared to reconsider the situation in Ireland, although I cannot at the moment promise that the Commission will be willing to take specific measures.

President. — Question No 2, by Mr Christodoulou (H-146/85), for whom Mr Stavrou is deputizing:

Subject: Delays in the collection of VAT revenue

Will the Commission give details of the exact amount owed by each of the Member States in connection with the collection of VAT for each year from 1975 up to and including 1984? What practical steps does the Commission intend to take in future to collect this revenue as quickly as possible?

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Mr Christodoulou asks if we can indicate what amounts are owed by each Member State in respect of VAT from 1975 to 1984. I can give a clear answer by sending Mr Christodoulou a list of VAT amounts demanded from the individual Member States in the years in question. There are in fact no amounts outstanding. Payments are made according to precise rules. At the end of the year, a final adjustment of the VAT amount can be made, and the Member State pays in what sums may still be due. In some cases there may be a disagreement between the Commission and a Member State on whether the adjustment is cor-

Christophersen

rect. There is a clearly defined procedure for such cases: the Commission writes to the Member State concerned, which must then forward the information in writing to justify the rejection by the Member State of the Commission's adjustment. There are also precise time limits specifying when the final settlement is to be made, but there is nothing dramatic about it. Perhaps Mr Christodoulou imagined that large sums were outstanding which could benefit the Community. There is no question of that. It is an entirely normal procedure, which very seldom gives rise to difficulties. I could give a few examples in which Member States were dissatisfied with some of Parliament's decisions and delayed their payments, but that is history now, so I will not burden Parliament with it.

Mr Stavrou (PPE). — (GR) I think the Commissioner's answer to the question by Mr Christodoulou, though it began with the phrase that it would be precise, was anything but that. Yet, I would like to say that just because no difficult situations are created, it might be quite easy to provide a precise answer. However, we have no figures on the sums owed by Member States from the collection of VAT, either year by year, or country by country.

Mr President, with this opportunity I would like to ask the Commissioner, in the hope that we may eventually receive a fuller answer, whether the outstanding sums owed include interest charges. I think this is a serious issue for securing the Community's interests.

Mr Christophersen. — (DA) I am sorry if I have not expressed myself clearly. There are no amounts outstanding to be listed. As I pointed out, there may be some cases of disagreement between the Commission and a Member State on the calculation of an adjustment. In such a case the Member State must submit documentation to support the claim that our adjustment is incorrect, but there are no overdue amounts outstanding. The money is coming in quite normally.

Mr MacSharry (RDE). — Arising from the Commissioner's reply — and I understand he is giving what might be described as an answer to a technical problem — when such a problem arises, can he say, waiting for these technical details to be worked out between Member States and the Commission, what would be the total amount outstanding at the end of any given year? Also, does the Commission borrow to pay its commitments or does it delay payments of its commitments pending resolution of the technical problems?

Mr Christophersen. — (DA) I can of course indicate what differences there are between the amounts the Commission considers are due and the amounts the Member State thinks it should pay. There is nothing to prevent me doing that. As to whether the Commission borrows in order to meet its commitments, there have

been times at which the Commission, on behalf of the Community, has had to have recourse to the national financial administrations. We had to do that, for example, during the long period from the time Parliament rejected the budget last year until we got a budget adopted this year and the intergovernmental agreement was hammered out. In that case the Commission had to finance some of its expenditure by drawing on the national financial administrations, but that is normal practice. There are clearly defined rules for it, and it causes no liquidity problems. It is more of a technical arrangement, even though of course we do not *want* to have to draw upon the financial administrations.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) I would like to amplify Mr Christodoulou's question concerning revenue from VAT as it applies to Greece. As we know, the Greek Government has asked for an extension of the deferment in implementing VAT, beyond 1 January 1986. I would like to ask the Commissioner what the Commission's response to that request was, and if its answer was specific about the term of this deferment; also, whether Greece's contribution to the Community's own resources will be calculated on the basis of the gross national product or on the basis of VAT.

Mr Christophersen. — (DA) I can understand the reasons for this question. The Greek Government has not officially notified the Community that it wants a postponement of the introduction of VAT in Greece, but it is true — it has been reported by articles in the newspapers and it has emerged from strictly informal discussions — that the Greek Government does not believe it can introduce VAT from 1st January. There must therefore be negotiations with the Greek Government to establish how we can ensure that this does not have any consequences for the amount Greece must pay to the Community.

Mr Wolff (L). — (FR) I should simply like to ask the Commissioner whether annuality applies in the case of VAT or in fact there is a time-lag of one or three months, since it seems rather difficult to me to record, during 1985, the total amount of VAT due from the Member States, which do not know their VAT volumes until after a certain lapse of time. There is presumably a certain time-lag.

Mr Christophersen. — (DA) The procedure for calculating the VAT each Member State has to pay to the Community each month is as follows: in conjunction with the preparation of the Commission's draft budget in the preceding year the VAT basis for each Member State for the following financial year is also provisionally calculated. There is an advisory committee which advises the Commission and whose advice the Commission normally follows, and on this basis the budget

Christophersen

is adopted. When the following financial year has elapsed, a final assessment is made of the actual VAT basis in the financial year in question. If the actual VAT basis diverges from what had been provisionally estimated for the financial year, an adjustment is made, in whatever direction applies, of the VAT paid by the Member State. There is thus no staggering. Each month each Member State pays one-twelfth of the total VAT amount which the budget says the Member State must pay. These payments are finally adjusted, once we know the true VAT basis. This means that, for 1986, the VAT collection basis is the indication of the VAT basis given in the Commission's preliminary draft budget which was presented in the summer of this year, and the basis is applied by the procedure I have just described. In 1987 we shall undertake a final assessment of what the actual VAT basis was in the Member States. If the two figures do not agree, we make repayments where our estimate was too high and the Community receives supplementary payments if our estimate was too low. But there is no staggering of the monthly payments.

President. — As their authors are not present, Questions Nos 3 and 4 will be answered in writing ¹.

Question No 5, by Mr Van der Lek (H-349/85):

Subject: European Network of Women

The European Network of Women, which coordinates the work of several hundred women's groups and organizations and maintains a dialogue between these groups and the European institutions, has each year received some support, albeit insufficient, from the Commission. The amount to be made available for 1985-86 (10 000 ECU, whereas the network requested 90 000 ECU, 50% of its total requirement of 180 000 ECU) is so small that the Network will have to cease its activities.

Can the Commission explain why women are treated differently from other large social groups, such as consumers, and why a request from a body coordinating several hundred grass-roots movements is treated in exactly the same way as requests from individual groups? Does this mean that no financial support is given to women's organizations at European level or are other groups supported? If so, which groups and according to what criteria?

Mr Pfeiffer, Member of the Commission. — (DE) The Commission is, of course, very conscious of the need to give financial support to action and also to organizations helping to promote equal opportunities for men and women. The Commission has been trying for several years now to encourage equal opportunities in

this way but the task is not made any easier by the insufficient financial resources at our disposal. The budgetary allocation, from which the *European Network of Women* is demanding financial aid, amounts to 760 000 ECU for 1985. This amount is destined to support Community action and assist the implementation of the working plan for the encouragement of equal opportunities for women, and extensive use will be made of it to promote measures outlined in this plan.

The Commission was concerned in its working plan with outlining practical steps to the achievement of equal opportunities. We are attempting to utilize the limited resources at our disposal in such a way as to allow as many groups as possible in the Community to implement specific and concrete projects, for example, initiatives destined to provide jobs for women at local level.

This specific and, by implication, most effective use of budgetary provisions is no longer possible if we are giving financial aid to one or more organizations on a regular basis. This has led the Commission to establish the rule that the above-mentioned provisions would not be used to support the day-to-day running of a business.

The Commission has already made an exception to this rule on two occasions in the case of the *European Network of Women*. When it was founded in 1983 the *Network* received an initial subsidy. In 1984 we earmarked in the budget a substantial amount of money to support this organization. When it requested further financial aid in 1985 we were once again prepared to grant a fixed amount of aid, in the face of the many demands on an already overstrained budget, but were unable to provide more than 10 000 ECUs.

You will appreciate, therefore, that this offer is not a manifestation of the Commission's lack of interest in the important work of so many groups working for equal opportunities. In the light of this, it should be clear that no comparison can be made with the regular budgetary allocations, for example, for consumer groups. We are not concerned here with a proportion of the budget specially allocated to aiding regular organizations, but money reserved for the achievement of the greatest possible progress in providing equal opportunities for men and women.

Finally, in reply to the last part of the question, concerning which groups and organizations have received money from the Commission from the above budgetary allocation, may I point out that the Commission has provided information at the request of the Chairman of the Committee on Women's Rights. I should be obliged to read out a long list of names which would be certain to exceed the limits of the time allocated to my reply.

Mr Van der Lek (ARC). — (NL) I am grateful to Mr Pfeiffer for his answer, but I find it difficult to follow

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

Van der Lek

his reasoning. What we are talking about here is a special task that is directly related to the Commission's activities. The Commission has said this is an important task, and it has also acknowledged that it cannot itself take on the coordination for hundreds of women's groups throughout the Community. I feel the comparison is perfectly valid. Could the Commission explain why a 'network of women' of this kind is not comparable to consumers, family organizations, trade unions and so on? This is a task which the Commission has itself set, and I find its attitude simply incomprehensible. I should also like to know what all these comparable — and I stress the word 'comparable' — initiatives are before I accept that this important initiative does not qualify for further aid.

Mr Pfeiffer. — (DE) I must emphasize yet again that the Commission is using this budgetary allocation to encourage equal opportunities and not to promote specific organizations. In reply to the question the honourable Member was so justified in asking, let me point out that the Commission is, of course, working with women's groups in general. In 1981, it set up a Standing Committee on equal opportunities on which two representatives from Member States are from the equal opportunities commissions, as they are known. This Committee, which meets at least three times a year, also includes the participation in an advisory capacity of the social partners. I believe therefore that this is the proper approach to the problem. I must emphasize again, however, that the primary aim of the budgetary allocations in question is not to give financial aid to organizations, but to support initiatives which actively encourage the achievement of equal rights through the implementation of the most feasible practical projects.

Mr Wijsenbeek (L). — (NL) My question is directed at you, Mr President, rather than the Commissioner. What we are witnessing at the moment is a clear violation of the Question Time procedure. First the Commissioner reads out a speech several pages long, and this is followed by a statement from Mr Van der Lek, which is certainly not the shortest ever heard. Does the Commissioner feel this complies with the rules on questions and answers during Question Time, and if we go on like this, will we ever reach Question No 20?

President. — Well, if we have any more interventions like that, we probably will not.

As the author is not present, Question No 6 will be answered in writing¹.

Question No 7, by Mr Hutton (H-355/85):

Subject: Infectious diseases

Would the Commission say what discussions have been held between the Health Ministers of the Ten about a programme to eradicate infectious diseases such as rubella and tuberculosis?

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — At the meeting held in Venice on 3 and 4 May 1985 the Ministers of Health of the Member States declared that they were in favour of cooperation between the Member States to control the incidence of infectious diseases and that there should be close cooperation with the WHO in this area. It was agreed that the Council's working party on health questions and the Commission would continue to work to promote such cooperation. Protection against rubella and tuberculosis will, of course, also be covered by their work. The matter was discussed by virtually all of the ministers who were involved in the actual discussion at the Council and all favoured a greater degree of cooperation.

Mr Hutton (ED). — I thank the Commissioner very much for his helpful answer. Would he agree with me that the sort of cooperation and coordinated action which he has touched on would have substantial benefits not just for the health of individuals in the Community but also in making savings for health services and making vaccines cheaper worldwide and in the Third World in particular?

Mr Sutherland. — I completely concur with the view expressed by the Honourable Member. It was a point, I think, which was brought to the attention of the Council by the Commission and indeed had been brought to the attention of the Council in the past by the Commission. One of the difficulties in this area of coordination is that there are differing standards throughout the Community in terms of the achievement of vaccination programmes and suchlike, and therefore one is not coordinating like with like. But a simple answer to the question asked is, yes, of course, we entirely approve of greater coordination and are doing everything in our power to stimulate it.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Can the Commissioner say whether the Minister and, indeed, his own department are examining and investigating the spread of AIDS throughout Europe and, if not, would they do something about it?

Mr Sutherland. — Yes, I can say that it is a subject which is naturally causing concern to the services of the Commission. In fact, DG XII and DG V associated with it during the course of last year had prepared a research programme into this and other topics but, as the Honourable Member will be aware, it was not adopted by the Council. Preparatory work involving discussions with experts of the World Health Organization, however, is continuing and it is the

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

Sutherland

intention of the Commission in the context of the next general programme of the Commission that this particular subject, in the course of the first six months of the coming year, will be addressed again and we are anxious that there should be a coordinated attack on this particular subject.

Mr Cryer (S). — In the discussions on the working party on health questions, could the Commissioner assure me that he uses every opportunity to encourage Member States to provide a basic national health service which is the best protection against the spread of any infectious diseases whether it is rubella, tuberculosis or AIDS? And in that context, does he encourage the United Kingdom Government to stop its present erosion of the National Health Service, the closing of hospital wards, the extension of unemployment to doctors and nurses and the privatization of the National Health Service which is placing profit before the welfare of the patients? Does he not agree with me that it would be a formula for disaster if profit were to come between the concern of doctors and nurses and the welfare of patients?

Mr Sutherland. — The Honourable Member appears to have trespassed somewhat beyond the limits of the question and I would not propose to go beyond the limits of the reply which was appropriate and was given in the first instance, namely, that we naturally favour all forms of cooperation between medical authorities within the Community in order to deal with the infectious diseases which were referred to in the question.

President. — Question No 8, by Mr Boutos (H-365/85):

Subject: Looting and destruction of archaeological treasures in the occupied territories of Cyprus

The very important report presented to the Athens Academy in May 1985 under the title 'Cyprus: the works of 9 000 years of civilization are being looted' presented masterpieces of art which have been 'repatriated' since the invasion of Cyprus, having been bought by the Cyprus Government on the Western European markets. The same report included the enlarged photographs which bear mute testimony to the scale of the damage sustained at the hands of the occupying army by churches, cemeteries, archaeological sites and museums in the occupied territories of Cyprus, as a result of looting, sacrilege and deliberate destruction.

Since these masterpieces of art, which belong, of course, to the Republic of Cyprus, are art works forming a part of Europe's cultural heritage, will the Commission say what steps it can suggest or has already suggested, in conjunction with the possibility of keeping a check on the art markets in the Member States when the exhibits on sale

are the products of looting of this kind, to protect our cultural heritage against such acts of vandalism?

Mr De Clerq, Member of the Commission. — (NL) As regards the first part of Mr Boutos's question concerning specifically the measures Member States can take to establish whether works of art bought and sold in their territory are the products of looting, I would refer to a whole series of international conventions under which the Member States that have ratified these conventions can take the necessary action.

There is, for example, the convention on the protection of the archeological heritage, the convention on measures to prohibit and prevent the import, export and transfer of illegally acquired works of art, the convention on offences involving works of art and the convention on the protection of the architectural heritage and historical places that has just been signed by nine of the Member States.

On the other hand, the convention on the protection of the subaquatic cultural heritage is still before the Council of Europe. The Member States which ratify the conventions I have just mentioned undertake, for example, to take the necessary action to combat unlawful practices, such as the export of and trade in works of art acquired by force. I would remind you that the Commission has always advocated that the Member States should use the means provided by the conventions I have named. Within the limits of its authority the Commission reserves the right to begin and/or continue, with the appropriate authorities, investigations into the implications of these conventions for the European Community.

As for the second part of the question, which concerns the measures the Commission has taken or will propose to protect the cultural heritage against looting, I must first stress the importance the Commission attaches to the existence and protection of a Community cultural heritage. I would refer the House in this context to the Commission's communication to Parliament and the Council of 12 October 1982. The Commission must point out, however, that the Community does not have the means to protect the cultural heritage in third countries.

Mr Boutos (RDE). — (GR) I would like to draw the Commissioner's attention to the fact that the specific subject my question was about relates to a segment of Europe's cultural heritage which has sustained organised looting by a country which now aspires to become a member of our Community, which was signed trade and economic agreements with the Community, and consequently that the Community has to hand several means to prevent acts of governmental plundering such as those deliberately carried out by the Turkish army.

Boutos

Bearing in mind the special conditions prevailing in Turkey, I would like to ask whether the Community is thinking of adopting further measures, beyond those already in force.

Mr De Clercq. — (FR) First of all, let me thank Mr Boutos for his supplementary. My answer will be brief. I think that I stressed in my initial reply that it was the responsibility of the Member States on the one hand and, where third countries are involved of course, of the Community on the other hand.

That said, of course no one could approve of looting, theft and illegal acts — wherever they occur, whoever the victims — damaging such an invaluable international heritage as the European heritage, defined in the broadest terms. No one can approve of that, it goes without saying. But, as the questioner himself has acknowledged, *rebus sic stantibus*, which may not be a Greek expression, as I understand it, but means that, as matters stand, what I said in my first reply is also applicable as an answer to the supplementary from Mr Boutos.

Mr Stavrou (PPE). — (GR) In connection with the question under discussion, the Commissioner has told us that it lacks the resources to protect cultural heritage. However, the matter is not one of economics. My question is, firstly, whether the Commission has taken steps to compel Member States to ratify the agreements referred to by the Commissioner — and of which, so far as I know, only Greece and Italy have ratified the most important — so as to undertake the moral obligation to protect our cultural heritage.

My second question is this: The treasures looted from Cyprus have been auctioned in the Member States. Were those countries aware of their provenance? Yes, or no?

Mr De Clercq. — (FR) This is not so much a matter of financial resources as of legal means, as I have been trying to explain, it seems to me, in my replies hitherto.

With regard to the Member States' obligations, we are, of course, going to urge that treaties not only be signed but ratified, in other words applied as soon as possible and as effectively as possible.

I can in fact give you a rather welcome piece of news. I have noted, among other things, the convention on the protection of the architectural heritage and historical sites, the convention known as the Granada convention. This convention has been signed not by two Member States, but by nine, which, in my view, is a very good sign. I do not know why the tenth has not signed, but the reason is probably to do with timetables, not a substantive reason.

We are going to try to promote what we regard as a desirable trend in this field, this, I repeat, within the limits of our competence.

Mr Wijnsbeek (L). — (NL) Can the Commissioner explain the link with the well-known 'Cyprus-constructie', which has been used by some members of the OGEM board, former CDA politicians, to avoid tax?

President. — I do not think that falls within the ambit of the question, Mr Wijnsbeek.

Question No 9, by Mr Ford (H-375/85):

Subject: Dumping of South Korean and Japanese batteries in Europe

Can the Commission state what steps they have taken to monitor and control the dumping of automotive and transmission batteries from South Korea and Japan within the Community?

Mr De Clercq, Member of the Commission. — (NL) My answer to Mr Ford's question is as follows: the Commission can only decide that dumping has taken place if a formal anti-dumping procedure is initiated, and it can only be initiated on receipt of a complaint from the industry concerned. The complaint must contain provisional evidence if such action is to be taken. As regards the product to which the honourable Member refers, no such complaint has yet been lodged with the Commission.

Mr Ford (S). — I thought that that would be the answer I would receive. I find it very disappointing that the Commission actually makes it extremely difficult for formal proceedings to be opened on the basis of anti-dumping regulations. I have a factory in my own constituency — and there are similar factories elsewhere in the United Kingdom and France — where the trade unions and management are united in the view that South Korean and Japanese batteries are being dumped on the European market. The difficulty is that some of these companies are comparatively small. They do not know the regulations. They do not have the resources to initiate formal proceedings as required by the Commission.

Can we have some recognition from the Commission that small and medium-sized enterprises do not necessarily have the resources and the knowledge to initiate formal dumping complaints? I will be encouraging them to do so in future, particularly in this matter. Yet, clearly, at the moment, you are discriminating against small and medium-sized enterprises and in favour of those large multinational corporations, which, of course, have the resources to make exactly the kind of formal submission that you insist on receiving.

Mr De Clercq. — (*FR*) There seems to be an implied criticism in Mr Ford's remarks, a criticism giving the impression — an entirely wrong impression — that the Commission is more accessible to large businesses than to small or medium-sized businesses.

First of all, the procedure was laid down by the Council of Ministers. The procedure — the Community rules against dumping and subsidies — is laid down in Council Regulation No 2176/84 of 23 July 1984, the legal basis of which is Article 113 of the Treaty of Rome.

I am of course, not going to go through the details of this procedure, but I shall merely give an outline. First, the procedure begins with the receipt of a complaint.

Next, a formal procedure is initiated, and announced in the Official Journal. Then an inquiry is carried out on the spot, followed, where appropriate, by the imposition of a provisional anti-dumping duty — this being done by the Commission — and, finally, the imposition of a definitive anti-dumping duty, the decision on which is taken by the Council on the Commission's proposal if it is considered that the provisional duty is not enough to meet the circumstances. This is how the procedure runs, assuming of course that it has not been brought to an end, for instance if the party accused of dumping has undertaken to keep to a given level of prices.

That, in brief, is how the procedure works. It is not very complicated, it takes account of our international obligations and is designed to defend the interests of our industries. And, as far as I am aware, it costs nothing to file a complaint in the proper form. If a given firm considers that its business is being interfered with, it files a complaint and this complaint is examined with all possible despatch. I would add that the Commission's staff are at the disposal of all firms, small or large, but especially small, to provide any information they may require, not only on the procedure, but also on the likelihood of a successful outcome. Our staff are at the disposal of anyone who may feel that they have grounds for complaint, but if there is no complaint we are powerless to act.

Mr Cryer (S). — Does the Commissioner accept that the record of the Commission in exercising its anti-dumping powers is pretty lamentable — in the textile industry, for example, when applications have been made, investigations have lasted as long as 12 months and in the meantime firms have gone out of business — and that its reputation for taking sharp corrective action on the dumping of goods in the United Kingdom and, also, no doubt, in other Member States is that of a body which is far too slow, too long-winded so that it is difficult for small and medium-sized firms to make the original approach?

Mr De Clercq. — (*FR*) I do not accept the view that the procedure has not been very successful. What hap-

pens in practice is that when it succeeds everyone is dissatisfied, and when an amicable settlement is reached nobody talks about it.

As for the time taken, this is a necessary fact of life. The average time is between seven and eight months. This is no longer than it takes when dumping complaints are filed in the United States or Japan, for instance, the only difference being, Mr President, that the staff and facilities available to those other two economic giants are out of all proportion to the pitifully limited resources that the Commission has to make do with in the very difficult task of protecting European industry.

The average is from seven to eight months but there are cases when it takes longer. There are, alas, cases which are very complicated. There are also many cases where complaints are not made in the proper form, where the complainants themselves — perhaps because they do not know what is required or because they are not so well organized — do not always provide all the requisite information in good time, to enable the Commission's staff to proceed even more expeditiously.

In short, I appreciate that the procedure cannot be allowed to drag on for too long but, on an international comparison, I do not regard an average of seven to eight months as excessive. If Parliament could vote the Commission additional resources when debating the budget, we would greatly appreciate it and we could then perhaps get the work done more quickly, and I would be pleased if that were the case.

President. — Question No 10, by Mrs Ewing (H-385/85):

Subject: The Assisted Development Programme in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland

What steps will the new Commission take to encourage the United Kingdom Government to support the proposed Assisted Development Programme in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland?

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (*GR*) On two previous occasions the Commission had to answer, regarding the same subject each time, that it was obliged to await the revision of the regulation on agricultural structures. This time I am in the happy position of being able to say that the revision was completed in March 1985, and that the Commission then contacted the authorities in the United Kingdom in connection with the initiative originated by the regional and local authorities in Scotland in May 1984, to progress towards a proposed regulation to Council covering Mrs Ewing's question. I know that those talks are at an advanced stage, and I hope a suitable answer will soon be forthcoming.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — When one gets as satisfactory an answer as that, there is no point in belabouring the Commission with a supplementary question. I would only say that it is regarded in the Highlands of Scotland as an urgent matter, as the plight of marginal farmers worsens year by year. I thank the Commission most sincerely for its answer today.

Mr Hutton (ED). — Could the Commissioner say whether the document coming before the Council will refer to all the less-favoured areas of Scotland, and if it does not, how does he justify giving special treatment to some of the less-favoured areas of Scotland while others are just as badly disadvantaged?

Mr Varfis. — (GR) I hope what I said earlier has not been misunderstood. I said that right now our talks with the United Kingdom authorities are progressing well, and that if they end soon, as we all hope, then the proposed regulation will be submitted to Council for approval. Now these talks with the UK also include the matter of which regions are to be included, and indeed the question of finance. Since we are still at the stage of talks, it is difficult for me to be more specific.

Mr McMahon (S). — Whilst welcoming the Commissioner's assurance about the Highlands and Islands, I hope on this occasion that the Commissioner will give me a further assurance that the local authorities — namely the Highland Region and Strathclyde Region — will be listened to very carefully. This was not the case with the question of weighted reductions with regard to the Social Fund, when their opposition to this was ignored. I hope that on this occasion the views of Strathclyde Region and Highland Region, who are very concerned about this scheme, will be listened to most carefully indeed.

Mr Varfis. — (GR) I think there are two issues here, and I will deal with them both. We are constantly in touch with all the regions and local authorities. Specifically in relation to the Strathclyde Region, the matter is two-sided. On the one hand, it concerns the possible inclusion of that region in the extension of the regulation to the Western Isles, and on the other hand it relates to an integrated study concerned with that region in particular, and whose implementation will not fall within the scope of the same legal basis of the same regulation. It is an integrated action of a different kind, but I take this opportunity to say that it is a study that has been very highly regarded by the Commission's services.

President. — As its author is not present, Question No 11 will be answered in writing¹.

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

Question No 12, by Mr Habsburg (H-421/85):

Subject: Proposal to extend the Stabex system to the least-developed countries which are not party to the Lomé Convention.

According to press reports, the Commission has submitted an application to extend the Stabex system to the least-developed countries which are not party to the Lomé Convention. One such country is Soviet-occupied Afghanistan. Does the Commission plan to extend the Stabex system to include Afghanistan, and if not, is it prepared to give a binding undertaking that it will not do so until Soviet aggression against Afghanistan has ceased and that country has a government which corresponds to the freely expressed wishes of its people? If such plans do indeed exist, what justification can the Commission offer for them, and is it prepared to give an undertaking that it will take no action on this matter without prior consultation of Parliament?

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — At the Paris conference on the least developed countries in September 1981, the Community said that it was willing to give favourable consideration to the possibility of extending some arrangement similar to Stabex to the least developed countries, not party to the Lomé Convention. With a view to the Community and its Member States giving by 30 September its responses to the 11 October Unctad session, which is devoted to a mid-term review of the Paris conference, the Commission proposed to the Council that a positive line be taken and that the opportunity be used to announce a unilateral decision to introduce a Stabex type system for least developed countries not yet covered.

Thirty-seven countries are on the United Nations list of least developed countries, 27 of them are ACP States and are thus already covered by the Stabex system. The system could be extended therefore to take in the remaining nine countries — Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Haiti, Maldives, Nepal, Laos, The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and the Yemen Arab Republic. On 1 October the Council agreed in Luxembourg to make an appropriate statement of intent and the statement was duly made on 2 October.

Its two main points are, first of all, the willingness in principle of the Community and its Member States to extend cover unilaterally to least developed countries which are not members of the Lomé Convention and, secondly, a criterion of eligibility over and above the fact of being on the list of least developed countries.

The last of these two points means that to qualify for cover under the new system, a country must fulfil two conditions set out in the statement. The first is that its exports to the Community of a product to which the system applied must represent a significant proportion

Sutherland

of its total exports, otherwise the system would give purely token, symbolic cover. Secondly, we would need to conclude detailed arrangements with the representative authorities of each beneficiary country to give us the fullest guarantee that the aid would be used to improve the welfare of the communities concerned.

The Community has always been concerned to see that among the goals which give development its meaning should be listed the promotion of human welfare, having regard to the human rights and dignity of those concerned. In this connection the Commission will naturally, in line with its existing practice, be taking due account in its contacts with the countries concerned of the human rights situation there. In the specific case mentioned by the honourable Member, there will be no contact with the authorities of the country while the present situation continues.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — I just want to thank the Commissioner for a very clear and very comprehensive answer.

Mr Elliott (S). — I would like to ask the Commissioner — and I do think it was a most enlightening reply — if he will undertake to give very serious consideration to the position of Bangladesh which is a country with which we in Europe have close historical links. Indeed, living within countries of the Community are many people of Bangladeshi birth or origin and I think it is particularly appropriate that we should consider helping them.

On the question of criteria, can I seek an assurance from the Commissioner that, contrary to Mr Habsburg's suggestion that we should not consider aid to countries which, to use his words, do not have 'a government which corresponds to the freely expressed wishes of its people' — if we were to use that criterion a great many countries in the Third World that have right-wing military dictatorships would be excluded — the criterion which will be used is the one the Commission has indicated. I hope they have an assurance that that is what will be used.

Mr Sutherland. — The answer to that question is that he can have the assurance that we will apply the criteria that I suggested in my first answer, and secondly I can assure him that we will look at the issue of Bangladesh, falling as it does within the categories of state to which I referred.

President. — Question No 13 cannot be called as it is on the same subject as that being discussed in the high technology debate. I refer to Annex 2, paragraph 2 of the Rules of Procedure.

Question No 14, by Mr von Wogau (H-754/84):

Subject: Turnover tax on books imported for public libraries

On 6 February 1984, in Written Question No 2145/83, I drew the Commission's attention to the far-reaching consequences that Council Directive No 83/181/EEC¹ would have on the importation of books for public libraries. By letter of 24 July 1984, the Commission indicated that it did not plan to discuss my question before the middle of October 1984 and some time would then elapse before it could express a view. More than a year has now passed without my receiving an answer. I would therefore ask once again:

Does the Commission not agree that, to promote the international exchange of culture and avoid additional import duties for public libraries, Directive No 83/181/EEC must be amended to the effect that books and other publications intended for libraries of public interest (as defined in Paragraph IVa of the Unesco Protocol of 26 November 1976) may be imported duty free?

Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the Commission. — I must first of all apologize to the honourable Member on behalf of the Commission for the quite unreasonable delay in answering his written question. I can now give him what is in effect the answer to both his questions.

A general exemption from VAT at importation for books and other publications which are destined for public libraries would discriminate against similar goods supplied on the domestic market and thus distort competition to the detriment of domestic book sellers. Such an exemption would therefore not be justified.

Mr von Wogau (PPE). — (DE) Mr Commissioner, there are very often cases such as these in which goods with no commercial value which are exported to neighbouring countries without commercial purpose have to undergo very complicated procedures. It is only after a very long time that duties paid can be reimbursed. This gives one the impression that unnecessarily complicated administrative procedures are being introduced. If the Commission's objective of setting up the common internal market by the year 1992 is to be realized, would it not be advisable to start by abolishing VAT on goods crossing the border with no commercial purpose?

Lord Cockfield. — I appreciate the point that the honourable Member is making. It is our objective to simplify all border controls and ultimately to abolish them altogether. Interestingly enough, when the present directive was under consideration in the Council, a

¹ OJ No L 105, 23. 4. 1983, p. 38.

Cockfield

suggestion that there might be an exemption on importation was, in fact, opposed by most Member States on the grounds that it would complicate and not simplify the customs procedures. But its general objective of simplification is one that I entirely agree with.

President. — Question No 15, by Mr Fitzsimons (H-768/84):

Subject: EEC support for designing and building a low-energy hospital

Will the Commission give an indication of the progress made to date in relation to project No EE/079/80 on the design and building of a low-energy hospital in the United Kingdom, particularly in view of the escalating costs of running hospitals in the Community? Is the Commission hopeful that the estimated energy savings of 900 toe a year will be achieved and the techniques incorporated in hospitals in Ireland and other Member States?

Mr Mosar, Member of the Commission. — (FR) As you have observed, this question is extremely specific and detailed, and I in turn want to be very detailed in my reply.

First, the question asks about the current state of progress of the demonstration project concerned. I can answer that the design phase has been completed, that building is in progress and will be completed by the middle of 1987, and that the 'measurements' phase will commence as soon as the building has been completed and run until 1990. The question then refers to the results anticipated from the project in question. I would reply that the only indications of the results anticipated refer to energy savings of the order of 800 tonnes oil equivalent a year.

With regard to the final part of the question, which is rather general in its scope, I would say that a hospital — which is always very complex, let us not forget — presents virtually all the energy problems met in other categories of building. Thus, a project such as this one, in which many innovative techniques are being used, should set examples which can be copied widely, not only in hospitals.

With regard to hospitals in general, I should also like to point out, in conclusion, that energy management is not generally a priority problem for hospital administrators. Staffing, equipment and strictly financial considerations are their primary concerns. Nevertheless, there is a very great potential for saving energy in hospitals, and it is reasonable to anticipate energy savings of at least 20%, with a very attractive lead-time — about two to three years.

It is therefore important to draw hospital administrators' attention to the savings that can be made very

quickly by investing in the rational use of energy, explaining the costs of financially viable investments.

Mr Fitzsimons (RDE). — I am pleased that progress has been made, albeit somewhat slowly, on this kind of low energy cost hospital. However, I would like to ask the Commissioner whether the energy-saving estimates are accurate and whether the hospital is cost-effective? If it proves satisfactory in the UK, is it the intention that the idea of having such a hospital would be extended also to other Member States, such as Ireland?

Mr Mosar. — (FR) On the first part of the supplementary, I can say that the figures, the results, tally with the norms, bearing in mind the special characteristics of hospitals.

On the second part of the question, I can report that other projects are under consideration by the Commission. In this connection, I can tell you that the Community is currently working on another demonstration project involving six existing hospitals, which is expected to achieve energy savings of 20% within two years. This project, which was started in 1984, is still at the preliminary stage, with the design of modifications going on at the moment.

On the subject of other action in connection with the rational use of energy in hospitals, I would add that the Directorate-General of Energy has brought out a manual on the subject of energy management in hospitals. This document is to be circulated to hospital administrators and is designed to bring their attention to energy problems and help them to invest wisely.

President. — Unfortunately, because of the pressures of voting, I have to end Question Time a little earlier than I would have liked to.

The first part of Question Time is closed¹.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Mr President, you announced just now that you were cutting Question Time short by just a few moments. In point of fact, it is about half-an-hour. That is an awful lot of time. I do not know whether there is a precedent on this but is there any opportunity of restoring that half-hour either tomorrow or at some other time? We have in the past always gone on for the extra time to make it an hour and a half. Obviously I have an interest because my question would have been the second taken. But really it was not a small cut, you have taken out half-an-hour of Question Time and this is bad news.

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

President. — Unfortunately, Sir James, it is true that because of the extra time used on the Commission statement which took up 23 minutes, I have had to bring Question Time to a close in order to complete this evening's voting in which I believe there are something like 100 amendments to be considered. That, unfortunately, is the situation I find myself in as President in the Chair. I am sorry about that and we shall have to take it into account in future.

Mr Marshall (ED). — Mr President, would you accept that by putting the Commission's statement on at 4.30 p.m., and Voting Time at 6 p.m., it was inevitable that Question Time would be less than one and a half hours? Can we ask that in future the Commission's statement be made at 4 p.m. so that Question Time is not interfered with?

President. — Mr Marshall, the problem is that sometimes the Commission statement is over in two or three minutes. Unfortunately, today it lasted much longer but we note your point and we will have discussions with the Commission to see if we can do something about it¹.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

7. Reference to committee of the Nordmann report

President. — During this morning's approval of yesterday's minutes, Mr Nordmann asked that the minutes be corrected with regard to the decision taken to refer his report on cocoa and chocolate products back to committee.

The President of the sitting stated that the matter would be investigated.

I have since studied this particular item of the minutes.

The minutes indicate that, on a proposal from Mr Jackson, who was supported by 21 Members of this House, Parliament decided by a majority to refer the report back to committee.

However, it is Mr Nordmann's contention that the report could not be referred back to committee on the basis of Rule 56.

We have in the past in some cases considered that Rule 56 could be interpreted as affording the possibil-

ity of referring a report back to committee. This interpretation was reaffirmed earlier during yesterday's sitting on the matter of Mr Toksvig's report, Parliament having decided to refer that report back to committee with no opposition having been voiced to my knowledge.

However, the question remains whether referral back to committee can be decided when adopting the order of business or whether it should only be decided once the item scheduled on the agenda comes up for debate.

Having reconsidered most carefully the relevant rule, I am personally of the opinion that referral back to committee can be decided at any time, although I can readily understand that certain Members may see the matter in a different light.

As it would be difficult to hold a debate in Parliament now on this procedural point, I propose that we refer the matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure, who will report back to us at the next part-session.

(Parliament agreed to the proposal)

8. Votes

Report (Doc. A 2-93/85) by Mr Fajardie, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. C 2-28/85 — COM(85) 174 final) for a Council regulation on a Community aid scheme for non-documentary cinema and television co-productions

Explanations of votes

Mr Griffiths (S). — I would like to support this resolution and proposal from the Commission wholeheartedly because I believe it will give valuable assistance to those television companies which are engaged in producing programmes in the lesser-used languages of the Community. In this respect I would like to mention Sianel Pedwar Cymru (S4C) which is Channel 4 Wales and it has been doing a magnificent job in providing Welsh language programmes and, in fact, has already sold its Super Ted programme all over the world and has gone into eleven languages. It is buying the Chateau Vallon from French television. I think they have already shown by the dubbing into 11 languages of the world that these co-productions can be very successful.

I hope that the Commission will give television channels using the lesser-used languages the opportunity to gain access to this fund. While in Britain at least they are generously provided for in terms of lesser-used

¹ *Topical and urgent debate (announcement): see Minutes.*

Griffiths

languages, in terms of providing adequate funds for television, it is still a struggle to provide high quality television programmes. Any little money will help. I hope the Commission will be especially sympathetic to Sianel Pedwar Cymru — Channel 4 Wales.

Mr Fajardie (S), rapporteur. — (FR) I speak on behalf of the Socialist Group, which is in favour of this report and of the Commission's initiative which prompted it.

It really was necessary for the European Community to make a strong gesture demonstrating two things. First, that it was not prepared to allow progress in the cinema and television to be confined almost exclusively to American productions. Secondly, that it was determined to make a collective effort to ensure that all available resources were devoted to ensuring that Europe was properly represented in the cinema and television, both for the benefit of its own people and so that its ideas could be carried beyond its frontiers.

It may be that we have our differences on points of detail, ladies and gentlemen, but the essential requirement here is for a clear statement by the European Parliament that our Community has an absolute duty to defend and illustrate European culture. As we all know, in today's society, and even more in the future, it is essential, in order to do this, to have a strong presence, and the highest standards, in the cinema and television.

We are of course dealing here with a pilot project. All these arrangements reflect the intention to get things started. For the future, all options remain open, anything can be improved. But today's gesture, ladies and gentlemen, is one which will have long-term repercussions. In my view, it is high time that something was done. With the very low level of earnings in the European cinema and the extremely precarious outlook for film-makers here, it will not be long before we are doomed to silence and the loss of our cultural identity unless all of us — collectively, I repeat — take the urgent action necessary.

We must therefore embark courageously on providing aid, at the most substantial level possible, to cinema and television co-productions, and we must take stock of our joint efforts at regular intervals. The Socialists approve of the proposals which have been brought forward. They will be following their progress with interest, because they are convinced that this is a most important venture for the future of Europe, if it means to keep and develop its many-faceted personality and offer its culture to the world, as it has done so often throughout history.

(Applause from the Left)

Mr Kuijpers (ARC), in writing. — (NL) I agree with the Commission's and rapporteur Fajardie's analysis of the situation in the European programme industry.

The European programme industry faces a very serious challenge, a life-or-death struggle with a gigantic industry that is dominated primarily by American interests. This industry is geared, as Mr Dumont said in a CEPES document published in 1984, to 'the production of series, backed by an economic strategy which has priority over any cultural development project'. 'America' already controls all the important sectors of Belgian cultural life (80% of film revenues, 70% of the record market, and so on). This dependence on America is an extremely dangerous phenomenon, which is a threat to the characteristic features of Europe and its peoples.

I therefore fully support the Commission's proposals and the amendments tabled by the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, which are designed to give the European programme industry rather more breathing space.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-109/85) by Mr Poniatoski, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Energy Research and Technology, on Europe's response to the modern technological challenge

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 19 — After the rejection of Amendment No 39

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, the Socialist Group tabled a request in writing for a vote by roll-call on a previous amendment. I should like to know why you did not allow the vote by roll-call?

President. — On what amendment, Mr Arndt?

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) We requested voting by roll call on Amendment No 15 and Amendment No 19.

President. — Please forgive me, Mr Arndt. I was not informed of the request for a roll-call vote. The matter is of course my responsibility.

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) If a request for voting by roll call is tabled, the vote must take place.

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments No 1 to 10;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 11, 13 and 14.

President. — But the vote has been taken, Mr Arndt. You know very well that even in the most perfect mechanisms, there can sometimes be a slight fault. I was not informed of your request for a roll-call vote.

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, I am terribly sorry but the voting by roll call is also intended to clarify the individual details of the matter and disclose the names of those who voted for and who against.

(Applause)

Amendment No 15 is especially important for us because our positions on the entire report will probably depend on it. In the light of this, I think that the failure to call the vote by roll call is contravening the Rules of Procedure. A vote by roll call must therefore take place.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, I sympathize with Mr Arndt's remarks, but we have just voted electronically on Amendment No 15, and you asked that Mrs Castle's statement on this matter should be recorded in the minutes. Therefore, we cannot declare this vote inadmissible.

We are somewhat puzzled by the situation, because I also inform people of my request for a vote by roll call, and then this kind of situation does not arise. However, I do not think there is any sense in continuing to discuss the matter because the result of the vote is clear. We voted electronically, and the supplementary statements were recorded in the minutes.

Mrs Veil (L). — (FR) Mr President, I really do not understand what all the argument is about. We voted once on Amendment 15 without an electronic vote. A point was raised, calling not for a roll-call vote but a check. You made that check by way of an electronic vote. It would have been perfectly reasonable at that point for Mr Arndt to ask for a roll-call vote. He had the time, but he did not do so!

(Applause from the Centre and the Right)

Even if he did make the request, it is perfectly understandable that there should have been an oversight. These things happen. We all know that, with so many votes, there can be omissions, but Mr Arndt, I repeat, had ample opportunity to ask for a roll-call vote when the vote was actually being taken. We have voted on three paragraphs since then. We cannot go back, but someone who has made a request in advance should check that it is complied with. Besides, we cannot expect the staff never to make a technical error. This was a mistake, but we are none of us infallible. The Chairman of the Socialist Group and all his Socialist colleagues should have woken up and asked for a roll-call vote at the time.

(Applause from the Centre and the Right)

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, I was very careful to observe the Rules of Procedure and I hope that Mrs Veil will grant me that. Let whoever interrupted to accuse me of being asleep listen to what I have to say. It will then be very clear that I observed the Rules of Procedure.

We are required to request in writing a vote by roll-call before voting has begun. When we were about to vote and you did not call the vote by roll-call, I immediately asked our assistants to find out if our request had, in fact, been tabled. If the mistake had been ours, that is, had we not requested such a vote, I should not have brought the matter up. I was told that our request in writing had not been passed on and as a result of this I invoked the Rules of Procedure.

(Loud applause)

I checked to see if the requirements of the Rules of Procedure had been met before I took the floor. I would recommend to those who accuse me of being asleep to read through these Rules at least once before making such accusations. The requirements for a vote by roll-call are given therein, Mr Klepsch, and a request for a vote by roll-call was tabled beforehand. I did not request the use of the electronic voting system, but I knew that a vote by roll-call had been requested. So, call the vote and that is the matter over and done with.

(Applause from the Left)

Mr Prag (ED). — Mr President, in addition to what Mrs Veil said, when you put Amendment No 15 to the House by a show of hands, had Mr Arndt been awake he should then have got up and said that he had asked for a roll-call vote. He did not. That was his fault, and the vote was taken.

(Protests from the Socialist benches)

The situation is absolutely clear. If I had been down there and had put in a written demand on behalf of my group, I would have risen as soon as you asked for a vote by a show of hands. Mr Arndt should then have known that you were not acting in conformity with his request. He failed to do so and that is his fault.

(Protest from the Socialist benches)

Mr Ford (S). — Mr Arndt's request seems to be eminently reasonable, namely that we stick by the Rules of Procedure. The debate is over and the amendment is voted on. The issue is whether or not we support the SDI programme. It is interesting that those on the right of this House seem to object to having their votes recorded using technical rather than political arguments, when I would have thought they should be

Ford

proud of their position and want to have their names recorded appropriately.

(Applause from the Socialist benches)

I am sure the people of Europe will appreciate the point.

Mrs Fullet (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to respond to what was just said by Mrs Veil, who seems to be getting rather indulgent towards the staff. She allows them the mistake of not having forwarded Mr Arndt's letter. I take issue with anyone who suggests that Mr Arndt was asleep, a 'mistake' to which he is not entitled. I find it a bit much to make excuses for the staff when they have not done their job and at the same time criticize Mr Arndt for doing his when he asked whether or not his letter was actually delivered. In the circumstances, why not take the vote again? At all events, if the vote is not taken again, it will be an affront to the House.

Mr Rothley (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, Rule 77 of the Rules of Procedure states 'the vote shall be taken by roll-call if so requested in writing by at least twenty-one Members or a political group before voting has begun'. A vote shall be taken it says! There are two aspects to the question: the group or 21 Members of this House have to table a request — and we all know that this was done in accordance with the Rules — and after that it is the sole prerogative of the President to ensure that a vote is taken by roll call, as is stated in the Rules of Procedure. It is no longer a question for the group or individual Members who tabled this request, but solely a matter for the President. According to the Rules of Procedure he must call the vote, and it is not the business of our Members to ensure that the President carries out his duties.

(Applause from the Left)

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, I think that we must be careful to keep our heads in this House. There is a tricky problem, admittedly. We know this and we do not dispute that the request was made by Mr Arndt. A mistake was then made, and the vote was taken. Mr Arndt had the opportunity to raise the matter. We dwelt at length on the paragraph concerned, since we voted a first time and then voted again. No request was made at the time for a roll-call vote and we had an electronic vote. We therefore knew the exact numbers voting. Ten minutes or a quarter of an hour then elapsed. The numbers voting either way will therefore not be the same. What is the House to do if the votes are not identical? That would be an impossible situation for a parliamentary assembly. An electronic vote has been taken. If this had not been the case, it would be conceivable to take another vote since the first had not been checked numerically. We must make sure that we do not find ourselves in the absurd situation of

having two different votes on the same paragraph, having decided in a second electronic vote that the first did not take place. I really do ask Mr Arndt to accept that to do this would set a very dangerous precedent. I fully understand, then, that there has been an administrative error, but we cannot try to correct one error with another which would be much more serious because it would be political error.

(Applause)

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, Mrs Veil would be correct if I had hesitated. But I did send somebody immediately to check that we were fulfilling the requirements of the Rules of Procedure. If our request had not been tabled in writing, I should not have brought the matter up. But as soon as I found out that our request had in fact been tabled in writing, a fact which was overlooked, I immediately invoked the Rules of Procedure. You must understand this! I am very sorry but the Rules of Procedure state clearly that when a political group tables a request in writing a vote shall be taken. Therefore, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure I request a vote by roll-call.

Mr Härlin (ARC). — *(DE)* Mr President, behind Conservative opposition to calling a vote by roll-call and their objection to being associated with a particular amendment lies the suspicion that the result of a vote by roll-call would possibly have been different. If the President, who made this mistake or is at least responsible for it, also belongs to the same political group which is now against voting by roll-call, then the whole affair — I am not referring to the Rules of Procedure — is obviously politically embarrassing.

Mr Stirbois (DR). — *(FR)* Mr President, this House has just voted in favour of the possibility of 'bringing countries from Eastern Europe seeking cooperation into various projects', meaning Communist countries. I say enough of this pretence! There are too many people here who betray their electors. Enough of this haggling over trivial mistakes, let us have a little order and dignity!

(Applause from the benches of the European Right)

Mr Lüster (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, perhaps Mr Arndt would be convinced if he gave a little thought to the possibility of what the situation would be if he had discovered the fact after five hours instead of after five minutes. I do not wish to offend him but simply to take his point to absurd lengths.

Mr P. Beazley (ED). — Mr President, an allegation has been made that Conservatives are not willing to stand up and say they are in favour of SDI. I am standing up and saying I am.

P. Beazley

I should like to suggest a possible solution. If those in favour were to give an explanation of vote under Rule 80 before you call for the closing vote, we could find out who is in favour.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, I am really sorry about this situation. I think the problem is clear. First, we held a vote by a show of hands. I had this vote taken not knowing that a request had been made for a roll-call vote. A check was then made by electronic vote. Consequently, the result of the vote is absolutely clear as far as numbers are concerned. If there had only been the vote by a show of hands, there might be grounds for doubt, and I must confess that I have sometimes been mistaken on a vote by a show of hands, thinking that the majority was on one side rather than the other. This has happened, but not very often. You may have noticed that on several occasions and without any request being made, I have myself called for an electronic check, and this has generally confirmed the result announced. So there is no doubt of the result of the vote. In this instance Mr Arndt has a right, which I recognize, to complain. It is regrettable that his request for a roll-call vote was not passed on to me; this can happen. I think I can say that the clerical staff do their work very conscientiously, competently and scrupulously, even though a mistake may be made on rare occasions. This is what has happened here.

The situation is therefore as follows: a vote has taken place in the proper manner — indeed two votes were taken — first by a show of hands, and then by electronic vote, but there was no roll-call vote. There cannot therefore be any doubt or dispute about the result of the vote, and that is the really important thing. The fact is simply that Mr Arndt regrets — and I can sympathize — that the vote taken was not a roll-call vote.

Now I cannot — and I apologize, and take responsibility for the decision — take a fresh vote.

(Applause)

Once a vote has been held, and held correctly whatever the particular circumstances, difficult though they may be, as in this particular case, I do not feel I have the right to have this vote taken and I must therefore say no.

Explanations of vote

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* My political group will adopt the report but I should like to make it clear that we are in somewhat difficult position. We gave our full approval to the report in its original form and we should have supported it wholeheartedly if the original version had remained unchanged. We were in disagreement as to whether the question of SDI should have been included in the report or not. A vote was

taken — I should like to explain this once more to those who only have voting lists — which deleted the reference hitherto made in the report to SDI. In was on this amendment that the question of how we should vote arose. We accepted your decision, Mr President, although it led us to refer the matter once again to the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Petitions to establish whether such a vote by roll-call should not be taken anyway.

We consider that as the electronic voting system yielded a result of 156 votes to 153 a serious vote by roll-call well have yielded the opposite result.

There is still the question of whether we should reject the report. We did not do so because Amendment No 20 — which was for us a far more decisive question — was not adopted by this Parliament, thank God.

This amendment, tabled by the Christian Democrats, envisaged that Parliament should take a positive stance on the question of SDI. It was the rejection that prompted our decision to adopt the report in its entirety.

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to say very briefly that this report contained some very positive things with which we were fully in agreement. However, the voting on the amendments has resulted in changes to the report which lead us to reject it.

I would simply like to point out that the deletion of paragraph 17, which was debated when it came to the vote, is pretty indicative of the attitude of the majority in this House. It is clear that the majority in this House has chosen to abandon the cause of European independence — technological Europe in particular — and latch onto the American bandwagon and the SDI.

This is reason enough in itself for us to vote against Mr Poniatoski's report.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, the way that the subject and the voting has developed makes it clear that in the end we are not voting on the Poniatoski report as a whole, nor on a range of important issues in it, but that we are simply voting on whether or not the EEC is to support the programme of initiatives on strategic defence. From this standpoint we are really astonished by the attitude of the Chairman of the Socialist Group, who adopts and indirectly supports a proposed resolution in which not only is the subject of Star Wars not dealt with at all, but also the reference to it that did exist has been dropped.

From this point of view we believe that our Parliament's attitude should not match those of either Weinberger or Reagan, but should show accord with the forces of peace, security, prudence and commonsense

Alavanos

called for by non-participants in SDI, and condemnation of Star Wars. For these reasons the European Members of the Greek Communist Party will vote against the Poniatoski proposal.

Mr Ippolito (COM). — (*IT*) For the reasons that the chairman of the Socialist Group has already indicated, we are extremely dissatisfied with the way in which the voting has been taken. Moreover, we consider that, by eliminating Article 17, the sense of the document is completely changed. Our position is unchanged: we have always maintained that the challenge of Eureka should have been an answer to SDI. This answer has not been given, Parliament has not made its position clear, and therefore our Group will abstain.

Mr Ford (S). — Mr President, this report is a very important report for the future of Europe. Yet, we have had very little discussion in the explanations of vote of the value of the overall report. The report does point out the technological threat facing Europe from Japan and the United States. It also makes the point that we should work together in Europe on strategic research and development; that we need to work together on strategic research and development if we are going to be in a situation where Europe can successfully compete with Japan and the United States.

What is required, of course, is a distinctly European approach that does not drag along behind the Americans or the Japanese, but learns some lessons from them both. What is sad is that the way the vote has gone this afternoon — and I, like Mr Arndt, think the vote would have been different if Members had had to have their names recorded as to how they voted — has now made this report a divisive issue. This report will no longer be able to get support across the political groups, as it could have done if you had not forced through the support for the SDI programme that has been put in by some of the amendments.

Therefore the British Labour members will be voting against the report.

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Mr President, this week was supposed to be devoted to new technology as a vehicle to demonstrate to the citizens of Europe a coherent European position on our research and development work. The admitted inadequacy of our services and the regrettable, and I believe *ultra vires* decision of the President, has projected this Parliament in a farcical light. To deny Members of this House the opportunity, when properly requested in accordance with rules, to register their votes and to be accountable to their public opinion on such an important issue as the strategic defence initiative, is a disgrace to the democratic traditions of this House and which this House is obliged to uphold.

I therefore, because of the position that you by your decision, Mr President, have put us in in not being

able to properly record our votes, will be following my other British Labour colleagues in opposing this report — a report that the decisions of the Chair have made an unnecessarily divisive issue in the way the whole report has been conducted in this House.

Mrs Lizin (S). — (*FR*) Mr President, while stressing the excellent work done by the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology and the importance of the matters to which the report brings a positive approach (whether special programmes, telecommunications or readier access to venture capital), and acknowledging the important and positive passages on the Eureka programme and coordination of it throughout Europe, I want to say that the pattern of voting has been particularly destructive, first of all because the social content of the report, in paragraph 25 especially, has been completely diluted, and because Monday's symposium gave much too short shrift to the trade union organizations, which were simply invited along for form's sake, but above all because the clear statement of opposition to the SDI has been abandoned. This testifies to a clear political option, a dilution of European options, which is likely, in time, to turn us into a dominated Europe.

I shall therefore be voting against this report.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (*DE*) I have nothing to add to the explanations of the Chairman of our group on the question of how our group votes. Personally, I think it is very important — to dispel any possible doubts about our position on this system — to declare publicly that I do not support SDI, which is simply an attempt to push the development of a costly and anti-social defence policy into space. In view of the fact that this week was devoted to technology and modern electronics, I deplore the fact that no arrangements were made to use the electronic voting system, which refers to specific numbers and Members' place, to establish which Members in this particular case voted for or against Amendment No 15 and Amendment No 19. That would appear to me to have been possible, and in the context of the debate on the Rules of Procedure I shall endeavour, in the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Petitions, to ensure that, as far as this matter is concerned, the minutes will be corrected accordingly.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S). — (*NL*) The Flemish Socialists will be voting against this resolution. Partly as a result of the vague procedure and your refusal to take a roll-call vote, the debate and the vote have lost all vestige of clarity. We want clarity in the policy, and we want to say clearly what we support. Where paragraph 17 is concerned, we say that we unconditionally reject any European participation in SDI. As regards paragraph 25 we say that we unconditionally support social and economic democracy, even where new technologies are concerned. In other words, the workers

Van Hemeldonck

must be involved in all relevant decisions. Finally, as regards Eureka, we say that only a civil project, in which all Community countries are involved, will have our support.

Mr Hughes (S). — I will be voting against this report because I am totally opposed to the dangerous game the American administration is playing in relation to Star Wars. The deletion of paragraph 17 in particular makes this report unacceptable to me.

In my view Star Wars represents a dangerous and unnecessary escalation in the arms race and a threat to the very real progress that could be achieved at Geneva as a result of Soviet initiatives. Any support we give here to Star Wars is a blow to the prospects for nuclear disarmament and peace. This report should therefore be voted against.

Mr Filinis (COM). — *(GR), in writing.* Despite the fact that the Poniatowski report contains a number of exceptionally positive points, it has already undergone such profound modifications as a result of the voting on amendments that I am compelled to vote against it. My main reason is that the resolution does not explicitly reject European participation in the SDI programme ('Star Wars').

Mrs Gredal (S), in writing. — *(DA)* The Danish Social Democratic Group wants a technically advanced Europe. Europe will need to draw on all its resources if it is to catch up on its technological backlog. We must therefore oppose any attempt to restrict European technological cooperation, as the report of Mr Poniatowski before us seeks to do. It is not just the Community countries but the whole of Europe which must join together in taking up the technological challenge.

The Danish Social Democratic Group moreover considers that the intergovernmental cooperation model represented by the European Monetary Cooperation system in the monetary field, CERN in the research fields and Eureka in the technological field, with its flexibility and pragmatism, is a much better means of promoting concrete solutions to current problems. We are therefore opposed to any move which will impede our joint technological effort by subordinating cooperation to the ponderous system of the Community.

Mr Colocotronis (S). — *(GR), in writing.* Very briefly, I want to explain the reasons why I shall vote against the Poniatowski report.

It is not the first time that Parliament has considered the subject of technology. Nor is it the first time that research at a Community level, and new technological applications stemming from the need for better, new,

and more competitive products have been discussed here.

The technological revolution, huge as it is in both scale and quality, presently under way in connection with the need for greater competitiveness of our products, methods and technological developments, leaves us no margin for complacency. On the contrary, it presses us to find answers as quickly as possible, to implement a strategy, to create a technological Europe, so that the Community's development may begin to make its mark.

There can be no doubt that our prime target must be to increase the competitiveness of European products in the international markets. New technologies can secure new and better products, improved production methods, increased productivity, and a real revolution in the service industries. There should be two aims. In parallel with economic growth we must strive for social improvement and cultural elevation. The development we seek must take place within an overall exploitation of all Europe's potentials, in which the criteria should not be only economic, but social and cultural as well. Here, we should emphasise the European character that our technological development must display.

The United States and Japan have each developed in accordance with their own political, economic and social patterns. Both those countries enjoy the advantage of centralised government, with a single centre of planning and decision-making. Our own development should not be a technological carbon copy of the USA and Japan, but a counter to the effort to exploit technology for directly or indirectly military purposes. We are diametrically opposed to participation in the USA's SDI programme, whose content is irrelevant to Europe's aims which should constitute a peaceful response to technological challenge. Finally, with the opportunity provided by the debate on new technology and research, I want to stress that our aim should be to use the fruits of research for peaceful purposes. All this effort should look towards economic recovery, the prosperity of our countries, the economic, social and cultural improvement of all classes and levels of Europe's population, so that we may progress towards an overall, balanced and equal development of the European Community as a whole.

Mrs Pery (S), in writing. — *(FR)* The success of our part-session devoted to the theme of 'Europe and the Technological Challenge in the Year 2000' reflects the keen interest taken by the public in new technologies.

This is a time of great economic and cultural turbulence. Europe is being jostled by other continents and is wondering about its future. The technological challenge is certainly one of the greatest, raising two questions:

Pery

- Will Europe still be a great power by the year 2000?
- How are men and women going to fit into this new society?

The first question is concerned with Europe's standing in the world. The present technological dominance of the USA and Japan is forcing the EEC into action and European States into cooperation. Witness the Commission's programmes, such as Esprit or the JET, the European Space Agency with Ariane, Airbus Industrie, or the Eureka project.

The other question, however, is philosophical and social in its implications, transcending economic considerations. It is not technologies themselves that are the issue, but the use to which they are put. Nuclear technology or computers can either serve man or enslave him in his life, his training, his work, his leisure. Automation means less fatigue, but today it also means more unemployment. Technological development cannot be made a sacred cow; it must be made to work for us.

I take the opportunity offered by this explanation of vote to express my pleasure at the strong interest aroused by the main theme of our part-session. This interest has been most notable, it has to be acknowledged, outside the Chamber, especially around the displays which have been visited by thousands of people, including many young people. This initiative, widely reported by the media, sits well with the European Parliament's information policy. This is perhaps one of the answers to our concern to project a more vivid image of Europe. The presentation of European projects and achievements is certainly a practical and dynamic approach which goes well with our debates and makes a stronger impact on public opinion.

For my part, I should like to see more such initiatives over the coming months, focusing on other aspects of what we are trying to do in Europe, such as Europe and the Third World or Citizens' Europe.

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED), in writing. — I shall be voting in favour because the welcome to new technological challenge must be sincere and, properly controlled, their impact on society can only be beneficial.

I am particularly keen that high technology shall be applied to the nuclear power industry. After all, world-wide we have now more than two and a half thousand reactor years of experience without a single fatality, but we need new technology to make our power stations even cheaper and quicker to construct. There are of course some over-enthusiastic ecologists who would wish to hamper the spread of nuclear power — we call them shortly the 'eco-nuts' — but they must be discouraged from trying to put a brake on progress. We should utilize to the full this peaceful use of atomic energy.

There is no party political mileage in going against it. The Republicans in America, Conservatives in England, Socialists in France and Communists in Russia are all in favour and I would remind the eco-nuts in the Community, some of whom may even be in this House, that according to the Commission's document on public opinion on energy, nearly 40 per cent of those questioned preferred nuclear.

Spain joins us in the new year bringing seven more units into the EEC. They have another eight under construction. Here surely they should have the benefits of all possible, available and foreseeable, relevant new technology.

Above all we must in no way delay or proscribe nuclear energy from its vital contribution to safe, reliable and economic power for our Community. This will give us prosperity by competitiveness in world markets, and help us combat the scourge of the moment — our horrendously high level of unemployment.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, I think that a serious moral and political issue has arisen, and without any desire to interfere in the functioning of other groups, I wish to stress the following: The Chairman of the Socialist Group, Mr Arndt, in outlining his Group's position, said that the Socialist Group was in favour of the Poniatowski report. This, however, was followed by speeches from Belgian, Dutch, British, Greek and Danish Socialists who voted against the report, and who as I understand the matter, constitute a majority of the Group in question. I think this creates a problem about the way in which each group reaches its decisions, and about who is responsible for expressing them.

Mr Ford (S). — Mr President, I would like to raise with you the issue of the length of time you left the voting open for. Clearly the work of this Parliament is going to proceed exceedingly slowly if on every occasion on which we have a vote like this you are going to leave the voting open for two or three minutes. I wonder if you could explain to the Parliament why we waited for the Right to come in from the bars and from outside, when most of this side of the Chamber was here to vote because they are actually interested in the subject in question.

President. — This point is not covered by the Rules of procedure. I think it is desirable that all present Members of the Assembly should be able to take part in a

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1, 2, 5, 11, 18, 20, 22 to 25, 44 and 45;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 3, 4, 6 to 10, 26 to 29, 31, 32, 38, 39, 41 and 42.

President

vote and I have not noticed any particular tendencies in this matter on the right or on the left.

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Mr President, can I just congratulate you on your flexibility in relation to the length of time that it took to get people into the Chamber for voting and contrast it with your remarkable inflexibility when it came to a properly requested roll-call vote on a properly requested amendment.

(Applause from the Socialist benches)

Report (Doc. A 2-110/85) by Mr Ciancaglini, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the consequences of the new technologies for European society

Mr de la Malène (RDE). — *(FR)* Mr President, it was agreed at the chairmen's meeting — and confirmed by the House's approval on Monday evening — that we would bring the voting to a close by 7 p.m. so that we could then hold our group meetings, at which we have matters to discuss and decisions to be taken. It is now half past seven, so that if we move on to the next vote, we are obviously not going to be able to hold the group meetings. If we go on now, Mr President, how are we going to be able to vote tomorrow, without having considered the issues? I would ask you to bring the sitting to a close now. It is already half an hour beyond the agreed time.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I should like to explain why we should carry on: we discussed the matter on Monday but it was decided that we should, in any event, finish voting by tomorrow, Wednesday, at 9 p.m. That was the express request of the Socialist Group. Tomorrow's voting has been fixed for between 6 p.m. and 7 p.m. We did not reach such an agreement as far as today's voting is concerned. Everybody here present knows that if we do not vote on the Ciancaglini report today, we shall not be able to do so tomorrow in the hour at our disposal, and it will have to be deferred to Thursday. Therefore, I should like to suggest that we continue voting in the half hour we have left; I have cancelled my group meeting because we could not have done much in 27 minutes.

(Parliament decided to continue voting)

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 29 — After the adoption of Amendment No 39

Mrs Viehoff (S). — *(NL)* I should like to point out that the rapporteurs of committees should express not

their own opinions but those of their committees. In the discussion of the last amendment Mr Ciancaglini said that he was in favour, even though it concerned a text adopted by the committee. I do not therefore think this was quite proper.

President. — We take note of your observation, but the position taken by the rapporteur is his responsibility alone.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC). — *(DE)* Mr President, we shall adopt this report although we are fully aware that it is already too late to jump on the high tech bandwagon and that this report is really only a cosmetic operation. But one should remain true to one's convictions to the last and this time will not be an exception.

Discussions on the consequences of all previous industrial developments — I am thinking particularly of chemical and atomic developments — always came afterwards, when the problems were only becoming apparent. Such problems will continue to be unresolved because man seems incapable of learning from his mistakes.

High tech is in full swing and the ensuing social, ethical, cultural or ecological consequences remain obtrusive. We feel we must catch up on America and Japan and forget that one can be blinded by the obsessive pursuit of some goal. We do not make the slightest attempt to find our own solutions as offered, for example, by soft technology. We should be honest enough to admit that there is no use in saying we are against SDI and the use of Eureka for military ends.

Eduard Teller hit the nail on the head yesterday evening when he said that the armed forces will always take what they need from research. Everybody in this Assembly knows that, and we should at least be honest enough to admit it openly.

(Applause from the Left)

Mr Filinis (COM). — *(GR)*, *in writing.* In voting in favour of the Ciancaglini report, I wish to make the following comments: Our struggle to face up to the American challenge must not conflict with the need to protect and develop in the Community's countries the democratic structures of our societies, employment, the quality of life, the ecological environment, our cultural, national and European identity, and the need to develop technologies moulded to the European pattern.

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED). — (Same explanation of vote as for the Poniatoski report)

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

(The sitting was closed at 8.05 p.m.)²

¹ The rapporteur was:

— FOR Amendments Nos 4, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 25 to 27, 30, 31, 35, 39 and 41;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 3, 5 to 8, 12, 13, 19, 21 to 24, 28, 29, 32, 36, 37, 40 and 42.

² *Agenda for the next sitting*: see minutes.

ANNEX

Commission action on European Parliament opinions on Commission proposals delivered at the July and September part-sessions

This is a report on action taken by the Commission on amendments adopted at the July and September part-sessions, within the framework of Parliamentary consultation, and on disaster aid as arranged with Parliament's Bureau.

The reports adopted by Parliament in July and referred to in the September report on action taken are only dealt with here if new factors have emerged in the meantime. This report also covers two reports adopted by Parliament in May and June where, following the September part-session, the Commission has adopted amendments to its original proposals.

I. *Commission proposals to which Parliament proposed amendments that have been partially accepted by the Commission*

The Commission has adopted an amendment to its original proposal which incorporates the amendments it accepted in plenary session in relation to the following reports:

— Report by Mr Hutton, adopted on 12 July (PE A-72/85), on the Commission proposals to the Council for

- I. a Regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2617/80 instituting a specific Community regional development measure contributing to overcoming constraints on the development of new economic activities in certain zones adversely affected by restructuring of the shipbuilding industry (COM(84) 715 final)
- II. a Regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 219/84 instituting a specific Community regional development measure contributing to overcoming constraints on the development of new economic activities in certain zones adversely affected by restructuring of the textile and clothing industry (COM(84) 715 final)
- III. a Regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2619/80 instituting a specific Community regional development measure contributing to the improvement of the economic and social situation of the border areas of Ireland and Northern Ireland (COM(84) 715 final)
- IV. a Regulation instituting a specific Community regional development measure contributing to the development of new economic activities in certain zones affected by the implementation of the Communities fisheries policy (COM(84) 715 final)
- V. a Regulation relating to the establishment of specific Community regional development measures in 1985 and amending Regulation (EEC) No 1787/84 (COM(85) 243 final — C2-52/85)

The Commission has made the amendment requested by Parliament to the first four proposals stating that 'Member States shall take the measures necessary to make potential beneficiaries and professional organizations aware of the possibilities offered by the special programme and to inform the public by the most appropriate means of the role played by the Community'. It has also incorporated the amendment adding two new areas in the Regulation at III above.

Commission position at debate: verbatim report of proceedings, 12 July 1985, pp. 247-248.

Text of motion for resolution adopted by Parliament: Minutes of 12 July 1985, Part II, pp. 6-21.

Amended Commission proposal: COM(85) 523 final of 26 September 1985.

- Report by Mrs Schleicher, adopted on 14 June (PE A 2-53/85), on the Commission's proposal to the Council concerning a Decision on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to quick-frozen foodstuffs for human consumption (COM(84) 489 final).

The amendments are intended:

- to introduce the idea of 'temperature of the product' instead of 'temperature at the centre of the product';
- to stress the fact that only short-term fluctuations in temperature are permitted;
- to refer to the temperature aspect during transport in a recital;
- to extend the requirement for temperatures to be maintained to the transport stage;
- to improve the labelling of thawed products or those in which the thawing process has begun;
- to draw the attention of manufacturers and packers to the need for suitable (sealed) packaging.

Commission position at debate: verbatim report of proceedings, 14 June 1985, pp. 308-330.

Text of motion for resolution adopted by Parliament: Minutes of 14 June 1985, Part II, pp. 30-38.

Amended Commission proposal: COM(85) 514 final of 23 September 1985.

- Report by Mrs Schleicher, adopted on 10 May (PE A 2-26/85), on the Commission's proposal to the Council for a draft Resolution on a programme of action on toxicology for health protection (COM(84) 248 final).

The amendments cover:

- annual updating of the work programme on the basis of contacts between the Commission, the Member States and international bodies dealing with toxicology;
- definition to the various points of the programme which form an annex to the Council resolution and cover the three fields of toxicological practice, clinical toxicology and training and information;
- submission to Parliament after the first year and on an annual basis thereafter, following consultation with the Member States, of a forward outline of work to be carried out in the context of the operations outlined in the annex to the Council resolution.

Commission position at debate: verbatim report of proceedings 10 May 1985, p. 314.

Text of motion for resolution adopted by Parliament: Minutes of 10 May 1985, Part II, pp. 28-33.

Amended Commission proposal: COM(85)522 final of 26 September 1985.

II. *Commission proposals to which Parliament did not request formal amendments*

Report by Mr van der Waal adopted on 12 September (PE A 2-83/85) on the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a Regulation laying down the conditions for access to the arrangements under the Revised Convention for the Navigation of the Rhine relating to vessels belonging to the Rhine Navigation (COM(85)10 final).

Commission position at debate: verbatim report of proceedings 10 September 1985, pp. 80-81.

Text of proposal adopted by Parliament: Minutes of 12 September 1985, Part II, pp. 30-31.

Report by Mr Starita adopted on 13 September (PE A 2-82/85) on proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for

- I. a Regulation on the promotion, by granting of financial support, of demonstration projects relating to the exploitation of alternative energy sources and to energy saving and the substitution of hydrocarbons
- II. a Regulation on the promotion, by the granting of financial support, of pilot industrial projects and demonstration projects relating to the liquefaction and gasification of solid fuels (COM(85)29 final).

Commission position at debate: verbatim report of proceedings 12 September 1985, pp. 299-301.

Text of resolution adopted by Parliament: Minutes of 13 September 1985, Part II, pp. 12-13.

Report by Dame Shelagh Roberts adopted on 13 September (PE A 2-88/85) on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a Regulation concerning the conclusion of the Agreement in the form of an exchange of letters between the European Economic Community and Spain on the granting of specific financial aid to facilitate and accelerate the adjustment of fishing capacity in Spain (COM(84)569 final).

Commission position at debate: verbatim report of proceedings 13 September 1985, p. 325.

Text of resolution adopted by Parliament: Minutes of 13 September 1985, Part II, p. 19.

III. *Commission proposals to which Parliament proposed amendments that the Commission has not felt able to accept*

Report by Mr Klingenberg adopted on 10 September (PE A 2-85/85) on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for

- I. a Decision on bilateral agreements, arrangements and memoranda of understanding between Member States relating to air transport;
- II. a Regulation on the application of Article 85(3) of the Treaty to certain categories of agreements and concerted practices in the air transport sector (COM(84)72 final).

Commission position at debate: verbatim report of proceedings 10 September 1985, pp. 73-76.

Text of proposal adopted by Parliament: Minutes of 10 September 1985, Part II, pp. 5-27.

IV. *Information on emergency aid granted in September*

Intra-Community emergency aid

Emergency aid to non-member countries

Financial aid

| <i>Country or recipients</i> | <i>Amount</i> | <i>Grounds</i> | <i>Administered by</i> | <i>Date of decision</i> |
|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Sudan | 4.1 million ECU | Dublin Plan | UNHCR | 16 September ¹ |
| Ethiopia | 800 000 ECU | Dublin Plan | ICRC | 16 September ¹ |
| Angola | 3.2 million ECU | Dublin Plan | ICRC | 16 September ¹ |
| Mexico | 500 000 ECU | Earthquake | Licross | 19 September |
| Ethiopia | 5 000 t cereals | Drought | Oxfam, UK | 20 September |

¹ The three decisions taken on 16 September exhaust the appropriations available under the Dublin Plan.

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY 9 OCTOBER 1985

Contents

| | | | |
|--|-----|--|-----|
| 1. <i>Approval of the Minutes:</i> <i>Mr Alavanos</i> | 92 | 9. <i>Question Time (continuation):</i> | |
| 2. <i>European space policy — transport</i> <i>(Doc. A 2-89/85, A 2-106/85, A 2-104/85</i> <i>and A 2-107/85)(continuation)</i> <i>Mrs Oppenheim; Mr Stevenson; Mr</i> <i>Zahorka; Mrs Lizin; Mr Narjes (Commis-</i> <i>sion)</i> | 92 | • <i>Questions to the Council:</i> | |
| 3. <i>New technologies — Reports (Doc. A 2-97/</i> <i>85), by Mr Brok; (Doc. A 2-96/85) by Mrs</i> <i>Salisch; (Doc. A 2-98/85) by Mr McMahon</i> <i>and (Doc. A 2-94/85) by Mr Linkobr:</i> <i>Mr Brok; Mrs Salisch; Mr McMahon; Mr</i> <i>Linkobr; Mr Vgenopoulos; Mr Gaibisso; Mr</i> <i>Turner; Mrs Boserup; Mr Larive-Groenen-</i> <i>daal; Mr Fitzgerald; Mr Kuijpers; Mrs Lehi-</i> <i>deux; Mr Van der Waal; Mrs Viehoff; Mrs</i> <i>Giannakou-Koutsikou; Mr Seligman; Mrs</i> <i>Lemass; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Pisoni; Mr</i> <i>Ferruccio; Mrs Peus</i> | 97 | • <i>Question No 62, by Mr Adamou:</i> <i>Deprivation of the right to work in the</i> <i>FRG:</i> <i>Mr Goebbels (Council); Mr Adamou;</i> <i>Mr Goebbels; Mr Alavanos; Mr Goeb-</i> <i>bels</i> | 133 |
| 4. <i>Welcome</i> | 112 | • <i>Question No 63, by Mrs Chouraqui:</i> <i>Conférence to assess the decade of</i> <i>women organized by the United</i> <i>Nations in Nairobi in July 1985:</i> <i>Mr Goebbels; Mrs Chouraqui; Mr</i> <i>Goebbels; Mrs Lenz; Mr Goebbels; Mr</i> <i>Cryer; Mr Goebbels</i> | 134 |
| 5. <i>New technologies (continuation):</i> <i>Mrs Daly; Mr McCartin; Mr Späth; Mrs</i> <i>Lenz; Mrs Salisch; Mr Narjes (Commission);</i> <i>Mr Tomlinson; Mr Cryer; Mr von der</i> <i>Vring; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mr</i> <i>McMahon</i> | 112 | • <i>Question No 65, by Mrs Jepsen: Pro-</i> <i>gress of negotiations concerning the</i> <i>introduction of uniform rules governing</i> <i>the construction of cages for egg-laying</i> <i>hens:</i> <i>Mr Goebbels; Mrs Jepsen</i> | 136 |
| 6. <i>Draft general budget for 1986 — Presenta-</i> <i>tion by the Council:</i> <i>Mr Junker (Council); Mr Christophersen</i> <i>(Commission); Mr Christodoulou; Mr Fich;</i> <i>Mr Tomlinson</i> | 128 | • <i>Question No 66 by Mr Rogalla: Joint</i> <i>institutional responsibility:</i> <i>Mr Goebbels; Mr Rogalla</i> | 136 |
| 7. <i>Topical and urgent debate (motions):</i> <i>Mr Sakellariou; Mrs Veil; Mr Glinne; Sir</i> <i>James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Prag; Mr Arndt;</i> <i>Mr Sakellariou; Mr Galland</i> | 125 | • <i>Question No 71, by Mr Ephremidis: US</i> <i>embargo on supplies of drugs to Nicara-</i> <i>gua:</i> <i>Mr Goebbels; Mr Ephremidis; Mr</i> <i>Goebbels; Mr Hughes; Mr Goebbels</i> | 136 |
| 8. <i>Draft general budget for 1986 (continua-</i> <i>tion):</i> <i>Mr Pfennig; Mr Curry; Mrs Barbarella; Mrs</i> <i>Scrivener; Mr Pasty; Mr Van der Lek; Mr</i> <i>d'Ormesson; Mr Cot</i> | 126 | • <i>Question No 72, by Mr Alavanos:</i> <i>Transport subsidies for remote Greek</i> <i>islands:</i> <i>Mr Goebbels; Mr Alavanos; Mr Goeb-</i> <i>bels</i> | 137 |
| | | • <i>Question No 73, by Mr Hutton: Aboli-</i> <i>tion of unanimity rule in Council bod-</i> <i>ies:</i> <i>Mr Goebbels; Mr Hutton; Mr Goebbels;</i> <i>Mr Tomlinson; Mr Goebbels; Mr Chan-</i> <i>terie; Mr Goebbels</i> | 138 |
| | | • <i>Question No 74, by Mr Barrett: MFA</i> <i>and Ireland:</i> <i>Mr Goebbels; Mr Barrett; Mr Goebbels;</i> <i>Mr Hindley; Mr Goebbels; Mr Wedek-</i> <i>ind; Mr Goebbels</i> | 139 |

- Question No 75, by Mr Flanagan: *EEC aid for the turf industry:*
Mr Goebbels; Mr Flanagan; Mr Goebbels; Mr Wijzenbeek; Mr Goebbels . . . 140
 - Question No 76, by Mr Lalor: *Making better use of human resources:*
Mr Goebbels; Mr Lalor; Mr Goebbels; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Goebbels; Mr Wijzenbeek; Mr Goebbels; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Goebbels 141
 - Question No 78, by Mrs Lemass: *Employment; and Question No 81, by Mr Fitzgerald: Luxembourg Presidency:*
Mr Goebbels; Mrs Lemass; Mr Goebbels; Mr Fitzgerald; Mr Goebbels; Mr Hindley; Mr Goebbels; Mr Chanterie; Mr Goebbels; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Goebbels 142
 - Questions to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs: 143
 - Question No 87, by Mr J. Elles: *Ethiopia:*
Mr Goebbels (Minister for Foreign Affairs); Mr J. Elles; Mr Goebbels; Mr Simpson; Mr Goebbels 143
 - Question No 91, by Mr Van Miert: *The detention of Benazir Bhutto:*
Mr Goebbels; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Goebbels; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Goebbels 145
 - Question No 92, by Mr Lomas: *The artificial division of one Member State by another Member State:*
Mr Goebbels; Mr Lomas; Mr Goebbels; Mr Howell; Mr Goebbels 146
 - Question No 98, by Mr Selva: *Terrorism in Europe:*
Mr Goebbels; Mr Selva; Mr Goebbels; Mr Pearce; Mr Goebbels; Mr von der Vrine 146
10. Votes.
Mr Wijzenbeek; Mr Sutra de Germa; Mr Filinis; Mrs Squarcialupi 147

IN THE CHAIR: MR FANTI

Vice-President

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

1. Approval of the minutes

President. — The minutes of yesterday's sitting have been distributed. Are there any comments?

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, I have just obtained the Annex concerning the general vote on the Poniatowski report and I see that I am not included among those who voted against it, although I gave an explanation of vote on the subject. I would, therefore, like to enter this statement into the Minutes.

President. — Mr Alavanos, I would ask you to submit your comments in writing to the Bureau.

(Parliament adopted the minutes)¹

2. European space policy — (transport Continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on the reports on European space policy and transport. (Doc. A 2-89/85, A 2-106/85, A 2-104/85, A 2-107/85)¹

Mrs Oppenheim (ED). — (DA) Mr President, colleagues, for the second day running, Parliament is discussing technology, and we still have three hours ahead of us. I hope that today's debate will be marked by the same enthusiasm that many speakers showed yesterday.

The technological challenge has become a new flagship for the Community, but — and please understand this as a positive 'but' — it must not be a ship without a cargo. We must be attentive to the fact that all the goals now being set and all the views expressed in the series of reports Parliament is debating during these two days also call for follow-up action and practical commitment, if we are to make progress. We should not think that our task is completed with this two-day show of enthusiasm and the exhibition here in the city, in which we have all been celebrating something that should really be a natural consequence of European integration. We must go out from here in the certain knowledge that things will continue to happen, and

¹ Documents received — Regulation on the use of ECU by 'other holders' (Application of Rule 33 of the Rules of Procedure): see Minutes.

¹ See debate of 8. 10. 1985.

Oppenheim

Mr Münch has drawn attention to two areas here which I also think are vital: to begin with, we shall not get anywhere unless adequate resources are provided. Whether the figure in the budget is to be 4, 5, 6 or 7 per cent is in principle immaterial. The crucial point is that there should be sufficient resources to ensure that all the ideas, aims and challenges which Parliament is setting itself can be actually achieved and become a reality. A second precondition — and here I agree with Mr Münch and others among yesterday's speakers — is that the internal market should be developed and made operational as soon as possible. This is also a condition for further progress in the technological field.

Mr Stevenson (S). — Mr President, I speak principally to the report produced by Mr Wijsenbeek. There is no question at all that this is an important report in this series of reports we are considering, because it clearly underlines once more the vital role that transport should play in our industrial, commercial, economic and social progress. It focuses attention on the scope for new and potentially beneficial technologies in this very important field.

Most would agree with the proposition that new technology really knows no bounds. I think we are all aware of that. It changes so quickly and the frontiers are being pushed back almost daily. But these advances clearly need to be harnessed in a way that is acceptable and to the benefit of all sections of our society. Most important, they must be tempered by the public perception of what is acceptable in all the circumstances.

Therefore, we welcome the amendments to this report adopted in the committee, because there were sections in the original draft of the report that sought to remove support for our more traditional forms of transport. Secondly, there was a passage in the report that sought to encourage the nuclear powering of shipping. Both of these, of course, would have been very contentious and, in some cases, very dangerous.

The development of new technologies, in our opinion, does provide a major opportunity for cooperation between States in this very important field. We hope that that cooperation will be forthcoming. The economic and technical progress that is necessary, in our view, has got a better opportunity of being achieved with that type of cooperation. There is a better chance to have our transport provision integrated in such a way that all its elements complement one another and are not, as seems at present to be the case, in conflict.

We believe very strongly that if progress is to be made it must be meaningful to our society as a whole. It must be relevant to present and future objectives and, most important, all aspects of change must involve the active participation of people who work in the transport industry, particularly through their trade unions. It has been estimated that for every job created by new

technologies 50 are lost. I am sure that this is not a situation this Assembly would want to see becoming a permanent one.

We must also have a very firm base on which the harnessing of new technology can be achieved. This means that all States must recognize the importance of the transport sector. We really do need an improvement in our transport systems. We have an example of this, have we not, when we talk about the relevance of new technology to our people. We have Concorde. There is no question, in my view, that Concorde broke some very important ground with regard to technical progress and was seen to be a great achievement. But one needs to ask the question: what relevance did it have to the vast majority of our people? I suspect very little to the vast majority of people in the European Community. They saw their transport services decline. At the same time we talk about breaking the barriers of new technology. They saw their environment damaged. They saw isolation through lack of transport. At the same time we are very proudly trumpeting the fact that millions, indeed billions, of pounds can be spent on new technology that at the end of the day is only seen to benefit a very small minority of the population.

We contend very strongly that we must stop this decline. We must improve the means available, and that can only be done by a very firm commitment to an integrated transport system that meets the needs of all our society. Then, and only then, will the undoubted potential presented by new technologies have any chance at all of being realized. In that sense we should welcome the report, but we need to adjust what is contained in it to the needs of our people.

Mr Zahorka (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, I too should like to refer back to Mr Wijsenbeek's report. Parliament's victory in its legal action over Community transport policy means that we now have a greater responsibility for getting the Community's transport policy off the ground. The enormous research funds needed for new transport technologies, the intricacy of communications between States, the job creation opportunities offered by the new transport technologies, and the need to reconcile transport and environment into a harmonious whole, all these are matters which can only be dealt with at Community level, and spending on transport will continue to increase up to the year 2000. I should like to make a specific point here.

In this densely populated Europe of ours we need a comprehensive system of high speed trains. The Community can benefit to a large extent here from experience gained with existing systems, such as the French TGV. It is encouraging to see that the experimental magnetic levitation system in Schleswig-Holstein is to be funded under Eureka. Many other transport projects should be similarly considered.

Zahorka

We are currently in a period of transition from an industrial society to a society of information and communications, and transport policy must take account of this. Parliament is thus pointing the way to Europe when it calls for modern technologies to be made a part of its transport policy — not only as an export article, but as an export service. We consider the rapporteur's suggestion for Community financing particularly significant.

Pessimism is not the right attitude today. The two extremes of a traffic-free, paralysed society which totally condemns the motorcar, and the elevation of certain aspects of motorcar traffic to the status of a divine right, are equally false: the right way lies in ideas, optimism, in policy as the art of the possible.

I congratulate the rapporteur, whose report we endorse. In his report our honourable friend Mr Wijsenbeek, who comes from a nation of cyclists, has borne in mind that Europe includes not only the flatlands of his own country, which are kind to the cyclist, but also mountainous areas as well. He thus favours better transmission systems for bicycles, and I believe there is no better proof of the fact that *high tech* has to go hand in hand with the human touch.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mrs Lizin (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, honourable Members, the Socialist Group would like to draw your attention to the global and corporate aspect of the subject which is at last being debated this week on the basis of these various reports. Research and development are not, in our view, art for art's sake. We do not want technology for its own sake but for what it renders possible: choosing the future of Europeans, choosing the kind of life in society we will live tomorrow.

To this end the Socialist Group wants to put the accent again on a special programme among the programmes set up at Community level, the RACE programme. We want it to obtain the necessary resources for the rapid and bold development of its supplementary phases, for many reasons, and perhaps partly because we think it embodies all the positive principles of our commitment to the new technologies. So we regard the RACE programme as exemplary in more than one way.

The spread of broadband telecommunications based on a system harmonized *a priori* and not *a posteriori* in Europe is, firstly, a unique opportunity to give practical form to the idea that Europe is a unique living space which wants to be seen *a priori* as a market without frontiers for new products.

Secondly, it is an opportunity to harmonize, from the outset, what will become the modern means of communication among Europeans, be it general informa-

tion, economic information or cultural and leisure programmes. We can thus exploit our special position and treat our cultural differences as an asset and not an impediment.

Thirdly, it is an opportunity to make rapid progress in areas such as optical fibres where coordinated European subsidies really can have a multiplier effect in the short term.

Fourthly, it is an opportunity to give concrete form to our speeches in support of small and medium-sized dynamic undertakings, in terms of new technologies in the specific sector of telecommunications.

Fifthly, it is a unique opportunity to address the private business world and the large national public sectors of the post and telecommunications services in our countries at the same time and encourage them to understand technological change more rapidly.

Sixthly and lastly, a programme such as RACE is a good example of the problems of financing such programmes, which require massive investment, for instance in new cables, throughout the territory of Europe. Such investment can have a significant multiplier effect in terms of jobs and added value, as was the case, *mutatis mutandis*, of the railways more than a hundred years ago. A major financing programme must necessarily accompany such programmes, if the phase of its mass application to the local and regional communities is to be rapid and effective. This financing programme is the pre-condition for preventing hesitation and mistrust. Here the Commission must play a role it sometimes hesitates to play, confining its research measures too much to their purely technological aspects.

To conclude, I also wanted to point out that such programmes, whose social benefits are decisive, cannot work without the support of a broad social consensus. So they must be explained, discussed and understood by as many people as possible. The workers' representatives bear a great responsibility here. They are prepared to assume it if in return their employment and social objectives are also taken into account. Monday's symposium was not a good example from that point of view, and quite a few of the workers' representatives returned home very dissatisfied with what they were offered. I hope the European institutions will not follow that example and that our Parliament will understand that it can and must play a specific role in the achievement of this social consensus, based on respect for all the partners involved.

Mr Narjes, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. As regards the so-called 'block 2' of our debate I should like to begin by thanking our honourable friends Münch, Longuet, Wijsenbeek and Barbarella for their clear and stimulating reports which will be a major contri-

Narjes

bution towards the success of this overall debate. They have all, in their respective fields, detailed the realities, the political action required, and the various demands and options available on the subject.

I shall start with Mr Münch's report, with which I agree to a very large extent and which contains many fundamental proposals for research and development policy. One thing mentioned is the motivation of researchers. This is perhaps the moment to point out that researchers are no less responsible in their actions than the social scientists of all persuasions who challenge them and frequently employ emotional arguments in doing so.

We should thus rid ourselves of the habit of assuming that researchers are morally vulnerable technocrats, less capable than their fellow-men of making responsible judgements about liberty. We cannot in this way motivate our research workers and make them an integral part of overall progress.

In the area of research referred to by our honourable friend Mr Münch, we are now entering the agreeable phase where we are reaping the harvest of a series of programmes which, like Esprit and Brite, require institutes and undertakings from at least two Member States to be involved in every project. This requirement in itself has the effect of integrating European industrial and research structures. Some 400 such projects are currently under way as part of Esprit and Brite and a number of other programmes, and 1 300 researchers are directly involved on Brite projects alone, together with an indeterminate number of workers who are indirectly involved.

Already we have all in all woven no less than 1 000 institutes and undertakings into the Community fabric and, if I can put it this way, the confidence-building, stimulating effects of these programmes have far exceeded our expectations and plans. The 'Esprit Week' begun two weeks ago in Brussels has been proof of this.

We have thus helped to strengthen existing relationships and contacts, and we have already observed that in addition to existing cooperation under the Esprit or Brite programmes other programmes, other projects have been started outside the Community — just as we want.

I also agree with Mr Münch when he points to language as a barrier to mobility. We should not underestimate this barrier. We should not brush it aside. It is a serious obstacle, and we should think how best to overcome it. This means not only calling on Ministers for Culture and Education to give even more importance to language instruction in the Community and take appropriate steps in their institutions of further education. We should also push forward with our Eurotra programme so that this can help to surmount the obstacles at least in part.

But when considering social obstacles to mobility we come back time and time again to differences in social security systems and the related problems. This is the heart of the matter. If the research worker, moving to a new place of work, is not fully assured of provision for his retirement, he and his family will hesitate. If the research worker's wife or husband cannot work at the place where their spouse is to work, the family will think twice. They will also think twice if local schools cannot prepare their children for qualifications recognized at home.

This is the real nub of the matter. It goes far beyond the powers of the Community and is so hard to resolve because social security systems must with good reason press hard for equality, whilst any special provisions for research workers could easily be condemned as preferential treatment. Here, then, there is a lot of political persuading to do.

My thanks are due to Mr Longuet in that he has not, in his report, glossed over the technological shortcomings which exist within the Community, but has measured their full extent. The details of these technological shortcomings within the Community are becoming more and more apparent with the progress of the Copol procedure, where the national research programmes are compared by the directors-general for research, meeting with the Commission in Crest. The difficulties in tackling and reducing these shortcomings are many and varied. They are not merely quantitative and qualitative, not to be overcome merely with money or budget funds.

One of the long-term objectives which Community bodies can tackle only to a limited degree is that of differences in education and training systems. It is a long-term problem, because in some areas of the Community we shall have to start with teacher training, and because we also have the difficult problem of a significant level of illiteracy in the population. Until we can get rid of this, *high tech* will have to wait a while.

The other set of obstacles arises from inadequacies in the research and development infrastructure of certain Member States. The Community is better placed to do something here, and has repeatedly indicated its desire to help. Above all it can use the Regional Fund to rectify shortcomings and inadequacies of infrastructure. We have no intention of leaving this area out in the cold; it would be a serious offence against solidarity within the Community.

But we cannot allow the European Community's research and development policy to mark time for a few years whilst those countries which have not so far been properly abreast of world technology developments catch up with the Community leaders. For even the supposedly more advanced Member States of the Community have to compete for a good place on world markets. So all we can do is give those who are

Narjes

not yet fully developed effective help so that they can, each at the appropriate time, jump on the bandwagon of general progress without suffering harm to themselves. The Commission will continue its policy towards this end and will take care not to acknowledge the idea of the *juste retour*, which has been voiced on occasion in this context.

Mr Wijsenbeek's report on transport has performed the valuable task of once more showing how much transport and transport policy has been the poor relation in our Community. I hope it will soon cease to be. For budgetary reasons we actually had to suspend for a time work on a transport research programme. This work has now been resumed. Five million ECU are earmarked for it in the 1985 budget and have been included in the preliminary draft budget for projects on transport technology.

In the absence of a research and development programme on transport the Commission has hitherto used the outline programmes on scientific and technical research as a framework for numerous measures concerned with transport and designed to prevent the gaps from widening too far — COST has been another vehicle. I would mention, for example, the research and development programme on energy saving and the current programme on non-nuclear sources of power.

Financial support is being given here to projects on batteries, fuel cells and certain transport systems. I would mention the demonstration programme on the rational use of energy. Financial support is being given here to the testing of electric and hybrid vehicles, lorries with flywheel systems to improve their engines and also new types of ship propulsion.

As part of COST we have assisted numerous initiatives which the Commission is particularly well placed to foster: COST 30 — electronic aids to traffic on major long-distance routes, notably § 11 of the Committee's motion for a resolution; COST 301 — landbased aids to navigation; COST 302 — use of electric vehicles; COST 303 — assessment of twin-car trolleybuses; COST 304 — use of alternative fuels; COST 305 — data systems for traffic forecasting; COST 306 — automation of clearance papers; COST 307 — rational energy in transport, and COST 308 — management of ship maintenance. All in all these are efforts to fill the gaps in transport policy by means of research policy, but they provide no satisfactory answer to the overall research and development requirements of transport policy. We thus hope that our proposed programme for 1986 will, at least for the medium term, provide the starting point for a coherent and wider-ranging strategy.

But I would also point out that transport will naturally in the long term provide a wealth of high technology challenges, which the Community will be able to take up once it has adequate bases for decision-making and

above all adequate funds within the framework of the European Technology Community.

This brings me to Mrs Barbarella's report. She began by asking me how I viewed the transition or development of the European Technology Community in relation to Eureka. I refer you to everything that was said in yesterday's debate, also to our two documents concerning the Milan summit and the document published a week ago. These contain primarily an ambitious schedule which binds us as to how we shall work out comprehensively the objectives and financing of the 1987-91 outline programme.

We are currently doing all the necessary preliminary work, involving variously the Esprit group, biotechnology, communications technologies and telecommunications, and the use of space, marine sciences and industrial manufacturing technology. I refer you to pages 4-11 of this report for details of how we are tackling this work. If the European Council and the foreign ministers give us a clear road on the budget and the improvements to the decision-making process which we are asking for by the end of this year, we should be able to put forward first suggestions for a basic discussion in good time for this to be held in February 1986. By July 1986 we shall then be able to present the Council and Parliament with our comprehensive programme for 1987-91. That is our plan and the concrete answer to Mrs Barbarella's question.

We know that Eureka is as yet still a collection of desiderata which will probably not be shaped into a comprehensive text until the Hanover meeting. Our relation to Eureka is conditioned by the ideals of complementary effect, constructive cooperation without rivalry, unrestricted Community opportunities for taking and developing initiatives and harmonious agreement on objectives and tasks, so that Community cooperation can lead to Community achievements. A method we have already announced we shall follow, on a smaller scale, in the COST programme.

This brings me back to Mrs Barbarella's report and particularly to what she said about Community financing of research work, primarily with reference to the possibility of supplementary programmes. I am aware of the advantages of having funds available as from 1 January 1986. Cash on the nail is always very welcome, of course. The Commission also stands by Article 4 of the decision of 7 May regarding new own resources and the additional money which will be available as a result to finance research activities.

But in order to do justice to this instrument of supplementary programmes I should perhaps give a few more details. Our selection of projects, our design of the overall programme, is to a large extent determined 'from the bottom up'. In other words the specific features of the project determine its type, the way it is organized and conducted, but also the way it is financed. The Community needs to be very flexible

Narjes

and should offer as broad a range as possible of organizing and financing methods, so that each project can adopt the model best suited to itself.

These of course include supplementary programmes. But in the past their attraction has suffered in that they brought more procedural disadvantages than material advantages to those concerned. It is not impossible that this may change in time, but experience in Euratom has led to this instrument being invoked usually when it was necessary, in the absence of unanimity, to rescue programmes with the participation of fewer Member States. This in itself is not, of course, a historic recommendation, but it is not impossible that circumstances may render this instrument more useful than it is at present.

At all events this instrument must not be used to override the Community framework, to break the discipline of the outline programme which we want to see implemented and respected as our contribution to a coherent overall policy. Consequently we are of course willing to prepare an implementing directive for this Article 4, and have indeed made the suggestion ourselves. But I repeat: we should not regard this instrument as a privileged one. It is just one among many. It must be kept available as an option.

At the moment our priority must be to secure the clarity over budget policy which will give us certainly in our planning, for without this we cannot tackle any of our major projects.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

3. *New technologies*

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

- the report by Mr Brok (Doc. A 2-97/85), on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on
- the communications from the Commission on
 - technological change and social adjustment (COM (84) 6 fin.)
 - vocational training and the new information technologies
- work programme 1985-88 (COM(85) 167 fin.)
- the report by Mrs Salisch (Doc. A 2-96/85) on behalf of the Committee on Women's Rights, on the impact of microtechnology on job opportunities for women,
- the report by Mr McMahon (Doc. A 2-98/85), on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Edu-

cation, Information and Sport, on new information technologies and the school systems in the European Community — Work programme for the period 1985-87 (COM(84) 722 fin.)

- the report by Mr Linkohr (Doc. A 2-94/85), on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the establishment of a European Parliament Office for Scientific and Technological Option Assessment.

Mr Brok (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. I should like to thank the Commission for the whole series of proposals it has put forward with an eye to the consequences for the labour market, for social and other conditions of the introduction of new technologies. I wish it well in its increased efforts to translate these proposals into concrete policy.

Changes in economic conditions have meant that technical change these days proceeds less smoothly than it used to. Up to the end of the 1960s technical advances were seen above all as a means of increasing productivity and finding solutions to employment problems as well. Now, as a result of protracted, marked unemployment and job uncertainty following years of poor growth, tardy adaptation to altered circumstances, insolvencies and concrete experience of company closures, the public at large has become more aware of the problem. Technical progress, once accepted virtually without question as the driving force behind growth, is now seen by many as the cause of increasing problems on the labour market. But in order to stay competitive on this market the decision is taken to use new technical methods, offered in the form of goods and services on a scale deemed saleable. Competition at home and abroad thus determines the innovative thinking of undertakings and thus determines how far and how fast technical changes are adopted.

The labour requirement correlates closely with the ability to react to altered economic circumstances, and structural analyses in the Federal Republic of Germany have shown that 80% of job cuts have been in those branches which failed, or were unable, to adapt to new structural developments.

Job increases are seen especially in those branches where labour productivity has risen more than the average, whilst job losses are seen primarily in those branches where productivity can be said to be poor. We observe that excessive reluctance to take renewal measures in the economy has led to more negative effects. But we also observe that where renewal measures have in fact been taken, they have concentrated on methods and rationalization and not on new ideas and new products, which would certainly have had a further effect on the labour market.

But the necessary structural changes, which are fostered and not, as it is often claimed, hindered by

Brok

higher industrial wages, also mean that in the medium term the number of people employed in industry will decline, and so it is not enough just to create new jobs in the industrial manufacturing sector.

The challenge posed by these structural changes must be answered by the creation of new jobs in the services sector in the broadest sense of the term, especially since these employees, as consumers, also secure jobs in the industrial sector. In 1982 when 69% of employees in the USA were working in the services sector, the figure in my country was only 55%. And these are not just the so-called cheap 'McDonalds'-type services, but often the 'intelligent' services which, to take consultancy services as an example, today account for some 10% of the labour market in the USA.

Opposition to technological change has meant that the State today is often seen not as a creator of new jobs but as a cowardly blocker of progress which would lead to new jobs. The State can be the initiator of sensible structural change entailing job creation, rather than preventing it by subsidizing obsolete sectors, if we pursue a research policy geared to the future and make the internal market a reality. The oft-reviled technology can in many industries make it possible for repetitive and identical work sequences to be taken over by machines, thus easing the job of the people working there. The automated painting rig is better than the spray gun and the colliery heading machine is better than the pick. All those who have been seduced into hostility to technology, all those over-refined creatures who break out in a sweat at the mere thought of hard physical work of the kind which had to be done in the past, need to be asked if they are not seeing the past through rose-tinted spectacles, whilst they would prefer not to be in that kind of situation themselves.

For this reason we do not want to see technology only as a source of new problems; it can help to humanize the world of work and thus provide considerable advantages to the worker. Technical methods which overcome the problems of long distances, and the fact that the worker no longer needs to be tied to production, mean that working time can be shortened and work hours, content and rhythm can be redesigned by agreement of the tariff partners and at the same time international competitiveness can be maintained.

It must not be forgotten, however, that despite all the positive aspects of the new technologies they will certainly give rise also to new physical and mental stresses. To enable the ergonomic and human stresses caused by changes in working conditions to be made more tolerable, management circles in the economy must be familiarized with the effects of technological change on working conditions and specialists must be trained in this field. If stresses of a financial and social nature are to be avoided, we must not overlook either the effects which the technological revolution will have on social security systems, living conditions and

social contacts, health and security, wage structures, trade union contacts and the labour market. But we must also ensure that the supervision of the worker at his workplace, made possible by information technology, is in turn strictly supervised so that workers do not have a new 'big brother' watching them.

It is often claimed that the new technologies and structural change will of necessity mean the dismantling of social guarantees. I do not think this should happen. We should, on the basis of the new developments, devise other social policy structures which meet modern requirements. The principle here must be not to dismantle, but to redesign!

Let me touch on another important point. We shall only make progress in the technological revolution if we replace battle strategies with social consensus. Because of our existing structures and traditions we cannot impose innovations by force, but only with the agreement of all those involved in the economy and in society. Quite simply, the social partners must talk to each other. Community efforts towards this end include outline agreements between the tariff partners, which will provide greater worker participation in the management of company and plant affairs, implementation of our 'evergreens' — the fifth company law directive, the Vredeling directive — and agreement, also with an eye to the new technologies, on a kind of European company charter.

This seems to me the decisive prerequisite if we are to get the workers on our side and find an answer jointly with them to the industrial and technological challenges of the present day, for this cannot be done without their support — the point needed to be made quite clearly here.

Mr McMahan will be saying more about this. In my report too I have said that these developments will naturally make a significant change in the worker's suitability profile. Because of this, premature specialization of the kind encouraged by our educational systems over the last few decades is precisely the wrong thing. We need broad general education and broad basic occupational training so that workers are able to adapt to constantly changing developments on the labour market.

Information technology must be made a part of this basic training, whilst undertakings must put greater effort into further training.

Machines are there to serve Man: they are not an end in themselves. Consequently we must not fall prey to technology worship or to advocacy of the status quo, but we must promote the technical revolution following the principle that Man is more important than his machines!

(Applause)

Mrs Salisch (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. Before I come to my report as such, may I say a word of thanks to my honourable friend Mr Brok who has, I think, done an excellent job in making clear the challenges we face in the overall social background to the introduction of the new technologies.

Mr Brok, I do not wish to make problems for you, but I have to say that what you have said sounded quite different from what your colleague Mr Sälzer outlined yesterday on behalf of the Group.

I have frequently been asked in the past few days whether it was really necessary to compile a special report on the social or employment repercussions of the technological revolution for women. It was! A computer is actually something very feminine, for it does not break things up; it combines, and creates wholeness. Certainly it is also true that the new technologies, microelectronics, have done away with physical discrimination on the job market since women, thanks to these new technologies, can now do 'tough' jobs just as well as men. All that sounds fine.

I said yesterday somewhat emotionally that I found our debate on technology very dishonest. This is the trouble. This is why the Committee on Women's Rights deemed it important to contribute a report of its own to this debate, for the position of women in the labour market is bad. In relation to their share of earnings, which is only just over 37%, the 42,1% of the unemployed workforce made up by women is extremely high. Women account for over half the population of Europe, and these three figures together show very clearly the great dilemma which faces women.

I have listened attentively to Commissioner Narjes and his comments on the various reports. I have also listened very carefully to my fellow speakers. All of them speak of researcher, scientist, manager, industrialist — masculine gender. This reflects the social realities very clearly. They mean nothing by it: it is simply a question of habit, and they are not unusual in this.

Everywhere where customs are entrenched, everywhere where women ought to be involved to exert influence, they are not to be found. In view of the overall trend on the labour market this is hardly surprising. What preoccupies and worries us women so much is that the new technologies have so far been used largely for new innovative methods and not sufficiently to develop new products.

Industrial development in the European Community has really reached a watershed here: either we work, by material intervention or moral pleas, for the development of highly specialized products which have a multiplicity of uses and thus do not serve the cause of rationalization because we expect them to provide more jobs. Mr Brok has also made this point

just now in his report. But this is not yet the case, and until there are moves in this direction it is to be feared that the rationalization process will primarily affect women's jobs.

I would emphasize that the policy would be doing itself a grave disservice if it pretended to know already the exact effects which the introduction and improved application of new technologies will have. It does not know, and for this very reason it must react very sensitively to the fears and also the suggestions of the people concerned, seeking ways to allay these fears and feelings of vulnerability. It must regulate, or to put it more elegantly, codify, areas of responsibility so that anxieties can really be taken into account. There is no other way of doing it.

What then are these fears? What are women in particular afraid of? They have nothing to do with pessimism about technology or hostility to it! Our fears concern the interaction of Man and machine. History has shown us that it took a lot of effort to make this interaction favourable to Man. If women are not there to share in deciding how this interaction is to be designed and how it is to operate in Man's favour, who else will think about it, who else will fight for it? No one, as far as I can see, and this is the reason for our great fears and anxieties.

If we want to develop new technologies to develop new products, if we have the courage here in Europe to develop further an industrial culture which contains a truly human working environment, then one cannot but endorse that unconditionally. The Committee on Women's Rights reiterates very clearly in its report that it wants this. But this also means, and here I agree with Mr Brok, that we need a revision of the labour laws, we need a new law on hours of work in all the Community countries. It would be a good thing if we could at last reach a Community-wide agreement on this. If women are not to be pushed on to the fringe of the labour market, if not actually out of it altogether, we also need legislation to regulate part-time work and naturally concrete rights as regards cooperation and codetermination.

I have already talked about this, and it applies of course not only to women but to workers in general. I also agree with Mr Brok that we need a legal framework for a company charter and staff representation law at Community level.

In the Committee on Women's Rights we have raised, though not fully discussed, the whole question of decentralized work. The report, as its title suggests, is an interim report. The Committee will have to consider further this question of decentralized work, for there are widely conflicting views on the probable consequences of telematics. Some say there will be a new kind of technological home working and that this will lead to a renewed discrimination between the sexes, because when it comes the women will tend to

Salisch

be sent home with the monotonous work, although at management level too, creative work may possibly be done from home. But this, as I say, is a matter we have not yet discussed at length, and some say experience in the USA has shown that this is not a problem. What is interesting is that all large undertakings are experimenting with this kind of decentralization. We consider it important that the Commission should also be requested to fund further research work to ensure that we get more data on the subject.

As I have just said, we need to combat rationalization losses if we are to defend women's jobs. Here again I would refer back gratefully to Mr Brok's statement that creating jobs, however well we do it, will simply not be enough to ensure that everyone who wants to work actually can work. This means that we need a perceptible shortening of work hours and a different organization of work. This is essential if even greater tensions on the labour market are to be avoided.

I would remind you of the great debate during the German metalworkers' strike, when the employers' side regrettably argued that it would not create jobs, but reduce competitiveness. The very opposite thing happened; we got jobs, and I cannot see that German cars are particularly uncompetitive on world markets.

In the Committee on Women's Rights we said that we did not want to be negative in our approach to the new technologies. That is quite right, but it in no way means that we shall succumb to mindless adulation of technology either. We shall consider quietly and sensibly where the new areas for action might lie. This is easily said, it has a good political ring to it, but behind it there is a fair amount of work to be done. This will make great demands on our democracy: initially we shall try, by amicable means, to achieve greater involvement of women in all areas of new technology. But one thing must be stated unequivocally, and it will of necessity be discussed in further work on this subject by the Committee on Women's Rights: if none of this succeeds, if we do not obtain a satisfactory degree of qualified training opportunities for women, if we do not manage to promote women's professional careers via voluntary plans, when it comes to familiarization with the new technologies, then we shall have to discuss whether we do not in fact need fixed quotas. If women are not given a fair share of this research work, of product development, but also of the production or provision of services, then we must go for quotas, because otherwise we shall suffer a reversal in social terms and there will be no social changes for the better.

(Applause from the left)

Mr McMahon (S), rapporteur. — Mr President, coming as I do from Strathclyde West which contains the giant multinational IBM with 2 800 employees and also has National Semiconductors sited there, I am

very much aware of the implications and importance of new technology for the economic prosperity of my community. Indeed, in Scotland as a whole there are now more people employed in the electronics industry than there are in coalmining, shipbuilding, transport and so on. These industries, which were formerly the cornerstones of the industrial greatness of Scotland, have now been superseded by the new technological industries.

Indeed, at the moment we talk in Scotland about the new technologies as 'sunrise industry'. Unfortunately, the sun in recent weeks has set behind a cloud and many of the workers in some of these industries have been laid off, forced to take holidays — there were about 500 redundancies in National Semiconductors alone. I only hope that this is a temporary phenomenon.

It is to be hoped that the recession will pass and that what is happening in Greenock will represent a warning to other counties in the constituency. The whole work programme which the Commission put forward for 1985 to 1987 represents in many ways the best in the European tradition: not some arid false federalism but constructive cooperation and discussion across nation state borders, working through the Member State governments and especially with the local authorities. Given this kind of cooperation, the Commission has achieved a great deal in its work programme. The exchange of views has been good. There have been seminars. Youngsters from several Community countries have attended those seminars. They have met fellow Europeans from different countries. They have exchanged views and opinions and it has generally been a very salutary experience for them. I hope that this type of activity can continue.

On the work programme itself. There are four main themes in the work programme. The first one concerns introducing new technology and computers into schools. In fact the acronym is NIT. Now those of you who know the English language will be aware that a nit is a little beast which infests the head and makes it itchy and scratchy and it is a problem we have been endeavouring to root out of the educational system for a number of years with the help of our health authorities. And here we are trying to reintroduce another form of nit which, hopefully, will not make them itchy and scratchy but will make them feel better citizens and better human beings.

The training of teachers, the second theme, is of very crucial importance. I think it is fitting and proper that we should be discussing the training of teachers today, particularly when in my country the teachers in colleges are taking industrial action because they are not happy with the remuneration they are getting from the government. If we wish the people who train teachers and the teachers themselves to adopt new curricula and to be flexible and to get involved in new technology, we have got to make sure that they are ade-

McMahon

quately rewarded financially for this. In my country, for the past year now, we have had tremendous unrest in the educational system. The teaching profession has been campaigning simply for an investigation or review of salaries, not for an increase in salaries but for a review to show how poorly they are paid. I would hope that if the Commission has any power it will intercede with the British Government to ensure that the teachers are well-paid.,,,

The next aspect is the question of software and hardware systems. Here again I think the Commission has avoided the danger of being too prescriptive and saying: you will use IBM, or you will use Siemens, or you will use Philips and so on. You cannot be prescriptive and decide to adopt one system, because one of the things we know about technology is that it changes so often. A new machine can be invented and something you have used can become obsolete in a matter of days. So I think they have avoided the evils of being too prescriptive. The best way to get round this is to have cooperation and discussion and a kind of flexibility.

The final point is the question of the introduction of NITs and the impact on the education and development strategies of the country's economic and educational system. One of the problems we have had in recent years as a result of the economic policies followed in many Member States has been that education authorities have been starved of resources. If we wish our education authorities to implement changes and to bring about the sweeping introduction of new technologies in schools, then it is up to us in the Member States, both in the national parliaments and through the local authorities, to make sure that there is sufficient provision of financial assistance, equipment and materials. There must also be adequate provision for technicians and experts to come and service the machines. One of the worst things you can have is a computer that has broken down — the teacher has prepared the lesson and the machine is not working.

We had a tremendous problem in Scotland when we introduced language laboratories for the first time because some of the youngsters found out how to short-circuit them. If they were finding the lesson boring, they could pull the plug on the machine and the lesson went by the board. So I think it is important that we have the necessary technical assistance and back-up to service the new technology we have in the schools.

The report, I say, is a good one. The seminars have been very worthwhile. I discussed the matter with some of the youngsters from Scotland who went to the seminars in Italy this year. They were very impressed. The only caveat they did enter was that they already knew a lot about new technology. Perhaps in the future, when the Commission is selecting people to go on these courses, it might take what we might term virgin pupils who have very little knowledge of the

workings of new technology. I would counsel them to take that idea on board.

Basically, my committee found this a very satisfactory start by the Commission. The interesting thing about the report is that there was virtually unanimous agreement on it in the committee. There are only three amendments, and I will be indicating when we come to the vote what my attitude to them is. I can accept two of the amendments. I am not so sure about Mr Provan's amendment because it wants to create another kind of bureaucracy, a technical institute for Europe. Nevertheless, our committee was unanimously in agreement and we look forward to hearing the Commission's reply.

We also look forward with keen expectation to their proposals for Comett. This is something that we will be discussing in our committee in the weeks and months that lie ahead when we talk about the vocational training of 16 to 19-year-olds. Education does not stop with schooling. I think this is an important idea which we must ram home. Education does not stop at 16, 17 or 18, it goes on throughout life. I think it is important, when we do establish computerized systems and new technology in schools, that we make provision to allow adults and others to go back and take advantage of these schemes. One of the things that we have found recently in making use of the Social Fund in Strathclyde is that many adults have been able to take up computerized courses. Indeed, some of the redundant steelworkers from Glen Garnock are doing computerized courses. The steelworks in Glen Garnock closed on 31 March. Whether they will get a job at the end of the day remains to be seen, but at the moment they are profitably filling in their time taking computerized courses at the local college.

So we look forward, Mr President, to the Commission's reply. They have made a modest start. I think it is a very important subject. I take Mr Brok's point that we do not want to go overboard completely for computerized learning. We must remember that there are still such things as books and so on in the educational system. Indeed, I was surprised only yesterday to find that in one school in Scotland the Latin teacher is using computers in instruction. I would be very interested to find out in detail just exactly how his class are using computers.

The important final point is that it is a tool. It is an aid and we must not allow it to become our master.

(Applause)

Mr Linkohr (S), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. In 1982 the American Congress passed the Technology Assessment Act, setting up an Office of Technology Assessment in the USA. I find this so significant that I should like to read out part of what this Act says:

Linkohr

'The Congress hereby finds and declares that as technology continues to change and expand rapidly, its applications are large and growing in scale and increasingly extensive, pervasive and critical in their impact, beneficial and adverse, on the natural and social environment. Therefore it is essential that to the fullest extent possible the consequences of technological applications be anticipated, fully understood and considered in determination of public policy on existing and emerging national problems'.

With this Act the USA has shown not only that it can build better and faster computers than the Europeans, but also that it is at least trying harder than the Europeans to control and master the consequences of the new technology.

If we talk of the Americans' head start in certain areas of technology, we must also admit that they have often been quicker than the Europeans to grasp the social and cultural implications of technology. We Europeans have not only been asleep as regards technology, we have also been dreaming our time away socially and ecologically. The same is true of environmental matters, where the USA had laws to reduce vehicle exhaust emissions ten or fifteen years earlier than the European Community — but this is just by the way.

This Act provided the United States with an instrument whereby relevant areas of policy can be appraised, complex relationships analysed and presented, and consequences assessed. Anyone looking through the list of publications by the Office of Technology Assessment will be impressed.

A number of Member States and parliaments in our European Community have naturally also been impressed, as they are currently trying similar experiments or have already done so, now that the American experience has proved so very positive.

The idea now suggests itself that the European Parliament too should have a similar tool, and my special thanks are due to Mr Roelants du Vivier who has tabled a motion for a resolution calling for an office of this kind for the European Parliament. After all we in this House, through our research decisions, our budget and our resolutions, also have a share in deciding the direction which technology in Europe is to follow.

Technical progress has been advancing for centuries unopposed, virtually in a vacuum. Technology has done a lot of good, no one will deny that, and no one will seek to reverse the thrust of history. But nor can it be denied that technology today is also a cause of unease. Our technical system has become so complex that hiccups are unavoidable.

As long as improvements in technical performance automatically brought cultural and social improvements in their wake, the classic engineering concept,

the classic research concept, was totally acceptable. According to all the rules, *new* always meant *better* in the past. There seemed to be no limits to what technology might achieve. Today, as we know, this view is no longer valid. More is not necessarily better, less sometimes actually means more. Preserving nature is often better than changing it. And so, strictly speaking, every technical innovation ought really to be vetted to see if it is really desirable. But cases can also be imagined where a technical improvement is not introduced because more important considerations, such as that of increased environmental pollution, judge that it would overall represent a deterioration.

Certainly there are formidable practical and theoretical obstacles to such technology assessment on the American model. The concrete effects of a given technical measure cannot be predicted exactly, nor is there any unanimity as regards standards and the institutional and organizational decision-making procedures which should be applied. So there are certainly objective restrictions in technology assessment, and nevertheless it is indispensable.

But the call for supervision of technical innovations faces a further basic difficulty, which I should like to touch on briefly. The standards so far applied to our actions were confined to relatively limited and clearly defined social units, to nations, regions. It was possible to do this as long as the consequences of our actions taken did indeed remain within these limitations.

But difficulties are arising now within the European Community. We know from our experience here in the European Parliament that despite all our Community spirit we are divided by hereditary and historically determined cultural differences. Our priorities are often different. Environmental questions are a good example. In Germany the question of dying forests is an emotive topic, whilst in other countries the reaction is at most a shrug of the shoulders.

In highly industrialized regions of Europe technological advance sometimes causes considerable unease, whilst people in other regions would be glad to have modern machines at all. Technology is often regarded only from the standpoint of jobs, without thinking about its possible negative effects. I can understand that, but it must be recognized that we in Europe have differing standards on this.

And so we cannot simply add all these values together. We must try, within the European Community and perhaps worldwide if there are problems which have consequences worldwide, to agree on harmonized standards, and so the debate on values, standards, or as the mathematicians would say, the common system of coordinates, is extremely important and not a waste of time.

I mention this lest I give the impression that we could solve the social and ecological problems if only we set

Linkohr

up an office which would do the assessment work for us. Decisions have to be taken in Parliament, industry, in developing laboratories, and the question of who decides for whom or against whom and what is decided, remains a question of power. But in order to know what one is deciding about one needs information, and the aim of this report is to provide such additional information.

What are we suggesting? Not an office, aping what has been done in the USA. That would be illusory and naive. What our Committee suggests is a method whereby information already available within the Community should be collected, cheaply and using little manpower. We propose a small working party to collect information and delegate work.

We should like to make use of the institutions and institutes which we already have, e.g. those financed by the Community in Dublin or Berlin, the Joint Research Centre, but also the Commission's FAST group, and the universities. We want to delegate work, if we have to, and not necessarily carry out this work ourselves. Collection and comparison, then. We need a dialogue with governments and the media, with the decision-makers. The European Parliament should be a platform for such a dialogue. We therefore suggest that two, three or maybe four people should devote themselves to this problem; they should be a kind of coordinating point in Parliament, delegating work and to a limited extent controlling the resources to enable them to do this.

If we want this, and as far as I am aware there are no voices against it in Parliament, we must also be prepared to demand the necessary budget funds. We need two to four staff posts. The work required does not cost much.

But above all we need Parliament's willingness to open this dialogue. It is not enough to have a few eggheads: we too must involve ourselves in the dialogue. This is what our Committee is proposing. I believe it is practicable and feasible. After three years we ought then to consider whether in the light of our experience the next step towards fulfilment of our objectives can be completed.

(Applause)

Mr Vgenopoulos (S). — *(GR)* Mr President, every change in the field of employment and production causes profound alterations in all aspects of social life and behaviour. Closely related factors are to be found within every technical, economic and social development, although each technological change has a significant influence at every level of life. The outcome of such effects and the reaction to them have varied in different historical periods. Progressively, however, social evolution has intensified this need for equilibrium to the point that today, this unparalleled

development and an appreciation in advance of its effects are not understood. It is a fact, Mr President, that today we are on the threshold of just such a change. It is similarly evident that Europe must face up to this fact, and as quickly as possible, if it does not wish to be overtaken by events. The need for new and better products, for new and improved methods of production, for increased productivity and, lastly, for greater competitiveness from European goods, will be met by new technology. This is the primary and principal objective, namely, economic recovery.

The consolidation of social gains and the fostering of social and cultural life are of equal importance. We believe that research and technology policy should aim to achieve technological development in a way which is not socially damaging and which is sensitive to the needs of the environment.

Important demands such as the creation of new jobs and the safeguarding of those already existing, the relations between the social partners, and worker participation in decision-making centres will not lead to social unrest only if the introduction and application of the new technologies hold the improvement of working and living conditions as their main objective. If, however, such problems emerge in the technologically developed nations, then just consider how much more acutely they will affect the less advanced nations of the Community, those having traditional industries, weaker structures, a lower degree of adaptability to new demands and developments, and a less organized labour market. Inevitably, these countries will proceed towards a contraction of their economies and an intensification of their social problems.

For these reasons, we believe that eventual social unrest, particularly in the more peripheral countries, can only be avoided by balanced development between all the Member States when the possibility of participation in Community programmes occurs, or when full and equal participation in common initiatives exists. The question of the free movement of goods between Member States has repeatedly been raised in this chamber. We believe in the free movement of goods, on the condition that this is accompanied by the free circulation of technology, free access to technological developments and full exploitation of all available potential. Only in this way can the less technologically advanced Member States be given a chance to consolidate and develop their social structures.

Finally, I should like to refer to the supplementary role the European Social Fund is called on to play in the field of education and preparation of young people for these changes. This is of particular relevance to the less developed countries with traditional industrial structures, such as my country, Greece, where it is the young who are hardest hit by unemployment, with a rate of over 50%.

In conclusion, Mr President, I would like to emphasize that technological change must consider working

Vgenopoulos

people as its major priority, and should not be applied at the cost of the weaker social groups.

Mr Gaibisco (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, technological innovation is no longer a remote possibility but is already an integral part of today's world; it is present here now in our society.

Technological innovation is, therefore, an irreversible option, which has and will have effects whether we like it or not. These effects will be negative only if we are unprepared for this option and passive; they will be positive and beneficial if we choose quickly, carefully and confidently.

We who believe in the central importance of the human person do not feel threatened by the process of technological innovation as long as it aims to promote human development and to serve society.

This cultural premise is clearly set out in Mr Brok's report. Given the precarious employment situation, with some 12.5 million out of work, we must ask ourselves what the new technologies can do to help job creation. We should approach the problems in a positive way. If it is true that the processes of rationalization and innovation have sometimes led to job losses in the short term, it is equally true that this was caused not so much by modernization as by delayed modernization. This delay cuts productivity, reduces growth, destroys international competitiveness.

The figures quoted by Mr Brok are clear. Technological innovation has various effects: large-scale job losses in traditional sectors, nominal losses in the services and technical professions, in infrastructure, health and advanced electronics. We do not deny that it is market laws that determine the creation of jobs in the medium and long term. So it is clear that where delays in rationalization and modernization allowed jobs to be saved temporarily, the consequences were all the more severe and inexorable. The changing requirements of the labour market following the introduction of the new technologies call for a new vocational training policy involving close interaction between schools, universities, research and the labour market. Greater participation by workers and the two sides of industry in the process of technological innovation is vital to the achievement of real change. Use must be made of the legal instruments designed to guarantee worker participation in the definition of the production targets and processes of the share-holding company in undertakings with complex and transnational structures. The new technologies can also give rise to a reorganization of labour. By giving the repetitive and boring jobs to machines, it enables more value to be placed on intellectual work, on research, leaving the individual time for himself, free time, time for his family.

The continuing employment crisis and the new technologies must be looked at in close relation to the idea

of a wider distribution of the available labour, made possible by more intensive utilization of plant. We expect the Commission to provide a more precise evaluation of the relationship between new technologies and new distribution of labour.

The debate in this Chamber, like the symposium and the exhibitions organized in Strasbourg, demonstrate the degree of concern about the delays that have occurred in the technological sector in Europe; but they are also full of encouraging signs about the great potential that has been shown to exist in each of our countries. We hope that this Assembly, which interprets the needs and wishes of the people of Europe, will clearly show itself in favour of a genuine research and technology Community, which will also help in the political building of Europe.

Mr Turner (ED). — Mr President, first of all I wish to speak for a moment on the Linkohr report. We do need reports, we do need technical assistance, but they must be short and sharp. We do not want permanent experts because they get out-of-date. The experts we hire this year are the wrong experts next year. I believe, therefore, that the office should be composed of skeleton staff channelling requests through to outside experts. I say all this bearing in mind what we saw in the United States in the Congress Office of Technological Assessment where they have a large staff — very expensive of course — and in our case it clearly would soon get out of date, because once we had taken them on we are lumped with them for the rest of their lives and ours. That is all my personal view.

I have to confess that when my group gave further thought to the proposals in Mr Linkohr's report, which I personally like, they felt that this was rather jumping the gun on behalf of one committee and therefore I have put down some amendments which say that the thing should be sent to the Bureau to be considered. I simply have to say that my committee took a rather broader view than one might do if one simply belonged to the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, which I regret because I happen to belong to that committee.

Mrs Boserup (COM). — *(DA)* Mr President, I will use my short speaking time to present a few comments on Mrs Salisch's report on the position of women in relation to technological development.

I find the report immensely cautious and moderate; I agree much more with what Mrs Salisch says than with what she writes. I can well understand the concern for the future which becomes apparent when one reads this report, for experience has taught us that major changes in working and production methods are not implemented in order to strengthen the position of women. The impending changes may be a severe setback for us. It will not be called that, of course: it will

Boserup

be called freedom of choice and flexibility, but the reality may be short-time work for lower wages and, what is worse: work at home with a VDU on the kitchen table, the kids yelling and fighting all around you and the soup boiling over on the stove, with no contact with workmates — only the demand for a certain volume of output hanging over your head.

If women are to benefit from the development which is about to take place, we must rely on ourselves. For me it is naive to ask the Commission to help — a table surrounded by middle-aged gentlemen exercising their high offices, borne along by the existing power structures. How are they going to renew or improve the conditions of women? We have to do it ourselves. We must work for it in the questions and areas of immediate relevance to us. We must fight to ensure that half of all officially supported training places are given to women, we must protest and campaign against the domination of men in the trade unions, we must demand a representative proportion of women in the leadership of our parties. The latter is something we *can* do — I speak from personal experience here; there is no harm in it — on the contrary.

I should like to say finally that it upsets me to see that even my female communist colleagues have been obliged to give way to the extraordinarily dilletantist way we work in Parliament. There are 42 motions for amendments to the Salish report; it is absolutely meaningless. I am pleased to note that a Danish colleague of a quite different political complexion yesterday indicated that he had also discovered this. I have said it many times: we operate inefficiently. This interim report has been rushed through; it need not have been. We have large numbers of officials and plenty of staff resources to get such work done. It is not good enough. Let me therefore say that, if the women in this House could get together and demand a decent working procedure, we would have achieved something through this report.

Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L). — (NL) Mr President, I should like to say a few words on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, and I would be extremely pleased if Members were prepared to depart from their written speeches to take up the points I shall be making.

Firstly, automation is by definition to the disadvantage of human labour and jobs, but the application of information technology is absolutely essential to the preservation of jobs in traditional industries and the creation of future jobs. Those who fail to adjust in a world full of competitors are bound to go under, with all that that entails for employment. And we know from history that the consequences of a technological revolution are almost always wrongly judged by those directly involved. The Scargills of the 19th century, the Luddites, smashed the looms for fear that their labour-intensive work would become superfluous.

When Gutenberg invented the printing press, academics and priests were afraid that the general availability of books and Bibles would make them superfluous, and that was not true either — although opinions do differ on that subject.

Twenty years ago 75 million Americans had jobs. It was predicted at the time that there would be 40 million fewer jobs in 1985 as a result of automation. In fact, ladies and gentlemen, there are 30 million more. The prophets of doom had not foreseen that innovation and demand would continue due to competition, efficiency and higher productivity, not to speak of the enormous growth of the service sector. Horses can be replaced with tractors, but people are not so easily pushed aside, and the fact that, unlike horses, people have votes to cast is not the only reason for this. No, man is inventive.

Two thirds of all the various kinds of jobs being done in the industrialized world a century ago no longer exist, but three times as many people now have jobs.

The software sector employed about 900 000 people in the Community of the Twelve in 1981. It is estimated that the figure will rise to over two million by the year 2000. It is also estimated that by that time a quarter of the European labour force will be working in occupations that do not yet exist: probably in the development of new technical products and services. Machines divert employment, and new technology means a race between new and redundant employment.

And this brings me to my second point. Europe must invest a great deal more in people. We may not have raw materials, but we do have people. Europe is more dependent on imported technology than it is, say, on imported oil, and this is largely due to its lack of well trained people. None of the Eureka, Esprit or RACE programmes we have been talking about this week will do us any good unless we have in the very near future well trained workers well adapted to the new technological labour market. So there is an urgent need for partnership programmes involving industry, universities and workers, for technologically coordinated vocational training, retraining and continuing training, adult education and trainer training. Here too, ladies and gentlemen, your pennies are worth an ECU in the Community, and the Commission's Comett proposal is a major step in this direction.

Thirdly, Europe should invest in the training not only of the male section of the population but also of its women. With the proportion of older people in the population growing, we shall need girls and women able and willing to cope with the new technologies just as much as able and willing boys and men. It is therefore dangerous and short-sighted to use today's unemployment as an argument for keeping the technological door closed on women. If we want to compete, gentlemen, we shall not get by with men alone.

Larive-Groenendaal

As women occupy a subordinate position and are hardest hit by the effects of automation, positive action is needed. I therefore emphasize once again the proposal I made in October of last year, when we were discussing the recommendation on positive actions: let us combine these actions under the heading 'women and new technology'. This will create new opportunities specifically for women in new jobs, and atrophied work structures can at last be eliminated. Although we may ask what the adverse effects may be — and there will undoubtedly be some for women, and for men too, of course — we must not allow this to stop us asking what we can achieve in this way.

Fourthly, unknown, unloved: knowledge through information is a precondition for acceptance and adoption. Many of us have remained in the dark ages of the information era. What was happening, ladies and gentlemen, around the year 1970? The computer was the preserve of an élite, it was expensive, and it was complicated. Fear, horror and despair among those who had nothing to do with it. Then we had the gothic period around 1980. Barriers began to fall, the computer became cheaper and more accessible, and the light began to dawn. 'Perhaps we can come to terms with it after all,' it was thought. And now in 1985 the renaissance has come. Anyone can use a computer and experiment with it, knowledge is becoming more accessible, technology is becoming a tool. My thirteen-year-old daughter enjoys using a computer and takes it completely for granted. I really do not think that all our children can be wrong. The goal is no longer just efficiency and suitability but also the increased value of those who know how to use a computer as a support and an aid.

The Liberals therefore call for large-scale pilot projects at schools and for the general public to familiarize people with the new technology and make them aware of the advantages of the new technological renaissance. As Mr Brok has already said, technology is there for man, not the other way round. Man is the boss, not technology. Those who do not keep up with the times fall by the wayside.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, are new technologies heartless, and do they undermine human dignity? That is what we have heard in Parliament this week. Three days ago I heard on the Belgian radio the artificial voice of a twenty-year-old girl with severe motor disabilities speaking for the first time in her life with the aid of a speech-generating computer. The French Research Minister used his voice to steer a car to our own 'Europa 2000' exhibition. Microchips can help the deaf, the blind and people with other handicaps.

Ladies and gentlemen, fundamental changes have always given rise to adjustment problems and risks. There are no new technologies: history is a continuous process of self-renewing technology. The question is not therefore whether we accept new technology but how we are going to accept it. Georg Orwell's alarm-

ing vision of the future has more to do with the application of technology than technology itself, and the warning is clear: the 'big-brother society' must not be allowed to become reality. In response to the challenge of the technological age Europe must not only formulate industrial and research and innovation policies: it should also respond constructively to the social challenge thrown down by new technology. In my opinion, Mr Brok's report will be a step in the right direction, especially if a number of amendments tabled by the Liberals are adopted.

Mr Fitzgerald (RDE). — Mr President, on behalf of my group I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Brok, for the excellent presentation he has made today of his report on new technologies, and of the views of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

I am particularly pleased that the committee was able to give its support to the majority of the amendments I tabled at committee level last month. These amendments which now form part of the Brok text help to highlight, I believe, important aspects of the debate on new technologies. What we are witnessing now is a fundamental change in the nature of the international economy and society which results from the introduction and rapid development of new technologies. This change is not restricted to the workplace, it is also present in our homes.

A conference held in Ireland last December on the elderly in rural areas made it clear that technological developments offer great potential benefits in the area of emergency contact systems and the provision of low-cost security equipment for the elderly. This is an important development in new technology of which I would like the Community to take note.

The greatest scope for employment lies in the development of new technology products and services. It is forecast that by the year 2000 a quarter of the population will be employed in types of activity which do not exist at present. The Irish electronic industry has grown dramatically over the past twelve years. In 1972 the industry base was quite narrow, comprising about 20 companies employing about 5 000 people and exports from the sector amounted to £ 39 million annually. Today that industry comprises over 220 companies employing over 17 000 people — three and a half times the numbers employed 14 years ago. In 1983 output from the sector was almost £ 1 500 million of which £ 1 400 million, or 93%, was exported. In 1983 exports in the electronics sector constituted over 25% of total manufacturing exports, underlining the growth of the industry. In more developed economies with older, longer-established electronics industries, the increasing integration of electronic devices and their use in the sector has reduced the electronics production workforce.

Fitzgerald

If the European Community is to improve its competitive position and increase the prosperity of the citizens of each of its Member States, it must dramatically increase its efforts, particularly in the fields of education, vocational training and retraining to identify, prepare for and successfully meet the challenges of the new technologies including biotechnology, robotics, telecommunications research and development.

Without question, one of the most important instruments available to the Community is the European Social Fund. While welcoming the fact that training programmes, partly financed by the Social Fund in the case of young people, women and the unemployed, will in future have to offer at least 200 hours of instruction including 40 hours of training in new technologies, it must also be emphasized that the number of applications for Social Fund aid has been increasing at an enormous rate. Applications for Social Fund aid rose from 752 in 1983 to 4 785 this year. This represents an increase of more than 600%. During the same period the resources of the Social Fund increased by only 6%. In terms of the new budgetary proposals and taking into account enlargement, the resources of the Social Fund are hopelessly inadequate. The European Community must make efforts to ensure that the needs of the smaller Member States, especially those in peripheral locations such as Ireland and Greece, are catered for in the area of new technologies, particularly where the structures for science and technology have not yet reached the comprehensive and sophisticated level of the more advanced Member States. Closer links between schools and local industries including the service sector must be encouraged to enable students and teachers to develop a real understanding of the opportunities and training requirements of such concerns as well as of the associated technologies. In this respect I must pay particular tribute to Professor Wrixon of University College in my own city of Cork, for his development of the microelectronics faculty and his great contribution to technological development.

In conclusion, Mr President, the new technologies are changing our lifestyle and are present in most branches of our activities. If we are to compete successfully with the United States and Japan, the importance of having a fully trained and acceptable workforce, a workforce skilled in technical literacy, cannot be emphasized enough. New technologies are the third wave. They offer new opportunities and new hope for the handicapped. I was glad to hear Mrs Larive-Groenendaal refer to the talking car at the exhibition. I think this is a major advance. The new technologies for the handicapped have revolutionized job opportunities and have offered an opportunity for handicapped people to participate more fully in society.

(Applause)

Mr Kuijpers (ARC). — *(NL)* Mr President, my name may be difficult to pronounce, but the social challenge

thrown down by the new technologies is far more difficult than my name. In the past fairly simple electro-mechanical methods were used in traditional industrial activities. They consumed energy in large quantities, they caused a great deal of waste and pollution, and they were characterized by long assembly lines controlled by poorly trained personnel doing monotonous work, while management was highly centralized.

The application of new technologies in electronics, the computer industry, the development of space travel, biotechnology and so on is not only changing obsolete production methods but also pointing the way for a new society with its own standards. Just as coal, steel and electricity last century led to the emergence of the car industry, for example, and the introduction of numerous products and practices which in the end radically changed mankind's life style, the interplay of new technologies will result in an unprecedented flood of innovations. I therefore welcome this debate.

The simple fact that countries like Japan and the United States are building up a considerable quantitative lead over Europe in this field is indeed disturbing. Europe should be taking action to avoid missing the boat in the third industrial revolution. Happy and peaceful cooperation with the countries I have just mentioned is absolutely essential. I should like to list a number of principles which might act as a guide for the direction in which the third industrial revolution could be steered.

Firstly, Earth's biosphere is vulnerable. The more powerful our technologies become, the greater the risk that irreparable damage will be done to our planet. Every technology must therefore be examined to see what adverse effects it may have. Dangerous technologies should be revised or banned.

Secondly, technology does not need to be large-scale, costly and complicated to be called advanced.

Thirdly, we cannot fail to be concerned about the very unequal distribution of science and technology. For example, 75% of the world's population have only 3% of the scientists.

Fourthly, the new technologies should be dissociated from military force.

Fifthly, the decentralization of technologies can benefit regional development, and regional imbalances can therefore be eliminated.

Mrs Lehideux (DR). — *(FR)* The new technologies which are the central issue of this debate are a vast subject, and everyone agrees that Europe must respond to the new technological challenges by making more intensive efforts and developing major research programmes at Community level, such as Esprit, RACE, etc. There is also full agreement about the

Lehideux

analysis of the reasons for the partial backwardness of Europe compared to the United States and Japan. There are two major reasons for it: the inadequate concentration of national research projects on common European objectives and the failure to convert the research findings into marketable products and processes.

In view of these major issues and major challenges, Mrs Salisch's report on behalf of the Committee on Women's Rights calls for the adoption of positive measures to ensure that women have the same access as men to these new types of job. The report implies in nearly every line that there is no reason to expect women's employment situation to be improved by the introduction of microtechnology at the workplace. Well, we want precisely the opposite approach. The introduction of new technologies is without doubt a new chance for women. For at last millions of women will realize their hope of combining a family life and a professional career, which were difficult to reconcile in the past.

Recently, Commissioner Narjes stated: 'Mastery of technological change presupposes that entrepreneurs, workers, scientists and politicians have the motivation and desire to be active participants'. The rapporteur would like women to shy away from these challenges and this battle in fright. We, however, and especially my group, very much hope for the opposite approach.

(Protests from Mrs Salisch)

Listen Madam, you have your opinion, and I have mine. Another problem raised in Mrs Salisch's report is that of regulating the 'European social area'. The Group of the European Right and I myself are against the introduction of rules, which will accentuate the rigid aspects of the labour market. Moreover, the proposals put forward in the report specifically concern out-work and ways of making working hours more flexible. Clearly it is not in the interests of certain parties, especially the left and the unions, to lose any potential militants.

Mr Van der Waal (NI). — *(NL)* The main question in the assessment of science and technology, in our opinion, should be whether they perform a useful function for the well-being of all mankind. Developments which do not satisfy this criterion should be discouraged, changes for the better encouraged.

It is in this century that technological progress has really taken off. We have become so accustomed to these technological achievements that we need pictures and information from the developing countries to remind us of the unprecedented luxury in which we live and of the wide gap that divides us from the majority of mankind. Western prosperity is based on science and technology, the prime movers of our economy. We owe them our prosperity, our social

security systems, our high standards of public health and so on.

If we want to retain these favourable achievements for the future, we must participate in new developments, and we cannot avoid fresh challenges. In certain areas of the new technologies we cannot therefore afford to fragment our efforts and talents. We must combine them at European level. But the question remains: how can we guide these developments along acceptable channels.

Past industrial revolutions have taught us that industry and technology have not only benefited the life of the individual in society. We need only think of the environmental problems, the negative sides of the high level of consumption, the effect on interpersonal relations and above all the attitude towards the Third World countries. There is no doubt, as most reports on the subject mention, that the new technologies will cause a further very radical change throughout society. Can they be used to the benefit of mankind?

Europe can probably become more competitive and perhaps increase its prosperity and eliminate routine and soul-destroying work. All that is very important, but do we know what to do with such attendant phenomena as increasing free time, the redundancy of less skilled workers and above all the many opportunities that will come our way? Should it not be said that, although technology has done a great deal that is positive, it is also threatening to become a force that will dominate our lives and deprive our lives of personal relations? Not everything that can be done should be done.

Rejecting new technologies is no solution. It is therefore all the more important to control developments and ensure that they satisfy standards and do not overwhelm us. A case in point is what can be done in biotechnology and specifically in the field of genetic engineering. This is an aspect that Mr Brok has also discussed. How easily, for example, the protection of the embryo can be endangered and the limits set in creation exceeded in experiments with the genotype in the interests of a given individual.

We talk about the challenge of the new technologies, and rightly so. But we believe there is another, no less serious challenge. We must find ways of exercising control over technology so that it is harnessed for the good of man as God's creation. It is therefore our task to ensure that we accept the new technologies in accordance with clear standards.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PLASKOVITIS

Vice-President

Mrs Viehoff (S). — *(NL)* Mr President, a European parliamentary bureau needs to be set up in the near

Viehoff

future to assess science and technology policy if Parliament wants to remain alert at all times to divergent aspects of the development and application of science and technology, because many of these developments have direct and very incisive effects on present-day society. I do not need to quote examples: plenty have already been given during the debate. Information, as the rapporteur has rightly said, can never be given impartially, but the fact that Parliament could obtain direct access to information through a bureau of this kind and itself develop more initiatives would be a major step forward.

Innumerable well-known bodies and research institutes are working on predictions and estimates. The European parliamentary bureau would, in my opinion, have to concentrate on social forecasting because this area is not adequately covered by commercial bodies or, unfortunately, in very many cases by the authorities. Frequently, little more than a kind of cost-benefit analysis is carried out. But I believe estimates of social effects and changes to be of the utmost importance because it is after all people who have to give shape to changing society rather than the new technologies transforming people in a given way.

I agree with the rapporteur when he criticizes the forecasts for being for the most part highly statistical analyses. Human behaviour is not so easily expressed in cold figures. When faces and voices are put to figures and statistics, various aspects usually differ from the results assumed on paper.

The bureau, if established, would perform an important service if it narrowed the gap between the European Parliament and specifically the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology on the one hand and the inhabitants of the Member States on the other. But everyone must then have access to the findings, and full and honest information must be provided. That is the only way to ensure that what is developed is acceptable to the public.

Perhaps I am expecting too much of this bureau. We must after all remain realistic and appreciate that there will probably be very limited resources available for equipping it properly. Although the rapporteur proposes that many existing agencies within the present European institutional system should be involved, we must not underestimate the enormous coordination problems this would raise for the few officials to be appointed. We should not therefore expect the European parliamentary bureau to produce studies of the same quality as the American Office of Technology Assessment. But this should nevertheless be the aim, because thorough studies of the European situation will be an important aid in the development of policy. We would not need to rely on American studies if we had the knowledge in Europe. In any case, the social climate in America is different from that in Europe.

Mr President, our research budget is relatively small. And yet not inconsiderable amounts are invested in

certain developments. It is the politician's task to consider the implications of these developments for society with great care. The very modest proposal for a bureau can help in these deliberations. We cannot leave technological developments to technicians and experts. The consequences may be too serious for society, as many speakers have stressed this week.

Mrs Giannakou-Koutsikou (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, fellow Members, I would firstly like to express, on behalf of the European People's Party, my satisfaction at this part-session being principally devoted to the question of the introduction of the new technologies into our daily working lives, and also at the interim report concerning women in relation to technology, prepared by Mrs Salisch.

The use of technology will make a substantial contribution to social progress and to the improvement of working conditions as long as provision is made for balancing mechanisms between man and machine. And it is exactly in this area that women have an important part to play. There is no doubt that the application of the new technologies will result in the introduction of new working practices. Practices which do not require large numbers of staff, but specialization at a high level. This reduction in the number of posts available poses a risk first of all to the career opportunities of women, and subsequently creates social tensions.

The introduction of microelectronics should prove to have a beneficial overall effect on efficiency in all areas of production, and should avoid negative repercussions on specific social groups — groups such as women, who make up the larger percentage of those employed in inferior and less highly specialized jobs.

There is no question the initial effect of technology will be to contract the jobs market. This must be compensated by the development of new working practices and new products, and all possibilities of changing working conditions and of examining the newly-introduced practices and their effects must be seized. The overall effect of the new technology will be positive, as long as social groups such as women are not obliged to accept a diminution of their career opportunities.

The European People's Party is of the opinion that the establishment of a special investigative programme under the auspices of Commission bodies would be a positive step, a programme which would study all factors related to the consequences of introducing the various new technologies with regard to working women and to the development of new patterns of work for them.

In summing up the positive effects of microtechnology, we can say that it will entail the following: avoidance of disruption of working practices, production of goods by methods more in line with contemporary

Giannakou-Koutsikou

realities, more comprehensive planning with the aid of electronic computers, increased leisure time for working people, possibly an increase in the quality of personal employment and various other advantages.

At the same time, quite enormous initiatives and coordinated efforts are required of the social partners in order to offset the adverse effects related to the reduction in the number of job opportunities and related to the psychological aspect, which could be described as the relationship between man and machine.

Women, who constitute a social group which is particularly vulnerable to technological or economic changes, are faced with problems which they are not strong enough to overcome on their own. Society as a whole must work towards a solution which ensures equal access to technical training and information. The speed with which this same technology is developing calls for full preparation, so that significant social groups do not find themselves definitely and irreversibly held back.

Europe must respond to the challenge presented by technology. On this our group is quite certain, but the outcome would hardly satisfy our aspirations if women were not to enhance their position in the productive process along with men, within the current technological revolution.

(Applause from centre)

Mr Seligman (ED). — Mr President, I particularly agree with Mrs Larive-Groenendaal that we have to take a positive view of training for technology and to emphasize flexibility of training so that people can be retrained frequently in their life — perhaps three times — to enable them to change jobs to keep pace with the rapid advance of technology. However, every leader of a technology company that I have talked to has the same complaint: they are short of the top scientists, the really clever and innovative ones. They are also short of programmers for computers and various other levels of technological activity down the line. I think the main reason for this is in our educational programme. Children are not encouraged by teachers to go into technology and science, or engineering for that matter. It is regarded as a dead-end profession where there is no chance of getting to the top. Somehow we have got to change the attitude of teachers so that they encourage children to take up science, technology and engineering.

I have a practical proposal to make to the Commissioner, namely, that he starts a system of scholarships for young people to persuade them, instead of going into the professions and the humanities, to go into science. I am sure we miss a lot of potential top scientists because they are not encouraged to study science. This applies to girls just as much as boys. I agree with the

last speaker that we must tap that hidden resource of women who at present are not being encouraged to enter this sort of profession. Science can be the way to the top. One can absolutely, and in these days more easily, get to the top by the scientific and engineering path.

My group supports the Linkohr suggestion for a technology office. We do not think it should be a big one. We think it should be just a few people to organize the necessary scientists or experts we need for any particular occasion. I think we will probably withdraw some of our amendments to the Linkohr report.

Mrs Lemass (RDE). — Mr President, I support the report by Mrs Salisch, as adopted by the Committee on Women's Rights, and I am very pleased that a number of amendments tabled on behalf of my group were included.

We should not look upon the introduction of new technologies as an extra nail in the coffin of employment opportunities for women. New technologies will, we know, have a practical impact on jobs in the service sector, such as secretarial, retail and clerical work, positions which have traditionally been filled by women. However, there are two important points to remember here. Firstly, computer-based systems will eliminate the repetitive and monotonous aspect of those jobs. Secondly, trained personnel will be needed to operate the new installations. It is, therefore, logical that induction courses should be improved in the workplace to equip women with the necessary skills.

On the industrial side, women have benefited in numerical terms from the growth of the electronics industry. In Ireland, for example, women comprise 53% of the total electronics workforce. However, the vast majority (81%) are employed in the clerical and non-craft production area of the industry. Conversely, women are under-represented in the technical and managerial categories. While technological change may pose a challenge to the rise in female participation in the workforce, it also represents an opportunity for women to progress from low-paid sectors of employment and move into better-paid, more fulfilling jobs with better career prospects.

Among the initiatives planned to redress the numerical and occupational imbalances between the sexes are measures to ensure that 25% of course places on training schemes in electronics are allocated to women — on a pilot basis. Action is also under way in the educational system to encourage girls to broaden their subject choice and thereby their career options. Affirmative actions such as these are essential to ensure equal opportunities for all members of the workforce in the technological era.

Looking to the future, I would like to mention the increased possibilities of working from the home. This

Lemass

will certainly be on the increase as a result of document transmission techniques and computer terminals installed in the home. If proper social security arrangements are devised for this sort of work, it would be an attractive option for married women who wish to continue working.

I will conclude by saying that the introduction of new technologies calls for additional qualifications to meet future company requirements. Every Member State must look upon this progress as an opportunity of giving women a better deal in the workplace.

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of my group I should like to comment briefly on two of the reports before us, the Brok report and the Salisch report. Mr Brok has drawn up an excellent report on the social implications of the information technologies. In his report he has described the effect the new technologies are having on the structure of the labour market, on education and especially vocational training, and on the structures of the provision of information and worker participation in industry. I should like to go into this last point in somewhat greater depth because a remarkable debate has recently begun on this subject in my country.

There is no doubt that the import of new technologies may have major implications for the labour market as a whole and for individual workers in the firms concerned in particular. It may after all be necessary to let some people go and replace them with new workers. It may be necessary to change the content of work or the hours worked. Workers often have to undergo retraining or in-service training, and sometimes working conditions have to be adjusted. Mr President, it is therefore quite clear, and my group fully endorses this view, that workers and their representatives must be involved in these developments, both at high level, during the main consultations between employers' and employees' organizations, and at company level, through works councils, for example. It is therefore of the utmost importance that employees' organizations should have sufficient information. In my country employers' organizations have reacted negatively to ideas put forward by the workers for involvement in this kind of development. I regret this, and I do not consider this attitude very wise because, if we want European workers to see the import of new technologies not as a threat but as a challenge, as something that provides new opportunities for economic growth and employment, we must gain their acceptance for these developments. We will not do this by keeping doors tightly closed, which will only fuel distrust: we must open doors, and everyone must sit down at one table to assess the value of the new opportunities, in social as well as other terms.

I should now like to turn to the Salisch report, which concerns the impact of new technologies on the posi-

tion of women in employment. There is a tendency in certain women's organizations — and I detect it in the Socialist Group too — to regard new technologies principally as a threat to the position of women in employment. I would oppose so defensive an attitude tooth and nail. New technologies have brought many benefits for women in the last few decades. You need only think of today's domestic appliances and contraceptives. Why should it not be possible to regard the new information technologies as a challenge for women too? It is very important for women and girls to be involved in the education and training in these new sectors. There will be many jobs in new and innovative firms in the future, and women must play their part in these new sectors. Women must regard this trend not as a threat but as a challenge. They must adopt an active, not a defensive attitude, and Parliament must support and encourage them in this. That is the line we want to see Mrs Salisch's report taking. Only then will we be able to support it.

Mr F. Pisoni (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, honourable Members, after congratulating Mr Brok on his valuable report, may I just make a few remarks.

Progress is that which benefits man, relieves suffering, makes people less unhappy and more able and prepared to cope with life and its risks.

The technological innovations we all want and hope for and which are at the same time necessary in the present world situation must have this progress as their object. So many people are trying to correct the deviations and contradictions that can arise; few direct or try to direct research and innovation at man. It will always be difficult to gear the economic system, which is governed by its own rules, to ethical and social needs. It is easier, while giving due respect to all disciplines, to start out from man and to build the economic system on that foundation.

In more concrete terms, I think the politicians must tell the scientists to look at innovations in terms of the need to respond to man's demand for self-realization; of the need for guaranteed work for everyone, from the most able to the least able; of the need not to discount from the start marginal groups and enormous welfare measures; not to restrict solely to leisure time the chance for people to satisfy their own aspirations and affirm their own personality.

The politicians must tell the scientists to remember when they plan the future that the quantity of wealth is not directly proportional to the degree of happiness or satisfaction attained or attainable. There will always be a need for remedies and cures, but it is important not to start out from that basis. Applied research cannot ignore the fact that most of the unemployed are women.

As to the present unemployment situation and possible remedies, I want to confirm a position that has been

Pisoni

put forward several times: we must convince ourselves that just as it is necessary to redistribute resources and means of support correctly, it is also necessary to distribute labour more correctly. Too many adults perform two jobs and too many parents do many hours of overtime to support their unemployed children. That which society does not give its members as proceeds of their labour, it most often gives them in unemployment benefit or social welfare payments.

A general agreement between institutions, social security bodies, employers, unions and social forces would make it possible to achieve a more correct relationship between labour and production and between employment and social welfare benefits. Today that is but a request; tomorrow it will be forced upon us by the transformations which are about to occur in the near future.

Let the Commission study these matters in more depth and courageously lead the way all the parties concerned to hold serious talks.

Mrs Peus (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, human communication will be considerably impaired by the increasing use of computers in education. Learning and teaching by machine will mean isolation, and abstract machine thought will end up being the dominant type of thought. This is what the sceptics and those critical of introducing the new information technologies in education repeatedly maintain.

From the point of view of the European People's Party this prompts at least three observations. Educationalists are largely agreed that computer studies should be incorporated into existing subjects and should not form a new informatics subject in their own right. This is justified, *inter alia*, by the fact that computer science is becoming a basic science whose expertise and abilities can be applied to other subjects. This emphasizes the function of the computer as a tool rather than an end in itself, and premature specialization, i.e. the spawning of experts who know nothing about anything else will be avoided.

In order to ensure that schools are adequately equipped with computers — there should be only two to three pupils to one computer, and the obsolete equipment often still in use should if possible be replaced — contacts between school and economy should be greatly increased, for example via EDP 'partnerships'. Basic and further training of teachers should cover not only the technical operation of computers but also their productive use, including all the political and social consequences.

Lastly, something should be done to encourage the girls. According to surveys in the state of Rhineland-Palatinate, in coeducational schools 30% of boys but only 14% of girls choose information science studies; in single-sex (girls') schools it is quite different. In

recent months in the Federal Republic no less than 24 000 young girls have applied for 500 places on computer courses for girls only.

When these and other aspects are considered, the advantages of information science teaching outweigh the dangers. It allows the learning processes, tempo and content, to be adapted to the special needs of the individual; complex subject matter can be made clear, and both abstract thought and creativity are encouraged.

(Applause)

4. Welcome

President. — (GR) Ladies and gentlemen, it is with great pleasure that I extend a warm welcome to the delegation of members of the Australian Parliament who are in Strasbourg this week for discussions with our Delegation for relations with Australia and New Zealand.

The people of Australia and the peoples of the European Communities are bound by common cultural, linguistic and historical ties, and share a common democratic tradition. I am sure that the conversations that the Australian delegation will be having here in the European Parliament will contribute to a further strengthening of these ties and will help our Australian colleagues to develop a fuller understanding of the European Communities in general, and of our Parliament in particular.

On behalf of the entire Parliament, I wish the members of the Australian delegation a fruitful and pleasant stay in Strasbourg.

(Applause)

5. New technologies (continuation)

Mrs Daly (ED). — Mr President, I wish to direct my remarks in this debate to the Salisch report on the impact of microtechnology on job opportunities for women. My group would oppose many of the sections of this report, because we do not like its negative attitude to new technology and because of our experience of job creation for women in the United Kingdom, particularly in the field of new technology. We believe that this report could do more damage to the cause of women who are looking for employment than be helpful. It is full of political rhetoric which does nothing to help the situation of women.

In the United Kingdom in the last 30 years the number of men on the job market stayed around 15 to 16 million but the number for women has risen from 7 to 11

Daly

million. That is a huge percentage increase. New jobs have been found to meet a very large percentage of this figure. Indeed, during 1984 the number of women in full-time jobs increased by 14 000 and the number in part-time jobs by as many as 187 000 as compared with a decrease of 60 000 in the number of men with jobs. Therefore, it is not true to say that women are worse off as far as the United Kingdom is concerned.

I have read statements from some of my Socialist colleagues, suggesting that some of these part-time jobs are not real jobs. I want to ask them, as I asked them in the Women's Committee, if they have actually talked to women in part-time jobs. They suggest that they do not want the jobs, but the truth is that they do want them.

Many of your Socialist colleagues from the United Kingdom have suggested it. Just read the British newspaper *The Guardian* today. Women do want these jobs and I suggest that more women should go to the trade union meetings — with the encouragement of their male colleagues, which is not evident throughout Europe — to say what they want in these jobs and to ensure that the truth is told.

Many women want part-time jobs in preference to full-time jobs because this suits their domestic circumstances. There are other women, of course, who want full-time jobs, and it is our duty to ensure that they are given proper training to meet the requirements the new jobs that are coming in the expanding sectors associated with new technology.

I appeal to both the men and women in this House not to be hypocritical. Put in amendments that change the whole thing but not amendments that are only wishy-washy and do nothing to change the negative tone of the report. What we in this Parliament need — particularly during these two days — is a positive attitude to new technology on the part of both men and women.

(Applause)

Mr McCartin (PPE). — Mr President, first I should like to thank Mr Brok for the work he has put into his report. It is not by his choice that the report is exactly as it is. Personally, I believe there is almost too much good advice in it: it tries to incorporate everybody's good ideas, and if it had confined itself to being more concise, concentrating on just one or two aspects of the problem, perhaps it would have had a great chance of being effective.

A lot of the discussion that takes place on the whole question of the new technologies is generally negative. Particularly in this Parliament, we are far too obsessed with the negative aspects of the effects of new technology. There is a risk that we shall convince young people in the Community that technological development

is their enemy, that it is responsible for the fact that their examinations get harder all the time and that the prospects of a job after their final examinations is reduced. I do not think that this is the reason for the present unemployment situation. There is nothing new about technological development. We talk about it all the time as if there were, but it has been going on since the cotton gin was invented and the reaper and binder, indeed, since man put the first steel point on a wooden implement. The impact of change in those days was just as great as it is today. I have absolute confidence in the experience that humanity has had over the ages that it will be able to cope with what negative aspects this whole question of technological development.

This development has enabled us to have more leisure time. It has given us standards of living that we could never have dreamed of. With regard to the 12 million unemployed in Europe today, technology should not be made the scapegoat for whatever has gone wrong. The pace is so rapid that we must accept that it will not come to all industries at the same time and at the same pace. We are therefore bound to have imbalances, and it is the duty and obligation of government to minimize them. Some of the unemployment has, I think, been created by excessive interference by governments and particularly the influence of some small groups who have acquired the skills of new technologies and their success in retaining for themselves the benefits of this knowledge and skill. Governments have placed high taxes on new products, thereby making it impossible for everyone to enjoy the benefits of new technology. A number of things have happened at the same time, and rather than blaming all the unemployment on the new technologies, I think we must assess the other things that have contributed to the unemployment problem.

Mr Späth (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. An Office for Scientific and Technological Option Assessment is to be set up. At first glance one might say, what, another office? Hello Parkinson! But that is not how it is. That is not the intention, and it does not come across that way in Mr Linkohr's report.

Nevertheless I would ask for your indulgence if, in expressing my group's endorsement of Mr Linkohr's report, I add a few comments and a few provisos. Before reaching a decision of this kind we must of course consider its repercussion. We are talking here about the repercussions of technology, so we must also consider the repercussions of our own decision. We must not allow another bureaucratic body to be created here. We must aim for a small office, a small secretariat to assist Parliament and its committees. We must in future draw primarily on outside expertise for this. This is how most of the work must be done. It must on no account grow slowly into a super-authority.

We consider the review after three years, mentioned in § 9 of Mr Linkohr's report, to be very important. We

Späth

shall then see what has been achieved, how this office has developed and what staff requirements are being made of us.

Mrs Lenz (PPE), Chairman of the Committee on Women's Rights. — (DE) As the last speaker on the subject of women and the new technologies I should like, in my capacity as Committee Chairman, to add a few comments.

The various opinions we have heard today about the opportunities and risks entailed by the development of modern technology in Europe have focused repeatedly on the social problems. Our Committee seeks in its report to concentrate on one population group for which the current employment problem is really two-fold. The penetration of new technology and its effects on the rationalization of jobs is already making itself felt in a disproportionately high level of unemployment among women and girls, and there is also a shortage of training centres and occupational skills.

If we want to fight the unwelcome idea of job losses with no hope of new opportunities in the job market in a society which views occupational skills, length and material assessment of employment as pointers in the careers of most people, we really need all centres of influence, governments, tariff partners, political parties, professional associations, educationalists and schools to work together to provide women and girls with a future.

In the last few days we have also spoken of long-term opportunities and grand designs. The Committee on Women's Rights is currently focusing more on the risks than on the opportunities, for good topical reasons. We hope that the European Parliament and its Committee will make a constructive contribution in the debate which will continue for months yet. We must find out the sectors in which the new technologies offer young people and women particular chances. We call on all those responsible for determining the nature of the world of work to give us concrete examples. The European Parliament could set a special example, across frontiers, and could encourage young women to share in the thinking process so that they are not passive and unprotected, facing the world with resignation, which is always the worst thing to do.

I will conclude with an amusing futuristic anecdote. I do not, of course, imply that all progressive trade unionists and dynamic young entrepreneurs think this way. She, trade unionist and young research worker, comes home in the evening after a 5-hour day. The year 2015, let's say. He says 'Sorry, darling. Despite our remote-controlled kitchen, supper isn't ready. The computer's sending an error message. After a lot of hard thought I have worked it out: although we programmed for the triple ch method — children, chow and church — and the right recipe — steak and french fries — somewhere in the deep freeze chain a label got

switched from IP to F. The remote control system couldn't run the programme properly because the kitchen computer refused to make french fries out of Italian pasta.' To which she replies 'It sounds old fashioned, perhaps, but let's go to the nearest chippie. We'll fix the computer tomorrow!'

Despite this, the points I have made to you are extremely serious!

Mrs Salisch (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, I should like to raise a point of order. On a number of occasions the report has been referred to as my own personal report. It is the report of the Committee on Women's Rights, and I am very grateful to its Chairman, Mrs Lenz, for pointing this out. The ladies who have spoken and already left the chamber have clearly not read this report, which is not negative in the wishes it expresses, but merely negative in its interpretation of the facts, and as rapporteur I cannot let this pass. The Committee approved this report by a majority. The report now before you is the work of the Committee. I just wanted to set the record straight.

President. — (GR) Mrs Salisch, your statement has been noted.

Mr Narjes, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DE) Mr President, may I begin with a sincere thank you to the four rapporteurs for this block 3 of the debate. Thank you for your interesting, balanced, informative and stimulating reports, all of which be incorporated into our work. Perhaps I could just add that after this debate no one will be able to deny the importance of this topic of the new technologies and their consequences.

It is important for the attitudes of people towards technology, important for the acceptance of the new technologies. Lastly, and here I agree with what several speakers have said, the problem is the fears and unease which people feel — fears and unease which are born of inadequate information, inadequate availability of clear and comprehensive facts, inadequate knowledge and thus the inability to make judgements.

These fears thus constitute a challenge to all those with responsibility for education in the broadest sense, they confer a duty on those in positions of authority in all walks of life, but they also confer a duty on us politicians to reach a positive position, if we want to make our voice heard in tomorrow's world.

We also thank all those, especially Mr Brok, who have pointed to the related topic of structural change. Structural change is reflected statistically in the declining number of those employed in industry and the rise in the numbers employed in the service industries. This is a process which is subdivided into a variety of minor individual decisions. I would thus warn all those who

Narjes

peddle statistical models and draw false conclusions from them. You should think again. Our problem is not change itself, but the speed of the change in which we find ourselves and with which we are at odds.

Short product lives and swifter successions in production processes demand and impose mobility and the risks this entails. These risks will be best dealt with by those who take personal responsibility for their own occupational skills seriously and do not close their minds to the tenet that we never cease to learn. All such people are entitled to our help.

Furthermore, science has as yet no definitive opinion regarding the effects of accelerated technological change on the workplace, labour market and on employment. We should not merely brandish our American figures at each other; we should try to evaluate the American model properly and in this way make progress in our own political assessment.

I am thus very happy that Mr Brok's report, with which the Commission is largely in agreement, has been so well received by Parliament, because this shows that there is room for consensus here. We should not throw away this chance, but build on it, because the decisions we take can only find acceptance in this House and outside if they are supported by a broad consensus in this House and by the Commission.

In connection with the two reports by Messrs McMahon and Brok I would point out that the Commission's two programmes, firstly to introduce the new information technologies in schools and secondly to provide occupational training in the new information technologies, are seen by us as just the first move towards tapping human resources to deal with the technological change I have described.

To give you an overview of the scale of the task: we have assisted many multilateral experiments to introduce new technologies into education. In 1985 we stepped up to 100 the number of exchanges of teachers carrying out these experiments in the Community and shall double these numbers again in 1986.

We have arranged teaching courses on new technologies in education, in 1983 in France, in 1984 in the United Kingdom and in 1985 in Italy and Germany. In 1984 and 1985 we introduced summer courses for researchers dealing with new research technologies. In 1985 we held a European new technology week in Turin attended by 150 young people between the ages of 15 and 19.

As far as our means allow, then, we take very seriously our task of giving young people especially the chance of a life worth living in their information-dominated society. We know that all our efforts to tap these human resources must be matched by corresponding progress in the Community's industrial, innovation

and research policy, just as the success of these policies depends on the availability at all times of the requisite number of trained, or willing, employees particularly young people.

Because the Commission attaches great importance to these human resources it has also submitted the Comett programme to increase cooperation between schools and universities over training matters. This programme has been referred to on numerous occasions during the debate and we hope that it will be approved by the Council of Ministers soon.

Mrs Salisch's report on behalf of the Committee on Women's Rights discusses very comprehensively an important and often neglected aspect of the technology debate, i.e. the effects of technological progress on women, especially working women. We at the Commission are aware that there is a need at Community level for special efforts to ensure that such effects which work to the disadvantage of women are prevented even before they arise, or at any rate recognized so that measures to prevent them can be initiated.

In its 1982-85 programmes the Commission took a number of steps concerning these problems, pilot measures under the Social Fund and the Vocational Training Centre, participation in seminars and studies on the topic, and measures aimed at broadening the range of occupational choices for women and promoting at national level coordinated programmes of training and further training with special reference to the new technologies. In its resolution of 7 July 1984 on measures to counter female unemployment the Council undertook to implement training programmes in a variety of technological areas to open these professions to women.

A further Council decision of December 1984 provides for specific measures to promote training and employment of women in technology-based professions. In response to the European Parliament's resolution of January 1984 the Commission launched a number of investigations of specific aspects of the new technologies and their effects on women. Particular attention is being given to how far account needs to be taken of the new technologies and their effects on women during wage bargaining.

As you know the Commission's first action programme will be completed at the end of this year. The final report, to be completed before the end of the year, also deals with the problems of technological progress. It is already clear that technology questions will occupy a particularly significant place in the new medium-term programme too. First of all the Commission proposes to continue discussions begun under the old programme on the basis of the knowledge obtained so far. It will also continue to support and promote national programmes and concrete measures

Narjes

aimed at improving the position of women in the technical professions.

The new technologies are a challenge to the Community and to all its citizens. They represent a particular challenge as regards equality of opportunities between the sexes. As in the past the Commission will do all it can to meet this challenge.

This brings me to Mr Linkohr's report on technology assessment, a report which provides much food for thought and which reminds me personally of debates on this same topic in the *Bundestag* 10 years ago. We also looked at the US Office of Technology Assessment. We know that it has at present 150 grade A employees and a budget of over 16 million US dollars. This office does useful work, but it also has a number of weaknesses.

But I am glad that you do not want to set up a straight copy of this office. After all we cannot create a substitute legislator; what we have to do is create an institution, an office which will usefully assist the legislator in his tasks, preferably as objectively as possible and in such a way as to render his decision-making easier.

A previous Commission set itself a similar task with its 'Europe plus 30' programme, a programme which led to the establishment of the FAST Group, a group which today is no longer able, with its 20 academics, to oversee the entire field of constantly expanding knowledge and specialization. But we will gladly, and more than willingly, make the work of the FAST Group available to the competent committee so that it too can be used as a basis in the ongoing award of contracts to institutes, undertakings, consultancy firms, individual scientists and anyone else who qualifies. It will be of decisive importance to see that the small organization you are endeavouring to set up, and which has our approval, is itself staffed by top-quality people.

In concluding the overall debate I should like to thank all those who have taken part for your many suggestions and positive criticisms to us. We shall act on them. The challenge facing the Community, its Member States and all parties is, as our debate has shown, a great one, greater perhaps than many of the protagonists involved today think; it is a technical, scientific, economic and political challenge. The inescapable consequences can only be drawn at Community level. Attempts by Member States to go it alone will have no chance of definitive success. If Community action is to be meaningful, however, our ideas must come from a single mould, there must be coherence, and the Community must also be given the money it needs to tackle this task successfully to the extent that it can be tackled on a Community basis.

And so we face a winter of severe testing in the European decision-making processes. They are headed by the European Council. It has to deal with the problems

before it, and it needs by the quality of its decisions, to show itself as the driving force in Community policy and not just a registration point for differing national interests and bodits.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Mr President, I have just had the opportunity of looking through the recorded votes for yesterday as set out in the Minutes. The number of manuscript changes to the Minutes are, as far as I can ascertain, totally unprecedented. There are on every recorded vote taken yesterday an exceedingly large number of added votes.

Was the electronic voting system not working yesterday? Is that the explanation? Or was there some selective reason why the system in one part of the Chamber was not working because the additional votes, as I say, are totally unprecedented. If it was not working properly when recording roll-call votes, was it working properly when we had an electronic check? You will remember yesterday that there was some doubt expressed about the decision of the Chair in relation to electronic checks and recorded votes, particularly when there had been a quite proper and constitutional demand from my party for a roll-call vote that was not acceded to.

I have to draw the conclusion that these Minutes and the number of manuscript amendments to them do in fact challenge the integrity of yesterday's votes.

(Applause)

It challenges not only the integrity of the roll-call votes but it also challenges the integrity of the electronic checks.

Now I understand that you are already referring to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions the questions that were raised with you yesterday. You know my views on that. I hope I expressed them with cogency yesterday. But I hope that in referring this matter to the committee you will raise the whole question of these Minutes, of the inadequacy of the recorded vote system yesterday, the fact that the integrity of this House is thereby being jeopardized and the imperative need for this House to have the opportunity, when it considers the report of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, to decide, in order to maintain its integrity as far as

Tomlinson

public opinion is concerned, whether it should have the opportunity to reassess its opinion as expressed, possibly wrongly yesterday, in relation to SDI.

Mr Cryer (S). — Mr President, I rise with regard to Rule 78 because I too, like my colleague, Mr Tomlinson, have been concerned at the very large number of additions to the Minutes. Rule 78 says that:

The President may at any time decide that the voting operations indicated in Rules 76, 77 and 79 shall be carried out by means of an electronic voting system.

This, of course, is a matter of routine. However, we have, as Mr Tomlinson has pointed out, an unprecedented number of alterations in the Minutes. It is the next section that causes me concern:

Where the electronic system cannot be used for technical reasons, voting shall take place pursuant to Rule 76, 77(2) or 79.

The question arises as to what that section actually means. Clearly, this applies if the electricity is cut off and the whole of the electronic voting system cannot be used. But at what stage would you, Mr President, invoke Rules 76, 77(2) or 79 to take the vote by show of hands etc., rather than electronically? Would it be because 10 or 20 or 30 Members' votes cannot be registered? One of the things that strikes me about yesterday's Minutes is that the number of people whose machines were not working was not brought to the notice of the House. That would have been an opportunity for the House to raise the matter and say that in view of the relatively large number of people who were not able to vote electronically, a different means should be used.

The information concerning the number of machines that were not functioning may have been conveyed to you separately, Mr President, and I would be grateful to know under what circumstances you would decide under Rules 76, 77(2) or 79 to take the vote by show of hands or by standing and sitting when the system is partially broken down. It is a matter of importance particularly when you recall, Mr President, that there was a great deal of controversy yesterday about the breakdown not of the machines, but of the administration's information that a roll-call vote had been requested. It is very important that our system of voting should be seen to have integrity and quite clearly from two points of view, one, the request for a roll-call vote and, secondly, the malfunction of the electronic system, that integrity has been called into question.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, if I understood you correctly yesterday you were afraid of setting a precedent in the matter of Mr Arndt's request. These Minutes are full of precedents, which

may have horrendous consequences, and I doubt that these Minutes are legal.

Otherwise next time we are voting on the Minutes I could put in a request and add more names, in order to alter the result of the vote. I doubt that this has been done in the proper manner. It almost looks as if a whole group, propping up the bar outside, had sent in their names, and someone was kind enough to record their votes in the Minutes. I find that scandalous!

Yesterday the question arose of how long after voting ends a result can be challenged. If someone comes along after five minutes and adds his name, that is the same thing that Mr Arndt was demanding, i.e. altering the vote by review. I consider this inadmissible, and I would ask for formal clarification of whether the vote is irrevocably cast once the President announces it. I do not think it is permissible to change the vote afterwards by claiming 'my machine was not working'. That may have other consequences. It is absurd and I cannot believe it.

(Applause)

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC). — (DE) Mr President, I am astonished that our group has been added by hand here, because all of us voted from our seats, and none of us went down and gave our names afterwards. That is really very odd. We are still there in serried ranks, as if we had not been in the chamber.

All of us used our machines, and they all seemed to work. None of us went down afterwards and gave our name. So what is the idea? I find the whole thing most dubious, and heaven knows that is not my style.

Mr McMahon (S). — Mr President, on the same matter, isn't it strange that the week we are discussing new technology we cannot even get the technology of this House properly organized. We have got all these experts on the premises showing us their wares and their activities and yet in our own proceedings we can't get the thing working properly. Perhaps you should ask some of these experts to have a look at the machinery. Better still, perhaps you should take a new vote on the whole matter.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, I thank all those who have spoken and who have drawn my attention to certain details concerning the presentation of the list of those who voted. In fact I can reassure you on this matter.

In the first place, the electronic voting system is working and worked yesterday. It worked properly. What happened is that the printers on which the results of the vote and the names of those who voted are transcribed had not yet been adjusted. They are now being adjusted. A change had been made because of enlarge-

President

ment, that is to say the arrival shortly of our future Spanish and Portuguese colleagues. That is why the old electronic voting system has been replaced by a new electronic system which worked perfectly.

Once the vote has been registered there follows a 'printing' phase. This printer is being installed; it will function continually but is not yet ready for use. That is why a number of names were written by hand. It was not a matter, as certain of our colleagues claimed, of correcting the result of the vote. It was not that at all. What happened was simply that a number of names were written in by hand instead of being type-written. But this was fully in conformity with the votes cast by those concerned.

Therefore, from a technical point of view there is no problem. We have an electronic system which works. It has already been adjusted to the future membership of the House which will include 84 new Members: 60 from Spain and 24 from Portugal. The printer still has to be adjusted. We are in the process of doing this at the moment. Of course, you are quite right to say that our own technologies should be working properly when we are dealing with the new technologies. However I can inform you that they are working well.

6. *Draft general budget for 1986*

President. — The next item is the presentation by the Council of the draft general budget of the European Communities for the 1986 financial year.

I welcome Mr Juncker, President-in-Office in the Council.

(Applause)

Mr Juncker, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(FR)* Ladies and gentlemen, following a custom that has now become well-established, the President of the Budget Council has to present the broad lines of the draft budget the Council drew up at the first reading. I am especially aware of the honour which befalls me here, as this is the first time I have had the privilege of addressing you in plenary session. May I begin by saying that the mission incumbent on me, as President of the Budget Council, is one of the most delicate. For it is precisely in the budgetary field that the European Parliament has managed to acquire real prerogatives, prerogatives which have increased over the years. Invested as it is with its own powers, the budgetary domain is certainly, at the present stage of Community integration, an exception. Everyone will understand — and I am the first to stress it — why the Members of this High Assembly jealously guard these prerogatives. Here we must agree that progress has been made in that you now have the final say over more than a

quarter of total budget appropriations. If we add that you have financial autonomy over your own budget, no one could dispute that the Community budget authority is in effect made up of two branches, each with its own powers but also, need we remind you, its own responsibilities.

Given that in the final analysis budgetary matters govern the proper functioning of the Community and therefore its policies, I would like to urge you to ensure that a spirit of serenity and frank cooperation prevails at all times over our exchanges of view in the weeks and months to come. It is as a responsible politician that I will now try to present to you the Budget Council's findings at the first reading and also the main elements that form the backdrop against which you must judge the positions adopted by the Council at this stage.

You all remember how 12 months ago the Community was faced with what seemed an insoluble problem, namely the inadequacy of its resources to finance all its policies and measures. Twice, first to produce a 1984 rectifying budget, the second time to establish the 1985 draft budget, the Council had to resort to intergovernmental agreements to obtain advances paid to the Community in the form of national contributions.

I would like all of you to know how much I personally regretted at the time the fact that Member States resorted to that means of financing which, in fact, was a definite step backwards in terms of the system of own resources as a guarantee of the Community's financial autonomy. We must also pay tribute to the tenacity of the governments in general, which ensured the happy outcome of difficult negotiations.

The maximum possible rate of call-up for VAT has now been raised from 1% to 1.4%. Perhaps this increase does not correspond to the suggestions you yourselves made, but it does give the Community a breathing space, which we should make use of both to restore order to our house and to think about new policies.

Now I would like to say a few words about another problem which some of you have raised like a spectre. I am speaking of budgetary discipline. At a time when we — Council and Parliament — were engaged in delicate negotiations on the 1985 draft budget, a large number of Members of this House believed they had uncovered, in these rules on budgetary discipline, a new weapon which the Council had supposedly fashioned for itself in order to break and annihilate Parliament's budgetary prerogatives.

Since it was not possible for us to explain this matter before, can I take this opportunity to briefly remind you of the objective the Council was pursuing with these rules, and describe their effect on the course of budgetary procedure. I am particularly glad to do so,

Juncker

because I think it is clear that a responsible presidency can evade this question only at the risk of prejudicing the smooth running of the current budgetary procedure.

Mr President, I will therefore try to clarify this matter.

Basically, the mechanism of 'budgetary discipline' is designed to make the Community budget develop at a rate comparable to its gross domestic product. Having stated that objective, the Council, when it had to decide on the matter during its preparatory work for the 1986 budget, clearly indicated that discipline must not be regarded, and I quote, 'solely as a means of limiting Community expenditure, but must also serve as an instrument to ensure that more rational use is made of available resources with a view to the balanced development of the Community policies'. End of quote. Need I add that the disciplinary rules govern the behaviour of the Council only, throughout the budgetary procedure. In other words, the mechanisms to which the Council has subscribed could in no way impinge on the obligation and thus the prerogative of the Commission to present each year to the budgetary authority a preliminary draft budget which responds to all the needs of the Community.

Need I also add that Article 203 of the Treaty must continue to apply in full, that is to say, the provisions on the qualified majority required to decide on proposed modifications or amendments tabled by the Assembly at the first reading, and those on the possibilities of exceeding the maximum rate whenever the two branches of the budgetary authority so decide.

May I add that the course of the budgetary procedure is in no way affected by the introduction of the Council's new own machinery; once the Council has established the draft budget, that budget becomes the Assembly's only framework of reference until the budgetary procedure is complete.

May I also draw your attention to Rule 6(2) of these disciplinary rules which makes provision for adapting the Council's reference framework if a qualified majority of the Member States should so decide.

I wanted to give you all these clarifications, Mr President to make sure there are no doubts left in the minds of the eminent Members of this High Assembly. In so doing, I have also tried to give an idea of the spirit in which the Council could enter into talks with Parliament, in order to formulate disciplinary rules common to the two branches of the budgetary authority, in accordance with the letter Mr Poos sent to you, Mr President. Two weeks ago, when I came to the Committee on Budgets in order to describe the broad lines of the draft budget established by the Council in Luxembourg on 18 September, my sole purpose was to convince you that this draft, imperfect as it still is, even in the Council's view, formed a solid foundation

for completing this year's budgetary procedure under favourable conditions.

I laid special emphasis on the undeniable fact that the Council took serious account of the budgetary implications of the accession of two new Member States, Spain and Portugal. In so doing, the Council has tried to enable the new Member States to take part from their first year of accession in most of the Community policies. The Council stated, after the completion of its activities on 18 September, that it intended to make the following declaration — if I may quote it to you: 'The Council declares that it is prepared to reconsider the appropriations entered under the Regional Fund and the Social Fund at the second reading of the draft budget and to ensure, on that occasion, that the amounts required to respect the obligations arising out of the negotiations on the accession of the two new Member States are placed at the disposal of the countries concerned, subject to the renewal of the commitment and payment appropriations entered in favour of the Ten in the 1985 budget.'

At its meeting of 1 October 1985, the General Affairs Council reaffirmed this commitment adding, and I quote, that it was necessary 'to take into consideration the spirit which presided over the accession negotiations and to take account of the statistical estimates provided by the Commission at that time'. End of quote.

I very much hope that those of you who have had some doubts in the last few days about the Council's intentions will have taken note of the unequivocal political signal the Council has addressed to you on two occasions as regards enlargement.

As I said a moment ago, each of the branches of the budgetary authority has its own powers but also its own responsibilities. In the context of today, it is obviously wrong to believe that it is up to the Council alone to ensure adequate financing of the existing Community policies and up to Parliament alone to make the Community advance towards new horizons. You often emphasize, among your priorities, the need for more jobs and to combat hunger in the world. You even add that it is thanks to your activities that these sectors have improved as they have. Under these circumstances the Council, which, within the familiar process of interaction, is the first to act in relation to the preliminary draft budget and which must therefore decide between a large number of proposals for additional amounts, is within its rights to turn towards you and to ask you, for your part, to make an effort in assuming your responsibilities. By a complementary approach of that kind, the two branches of the budgetary authority will manage to ensure the proper functioning of the Community, especially when it is joined by two new Member States.

That is the situation facing you as regards the two major structural funds, the Regional Fund and the

Juncker

Social Fund. May I explain the reasons underlying the Council's decisions here. Traditionally, at the first reading, the Council respects — in implementation of the Treaty — the maximum rate which is established pursuant to Article 203(9) for non-obligatory expenditure. May I note in passing that some of you seem to be trying to cast doubts on the figure established by the Commission. The Council does not share these doubts and will leave it to the Commission to explain to you, if necessary, the basis of its calculations.

Here we have to come to the budgetary field where you have for years had real influence since you have genuine power over expenditure. So there are two special sectors where the two branches of the budgetary authority meet up. This year, given the special situation of the transition to a Community of 12 Member States, the Council has used all the margin resulting from the application of the maximum rate and has therefore made provision for an additional *tranche* of budget appropriations which would not otherwise exist. May I point out that this decision has no implications for the margin which is still yours.

In so doing, the Council is aware that it has but taken a first step. For the Ten it has in effect repeated in the 1986 draft budget the payment and commitment appropriations entered in the 1985 budget. It then increased the two structural funds by allocating to them all that remained within the 7.1% margin. Once again, since this was but a first step, this decision is obviously not the Council's last word. Under the rules governing us, it submits its draft and its declarations of intent. It has the right to expect you to take up a responsible position on the increase in the two structural funds. Some people have already made threats, accusing the Council of having violated legal obligations. At least that was my impression at my first meeting with the Committee on Budgets. My position is clear and unequivocal: it is not illegal to respect the maximum rate during the present phase of the budgetary procedure. It is not illegal for the President of the Council to note the absence of the qualified majority required within its institution in order to fix a new rate. It is not illegal for the Council to indicate the position it will have to take at its second reading.

Another matter to which the Council has paid much attention, and which was raised during our meeting with a delegation from your Assembly, is what the Commission has described as the weight of the past. As you have seen, that is a difficult and fairly far-reaching matter, at least it is if we think of the large amounts the Commission has proposed in its preliminary draft budget. The uncertainties and doubts at the centre of our brief exchange of views on 17 September could not be dissipated during the Council's deliberations. Convinced that this is a question we must try to resolve jointly, not only for the sake of the present budgetary procedure but also in subsequent financial years, the Council has given the presidency an exploratory mandate to analyse this question with the Com-

mission, taking account of Parliament's view. The necessary first contacts have been established. The analysis by the Council has begun. A written questionnaire will be forwarded to the Commission. As soon as it has received the replies the Commission will certainly forward to it, the Presidency will contact Mr Christodolou, the rapporteur, again, to explore possible solutions with him. As before, I very much hope the Assembly will respond to the Council's legitimate expectations and in particular to its wish for a dialogue and for cooperation. This willingness to enter into a dialogue and to cooperate are also at the basis of the draft budget, which contains a number of causes for satisfaction for both the Commission and Parliament.

As for the EAGGF/Guarantee Section, the Council has, via the amounts earmarked both for the organization of the agricultural markets and for depreciation of stocks, responded to the concerns you yourselves expressed in your resolution of 18 May 1983 on the future development of the Community and its financing. The sample applies to the entries under 'enlargement'. As before, the Council has maintained the appropriations proposed by the Commission. However, it did not consider it advisable to adopt the idea of a reserve for 'contingencies', feeling that the formation of such a budgetary reserve does not comply with sound management, a point of view you have repeatedly endorsed in the past.

As for the other part of EAGGF, the Guidance Section, the Council has entered amounts exceeding those of 1985 by 16.28% for commitment appropriations and 14.47% for payment appropriations. Here the Council wanted to take account both of the Commission's proposals relating to certain specially significant measures under the five-year financial framework which the Ecofin Council adopted in March 1985 and of the implications of enlargement for the policy of agricultural structures.

As for food aid, it must be emphasized that the Council shares your interest in the Community measures taken in this sector, on whose importance we need not dwell here. May I point out that thanks to the excellent cooperation we have established with the Commission's help, the Community has very substantially increased the aid granted this financial year to the regions struck by an exceptionally severe famine. The Council considers it essential to keep the aid at the present level. It intends, moreover, to follow developments in the food situations closely. In a declaration attached to its draft budget, it declares itself willing to review the measures it has taken in the light of any further requirements that may arise. As regards implementing the integrated Mediterranean programmes, Mr President, the Council, in accordance with the political agreement it had reached and following the adoption in record time of the implementing regulation thereto, has endorsed the Commission proposal to enter 230 m ECU in commitment appropriations.

Juncker

However, the 85 m ECU of payment appropriations reflect its conviction that these programmes will get going and be implemented more slowly than the Commission expects.

In the field of industry and energy, research and innovation, forward-looking sectors and therefore of undeniable interest to your Assembly, let me point out that the Council accepted all the Commission's proposals at first reading barring a few modifications. In so doing it ensured that programmes such as Esprit, information technology, RACE and JET can continue under good conditions. The Joint Research Centre has not suffered any severe cuts either. On the contrary, I am convinced that with the amounts allocated by the Council, the programme given to the Joint Research Centre will be able to keep to the original time schedule.

As for the Eureka project, need I remind you that we are still at the stage of defining the project and planning it for the next few years. On 22 July the Council invited the Commission to propose measures to be undertaken in a Community context to ensure the coherent and coordinated development of European technology on the basis of the Eureka project. So it would be premature to affirm that Eureka must necessarily be reflected by substantial budget entries. May I add that in this respect there is no difference of opinion between Commission and Council.

To conclude, I would like to mention the operating appropriations, in relation to the Commission and to the institutions which are often called the small institutions. Here we are on ground where, to be honest, Council and Parliament have often found themselves at loggerheads. The 1986 draft budget makes considerable progress in that respect. This year the Council, after consulting all the institutions, has managed to enter appropriations at a level which largely responds to the wishes of the administrations of these institutions. This is especially true of entries for the new staff resulting from accession, where quite honourable solutions have been found. In these conditions, you will not be able to reproach the Council again with forcing you to levy from resources deriving from your own margin in order to ensure the proper functioning of the Community institutions. I personally would be happy to find that you accept the package of our decisions in this area.

I have deliberately refrained from giving statistics or explaining on the basis of percentages and decimal points. The explanatory statement, drawn up under the responsibility of the President of the Council, will give you the statistics which support what I have said to you. I hope you will interpret this statement as evidence of the Council's desire to cooperate effectively with you and thus ensure the smooth conduct of this budgetary procedure. May I tell you that the Presidency of the Council will do its utmost to enable the Community of 12 Member States to have before it, on

1 January 1986, a balanced and complete budget, for the greater good of our Community. Mr President, at certain points in my speech I observed various signs of movement in the Chamber. May I point out to those who expressed their views in that way that I have spoken on behalf of the Council.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission.

— Mr President, the Commission's view of the Council's first reading of the draft budget can be very briefly, though extremely precisely, set out. The Council's draft leaves two major problems unsolved, the problem of financing Community enlargement and a solution to the problems resulting from burdens carried over from the past. It also leaves unanswered a series of lesser questions which I do not want to go into in detail today, though there are, for example, the questions relating to the extent of food aid, the implementation of the integrated Mediterranean programmes and a rise in appropriations for the transport sector as a result of, among other things, the recent decision by the Court of Justice.

I should like first of all to make a comment on the consequences of enlargement. It is quite simple: the 10 Member States of the Community, in entering into negotiations with Spain and Portugal on accession, contracted both political and economic obligations. In signing the treaty of accession, the Community committed itself, naturally, to honouring these obligations. In its first reading the Council has ignored these obligations, since the Commission's figure for what enlargement will cost has been reduced by no less than 700 m ECU. In the Commission's view, this constitutes an infringement of an obligation entered into, and an unreasonable way to treat the two new Member States. Permit me to add that I am, of course, well aware that the Council of Foreign Ministers subsequently adopted a declaration in which the commitment was reiterated. Declarations are worth less than figures, at least from a budgetary point of view, but the Commission regards this declaration as an assurance that, at the second reading, the Council will take decisive steps to rectify the error made at the first reading. Obviously it is also the Council's particular responsibility to correct it, since it is an agreement between the members of the Council on the one hand and the two new Member States on the other. The Commission therefore now urges the Council to draw, at the second reading, the appropriate inferences both from the conclusion of the accession negotiations and from the declaration which, on the initiative of the President of the Council was fortunately adopted at the Council meeting of 1 October.

The other important unsolved question is the matter of paying for the cost of the past. I do not mean to go into all the technicalities here — that would be completely superfluous. In fact, it is not an especially complicated matter at all. It has arisen because, in recent years, the budgetary authority has granted annual

Christophersen

increases in commitment appropriations without at the same time increasing payment appropriations to an adequate degree, with the result that large arrears of payment have now accumulated. These are the arrears which the Commission has entered in its draft, for example, in the case of the structural funds, under three headings which together comprise an extra payment appropriation of 1 400 million ECU. It is absolutely essential that the budgetary authority now acknowledge that this problem exists. I can one more reveal, as I did before in the spring, when the inter-governmental agreement was reached, that when this financial year is over we in the Community will have unpaid bills for the structural funds amounting to some 700 m ECU — obligations, in other words, which we undertook but which we are not in a position to honour, since the necessary payment appropriations have not been granted. If we are denied them once again, it will mean, for example, that the Community's structural funds cannot operate in 1986. This means, for example, if the Council's budget were to become a reality, that the Social Fund will by and large have to stop operating before we are halfway into 1986. It is therefore obvious that this is the other major problem we must solve.

Next I have a remark to make concerning the EAGGF Guarantee Section. The Council has, to our satisfaction, approved our proposal for the compulsory EAGGF expenditure. All I should like to add today is that those figures are, of course, based on the market, exchange-rate and price conditions prevailing four or five months ago. Obviously these conditions, as is always the case, have undergone certain changes since then: for example, the dollar has fallen; it is now at the level which was the assumption behind the 1986 draft budget. We cannot know what else may happen, but the Commission obviously follows developments in all these fields very closely. And they may, of course, develop in such a way in the next few months that the original figures will have to be revised. If this happens, the Commission will make savings on day-to-day administration, even if doing so may create problems. And if that is not sufficient, the Commission will, of course, submit proposals to the Council and Parliament for any necessary changes in particularly costly parts of the agricultural policy, since the Commission's aim is to respect the framework which is clearly bound up with the limitations designed to ensure the Community's freedom of economic manoeuvre.

The last matter I should like to raise today is the fact that the Commission has decided to issue a letter of amendment to the 1986 budget. This is what normally happens, and we are also doing it this year. The letter of amendment contains a single point: an increase in the estimated amount of compensation to be paid to the UK.

The background to this is that Britain, as part of the normal process of adjusting the basis of assessment for VAT for 1983 and 1984, is to pay an extra amount in

VAT in 1985; and that decision was taken in September, in other words, a long time after the Commission's draft budget was submitted. The fact that Britain will have to make an extra VAT contribution this year because the basis of assessment for VAT was set too low in the draft budget for last year means that Britain will have to be paid extra compensation in 1986. Compensation to Britain in 1986 will not, therefore, be 1 400 m ECU but 1 664 m ECU, in other words 264 m ECU more. In the current year it is 1 000 m ECU, and we now see that the Fontainebleau mechanism is beginning to exert a greater and greater influence on Community finances and on the way the burden of contributions is apportioned among the Member States.

Obviously the Commission, quite level-headedly and coolly and without letting any emotional considerations sway its judgement, has to take this into account and duly brief the budgetary authority so that we are not subsequently criticized for having concealed information important for consideration of the budget. I hope that with these few brief remarks I have set out the Commission's main points of view.

Mr Christodoulou (PPE), general rapporteur. — (GR) Mr President, in yet another year the Council has proved its unfortunate incompetence in handling Community budget matters. This may be harsh, but is not far from the truth. The procedures for the approval of the 1985 budget and recent developments concerning the 1986 budget fully justify this opinion. In 1985, the Council denied current reality, in other words, the lack of own resources, and at the same time, with Fontainebleau, is quite unjustifiably introducing a discretionary mechanism into Community affairs for treating Member States in relation to Community commitments, a mechanism which will be causing us problems for years to come. For 1986, we hoped that past experience would have had some positive results. In vain — yet again, reality has not borne out predictions. With the fanaticism of the newly-converted, the Council is to accept the principle of unilateral and arbitrary financial discipline, and will attempt to impose it even beyond the scope of our contractual obligations.

On the 18 September 1985 the Council, by special majority vote, approved a draft budget for 1986 which takes no account of the effects of increased spending from structural funds, does not accept the Commission's view that Community commitments should be met by the withdrawal of payments from previous years, and cancels the allocations for the de-stockpiling of agricultural surpluses. These are just a few of the major points, as we do not wish to enter into a detailed analysis of the draft that emerged from the first called reading, a draft which is so deficient that it could easily be construed as illegal. What we are asking the Council is whether it can reassure the European Parliament that it has taken account of the two

Christodoulou

basic structural funds covering required expenditure both for the enlargement and for past commitments? And if not, then why is it making provision for payments to settle Member States' contributions intended to meet the requirements of the 1985 budget? Are not both these obligations equally important and equally binding on the Community?

However, the Council, by trying — somewhat naively — to push the European Parliament into a dead-end, is stirring up reactions which will not be easily controllable, since we all understand that the 1986 budget, with all the particularly significant aspects it contains, will create a precedent for budgets in coming years, especially with regard to Parliamentary powers. So that the extent of the problem may be fully understood, Mr President, I would like to point out that as far as the EAGGF (?) is concerned, the totality of allocations for payments set, i.e. 1 668 million ECU, is not sufficient to meet even the past commitments, which amount to 1 675 million ECU, without beginning to consider the new requirements created during the course of 1986.

The same applies to the Social Fund. 1 447 million ECU were approved, with 1 203 million ECU required for the payment of past obligations alone. The Commissioner stated, quite correctly, that if this is maintained, the structural funds will basically not be able to operate. The Council has revealed its intentions concerning the new members and past Community commitments. Basically, it has neglected its responsibilities and transferred the burden to the Parliament, as if it were playing Russian roulette. I do not believe that the Parliament can accept the standpoint expressed by the President of the Council — a man whose good intentions are unquestionable — a standpoint according to which the draft does not take account of the effects of enlargement and that the Council is waiting until the second reading in November to introduce definite payment withdrawals. If the Council considered these withdrawals to be necessary in the first reading it should have accepted them from the beginning, as the Commission correctly proposed in its draft plan. There is however still time for the Council to rectify these mistakes, and to show, before the first reading of the draft budget in the European Parliament, that it is facing up to reality responsibly, particularly with regard to the two basic points, namely, the cost of enlargement, and obligations assumed in the past. And the Council may rest assured that if it has the courage and sense of responsibility to proceed with tackling the real roots of Community problems, it will find itself dealing with a Parliament free of petty political ambitions, with an increased sense of responsibility, and with a will to cooperate.

(Applause)

Mr Fich (S). — *(DA)* Mr President, I should like to begin by thanking the President-in-Office of the

Council for his speech. Of course it was unfortunately not the speech that the President-in-Office would have wanted to give, but the speech which had been imposed on him by a majority in the Council. I deeply deplore that. The President-in-Office of the Council also drew attention to the fact in his concluding remark. However, I cannot help pointing out in passing that the Luxembourg Presidency also voted for the draft budget which the Council adopted by a qualified majority.

So to business: the situation we are now in is one we are familiar with. In the six years I have been in Parliament it has always been the same. We have an ambitious Commission proposal and a Council which makes drastic cuts in this ambitious proposal. It is a classic situation, and we have been through it many times before.

Nevertheless I maintain that the situation this year is different to what it was in previous years. This year is the first one in which we have a budget geared to a VAT ceiling of 1.4%; it is the first time we have a budget which is to cover enlargement with the entry of two new countries and the first time we have a decision in the Council which is called budgetary discipline. All three are important new elements which make the situation this year seem to all of us different to what it has been in the past years.

I also think that a fourth element should be added, which is really the crucial one: this year for the first time the Council has sent us something which cannot really be called a draft budget. Listening to the speech of the President-in-Office of the Council and looking at what has been put before us, we have to conclude that it consists of two things: on the one hand a set of figures and on the other hand a series of declarations. That is new. It cannot really be called a proposal therefore, but rather a proposal plus a series of intentions. It could at most be called a provisional proposal from the Council of Ministers, which of course is difficult for Parliament to relate to. In accordance with the treaties, Parliament can work on the basis of the set of figures which has been presented to us, but in this case a number of additional statements are included which form no part of the procedure laid down by the treaties. This means that the entire budgetary procedure becomes virtually impossible for Parliament. How are we to deal with these statements?

Examining the content of what we have been presented with, I should like first to deal with the question of enlargement. Let me say quite plainly at the outset that the Socialist Group cannot accept a budget which only covers 10 countries. We demand that, when we conclude the procedure in December, the budget will cover 12 countries. There is no question of compromise on this question.

Mr President-in-Office, you said yourself in your presentation that what is on the table is in fact for 10

Fich

countries and that there is a residual problem, namely the two new countries. We cannot treat the two new countries in this way. I myself was in Portugal with the leadership of my group when the result of the Council's negotiations was announced and, as you have no doubt heard, the reactions in political circles in Portugal were not enthusiastic. It is not a fair way to treat the two new Member States.

What are we offering them? A series of declarations, a few speeches, but not what we actually agreed with them. The Council of Foreign Ministers can issue all the declarations it wants. What counts at the end of the day, are the figures entered in the budget. I cannot help asking the following question, Mr President-in-Office: how many Councils of Ministers are there? Is there an autonomous Council of Finance Ministers, which neither the foreign ministers nor the Heads of State or Government have the slightest control over? It is a crucial question, for we need to know how the Council of Ministers actually does its work.

I am sure that a lot more will be said on enlargement, so let me turn to another problem: the whole question of support to the developing countries. In this field too, I think there are grounds for a negative comment. It is indeed true that the Council of Ministers has included the amount that was in the 1985 budget. But we must not forget that there is something called inflation. Nor must we forget that in real terms the same figure two years running means a reduction, for example, in food aid. Even though the situation is hopefully on the mend, particularly in Africa, it has not improved to such an extent that we can already start to cut back on development aid. This is a very crucial point for the Socialist Group.

Next I should like to comment on two items of information given to us by Commissioner Christopherson today, two interesting items of information. One — if I understood it correctly — is that, if the figures for the EAGGF Guarantee Section cannot be held, proposals will be presented for amendments to the regulations so that we stay within the limits. I welcome such a proposal. I think it is the proper way to proceed and, moreover, one which the Socialist Group has advocated on a number of occasions.

With regard to the other point of information on the repayment to the United Kingdom, which is now to be increased by 264 million ECU, my spontaneous reaction is: you see, we were right! What is the situation in fact? It is that this is not the last time the repayment to the United Kingdom will be increased. We shall see it in budget after budget over the next four years. We shall see these repayments rise to over 2 000 million ECU, and that will show that the intention of the repayment to the United Kingdom, ie that the United Kingdom should enter a more favourable development trend, is not being fulfilled. Instead we shall be making higher and higher repayments to the United Kingdom year after year, and we shall be achieving exactly the

opposite of the original intention in making repayments to the United Kingdom.

Then there is the question — and here I refer back to the speech of the President-in-Office of the Council — of what I would call the sins of the past, in other words that pile of commitments entered into previously which must now be released for payment. I should like to make it quite plain at the outset that these do not consist exclusively of unpaid accounts; there are also a number of political commitments which in my opinion must be honoured. But the Socialist Group refuses to take any responsibility for this situation. When Mr Christopherson says, for example, that it is because we allowed too many commitments in relation to payments last year, he is right — but it is not our fault that the payments were too low. That is where you are wrong; the address you want is the Council of Ministers, since it is the Council of Ministers which allowed too little in payments. I think the commitment level was right, it is the payments which were too low. And there you must refer to the Council of Ministers. They are at fault, and it is they who must pick up the tab.

Finally I should like to say a few words on the legal aspect. I think it is reasonable to put the following question to the Council of Ministers: can you invoke Article 203 of the Treaty of Rome at all? Article 203 requires that we should proceed from one year's budget to the next, and that we should calculate a rate of increase. According to my reading of Article 203, this applies under equal conditions, i.e. in two comparable situations. But that is not the case when we are changing from 10 to 12 countries! The question is: is it reasonably possible to apply Article 203 when we are switching from 10 to 12 countries? In my opinion it is not. In my opinion this is a special situation. It is obvious that the figures in the Community — the gross national products — will rise about 9%, and inflation has to be added to that. So, just to maintain the present level, we would get an increase of around 16%, which is far from the rate calculated in purely mathematical terms on the basis of Article 203. I doubt, Mr President-in-Office, whether it is possible to use Article 203 in this situation.

I shall not go into the question of procedure but will merely point out that, at the present time, our group thinks it appropriate for the Presidents of the three institutions, the Council, Parliament and the Commission, to meet and discuss this situation because, for the reasons I have already stated, I find it difficult for Parliament to deal with this proposal. I formally propose on behalf of my group that the three Presidents meet and, if possible, get the Council of Ministers to put forward a proper proposal for the budget so that we know what we are dealing with.

My final comment is that this can end in many ways. I would ask the Council to look carefully at a situation in which Parliament proposes no amendments at all.

Fich

Perhaps it is just not possible to muster 218 votes for a single amendment. In this situation the Council of Ministers will be stuck with a proposal entirely of its own making, and it will get into a very serious predicament with it, which will force the Community to present a supplementary budget within a few weeks of the start of 1986. It may be an interesting situation, since Spain and Portugal will also have a vote in the debate. But I would ask the Council to reflect that this is a possible consequence of what it has put forward.

I do not want to be prophet of doom, merely to draw attention to these possibilities.

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

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Madam President, this morning I raised a point of order about yesterday's vote and the way it was recorded in the Minutes of yesterday's sitting.

(Protests from various quarters)

It is interesting to see the reactions of the parties of so-called law and order.

Madam President, I do not want to rehash the arguments that I raised this morning, but it will be quite clear from the record of this morning's discussion that I formally asked the President to refer the question of yesterday's voting to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. The President failed to respond to that request.

I ask now that the matter be referred to that committee.

President. — The President is sending you a detailed written reply.

7. *Topical and urgent debate (motions)*

President. — Pursuant to the second sub-paragraph of Rule 48(2) of the Rules of Procedure, I have received the following objections, justified and submitted in writing to the list of subjects for the topical and urgent debate scheduled for tomorrow morning.

(The President read out the objections)¹

¹ See Minutes.

I remind the House that the vote on these objections is taken without debate.

I put to the vote the objections by Mr Habsburg and 23 others seeking to enter as Point 2 the motion for a resolution by the Group of the European People's Party on the invitation from the President of the United States to seven leading industrial nations to meet him in preparation for the Geneva Summit. (Doc. B 2-1001/85).

(As the result of the vote by show of hands was doubtful and the electronic voting system was temporarily out of order, Parliament voted by sitting and standing)

President. — 98 voted in favour, 92 against. However, I shall not declare the objection approved as there is a doubt concerning the count. The machine will probably be ready in a few minutes and we shall then vote.

After the vote on the objection by the Group of the European Democratic Alliance.

Mr Sakellariou (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, in contrast to the figures you announced, I counted 92 votes for and 98 against in the first vote.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, I have been informed that it will take another hour to put the machine right. The vote on the objections to urgent procedure is therefore postponed until 6 p.m., before the secret ballot on the resolutions.

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* Madam President, I just want to raise a question of principle. I do not think we can under any circumstances vote again on a matter which has already been voted on. That is a matter of principle.

(Applause)

For my part, may I say that I did not vote for this result. Yet I think that on principle we should not hold a new vote once we have voted.

(Applause)

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, two requests have been submitted for a roll-call vote but we cannot vote because the electronic voting system is not working.

Mr Glinne (S). — *(FR)* You have just suggested that in the case of urgent debates we should vote when this is technically feasible, i.e. at 6 p.m. I am not opposed to that. But what about the deadline for tabling amendments?

President — This evening at 6 p.m., at the beginning of the vote on the resolutions, we shall also vote on the urgencies. We would lose further time if we had to take a roll-call vote without the electronic machine.

With regard to the amendments, it will be 8 p.m.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Madam President, of course you can have a roll-call vote if you wish it. We used to have it before the electronic machinery came into operation. You get someone to call the roll of Members and they say 'aye' or 'no'. Of course you can do it. Why don't you?

Mr Prag (ED). — Several points, Madam President. Firstly, to support what Mrs Veil said: once a vote has been taken, it has been taken, and it cannot be retaken. Otherwise that would be admitting the inability of your staff to count.

Secondly, there are no roll-call votes where objections are concerned. These are simply electronic votes. They are not roll-call votes. They are check votes, if you like, but there are no roll-call votes, so that problem does not arise.

Thirdly, with regard to amendments, are we sure, since we have to vote at the end of the first debate tomorrow morning, that it will be possible for us to have amendments in all languages in time for the debates tomorrow morning if the deadline for amendments is put off until 8 p.m.?

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Madam President, you are faced with technical difficulties here. It is silly to try and push the blame on to the President. I think your suggestion makes sense. The machine will be working again at 6 p.m., so let us vote again then, because an electronic check vote has been called for.

Mr Sakellariou (S). — (DE) Madam President, I should like to make sure I have understood correctly. You propose that we should vote at 6 o'clock on all the objections arising out of the topical and urgent debate?

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, objections once approved cannot be put to the vote a second time. We are dealing with a vote which we were not able to check because the staff informed me that the numbers 98 and 92 were doubtful and that a electronic check should be made. This vote will be taken at 6 p.m. together with the others.

Mr Galland (L). — (FR) Madam President, your decision not to validate the vote is clearly not unanimously supported by this Chamber. You cannot decide

like this that a vote that has been taken, that has been controlled by the officials seated behind this table, cannot be endorsed.

So I ask you to vote on whether the vote taken a moment ago should remain valid.

President. — Mr Galland, you know perfectly well that this is a matter for the Chair, and the Chair has so decided.

8. Draft general budget for 1986 (continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the presentation of the draft budget for the 1986 financial year.

Mr Pfennig (PPE). — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentleman. I am glad that we are holding a budget debate when for once so many of our members are present.

On behalf of the Christian Democratic Group in this House I would make the following comments on the Council's 1986 budget draft: I have already said on one occasion during this year's debate on the European Community's future financial regulation that no one can seriously believe that a Community of 12 Member States and more than 300 million people can manage in the long term with a budget of 32 to 35 thousand million ECU, of which a good 20 thousand million ECU are pledged to agriculture. This is not to say that we do not need 20 or so thousand million ECU for agriculture, especially once Spain and Portugal join, but my point was that this money could be put to better use, and above all I expressed doubts that our budget provided enough money to ensure economic prosperity in Europe, particularly as regards future investments.

For the finance ministers this question clearly does not exist. They have put before us a 1986 draft budget which is a list of figures, apparently unsullied by political problems. The Council dismissed as unrealistic the Commission's preliminary draft which for the first time envisaged Community spending equal to 1% of the gross domestic product of all 12 Member States. It did so despite the fact that this preliminary budget draft of the Commission bore the signature as Finance Minister of the European Community of no less than the former Danish member of the Council of Finance Ministers. By cutting back expenditure, particularly non-agricultural spending, the Council has reduced the budget to about 30 thousand million ECU, which would be insufficient even for a Community of Ten.

The reproach of unreality levelled by the Council against the original budget draft stems from the fact

that the rise in Community spending since the 1970 is supposedly too high compared to national growth rates. This is a false conclusion based only on percentage comparisons by the Council. The comparison was already wrong in past years because no account was taken of the quantitative expansion of the European Community by four Member States or of qualitative growth from new responsibilities. The Council has got so entangled in its own figures that it now takes them as gospel. The call for budgetary discipline produced a budget draft geared only to a certain percentage increase in spending which simply ignores the forthcoming expansion of the European Community on 1 January 1986 when two more Members, Spain and Portugal, will join. The Council and its draft budget are thus totally out of touch with reality. This is particularly clear on three counts:

One: spending on regional and social policy has been cut so drastically that it would not be enough even for the Community of Ten, since it has increased by less than the rate of inflation.

Two: spending on transport, energy, research and industry has simply been redistributed in comparison to last year, with a slight increase in the research sector. In other words, even in the Community of Ten there would be barely enough money to invest in future projects. Nor, for example, has the Council earmarked any Community money in its preliminary draft budget for the Eureka programme of technology research.

I ask myself this: do the finance ministers find it particularly funny or amusing that agricultural expenditure is now back to 70% of the EC budget as a result of refusing adequate funds for research, for example? Is it so very amusing, or is it perhaps a deliberate move, so that they can again complain at home that agriculture swallows up too much of the EC budget? In any case the consequence of the Council's behaviour on these two counts is that the citizens of Spain and Portugal will have to contribute 246 million ECU more to the Community budget than they get back, even though both Member States were promised financially neutral treatment during the agreed transitional phase.

I have lost count of the number of times I, or other colleagues in this House, have warned in the past that Portugal would find itself in an intolerable situation under the present financial regulation. I am somewhat saddened to see that these fears are apparently about to be realized as a result of the Council's decision.

My third illustration of how the Council has lost sight of reality with its decisions is this: as regards the problem of pre-existing commitments, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, the Council has ignored every solution put forward by the Commission. In the Commission's view the Council has simply not provided enough funds for commitments entered into to a total

of 10 300 million ECU which, as pre-existing commitments, now have to be discharged. I wonder if the Council can publicly confirm that it simply does not intend, as in the case of the costs of enlargement, to provide resources to meet these commitments under the Regional and Social Funds. If these commitments are not met the result here too will be that both problems will weigh even more heavily on us in subsequent budget years with Spain and Portugal also having to meet part of these old commitments if they are settled after expiry of the transitional period.

I believe these three examples alone are enough to show how far the Council's decisions have become detached from reality — legal reality as well. Instead of Europe taking the bull by the horns and squaring up to the future once the Community's revenues are increased, something we are happy to see, the finance ministers have resolved to approve just that amount of money which will stop the cows on the butter mountains from getting vertigo. I do not think this is good politics. The Council too ought to bear in mind that the budget is not a statistical end in itself but the quantitative expression of an underlying policy. The finance ministers at the moment clearly lack the vision to perceive this.

What is the European Parliament to do in such a situation? My honourable friend Mr Fich of the Socialist Group has indicated some possibilities. The Christian-Democratic Group has of course also thought about rejecting the budget or letting it pass, both possibilities which are similar but different in their repercussions. I think neither of these possibilities can be altogether discounted. But I would point out to the Council that there is also a third possibility. Perhaps even a fourth and fifth, which I am unaware of at the moment.

The third possibility is to reincorporate into the budget all necessary expenditure required under legal commitments or, for example, under contractual obligations towards Spain and Portugal, in other words all these legal commitments, and to identify these as specific legal commitments to be met in 1986 as an extraordinary payment for the costs of enlargement or in settlement of pre-existing commitments. We would then do the job of the Council and prepare a kind of Parliamentary letter of amendment to the Council's budget draft. All the other avenues open to us — of increasing but also of course, cutting out — we would use correctly under the powers we possess. The Council President has already agreed that we can discuss further on the upper limit following the first reading.

I know this third solution is a very difficult one, not only for the European Parliament but also for the Council, which will have to consider whether it can reject a second time what the European Parliament reinserts into the budget as a legal necessity and commitment. After the first budget reading we shall no doubt have a tripartite meeting of the Presidents of the

Pfennig

Commission, Parliament and Council, and I think that by then the Commission will have given us a reasonable financial prediction and particularly a reasonable overview of pre-existing commitments. I think we can quietly wait till then to see if the Council does anything, and if after the first reading we proceed along the avenues open to us we shall see how the Council reacts. We can always reject the budget at the second reading.

Mr Curry (ED). — Madam President, when Napoleon went to see the Pope to ask him if he would preside at his coronation — It was actually a fairly compulsory invitation, as I recall it — the Pope in response to Napoleon's first set of pleadings described him as being a tragedian and in response to his second set of pleadings told him that he was a comedian. While I do not wish to draw a comparison between the President-in-Office of the Council and Napoleon, for all reasons which may be apparent, I do feel that he has inherited something of that gentlemen's sense of theatre. But I notice that since he appeared before the Committee on Budgets he has been nobbled. In that committee the President-in-Office of the Council said: 'The debate has nothing to do with me. I was just the President. We did not like it and I just happened to be there, almost by accident, and now I am unfortunate enough to have to present it to you'. And all along the back you could see the vultures from the Member States sitting listening to what he said. They are still there sitting behind him now. They always sit at the back for obvious reasons regarding the nature of the target. Since then they have obviously been applying the thumbscrews. Today the President-in-Office of the Council said: 'I am speaking faithfully on behalf of the Council'. In fact, he finished up with a very moving remark that he was speaking on behalf of the Council, which indicated he wished that he weren't, but he was, so there we are. Then he concluded with a very passionate appeal to the Parliament to act responsibly. I thought this was one of his better moments. It is, Mr President, the first time that I have noted a brothel keeper promoting the virtues of chastity.

I would now refer to page 44, Vol. 7, of the Council explanatory statement where it says: 'The Council states that it is prepared to reconsider the appropriations entered against the Regional Fund and the Social Fund in the second reading of the draft budget and to ensure on that occasion that the amounts necessary to comply with the commitments arising out of the accession negotiations in respect of the two new Member States are made available to the countries concerned, taking into account' etc.. The President reminded us that this was not written in the language of Racine. Though I wonder whether or not it was written in the language of Molière, it is certainly sub-Shakespearian if I may say so. But, Madam President, this does call forth the question: What is the Council doing? What are the purposes of the Council? What is this contradiction which the Council has written into its own

memorandum? Either it is going to settle the problem of enlargement or it is not going to settle the problem of enlargement. If it is, why doesn't it? And if it is not going to, why has it promised to?

It is a curiously obscure piece of writing in all the known languages of the Community existing now, and no doubt in the expanded group of languages from January next year. Either there is a deliberate dereliction of duty by the Council in regard to their negotiations for Spain and Portugal — and, of course, the Council are honourable men and they would, of course, wish to remain absolutely true to the commitments which they had undertaken — or it is a deliberate manoeuvre to trap Parliament into spending its fire power on purposes which have been earmarked for it by the Council. And this corresponds, Madam President, to a constitutional ambush or a form of crude political hijack. I do not believe that the gentlemen of the Council would be so disreputable and so dishonourable as to wish to engineer either of those two events.

It may of course not be either of them, but rather a combination of both. It is both dishonest and a dereliction of duty and this I think is probably the safest conclusion. This means that we have a challenge on the external front — the external front being our commitments to the new Member States — and we have a challenge internally as far as the constitutional authority of this Parliament is concerned. I firmly believe that Parliament must not collaborate either in a dereliction of duty or by volunteering for ambush. I therefore endorse the remarks made by my colleagues and I must state that my group agrees absolutely with the views already expressed in this Parliament as to the nature of this budget. But we think it is the Council's job to sort out the Council's mess using the Council's money. This is the position that we believe we should sustain.

Incidentally I think there is a very good case to be made for the meeting of the three Presidents and for the President of Parliament to communicate with the President-in-Office of the Council and invite him to put this matter on the agenda at one of the forthcoming Council meetings since both Foreign and Finance Ministers are due to meet before the end of this month and certainly before Parliament reaches even the stage of consideration of detailed amendments in committee stage for this first reading of the budget.

I notice that the Commissioner mentioned that the EAGGF is going to be in difficulty and that he would fudge the account until the Member States had ratified the own-resources agreement. This may be putting a rather unhappy gloss on what he said but I suspect that the intent was not a million miles from that. In other words, they will play with the books until we have got his through. I would like to know from him: How serious are we? The dollar, as he said, is now at the level which he predicted. Grain prices are 5-10% down

Curry

over the last couple of months because of the effects on the market of the American export enhancement programme. In other words, we are looking at a very serious problem of farm expenditure and there does not seem to be much progress on rapid decision-making in the Council as far as agricultural measures are concerned. So it looks as if we are in serious difficulty. If this is going to be the case, then please can we have warning of it at a very early stage so that we can consider it, Mr Commissioner? I do not wish suddenly to wake up and find in my local press that there is a demand for a large amount of extra money for agricultural spending. Let us know as we go about this one, please, Mr President.

Finally, I am indebted to my colleague, Sir Fred Catherwood, who is conversant with the Holy Book. I asked him if he could find a quotation which would sum up our position and he came up with something from the Book of Proverbs: 'Let the wicked man fall into his own trap'. Madam President, I commend the Book of Proverbs to you.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

Vice-President

Mrs Barbarella (COM). — (IT) I think it would be very difficult to find a moderate response to the way in which the President of the Council presented his institution's draft budget here this morning. I would like to draw our Assembly's attention to three things the Council representative said.

At the beginning of his speech he asked us European Members of Parliament, and I am quoting verbatim, '*à veiller jalousement au respect de nos prérogatives*'. I think all of us in this Chamber can reassure him that we will respect our rights and obligations even if it is in fact that Council that prevents us from exercising our powers by the draft it has presented and which is based, as other Members have noted, on unrealistic figures, on inaccurate justifications that are both confused and ambiguous. I think perhaps we should ask the Council to respect its rights and obligations, its competences, a primary one of which is to present a realistic and serious budget, since it is, together with us, the budgetary authority.

May I point out a second matter to the Assembly, the fact that this same Council representative called, again with great emphasis, for respect of legality, with special reference to Article 203 of the Treaty and to the majority required during the budgetary procedure. I would like to say to the Council representative that it is the Council that is presenting an illegal budget. As

others have already said, I too would like to say: is it legal to fix a budget with a maximum rate of increase for 10 Member States when everyone knows that we will be 12 on 1 January? I do not think anyone can reply that the Treaty of Rome must be applied here, because may I point out to the Council that it has signed two other treaties: the treaty with Spain and the one with Portugal; and it seems to me that they are just as valid. Incidentally, may I also emphasize that the Council respected and took account of the treaty with Spain when Spain's VAT revenue was recorded in the normal way for revenue purposes. So as regards revenue, the presence of Spain is a fact, but not when it is a question of allocating the appropriate expenditure to other areas.

Allow me to point out that the entire revenue framework is one which could be regarded as highly illegal as far as VAT is concerned. The differences between the various Member States' contributions seem manifest at present and show the growing imbalance between some countries and others, between the richest and the poorest. So I think we must look at this matter, as was said this morning. Commissioner Christopherson has also drawn our attention to the increasing imbalances on the British side.

Furthermore, still on the question of legality, may I say this: is it legal to fix a maximum rate about which the Council says right now, at the first reading, that it will have to be reviewed? What is the point of all this?

There is a third thing the Council representative said this morning; he urged us to assume our responsibilities. I would urge the Council to assume its responsibilities, referring in particular, dear colleagues, to what has now become known as '*le poids du passé*'. But who is responsible for all this? Is not the Council itself responsible for this matter? Are there not obligations which the Council itself has assumed by virtue of the regulations it has adopted? And recently too. Is it not because the Council 'under-budgeted' the payments for two years that we were faced with the exhaustion of own resources and had to carry over payments that had to be made to other financial years? Is it not illegal to get to a point where — and the same Commission representative said so here — next year, if we keep to the Council's figures, the Social Fund will be totally gone? I shall not go on any longer, although there could be many more examples. I merely want to note that I do not think it is legal, and even less responsible, to emphasize the importance of food aid while at the same time cutting it drastically. Obviously I will not go into detail on all these questions now, even though it is extremely important that they are raised in the context of this draft. I think we will have the time to do so and I reserve myself the right to speak later in the procedure.

May I quickly conclude by affirming that our group finds this draft absolutely unacceptable, at least as it stands now. Returning to the point where I started, I

Barbarella

would like to say to the Council that certainly my own group, and surely the entire Assembly, will assume in full the responsibilities deriving from their competences; in any case we will avoid the traps the Council has set by presenting a draft budget which makes a correct and legal first reading of the budget virtually impossible for Parliament.

Mrs Scrivener (L). — (FR) Mr President, I will not linger over preliminaries but will come straight to the point.

We think that unfortunately the Council's attitude in its draft budget for 1986 is more like a farce than like that of a responsible institution. But it is a farce in very poor taste since, after all, it is being played out at the cost of two countries which have patiently and seriously negotiated their accession to the European Community, countries the Community wanted to have as members and which naturally did not imagine for a moment that the political agreements would not be implemented at budgetary level. This business makes a mockery of the two future Member States and of the European Parliament and in the end, which is saddest of all, of the Community as a whole.

We feel, and others have said the same, that the Council has tried to trap Parliament, which is a most disagreeable feeling, for we had imagined that after the Council's oversights in the 1985 budget the two branches of the budgetary authority would at last be able to get on with their work for 1986 harmoniously. So thank you, Mr President of the Council, for your appeals; we too, however, must address certain appeals to you. The Council, in contempt of formal undertakings it had entered into, is presenting a draft budget which cuts by about 700 million ECU the amounts corresponding to the additional expenditure for Spain and Portugal.

Throughout the last few months we have kept repeating that the accession of two Member States would have budgetary implications which the Community would have to take into account. Yet the way things are going today it looks as though the Member States had decided not to respect their political undertakings. We regret it, but we cannot share this irresponsible attitude. The position of the Liberal and Democratic Group is clear, and here we endorse what preceding speakers said: we call on the Council to review its position and to give the guarantees that are essential for the accession of these two new Member States. The Council must understand that we will not accept a truncated draft budget.

In conclusion, to be practical, we think the time has come for the Presidents of Parliament, the Council and the Commission to meet in order to seek the solution to this vital question, failing which the Community will lose much of its credibility.

Today, Mr President, we think the question of enlargement is primordial. All our efforts must be directed towards it and we cannot imagine for an instant that the Council does not share our feelings.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Pasty (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, once again, our budgetary debates are to be held in a shadow theatre. Once again the Council is presenting a truncated budget, this time by not reflecting in its budget entries all the financial consequences of enlargement and of certain decisions taken especially in relation to commitments.

This procedure is all the more unacceptable because the 1986 budget should have broken with those bad habits of the past, for at least two reasons: The first is that since this is the first budget of the Community of Twelve, it is extremely unhealthy to create from the outset a situation of conflict whose outcome could in the end be decided by the two new Member States.

The second reason is that the increase in the ceiling of own resources from VAT decided at the Fontainebleau Summit normally have made it possible to adopt a truthful and realistic budget.

Yet one cannot deny that it is nothing of the kind and that people are being taken in. Spain and Portugal have been duped by the Community's accepting them without being willing to pay the price; or you could say the citizens of the existing Community of Ten have been deceived by not being told that it is they, the farmers, the unemployed, the less-favoured regions of the present Community, who would have to bear the cost of enlargement.

Lastly, there is deception on the question of the increase of own resources, for it becomes clear today that the increase decided at Fontainebleau is not enough to enable the existing policies — and I am thinking of the common agricultural policy — to function normally and, all the more, to satisfy the European ambitions for new policies.

We are indeed facing a triple crisis: institutional crisis, financial crisis, political crisis. An institutional crisis in the decision-making process, which is reflected by a hateful climate of mutual distrust between Parliament and Council. If this unanimity rule can delay or block decisions, what can one say about the decisions taken by change majorities, which can prove inconsistent, as shown by the example of the vote at the first reading of the budget.

What are we to think of the cat and mouse game the Council is playing with Parliament to find out who will eat into the other's margin? What are we to think of the conciliation procedures between Parliament and Council which, paralysed by the most rigid formalism,

Pasty

have become totally ineffective? For conciliation implies the desire to agree on common objectives. Are the Community institutions still capable of that? Is the Community not risking dying of its institutions?

Then there is the financial crisis which the Member States are trying to camouflage. Once again we must repeat what our group has never stopped saying: Fontainebleau did not settle anything. At the very moment when it decided to raise the own resources ceiling from 1 to 1.4% from 1 January 1986, the old ceiling had already been exceeded and the new ceiling was reduced to 1.3% by the machinery set up to lighten the British budgetary contribution.

Under these conditions, to present this increase in own resources as the means of dealing with the cost of enlargement and implementing new policies is a kind of fraud. In fact, the institutional crisis and the financial crisis are but the manifestation of a profound political crisis in the Community's identity. How can people pretend they want to create the Europe of tomorrow when the most powerful Community States plan to strangle the only genuine Community policy that exists, agricultural policy, and to financially dry up the structural policies by not allocating adequate funds to the ERDF, the Social Fund and EAGGF/Guidance?

Community means solidarity. If we reject solidarity, how can we want a community. Indeed, the 1986 budget faces us with a crucial question at the moment of enlargement, that of redefining the Community's identity.

After 1 January 1986, the Community will no longer be what it was. What sort of a Community is the Council proposing, by giving it such a budget? A cramped and soulless Community, reduced to an accumulation of disunited States, in which the coalition of a circumstantial majority outvotes an equally circumstantial minority. It would be a split Community, without ambition and therefore without a future. And what sort of Community must Parliament stand for? We want a Community of progress, which must evolve if it is to exist, which must go deeper if it is to expand. It is a Community built on genuine policies, endowed with enough funds to fulfil its objectives.

Mr President, honourable Members, no doubt there will never be a more difficult budget to draw up. For its part, the EDR Group will under no circumstances resign itself to accepting the unacceptable.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Van der Lek (ARC). — *(NL)* Mr President, the Council has, as many Members have said, created an absurd situation.

We do not agree with the Commission's budgetary proposals in many respects, as we have made clear in

past budget debates. Everyone knows what we think of the Community and the kind of policy it is pursuing at present, and we would have proposed drastic changes to the Commission's preliminary draft. But what is happening now is that the Council has lopped off bits in a completely arbitrary way and is telling this Parliament it must adopt a sensible and restrained attitude and obviously cannot exceed its famous 7.1% margin. The Council has thus rendered Parliament inactive. This is absurd. Now we cannot even discuss policy in this Community with the Council and Commission in a budget debate. That is completely unacceptable, of course.

Mr President, I agree with all those who say it is an insult to Spain and Portugal that this budget takes absolutely no account of their accession. As you know, we had grave doubts about the accession of these two countries, not on any personal grounds, but because we still wonder if it will improve the lot of their citizens or put them in a far worse position in many respects. All the Council has done is once again emphasize its concern about what will happen to the people in these countries, because it is not even making resources available, particularly for social and regional policies in these countries. What is more, the resources earmarked for these policies in the rest of the Community are completely inadequate.

Mrs Scrivener said that the Council is making the Community and thus the whole idea of European unity look ridiculous. We do the same here sometimes, because we have great difficulty over the form which most Members believe this unity should take. What we think is that the budget now before us perhaps reveals a great deal of what the Community is really all about. After all, the governments which have together taken this decision, and I include my own government, are making it abundantly clear that they are only interested in the advantages of a free market, in opportunities for high finance, in talking to each other about policy, the armaments industry, sabre-rattling and increasing their power.

There is a great deal of talk about a people's Europe, Mr President, but what account is taken of the people in a budget like this, which makes a mockery of the European idea? There is almost nothing in it for a social policy, as I have already said. There is nothing at all in it for a new policy to meet regional needs. The budget makes no mention of weak areas. The Community should be able to play a part in saving the environment, if there is anything left to save, but not one penny has been set aside for a new policy.

If any budget clearly reveals what fascinates the governments of the Community countries — technology, production, competition with Japan and the United States, high-tech methods that make people even more dependent than they already are — then it is surely this one. We shall join in any action taken by this Parliament that enables us to have a genuine discussion on

Van der Lek

the budget, by which I mean a discussion on future policy. And if it also proves necessary to reject the budget in its present form and say we cannot do anything with it, we shall not stand in Parliament's way.

Mr d'Ormesson (DR). — (FR) Mr President, the confusion in our minds here simply reflects the uncertainty in the Council of Ministers. I must say that listening this morning to the President-in-Office of the Council himself speaking of uncertainties, how could we not feel doubt and confusion?

The reading of the draft budget had already plunged my group into doubt and confusion. But after hearing the courageous statement by the Vice-President of the Commission, followed by our rapporteur, this confusion and doubt have turned to anguish. It is quite clear that the cost of enlargement was not taken into account. But scarcely has Spain signed its accession to the Treaty of Rome before it already questions any contribution to the 1986 budget. The truth is that the very basis of the Treaty of Rome and the future of the Community are at stake. I would not like to see the Fontainebleau agreements, whose weaknesses become more apparent and serious every day, become the prelude to saying farewell to one type of Community, the Community of solidarity of which Mr Pasty just spoke, based on a common agricultural policy.

I also think the heart of the debate lies elsewhere. The heart of the matter is that this Parliament must have the courage to pose the problem of a different kind of Community own resources. It is not true that we can envisage the future by increasing the VAT rate a bit more, every year, when possible. That is not how you will breathe life into the Community budget. It is by posing the problem of the criteria of the Community's own resources in order to create a better balance between the contributions of each Member State. That is why I had the honour to propose, on behalf of my group, the creation of the criterion of agricultural wealth and of industrial wealth, to determine new resources for our budget.

If we do not have the courage to go to the heart of the problem, to create new resources for the Community budget, we shall drag on year after year carrying what is called — wrongly — the weight of the past, which is in fact the acknowledgement of our debts. Ladies and gentlemen, faced with this draft budget which my group obviously will not accept, which it rejects with all the strength of its European conviction, I think the moment has come for us to talk together to find out whether we want to continue our advance towards European union. To do so we must create resources which will enable us to face the future.

Mr Cot (S), Chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (FR) Mr President, we could have expected some improvement in the situation after the budgetary ups

and downs of last year, thanks to the implementation of the Fontainebleau agreement, the decision on new own resources, the successful outcome of the negotiations on the accession of Spain and Portugal and, lastly, the talent and goodwill of the Luxembourg presidency, to which I am happy to pay tribute. All that was not enough. The Council has refused to assume its budgetary responsibilities and to forward a complete draft budget to us at the first reading. What we have is more of an outline, a sort of poetic sketch instead of precise figures, columns of figures on the basis of which Parliament can propose amendments. We are faced with sibylline phrases, corrected by one Council after another, which are to serve us as directives.

Surely you agree, Mr President, that it is a strange call for dialogue that begins with silence on the crux of the matter and asks us to speak.

I think we should refer back to the provisions of the Treaty. Article 199 provides that the expenditure shall be shown in the budget. Article 203 (10) provides that each institution shall exercise the powers conferred upon it by this article, with due regard for the provisions of this Treaty and for acts adopted in accordance therewith.

So it is rather confusing to read that the Council itself publicly declares itself prepared to reconsider the appropriations entered under the ERDF or the European Social Fund at the second reading. All in all, and to be brief, I would say that it looks as though budgetary discipline is confined to what the Council gives up at the first reading of the budget. We have to reconcile ourselves to that situation.

For in its draft the Council is refusing to take account of what the Commission has called the weight of the past, preferring to give its president a vague mandate. It refuses to enter the cost of enlargement on the balance sheet, as it should have done at the first reading.

The question is, what does the Council expect from Parliament. Does it expect Parliament to use its margin — 217 million ECU — to make up the Council's commissions? We are not talking of the same kind of orders of magnitude, since the Commission estimated the cost of enlargement at about 733 million ECU more than is entered in the draft budget, of which 427 million ECU for the Social and Regional Funds alone. As for absorbing the imbalance between payment and commitment appropriations, it would require about 800 million ECU this year to try to do that.

So by its silences the Council is inviting us to commit an unlawful act in response to its own irresponsibility, to go far beyond the maximum rate established by the Commission to enter the appropriations it has omitted, but all this without a chance of the dialogue which the two readings by the two branches of the budgetary authority are supposed to ensure. I do not in fact

Cot

know whether I ought to thank the Council for its challenge to our sense of responsibility. But I would like to urge it not to presume on our naivety. For if Parliament proceeded the way the Council seems to be trying to persuade it do at the second reading, the Council would find itself in the position of actually adopting the budget on the basis of the new maximum rate it will have chosen by a qualified majority. A first dictated reading, a second reading devoid of any meaning, what a strange dialogue, Mr President. Even if the budgetary procedures of preceding years have often been difficult, I for my part cannot see any precedent for such an obvious attempt to amputate Parliament's budgetary powers and we do not intend to allow the 1986 budgetary procedure to constitute such a precedent. We fully intend, within the confusion referred to a while ago, to preserve our Assembly's budgetary powers. So you will understand, Mr President, that I cannot blame those Members who considered rejecting the budget at the first reading, or those who refuse to follow the path you have traced for us with a lot of talent and a touch of perfidy, if I may call it that. For we must choose one thing or the other: either we keep to the system of a maximum rate, and even before the first reading you must make your position quite clear. Or we dismiss this system as inapplicable under present conditions, especially in view of enlargement. Then we have to know what these considerations are. In either case, we cannot be content merely with declarations of intent set out in the draft budget. In either case we find it hard to be satisfied merely with the personal commitment which you expressed here, Mr President, with a great deal of faith and courage. And once again I want to thank you for all you are doing to try to get us out of this impasse. I would say however that we have now reached the stage where we need guarantees that can be measured, regarding the conditions under which you envisage the financing of enlargement and of what the Commission has rather unfortunately termed the 'weight of the past', which I would prefer to call the balance between commitment and payment appropriations. Without these guarantees before the first reading, the 1986 budget that we adopt could not in my view be more than a chancy and, no doubt, provisional budget. I think the time that remains until the first reading will enable us to obtain the necessary assurance to restore to this budget debate the harmony it lacks today.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

(The sitting was suspended at 4.05 p.m. and resumed at 4.30 p.m.)¹

¹ Membership of Parliament: see Minutes.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

9. *Question Time (continuation)*

President. — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. B 2-960/85).

We begin with questions to the Council.

Question No 62, by Mr Adamou (H-361/85):

Subject: Deprivation of the right to work in the FRG

The 'Berufsverbot' or prohibition on working and dismissal of workers from their jobs because of their political opinions has for 13 years remained a very important feature of political life in the FRG. According to figures supplied by the trade unions in that country, since this law 'prohibiting the exercise of a profession' (28 January 1972) was first applied, 6800 people have been turned out of their jobs. These include teachers of various grades, post office employees, etc., on charges of having signed an appeal against war and in favour of peace, of being members of the German CP, of having Communist friends, of being on local peace movement committees, etc. A typical case is that of the teacher Ulrich Volz, who is being threatened with dismissal because he belongs to a peace organization. These types of persecution are in flagrant violation both of Article 48 of the UN's Declaration of Human Rights and of the spirit of the European Convention on Human Rights.

What steps will the Council take to put a stop to these cases of persecution in a Community Member State, trampling as they do on the first human right — the right to work — as well as freedom of expression and the citizens' right to form associations?

Mr Goebbels, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) I should first like to apologize for the slight delay, but I have just received a delegation from the national people's assembly of the Republic of China and I was somewhat delayed. Please excuse me.

As regards the question put by the honourable Member, I have to point out that it is outside the Council's sphere of responsibility. This attitude on the part of the Council is justified by the fact that the question relates to national legislation concerning the national civil service, an area which is not covered by the Treaty.

I do not wish to give my personal views on the question raised by the honourable Member, and indeed I

Goebbels

am not allowed to do so, but I would like to say that in no country of the world is there a right to public office. For example, I have never yet met a civil servant in a Communist country who has been opposed to his regime.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) The first thing I want to say is that in 1978 the state government of Bavaria dismissed Mr Gerhard Hoff, a teacher, despite his unimpeachable professional qualifications, because he was elected as president of the German Peace Union, and because he is a fighter for peace. His second appeal against this injustice is indeed being heard today in Munich. I wish to express my solidarity with him.

I would also like to put a supplementary question to the President of the Council. He has said that the institutions of the Community are frequently, and successfully, engaged against violations of human rights in various countries outside the Community. If the enforcement of the laws of a Member State is, as the President has said, a matter for the competent authorities in that country, then by what right does the Community campaign against human rights violations in third countries — particularly when human rights are viciously abused in Member States, while the Community behaves like Pontius Pilate?

The President also said that no non-communist officials are appointed in communist countries. This is unacceptable and inaccurate, the President ought to have taken greater care in his statement.

My question is, then, as follows: since the Community tolerates human rights abuses in its Member States, by what right, on what moral basis, does it condemn violations of human rights in other countries outside the Community?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) The honourable Member should first tell me where in the Community there is violation of human rights. Personally I do not see any. On the other hand I respect his opinion. I hope that he also respects my reply.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Very briefly, I would like to ask the President-in-Office of the Council if he has ever travelled in Ireland, or in the Federal Republic of Germany, or in Great Britain, not to mention other Community countries where his doubts concerning human rights violations could be put right.

The question I would like to put to the President-in-Office of the Council is as follows: does he believe it to be reasonable for the Community to maintain a continuous activity — which I am not at this point criticizing — with regard to violations of human rights in non-Community countries whether they be in Latin America, Asia or Africa; or whether they are socialist

countries or developing nations of the Third World while at the same time the Community claims that the violation of human rights in Member States is a matter for their internal systems of justice, and fails to adopt any meaningful position on the subject?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) Firstly, I do not see any violation of human rights in Europe. The honourable Member has named some countries for me: the Federal Republic of Germany, Great Britain, Ireland. I have travelled in all those countries. I have travelled freely in them. In all those countries I found that everyone has the right to express his political opinion, which is not the case in many other countries of the world, and I believe that this Parliament is fully entitled to intervene to defend human rights anywhere whatever the regime, but I really do not see that there is any violation of human rights here, in Community Europe.

President. — Question No 63, by Mrs Chouraqui (H-364/85).

Subject: Conference to assess the decade of women organized by the United Nations in Nairobi in July 1985:

The Council has announced its intention of attending the Conference to assess the decade of women that the United Nations will be holding in Nairobi in July 1985. What is its view of the role played by the European Community during this decade and what progress would it like to see achieved during the next decade?

Mr Goebbels, President-in-Office of the Council — (FR) The Council takes a positive view of the role played by the Community over the last 10 years in female emancipation, as described by the Community's representative in his speech in Nairobi at the end of July.

Within the Community the progressive establishment of equal treatment for men and women has been a major concern. Equality in pay, employment, and social security systems has been achieved at the legal level and a programme of parallel measures has been implemented with a view to promoting equal opportunities in practice.

In addition the Community has paid particular attention to questions of health, education and training of women. It has always been sensitive to the problems of the most vulnerable groups such as immigrant women and unemployed women.

But the Community has also made an important contribution towards systematically improving the position of women in the developing countries, where to a considerable extent their fate depends on achieving

Goebbels

nutritional self-sufficiency and on getting away from the tedious daily toil which is the lot of millions of women in these countries.

That is why the Lomé III convention, which was signed in December 1984, contains for the first time an express provision relating to the economic value of women's work and to the improvement of their way of life, including access to all aspects of training.

In my view, this text is an important milestone.

In the same positive spirit which it has evidenced in the past, the Community intends to remain active and receptive on all the many women-related problems which are going to arise in the future.

The system of equal treatment in particular should be consolidated and extended. The programme for female emancipation for the period 1986-90, which the Commission will be presenting shortly, will certainly help towards achieving this objective. The Commission's communication to the Council concerning Community participation at the Nairobi conference contains a detailed review of the successes and difficulties of the last decade, as well as listing a series of initiatives for the future.

If the honourable Member would like more details of past results and future forecasts, they can be found in the communication.

Mrs Chouraqui (RDE). — (FR) Thank you, because, three months after the Nairobi conference, Parliament has not in fact been informed of the results. You have replied at considerable length, for which I am grateful. But I did in fact ask for this information in order to obtain more details, because we felt — let me say that I am less optimistic than you and less easily satisfied — that the Nairobi Conference was somewhat over-political and moved away from the objectives which had been set for the conference, because some of the debates were quite violent and involved confrontations between political parties.

The aim of the question, though, was to find out what the result of the Nairobi Conference was. You have partly answered that, but only partly.

Mr Goebbels — (FR) The Commission's communication to the Council on Community participation at Nairobi, during the United Nations conference on the decade of women, sets out in the first part the results achieved and the difficulties encountered during the last decade for women, and in the second part suggests a number of initiatives for the future, namely: more detailed study of the present topics, particularly women's place in society as regards the problems of employment, social security, education and development; secondly, Community participation in the fol-

low-up to the Nairobi Conference, especially in the drawing-up and implementation of an action programme to produce concrete measures in equality of treatment for men and women; thirdly, the strengthening of existing legislation relating specifically to equality of opportunity at work for men and women by adopting appropriate supervision, for example, establishing inspectorates to ensure that the rules on equal treatment are observed; fourthly, the adoption of the existing proposals on parental leave and leave for family reasons, as well as equal treatment for self-employed men and women, etc. and, finally, taking positive action, particularly to increase protection for women working in large factories and women who are heads of families.

Mrs Lenz (PPE). — (DE) I am sorry that the Council President has replied quite so quickly, because there is shortly to be another oral question on Nairobi which is considerably more critical because it is raised by observers who were actually present there. I myself spoke with the Council President who attended. The report on Nairobi is yet to be discussed by the Committee on Women's Rights. My question today is this: is the Council President prepared to return to this subject at the next opportunity and then to give us not just standard replies — which I do not reproach him for — but replies which are really rather more relevant to what was discussed in Nairobi?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) I was not at Nairobi myself, but I am sure that my colleague, Jean Spautz, who represented the Community on that occasion, would be willing to come to Parliament, although that is not for the Council to decide. It would depend on the Bureau.

Mr Cryer (S). — Could the Minister re-examine his remarks about the next 10 years of the Community and women? Does he not acknowledge that there are 15 million people unemployed in the Community, many of them women? Does he not acknowledge that women are exploited more than men by the capitalist system to which the Community is committed? Most women employees are low-paid. Does he not acknowledge that, far from helping the developing nations, the common agricultural policy dumps large quantities of food on world markets which severely damages the agricultural interests of the developing nations and therefore damages many of the women who barely have enough to survive and find enough shelter and clothing in the developing countries? What is the Council going to do to try to improve this wretched Community?

Mr Goebbels — I do not share all the views expressed by the honourable Member. Nevertheless I do share some of them, and I certainly agree with him that there are still a lot of women in the world who are exploited, even in the European Community. We —

Goebbels

Council, Commission and European Parliament — must make a combined effort towards improving the status of women, and not just indulge in facile arguments on the subject.

President — As the author is not present, Question No 64 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 65, by Mrs Jepsen (H-390/85)

Subject: Progress of negotiations concerning the introduction of uniform rules governing the construction of cages for egg-laying hens

Would the Council state what progress has been made in negotiations concerning uniform rules governing the construction of cages for egg-laying hens and would it also state what guidelines are to be followed in implementing the common rules, including the date on which they should become effective?

Mr Goebbels, President-in-Office of the Council — (FR) Work is actively continuing within the Council on the proposal for a directive laying down minimum standards for the protection of egg-laying hens in cages. The Council discussed this question at the meeting on 16 September and will discuss it again on 21 and 22 October, with the intention of reaching complete agreement on this directive.

Mrs Jepsen (ED). — (DA) I should like to thank the President-in-Office for the information given. We are very pleased, in Danish circles at least, to hear that a settlement of this matter may be expected before the month is out. Further questions are therefore unnecessary. But of course I shall raise the matter again if it turns out that the question is not resolved on 21-22 October. It is of vital importance to this sector in Denmark that we get a very early decision on the matter.

President — Question No 66, by Mr Rogalla (H-412/85).

Subject: Joint institutional responsibility

What is the significance of the fact that when speaking in the European Parliament the Presidency (State Minister Santer and Foreign Minister Poos) refers to 'your Parliament'? Does the Council not feel that, as part of the Community, and one of its institutions, it is bound by institutional decisions?

Mr Goebbels, President-in-Office of the Council — (FR) Rule 64 (1) of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament states that the speaker shall

address the Chair. In order to comply with this provision Presidents-in-Office of the Council use the expression 'your Parliament'. The use of the possessive adjective 'your' does not of course in any way prejudice the importance which the Council, and the Luxembourg Presidency in particular, attaches to compliance with the Treaties.

I should merely like to stress that from the Luxembourg point of view our common European Parliament does not always fully appreciate the efforts made by the Luxembourg authorities on behalf of this essential institution, which has our respect and our esteem.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) I should like to applaud the Council President's reply as a master-stroke of Community politics and diplomacy and ask whether in the view of the Council Presidency the achievements of this Parliament are likely, both with regard to the Luxembourg Presidency and the Member State Luxembourg, to lead to a level of Community coherence which in the last analysis will yield beneficial effects in doing away with unemployment, establishing the internal market and enabling the Community's economy to flourish.

President — Mr President, I do not believe that it is possible to reply to a question of this sort.

As the author is not present, Question No 67 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 68, by Mr Habsburg, has been withdrawn.

As the authors are not present, Questions Nos 69 and 70 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 71, by Mr Ephremidis (H-306/85).

Subject: US embargo on supplies of drugs to Nicaragua

The American Government's trade embargo against the legally elected government of Nicaragua prohibits the exportation of drugs to Nicaragua, when 25% of that country's requirements are met by imports from the USA. This action puts at risk the lives of thousands of sick people and of the casualties resulting from foreign intervention, etc.

What measures could the Council take, in agreement with the Nicaraguan Government, to meet the country's intensified need for drugs?

Mr Goebbels, President-in-Office of the Council — (FR) At the present time no approach has been made to the Council by the Nicaraguan authorities about the supply of pharmaceutical products to Nicaragua.

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

Goebbels

In any case the Council finds that at present, pursuant to the common commercial policy, no restrictions are applied to the export of pharmaceutical products by the Community.

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — (GR) From what I have understood of the answer, it appears that the President-in-Office of the Council has not fully grasped the point of my question. The United States, among other measures which it is enacting against Nicaragua, has blocked the import of drugs to that country. 25% of Nicaraguan needs are met by imports — needs which have grown significantly recently.

My question is: what has the Council done, on a humanitarian, not commercial basis, to meet these increased needs? The country is in need of the drugs. I would like a precise answer to this.

Mr Goebbels — (FR) It is difficult enough for a Luxembourg Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to reply on behalf of the whole Community. Moreover I cannot claim to speak for the United States of America. What I can say in reply to the question from the honourable Member, is that I personally received the Nicaraguan Ambassador to Luxembourg and Belgium only last week and that he did not draw the Presidency's attention to the matter raised by the honourable Member.

Mr Hughes (S). — No one is asking the Council representatives to speak on behalf of America, we ask them to speak for themselves. Really, I would have expected that they could have raised the issue of Nicaragua and the problems with America. But I wonder if the Council is willing to condemn the war the United States is waging against Nicaragua through the Contras there at the present time and also to condemn the refusal by the United States to accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice on the matter. What is the Council's view of the way the United States has applied sanctions against the democratically elected government in Nicaragua, thus harming innocent people, while it has refused to apply sanctions against an entirely reprehensible regime in South Africa?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) It seems to me that all these questions are outside the scope of Question Time. I am of course willing to return to them during questions on political cooperation, but in any case, I speak here for the Council of the European Communities, and the Council of the European Communities has not been approached by Nicaragua on any of the questions mentioned by Mr Ephremidis.

President — Question No 72, by Mr Alavanos (H-308/85).

Subject: Transport subsidies for remote Greek islands

What precise measures does the Council propose to take, following the Commission's proposal in response to the Greek Memorandum, to subsidize transport for the remote Greek islands, and why is the relevant decision not yet forthcoming?

Mr Goebbels, President-in-Office of the Council — (FR) The proposal to which the honourable Member refers was submitted by the Commission in May 1984, at the same time as two other proposals concerning the agricultural sector in Greece, namely, aid to transhumance and measures to strengthen the sections responsible for quality control of agricultural products.

The Council examined the file carefully and, at its meeting on 11 and 12 March, adopted two out of the three proposals. The Council was unable, however, to reach agreement on the third proposal for granting subsidies for the transport of certain agricultural inputs to the Greek islands, as there was some doubt about the advisability of introducing direct aid to the purchase of agricultural inputs and also as to the actual effectiveness of the measures proposed by the Commission for aiding farmers in these islands, where the problems are essentially of a structural nature. In conclusion, let me say that the Council has agreed to continue discussion of this problem with a view to finding the solution which is most appropriate.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) The President-in-Office of the Council has given me an answer about the other two Commission proposals.

The problem in question, and for which I want a more concrete answer concerns the third proposal, the one relating to transport subsidies for agricultural produce from remote Greek islands given that a commitment exists, within the framework of the negotiations between the agencies of the European Economic Community and the Greek Government on the memorandum which this proposal would approve. Almost three years have elapsed since the memorandum was submitted, and there has been no reply.

Given that some uncertainty exists as to whether the Council would approve this proposal, I would like to see a definite time-limit set for the acknowledgement of the decision in question.

Mr Goebbels — (FR) Madam President, since the Greek Government, on 19 March 1982, submitted its memorandum setting out the main economic problems facing Greece following accession to the Community, many measures have been adopted in favour of Greece, and I am very pleased about them.

Admittedly there still remains the proposal which the honourable Member mentioned. I have to tell you

Goebbels

quite frankly that when this proposal was examined in Council, several delegations expressed serious reservations about the effectiveness of the aid, which did not seem to offer any lasting solution to the problems of agriculture in these islands.

The Council agreed to continue to examine the question, but the solution will probably be found to lie in measures to improve the agricultural structures of these areas, rather than in providing temporary subsidies for the transport of inputs.

President — Question No 73, by Mr Hutton (H-357/85).

Subject: Abolition of unanimity rule in Council bodies

In view of the need to speed up decision-making by the Council, will the Presidency propose that the unanimity rule should by agreement be set aside and voting should follow the stipulations on the Treaties in all bodies of the Council, e.g. Coreper, the committees and working parties, except the Council of Foreign Ministers and of Ministers in other sectors?

Mr Goebbels, President-in-Office of the Council — (FR) May I remind the honourable Member that as far as decisions on matters of Council responsibility are concerned, it is only the Council that is empowered to take them, not the Committee of Permanent Representatives or a working party. The voting rules laid down by the Treaties therefore apply to the Council alone.

The Council also wishes to point out that its decisions are taken in accordance with the provisions of the Treaties. These provide that a decision may be taken unanimously, or by a simple majority, or by a qualified majority.

The Council considers that the Treaty provisions which specify that a decision can be taken by a simple or a qualified majority do not prevent members of the Council from trying to reconcile their opinions before Council takes a decision. The question of the Council's decision-making process will certainly be raised at the Conference of Representatives of the Governments of the Member States.

Mr Hutton (ED). — I thank the President-in-Office very much for his full answer. Would he agree with me that adhering to the unanimity rule, where it is adhered to, and extending the search for unanimity slows down the work of the Council? Would he say if his Presidency is prepared to make a proposal to outlaw the unanimity rule at the intergovernmental conference?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) Certainly the search for unanimity does sometimes slow down the decision-making

processes of the Council. But the search for unanimity is still necessary, in order to maintain unity of action by all the member countries of the European Community.

The honourable Member has also asked me whether Luxembourg and the Luxembourg Presidency are prepared to make proposals in the direction indicated by his question. At the moment the Luxembourg Presidency is waiting for the proposals from all the Member States of the European Community, and you will be aware that a final date of 15 October has been set. After that date the Presidency will of course consider the matter; it will make proposals, but I should not like to anticipate the outcome of the intergovernmental conference while the preparatory work is still in progress.

On the other hand, I should like to point out that the Luxembourg Presidency will certainly ensure that the Treaty is strictly enforced and that it has already had recourse to the vote in some Councils.

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Would not the President-in-Office of the Council agree that it is not just a question of speeding up the decision-making procedures of the Council, but of improving the quality of the decisions which are reached? For example, we would not exactly welcome a speeding up process which leads to further disgraceful decisions such as those we have had in the budgetary process for 1986. Will he accept that many Members of this House would welcome them slowing down somewhat if they are going to reach the decisions which so dramatically affect the Regional Fund, the Social Fund and the interests of the Third World?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) I must admit that I do not agree at all with some of the remarks made by the honourable Member.

Mr Chanterie (PPE). — (NL) I gather from the first answer given by the President-in-Office that he is in favour of the retention of the consensus, because he said it was necessary to maintain unity of action. At the end of his reply he also said the Luxembourg Presidency would respect the Community Treaties. Which is the right answer? The Treaties state precisely when a normal majority, a qualified majority or a consensus is required. Was there not some inconsistency in the answer in this respect?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) I do not think that there were any contradictions in my remarks. I believe in the necessity of unanimity, because I find it inconceivable that it should be possible for certain States to be defeated on vital issues in this Community.

But the Treaties are clear. In the ECSC Treaty there are four articles in which a qualified majority can be

Goebbels

requested. In the EEC Treaty there are seventeen which provide for a qualified majority. And in the EAEC treaty there are four.

If the search for unanimity fails, there comes a point where there has to be a vote. I myself, for instance, in an 'Industry' Council at which I presided, recently applied an Article of the ECSC Treaty which allowed me to have a President's proposal voted.

President — Question No 74, by Mr Barrett (H-437/85).

Subject: MFA and Ireland

Will the Council state its position regarding the renewal of the Multi-Fibre Agreement, which is due to expire in July 1986, and does it accept that failure to renew this vital agreement could seriously damage the future prospects of the Community's textile agreement and the need to safeguard employment in this vital sector?

Mr Goebbels, President-in-Office of the Council — (FR) International discussions on a future system of trade in textiles after the expiry of the present Multi-fibre Agreement were opened on 23 July 1985 by a meeting of the GATT Textile Committee at the start of a series of meetings aimed at reaching a decision before July 1986.

It was agreed that a further meeting would be held before the end of the year. At this preliminary stage of the discussions the Council evolved some preliminary guidelines, which were presented in a declaration of the GATT textile committee at the meeting on 23 July.

It is the Council's view that the statements contained in the declarations are balanced and take into account all aspects of the situation. Whilst recognizing the objective of greater liberalization, the Council took account of the concern expressed by the honourable Member, both as regards employment in the textile sector and the need to provide an adequate multilateral framework to allow continuation of efforts towards the restructuring of this sector.

In due course, on the basis of proposals to be made by the Commission, the Council will be called upon to discuss more detailed guidelines for the negotiations to be held on a future system for trade in textiles.

Mr Barrett (RDE). — Because of the loss of 1 300 000 jobs over the last 10 years, and in order to maintain the present number of jobs in the industry at 2 700 000, will the President-in-Office agree that under present trading conditions there is no effective industrial or social alternative to the renewal of the MFA?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) I thought I had already answered that question. I cannot and would not wish to anticipate the outcome of the negotiations for which the preparatory work is being carried out in the textile committee in Geneva. If the honourable Member insists, I can refer to the statements made in July by the European Communities, namely that at this initial stage in the discussions the Community stresses its desire to reach a solution with all the countries involved in trade in textiles on a fair and reasonable basis.

The Community has expressed its willingness to pursue the objective of strengthening the multilateral free trade system and of liberalization of world trade.

Our objective must continue to be the expansion of world trade and, in this context, we confirm the importance which we place on the objective of gradual liberalization of trade in textiles on the basis of a better balance between the rights and obligations of the contracting parties.

Mr Hindley (S). — Is the Council prepared to use the renegotiation of the MFA to make a positive contribution to improving the living and working conditions of people in the Asian countries which produce textiles by insisting on the inclusion in the new MFA of so-called social clauses which would make quotas of the EEC market that are available to countries in Asia dependent on those countries' textile industries observing certain ILO standards?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) As I said just now — and I can only repeat it — I cannot anticipate the outcome of the negotiations. I would simply like to say that the Multifibre Agreement has made the gradual restructuring of the Community industry easier. Of course there are still enormous difficulties in this sector and I can only say that we hope that the eventual renewal of the Multifibre Agreement will also facilitate the restructuring and improvement of the living conditions of workers in this sector in other textile-producing countries.

Mr Wedekind (PPE). — (DE) The Council President should know that the intention was for there to be greater liberalization of world trade on expiry of the Multi-Fibre Arrangement. This will make for a better balance between exports and imports, notably Community exports particularly to textile manufacturing countries, by offering these countries better import terms so that jobs in Europe are not put at risk but rather that more jobs can be created in the Community as a result of a better trade balance and increased export opportunities. Does the Council believe that protectionist measures using special prices, tariffs and quotas will help to create more jobs in the Community, or does it not think that we in Europe must

Wedekind

ensure that there is more scope for free world trade so that countries wanting to import goods from us can also export their own goods at good prices?

Mr Goebbels — (*FR*) I think this question contradicts the other questions which I have heard here. I should simply like to say that I quite agree with you that absolute protectionism is wrong. But I should also like to point out that to open up markets completely would be detrimental not only to our own European industries but also to some industries in the developing countries, because we know full well that some of the developing countries have industries which are much stronger than others.

That is why I agree with the Commission when it says that an immediate return to the GATT rules could result in instability which would without any doubt increase uncertainty in trade and probably damage the least developed exporting countries.

President — Question No 75, by Mr Flanagan (H-441/85).

Subject: EEC aid for the turf industry

In reply to my Question No H-510/84¹ on the Council's failure to reach a decision on aid for the turf industry, the Council stated that 'serious difficulties' had emerged regarding this proposal.

Furthermore, the Council stated that it would start to re-examine this dossier as soon as the Commission indicated what it intends to do with this dossier.

Is it not a fact that the Council has already turned down one set of Commission proposals and already has a second set submitted by the Commission?

Mr Goebbels, President-in-Office of the Council — (*FR*) As the Council has already informed the honourable Member, in reply to his March question. No H-510/84, three factors have to be taken into consideration in any discussion of possible Community aid to the peat industry.

Firstly, all the delegations in the Council want to improve the effectiveness of the Community energy policy and have signified their willingness to attain their objective of moving towards a fair and global Community strategic plan for solid fuel.

With this in mind they declared their resolve to continue efforts towards increasing the proportion of solid fuel in the Community energy figures.

Secondly, as the honourable Member will recall, the Council encountered serious difficulties last Novem-

ber and was therefore unable to reach agreement on a proposal, even one revised by the Commission, which provided for financial aid to solid fuel industries, including the peat industry.

Thirdly, the Council declared that it was prepared to reexamine the file and could do so in the light of the Commission's comments after detailed consideration of this aspect of energy policy.

The situation has not changed since the Council's reply last March. The Council can therefore only repeat its commitment to examining immediately any proposal submitted to it by the Commission.

Mr Flanagan (RDE). — At this stage could I ask for a more candid reply as to the nature and scope of the difficulties which the Council says it has encountered and continues to encounter? May I make the comment that I appear once again to be getting two contrary stories, one from the Commission and the other from the Council? In the meantime, so far as the industry in my country, Ireland, is concerned, no possibility of progress exists.

Mr Goebbels — (*FR*) I try to be very frank with the House. At the meeting of 20 June 1985 the Council heard an oral statement by the commissioner, Mr Nicolas Mosar, on the state of progress of his institution's work on solid fuel, and noted the Commission's intention of submitting proposals to it within a short period of time.

Since then, the Council has received no new information on this file from the Commission. The date set for the next Council meeting on energy matters is 11 November 1985. The problems of solid fuel will be on the agenda, but it must be pointed out that the specific question of possible aid for the peat industry — and I am being frank now — will not be the central item under discussion.

Mr Wijsenbeek (L). — (*NL*) Is the President of the Council aware that, while peat may not be the most important of fuels, it is particularly important for giving Irish and Scotch whisky their special taste when it is distilled and that it should therefore be governed by the agricultural policy?

Mr Goebbels — (*FR*) Unfortunately I cannot enter into a discussion on whisky. I apologise to my Irish and Scottish friends, but I do not drink it.

But I do share the honourable Member's opinion that peat is very important and that we must try and protect the industry. That is what the Commission — I hope — and the Council will be doing in the coming months.

¹ Verbatim report 2-324, 13. 3. 1985.

President — Question No 76, by Mr Lalor (H-445/85).

Subject: Making better use of human resources

At its meeting of 29 and 30 March 1985, the European Council endorsed the Commission's view that the Community should make better use of human resources, in particular by means of increased mobility for students and researchers and by recognizing certain high-level establishments as Community's 'centres of excellence'.

Has the Council, as requested, pursued this objective, and will it make a statement on the matter?

Mr Goebbels, President-in-Office of the Council — (FR) The Council endorses the objective, mentioned by the honourable Member, of making better use of human resources, in particular by means of increased mobility for students and researchers.

At the beginning of August 1985 the Council received a communication from the Commission on cooperation between industry and the universities on training for the Comett programme, and this contains a proposal for a decision along these lines, on which the European Parliament is to be consulted.

This initiative by the Commission is a direct response to the request first put forward by the European Council in June 1984 and repeated in its findings of March 1985, to which the honourable Member referred.

The Council itself regards this as a matter of urgency and the Presidency intends to continue examination of the Commission's proposal very shortly.

Mr Lalor (RDE). — I am grateful to the President-in-Office of the Council for the information he has given. It appears to me that the Council is leaving full responsibility for this to the Commission. I would like to ask the President-in-Office, in relation to the 'centres of excellence' whether he is aware that historically the educational facilities in Ireland were a Mecca for European students seeking top level knowledge. We had an example just a few moments ago of such top-level knowledge possessed by my colleague Mr Wijzenbeek. Would the Council now bear in mind that Ireland was a Mecca for education seekers when establishing 'centres of excellence'?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) The Council has no wish to hide behind the Commission in this affair, but this question is the Commission's responsibility. I think the questions which are being raised by the honourable Member at this time will have to be considered in that overall context.

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — (NL) In his first answer the President of the Council referred to the Comett programme and said that it provides for exchanges of students. That is true. The programme provides for exchanges of 10 000 technology students over a period of five years. It will be debated by Parliament in November and approved by the Council in December. But I have a question.

I see that the amount the Commission entered in the budget for the beginning of this programme in 1986 has been removed by the Council. This means that, while the Council utters fine words here about the Comett programme and exchange programmes for students, the initial amount proposed by the Commission for the programme, which belongs in the 1986 budget, has been changed into a token entry by the Council, and I should like an explanation for this because, if all we hear are fine words here, without their being followed by deeds, the citizens of Europe will not be getting a great deal out of it.

Mr Goebbels — (FR) This House held a preliminary debate on the 1986 budget this morning. The procedure is under way. It is therefore up to Parliament, the Commission, or, of course, the Council, to restore the necessary appropriations as they see it.

Mr Wijzenbeek (L). — (NL) Might I ask the President of the Council if the deletion of this item from the budget under the Luxembourg Presidency has anything to do with the fact that Luxembourg is forced to send all its students abroad?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) I formally refute the honourable Member's question. I should merely like to point out that the Council never enters appropriations in the draft budget, if there has not been a decision on the basis, as is the case here.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Does this not yet again show that the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing in the Council? One side of the Council says that it does want student exchanges up to this number and the other side says: 'oh, no, we have not got the money'. This really is absolute nonsense. Is it not time the Council got its act together and decided what it really wants, and told us?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) The budgetary token entry is a structure for accommodating new proposals. That is all I have to say.

President — As the author is not present, Question No 77 will be answered in writing.¹

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

President

As they deal with the same subject, the following questions will be taken together.

Question No 78, by Mrs Lemass (H-448/85).

Subject: Employment

At the Summit meeting of the Heads of State or Government held on 29 and 30 March 1985, the European Council laid particular emphasis on the need for specific action to expand employment, including a Commission study of the potential for using the Social Fund to promote innovatory model schemes and programmes for solving the employment problems of certain disadvantaged social categories. Will the Council now comment on the development of these specific actions?

and Question No 81, by Mr Fitzgerald (H-470/85).

Subject: Luxembourg Presidency

Will the Luxembourg Presidency state what policies it proposes to pursue aimed at generating new employment opportunities in the European Community, particularly with regard to the long-term unemployed and youth unemployment?

Mr Goebbels, *President-in-Office of the Council* — (FR) The problem of unemployment is a continuing subject of concern to both the European Council and the Council, whether made up of Economics and Finance Ministers or those for employment and social affairs.

The Council can only reemphasize that it gives priority to combatting unemployment through economic growth, which creates more jobs. Obviously the attainment of this objective is particularly important for young people and the long-term unemployed.

The report of the European Council of 28 and 29 June 1985 on the economic situation, emphasizes that the problem of job creation has to be resolved through initiatives which transform the economic base of the Community. The report stresses that the productive capacity and economic growth of the Member States must show a steadier trend than in recent years and that investment must be encouraged so as to create a volume of supply better able to respond to an increased level of demand, without reviving inflation.

It also states that the Community must adopt a new political and economic strategy to encourage more effective investment, using the new technologies to increase activity instead of just achieving manpower savings.

The Commission was invited to highlight this theme in particular in the next annual economic report, on which the European Parliament will of course be consulted.

The Council has also adopted two important texts on unemployment during the last two months: the resolution of 19 December 1984 on combatting long-term unemployment, which specifies several measures to be taken by the Member States as well as by the Community and the conclusions of 13 June 1985 on a specific programme of action for employment.

The Council hopes that these two texts will be implemented very soon.

Finally, as regards one particular aspect of Mrs Lemass's question, I can only say to you that the Council has not yet received from the Commission any study of the possibility of using the European Social Fund to promote innovatory model schemes and programmes as well as programmes for solving the employment problems of certain socially disadvantaged categories.

Mrs Lemass (RDE) — That last phrase uttered by the President-in-Office of the Council says it all. How long is it going to take, may I ask, before the money from the Social Fund is there to promote those modest schemes for the disadvantaged social categories, including women and young people? When is it going to happen? The Commission and the Council agree that the unemployment situation is getting worse in all the Member States and the number of unemployed is increasing. Those schemes are fine and we are told they are going to be implemented. We have been waiting a long time and I am just wondering when something is going to happen to help the unemployment situation.

Mr Goebbels — (FR) I have just said that it is for the Commission, the Economic Policy Committee and the Coordination Group to continue to take stock of problems and to propose initiatives for remedying the worrying employment situation in all the Member States.

Mr Fitzgerald (RDE). — Would the President-in-Office of the Council not agree with me that, as has been the case under previous presidencies over a number of years, the Council is only paying lip service to unemployment? It talks about the need for changing economic structures and training people in various categories. For what? For jobs that are not there? Would he not agree that the unemployment position continues to worsen? Would he not further agree that that worsening situation is a large contributor to the type of riot situation we are seeing now in many of the areas of high unemployment, even in the United Kingdom, and that the situation is long past being urgent?

Would the Minister not agree that nothing has been done over a number of presidencies?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) I agree with the honourable Member that unemployment, if not the most serious, is one of the most serious problems, facing our Community, and not just our Community. And I agree with him that it is wholly unacceptable for young people, women and the 'elderly' to suffer what amounts to social isolation. Even so, I have to say, Madam President, that no miraculous solution, is possible either in Europe or in any other industrialised area. I should also like to point out to the honourable Member that the Community has nevertheless taken a number of initiatives to combat this disturbing rise in unemployment.

There were some measures — and some of these are still current, for example those which aim to achieve a single larger market between now and 1992, in the hope that this larger market will also help create new jobs — to foster the creation and development of small and medium enterprises, as it has been found that it is primarily small and medium enterprises which create jobs. And there are still other similar measures which are to be taken. There have been measures to alter and adapt working conditions to new social, economic and technological circumstances in order to increase the efficiency of the labour market. Finally there has been specific action to expand employment. But I agree with all the Members here present, that all these measures have not yet succeeded in vanquishing unemployment. But I should also like to hear specific concrete proposals from Members to help the Council achieve this great objective of returning to full employment in the European Community.

Mr Hindley (S). — Would the President-in-Office not agree with me that the potential for innovatory schemes under the Social Fund can only be fully explored if there is proper monitoring of the existing Social Fund schemes? Is he aware that there is scarcely any monitoring of how vast amounts of money are spent? Is he also aware that the results of this monitoring are not published and are not accessible to Members of this House? Is he prepared, therefore, to use what influence he can to make sure that there is better monitoring and that such monitoring is published to help those who are actually concerned about the Social Fund and anxious to improve it?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) The Commission is responsible for implementing financial measures under the Social Fund, and the Council can, of course, discuss with the responsible Members of the Commission the possibility of improving the functioning of the Social Fund.

Mr Chanteric (PPE) — (NL) I am pleased that the Minister has just referred to the Commission's responsibility. But the Council also has its responsibility. Together with Parliament, the Council is responsible for the budget. The President-in-Office of the Council referred to a number of resolutions concerning the

importance of the European Social Fund. In the draft budget the Council has reduced the European Social Fund by 1 000 million ECU, from 2 300 m to 1 400 m ECU. How does this square with what the Minister has just been saying. This reduction will make the Social Fund completely ineffective.

Mr Goebbels — (FR) We still have to deal with the draft 1986 budget, which is under discussion at the moment. I cannot anticipate the outcome of those discussions.

You held an initial debate on the subject this morning and I hope that at the end of the day the conciliation which will have to take place between the Parliament, the Commission and the Council will be acceptable to all the Members here present.

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — (NL) The Minister's answer is unacceptable. He is responsible for the draft budget at its first reading and, after it has been discussed with Parliament, for the draft budget at its second reading. On what grounds has the Council, and the Minister should be able to answer this, reduced the European Social Fund by almost, 1 000 m ECU, which is equivalent to 2 500 m guilders? There must surely be a reason for this. We have to know because we have to be able to discuss this point as a Parliament. The answer is therefore unacceptable, and I feel the Minister really should give an answer to Mr Chanteric's question.

Mr Goebbels — (FR) I am sorry that my reply is unacceptable to the honourable Members, but I can only repeat what I have said. We still have a draft budget which has not been adopted finally. I hope that, especially where the Social Fund is concerned, it will — I repeat — be acceptable to all the Members here present.

President — We now move on to questions to the Foreign Ministers.

Question No 87, by Mr Elles (H-370/85).

Subject: Ethiopia

In the light of the promise given by the Council replying to question (H-136/85) by Mr Raftery¹ and question (H-260/85) by Mr Marshall², to follow up their requests with the Ethiopian Government, would the President inform the Parliament what steps have been taken to pursue them?

Mr Goebbels, *President-in-Office of the Ministers for*

¹ Verbatim report of proceedings of 10. 7. 1985.

² Verbatim report of proceedings of 10. 7. 1985.

Goebbels

Foreign Affairs (FR) The situation in Ethiopia is examined regularly within the framework of political cooperation.

As indicated during question time in July, the Ten are very concerned about the problems associated with the distribution of emergency aid in the southern regions of the countries affected by famine. They have pointed this out to the Ethiopian authorities.

It seems that the distribution problems which are due to the conflict situation and to logistical difficulties are now less serious, even though the situation remains grave.

In contacts which they have had about this with the Ethiopian authorities, the Ten have always given, and always will give, the necessary attention to ensuring that there is an adequate response to the problem of famine and the transport of aid.

As far as the fate of certain members of the Ethiopian royal family is concerned, this is a question of political prisoners held in that country, a problem which receives considerable attention within the framework of European policy.

In this context the Ten, in contacts, which they have had with the authorities in Addis Ababa, have expressed their concern at the humanitarian level, about the fate of those still held, and they will continue to do so in future.

Mr Elles (ED). — I would like to ask two questions. Could you tell us what the situation at the moment is in the Eritrean and Tigre provinces of Ethiopia where a civil war has been waged during the whole period of famine and starvation in Ethiopia? Will the Council do all in its powers to convince the Ethiopian Government not to continue to abuse flagrantly international opinion concerning the urgent need for a truce in its civil war? Will the Council undertake to raise once again and on a continuous basis the holding of political prisoners. They have now been in prison for more than 10 years, and it is quite unjustified that they should be held any longer?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) The continuation and intensification of guerilla activity in the provinces of Eritrea and Tigre make it very difficult to provide adequate supplies to the population.

The Community is doing everything it can.

According to certain sources, it has been estimated that, not just in Eritrea, but throughout Ethiopia, some 5 million Ethiopians have been reached by the aid programmes which have been set up, including those which are the result of the solidarity of the international community.

Although the food situation has eased somewhat with the arrival of rain and the next harvest, it cannot be denied that there are still some serious problems. The problem of distribution continues to be a crucial one in the absence of an adequate fleet of lorries. At the beginning of September there were still more than 120 000 tonnes of cereals in the port of Assab.

The closure of some of the refugee camps and the Ethiopian government's resettlement programmes, which affected more than 500 000 people, have given rise to some criticism and caused some concern.

Be that as it may, it is essential that a joint effort be made by the whole of the international community in the near future to enable Ethiopia to overcome the disastrous consequences of the famine which that country has experienced, and is still — admittedly to a far lesser extent — experiencing.

The Member States of the European Community and the Commission will of course play their part in this effort and will maintain contact with the Ethiopian authorities so as to ensure that food aid to famine victims is transported throughout Ethiopia under the best conditions possible.

Mr Simpson (ED). — The Community gives many thousands of tonnes of grain to Ethiopia and the people of Europe given many millions of ECUs to support the relief there. Yet the Ethiopian Government spends a large part of its national income on arms and weapons to fight this civil war. Furthermore, it fails to devote the necessary attention to rural development to improve the agriculture of the country for the future so that it can become self-sufficient.

What steps is the Council taking to try to persuade the Ethiopian Government to spend less on weapons and more on developing the agriculture of its country so that its people don't find themselves in the situation of starvation again?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) As the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs for Luxembourg I spoke at the United Nations Conference on famine in Africa.

On that occasion I pointed out that there are some African States, and that certainly includes Ethiopia, which are more interested in celebrating revolution than in feeding their own people. Nevertheless I feel that we should not simply concentrate on the image of a regime, we must think about the people's suffering and do everything we can to save life. That is what the European Community has tried to do and what it will continue to do.

President. — As the authors are not present, Questions Nos 88, 89 and 90 will be answered in writing.¹

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

President

Question No 91, by Mr Van Miert, for whom Mr Tomlinson is deputizing (H-432-85).

Subject: The detention of Benazir Bhutto

On 29 August 1985 Miss Benazir Bhutto, Acting Chairman of the Pakistan People's Party, was detained in Pakistan and placed under house arrest.

This measure was taken despite the guarantees previously given by the Pakistani authorities that she would enjoy total freedom of movement on her return from Europe for the funeral of her brother, Shanawaz, and the arrest took place while she was in full mourning for the death of her brother.

What representations do the Ministers intend to make to the Pakistan military authorities, in particular with reference to the agreement for commercial, economic and development cooperation between the European Economic Community and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan signed on 23 July 1985, with a view to securing the release of Benazir Bhutto.

Mr Goebbels, President-in-Office of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs — (FR) The case of Miss Benazir Bhutto has not so far been examined specifically within the framework of political cooperation, although it has, of course, been mentioned.

The Ten are following the situation in Pakistan very closely, especially where the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms is concerned. They have not hesitated to approach the authorities in Islamabad on behalf of those held or imprisoned for political reasons.

The general elections of 25 February were a first step along the slow and gradual road towards more representative institutions in that country.

The Ten very much hope that this trend will continue as rapidly as possible, which would help to strengthen relations between the European Community and Pakistan.

In this respect it is interesting to note that the Pakistani authorities recently intimated to one member country of the European Community that the state of emergency might be lifted fairly shortly.

Mr Tomlinson (S). — I would not expect the President-in Office of the Council to agree with me if I suggested that his statement was long on intention but short on achievement. Would he agree with me that the report in the *Times* of 5 October about the state of health of Miss Bhutto, the way she is being detained without access to a telephone, or to medical assistance, and outlines her need for urgent medical treatment, raises issues which should impel the Foreign Ministers

meeting in political cooperation to deal with this question a little bit more urgently?

Would he also recall that during the July part-session in Luxembourg the President-in-Office of the Council informed this House that the Pakistan Government had submitted to the Foreign Ministers a memorandum on the human rights situation in Pakistan and that the Foreign Ministers would be considering this memorandum. He also promised that the President-in-Office would report back to Parliament on their deliberations following the receipt of that memorandum.

(The President urged the speaker to conclude)

I come now to the final question, Madam President. Are the Foreign Ministers now in a position to report to Parliament on the human rights situation in Pakistan? Would the President-in-Office give his evaluation of a statement made to this House by Mr Prag in July that there were now only a handful of political prisoners still detained in Pakistan?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) May I remind the honourable Member that political cooperation follows developments in Pakistan very closely and that it touches on all the problems which arise in that country, including, obviously, the case of Miss Benazir Bhutto, which we discussed just now.

Political cooperation will not hesitate to approach the Pakistani authorities again in the appropriate way in the future, should it consider it opportune.

As regards the defence of human rights, including attempts to obtain the release of political prisoners in all countries, I would like to point out that this is an area in which discreet action is normally more effective than large-scale operations.

Mrs Van den Heuvel (S). — *(NL)* I would point out to the Minister that in September this Parliament adopted a resolution concerning Miss Bhutto's position, and I am surprised to hear him say this subject has not been specifically discussed — at least that is what I understood from the interpretation — but has been on the agenda. What does that mean exactly? Would he explain that to me once again, and would he also answer the question as to what in fact the Foreign Ministers do with resolutions that have been adopted in this Parliament. Are they in fact discussed at all, and is any action in fact taken on the basis of these resolutions?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) The Council and political cooperation have great respect for the resolutions adopted by Parliament. As regards this resolution I can only repeat that political cooperation has spoken of the situation in Pakistan and that it has touched on the

Goebbels

case of Miss Bhutto. That is all I can tell you at the moment.

President — Question No 92, by Mr Lomas (H-433/85).

Subject: The artificial division of one Member State by another Member State

Do the Foreign Ministers believe that the artificial division of a Member State, Ireland, by a border enforced by another Member State, the United Kingdom, is compatible with the aims of the EEC, and will the Foreign Ministers bring pressure to bear on the British Government to withdraw British troops from Northern Ireland, to end the right of veto by Northern Ireland Unionists on the reunification of Ireland and to negotiate with Ireland the ending of partition and the establishment of a united Ireland?

Mr Goebbels, President-in-Office of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs — (FR) My reply will be very short. The question put by the honourable Member has nothing to do with European political cooperation.

Mr Lomas (S). — The Foreign Ministers, and the Council for that matter, often make statements on events all over the world, however remote the possibility might be of actually doing anything about them. Are the Ministers really saying that they cannot make any suggestion as to how to try and resolve the problem where hundreds of Irish people have been killed in their homes and in the streets, where arrest without charge is common, where trial, conviction, imprisonment without jury is common, where people are living in fear ...

(The President urged the speaker to put a question).

I am asking: are the Foreign Ministers really saying that they cannot suggest any initiative to bring an end to the terror, torture and persecution that is going on in one part of the European Community?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) I can only repeat: the question put by the honourable Member has nothing to do with political cooperation. I also think — and this is my personal opinion — that this question could be raised more effectively in the context of a national parliament.

Mr Howell (ED). — I was intrigued by the question of Mr Lomas. My question to the Council is this: does the Council not think that taking Mr Lomas' question, to its logical conclusion if Mr Lomas as leader of the Labour group in this Parliament were to take that question further and talk of *all* national borders as being artificial, then he would look upon the concept

of a united Europe in a rather better light than the Labour group look at it now?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) I think this question was addressed not to me, but to another Member, and I do not wish to interrupt discussions between the Members of your Assembly.

President — As the authors are not present, Questions Nos 93, 94, 95, 96 and 97 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 98, by Mr Selva (H-497/85):

Subject: Terrorism in Europe

After yet another terrorist attack, this time carried out in Via Veneto in Rome on 16 September 1985, what action do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation intend to take in order to coordinate more efficiently the crime prevention and detention duties carried out by the police and security forces in the Member States? When is the forthcoming meeting of the EEC Ministers for the Interior and Justice to be called to discuss measures to combat terrorism in Europe?

Mr Goebbels, President-in-Office of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs. — (FR) The Ten are very concerned about the recent revival of terrorism in Europe and agree on the need for closer coordination between the Member States in order to combat it. At their meeting in Rome on 12 February last, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Ten emphasized the need to step up the cooperation which already exists between the Ten in this field.

A meeting of the competent ministers also took place in Rome on 20 and 21 June within the TREVI group, to discuss ways of increasing cooperation in the joint struggle against terrorism.

In particular the Ministers agreed to meet regularly on the initiative of the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers, and at least once a year, on the basis of a precise and well-prepared agenda.

Furthermore the Ministers affirmed the need for technical cooperation at European level, which would also include the combatting of major international crime, for better coordination of policies and increased exchange of information.

Mr Selva (PPE). — (IT) I should like to thank the Minister for his answer. However, I have to state that the answer to the numerous question which I have put on this subject is always the same: good intentions, plans for the future, but very little concrete action.

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

Selve

Euro-terrorism is something which strikes and has struck recently not only in Italy but in other countries as well. However, I should like to request the Minister to report concrete results next time. For example with regard to the answer he has just given I would ask him to state whether the meetings in question concerned the Ministers of the Interior or the Justice Ministers in trying to create a common legal and common law enforcement space.

Mr Goebbels — (FR) I hope to be able to give you far more concrete replies at a later session.

In the near future an *ad hoc* group will meet within the framework of European political cooperation to study the question of combating terrorism and hijacking. The group will also include other ministers concerned, such as the Ministers for the Interior, Ministers for Justice and Transport Ministers of the European Community.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Does the President-in-Office of the Council not agree with me that in combating terrorism the use of exaggerated and malicious statements, in support of the causes supported by terrorists, albeit not of terrorism itself, such as the statement in Question No 92 about Northern Ireland which we have just endured, actually encourages people to resort to violence even though it is not meant to? Will he, with me, deplore those people who support the objectives of terrorists and recognize the contribution that sort of thing makes to the growing menace of terrorism in our society?

Mr Goebbels — (FR) May I point out that the Council has never condoned acts of terrorism, of whatever origin, country or group.

President. — Question Time is concluded.^{1 2}

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, it was stated from the Chair this afternoon when the electronic voting system was not working that the new deadline for amendments on matters of urgent debate would be announced this evening. It seems to have been forgotten.

¹ See Annex Question Time.

² Topical and urgent debate (Objections — continuation): see Minutes.

President. — The deadline for tabling amendments for the topical or urgent debate has been fixed at 8 p.m. this evening.

VOTES

Report (Doc. A2-89/85) by Mr Münch, on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the creation of a European research area: adopted¹

*
* *

Report (Doc. A2-106/85) by Mr Longuet, on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the differences in technological development between the Member States of the European Community: adopted²

*
* *

Report (A2-104/85) by Mr Wijsenbeek, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the role and the use of advanced and new technologies in the field of transport

Motion for a resolution

Recital E — Amendment No 4

Mr Wijsenbeek (L), *rapporteur*. — (NL) I am opposed, Mr President. I must also make a statement at this juncture. None of these amendments was discussed by the committee. As *rapporteur*, I cannot therefore but be opposed to all of these amendments except two, which are completely in the spirit of what was said in committee and could be treated as amendments seeking to add something to the resolution. I shall therefore indicate to you when I should like an amendment to be regarded as such. I shall also have to hear the opinion of the authors of these amendments. This applies, for example, to the next amendment, which concerns paragraph 1.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)³

*
* *

¹ The *rapporteur* spoke:
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 and 2.
² Mr Poniatowski, deputizing *rapporteur*, spoke:
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1 to 3, 7, 9 and 10,
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 4, 5 and 8.
³ The *rapporteur* spoke:
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments No 27,
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 4 to 12, 14 and 25.

Wijsenbeek

Interim report (Doc. A2-107/85) by Mrs Barbarella, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on Article 4 of the decision of 7 May 1985 on new own resources concerning the financing of supplementary research programmes.

Explanations of vote

Mr Sutra (S). — (FR) I should like to thank Mrs Barbarella for her excellent work in the Committee on Budgets and to draw your attention to this report which gives concrete, i.e. budgetary, form to the new concept of a variable-geometry Europe, but one which, of course, is nevertheless dependent on the Community nucleus.

If, in the future, new flexible formulae should make it possible for some project like Eureka, or so many of the others, to become part of the general Community action, we shall remember this concise, initial report and its concern for clarity and efficiency.

Mr Filinis (COM). — (GR), in writing. In her interim report, Mrs Barbarella asks us to accept the financing of research for the new technologies via national contributions beyond the special items allocated for this in the Community budget. We would agree with this report in view of the fact that she concludes the report seeing it as a necessary solution, while at the same time emphasizing that the total abolition of national contributions is desirable. She considers that under current conditions there is an immediate need to find resources for the financing of research for the new technologies.

We suggest that our Parliament insists on an increase in the item allocated in the 1986 budget and that it sets an increase from 1.9% to 6% as the target for spending on research.

Any such policy must, however, be immediately accompanied by an increase in the Community's own resources if the Community budget is to be capable not only of financing increased research requirements for the new technologies but of backing up other new Community policies without reducing spending on existing policies.

Having clarified these points, we are voting in favour of Mrs Barbarella's excellent report.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Report (Doc. A2-97/85) by Mr Brok, on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on the communications from the Commission on:

- technological change and social adjustment (COM(84) 6 final)
- vocational training and the new information technologies work programme 1985-1988 (COM(85) 167 final)

Explanation of vote

Mrs Squarzialupi (COM). — (IT) Although we recognize the rapporteur's efforts to modify his original motion for a resolution and deeply appreciate the fact that Parliament has accepted many of our amendments, we are nonetheless obliged to abstain. It is regrettable moreover that it was not possible to adopt our interim motion for a resolution not indeed because of the rapporteur but because of the short time available the exchanges and the discussions in the Committee on Social Affairs took place in haste and, so to speak, under the pressure of the amendments.

The new technologies are an important contemporary subject. They are the key to the coming into being of the society of the future. However, there are many confused ideas and confused situations which indeed are evident in this motion for a resolution itself.

On the basis of this premise it is difficult if not impossible to arrive at solutions. We believe that in the resolution positive and negative attitudes to the new technologies are jumbled together in a confused way. This prevents them from being included as part of a wider and complex effort to find a new development strategy combining economic development and development in the area of jobs and social progress.

In short, man and his problem have not yet appeared alongside the new technologies. On the other hand, Mr President, these matters were very evident in the symposium which took place here last Monday.

The new technologies have been planned to the detriment of employment. Correct use based on a new model of social development appears to be still too confused in this resolution particularly at a time when so many men, women and young people are being denied the basic right to work which is one of the primary rights.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

(The sitting was closed at 7.05 p.m.)²

¹ The rapporteur spoke:
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 10, 13, 15 and 17,
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18 to 28.

² Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.

ANNEX

I. Questions to the Commission

Question No 3 by Mr Andrews (H-171/85)

Subject: National committees of volunteer development workers

In June 1984 the communiqué issued after the Fontainebleau summit '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 who wish to work on projects in developing countries'.

Is the Commission aware that national committees of volunteer development workers already exist in nearly all Member States of the Community in the form of bodies coordinating the work of volunteer development NGO's and also that the developing countries need professional qualified, mature and well prepared volunteer workers with work experience and not young Europeans without professional training or work experience?

Answer

The Commission is well aware that volunteer development NGOs coordinate themselves regularly at national as well as at Community levels. On several occasions, it has expressed the view that the objectives of the Fontainebleau summit, as far as the enhancing of European volunteer activities in the Third World is concerned, could be best reached by strengthening and facilitating the existing coordination bodies and procedures;

The Commission shares the opinion of the honourable Member of the European Parliament that sending out systematically young, ill-prepared volunteer workers without professional training or work experience may involve considerable risks and would most probably not serve the developing countries' needs in this domain.

*
* *

Question No 4 by Mr Guermeur (H-285/85)

Subject: Ban on diesel engines in Greece

Can the Commission give precise information on the decision by Greece to ban diesel engines in private cars and on the action which it intends to take against this country?

Answer

Under the terms of a regulation dating from the 1960s, private cars cannot be equipped with diesel engines in Greece.

In the Commission's view this prohibition is incompatible with Community law on the free movement of goods. Accordingly, proceedings have been commenced under Article 169 of the Treaty.

In reply to the Commission's letter of formal notice, the Greek authorities stated that they considered this prohibition necessary to avoid a worsening of the existing air pollution problem in Greece. In addition, the Greek authorities have provided the Commission with certain information and technical data which are currently being examined by the Commission's services.

*
* *

Question No 6 by Mr Marck (H-352/85)

Subject: Setting-up of a large-scale poultry unit at Baudour (Ghlin) and investment aid for poultry farming

Council Regulation (EEC) No 797/85 of 12 March 1985 on improving agricultural structures¹ prohibits investment aid for new construction projects in the poultry sector.

If a poultry unit or factory farm were set up it would no longer be regarded as an agricultural undertaking and would therefore be eligible for government aid, possibly with a State guarantee, whereas family farms are not eligible for such aid.

If this is the case, can the Commission clarify whether national or regional authorities may grant financial aid, possibly associated with a State guarantee, to such a project, on the grounds that it will promote employment opportunities in the area.

In view of the saturated egg market in the Community and falling export outlets, what measures does the Commission envisage to prevent the setting-up of such units, and thus to safeguard jobs in family poultry farms?

Answer

Articles 3(5) and 8(4) of Regulation (EEC) 797/85 prohibit all investment aid in the egg and poultry sector. This ban also covers the establishment of large firms in this sector.

Only two exceptions are permitted:

- securities for loans contracted;
- aid for investments made necessary by obligations or constraints imposed by public authorities with a view to protection and improvement of the environment.

*
* *

Question No 11 by Mrs Dury (H-392/85)

Subject: Registration fees ('Minerval') charged to foreign students

Following the ruling of the Court of Justice of 13 February 1985 in the Gravier case (Case 293/83-ruling 33) the Commission of the European Communities is now aware of the intentions of the Belgian Government. Since this ruling, however, the Belgian Government has still not resolved to amend its policy on the subject and, in particular, refuses to refund fees paid prior to 13 February 1985.

What attitude does the Commission now intend to adopt on the eve of the September-October start of the academic year?

Answer

The Commission has examined the Belgian law of 21 June 1985 on the educational system which provides, *inter alia*, amendments to the previous regulations dealing with the payment of the special tuition fees for foreign students, known as 'minerval-étudiants étrangers', in the light of Community laws, as interpreted by the European Court of Justice.

These Belgian law amendments are intended to regulate the matter in conformity with the conclusions reached by the European Court of Justice in the case 293/83 (Gravier) of 13 February 1985.

¹ OJ L 93 of 30 March 1985.

The Commission has examined and also discussed the new provisions during an informal meeting between Commission's representatives and Belgian officials. On the basis of that examination, the Commission has decided to pursue proceedings under Article 169 of the EEC Treaty against Belgium in order to obtain the necessary further amendments to certain provisions of the above-mentioned law. One of the questions raised *vis-à-vis* the Belgian authorities concerns precisely the time limits for the reimbursement of the tuition fees (minerval) incorrectly paid by Community nationals, and imposed by the provisions of Article 63(2) of the new law.

The Commission, being aware of the fact that the academic year will start very soon, decided to initiate the accelerated procedure in this matter and finally brought the matter before the Court of Justice on 1 October 1985 (Case 293/85).

The Commission has applied to the Court for interim measures to safeguard immediately the interests of the EEC students concerned.

Finally, I must remind all here that the Commission's initiatives in this matter are placed in the context of the Community law prohibiting any discriminations on grounds of nationality between nationals of Member States.

*
* *

Question No 17 by Sir James Scott-Hopkins (H-3/85)

Subject: Depopulating rivers

In the view of the Commission, what effect have thin mesh nets had in depopulating rivers, such as the Wye in the Welsh Marches, of salmon, and what action does it intend to take to ensure that the trend established in recent years is reversed?

Answer

The Commission has no information on the effects, if any, that thin mesh nets may have in depopulating rivers such as the river Wye. As has been already indicated to the Parliament, the Commission considers that the management of salmon fisheries in the waters adjacent to the rivers of origin as well as in those rivers is best left to the local authorities since such management, if it is to be effective, must be based upon the assessment and day-to-day monitoring of stocks from each individual river or river-system.

Whilst the statistics on catches of salmon in the river Wye are consequently not in the possession of the Commission, I would inform the honourable Member that total annual catches of salmon in England and Wales do not appear to show a downward trend but rather have tended to fluctuate from year to year.

*
* *

Question No 18 by Mr Van Miert (H-106/85)

Subject: Attendance by the Commission at international meetings

The position of the Commission has been called into question in connection with the meetings of the Interim Committee of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank's Development Committee in April 1985 in Washington, at which the Commission has only observer status. What steps has the Commission taken to ensure that it can attend such meetings in future as a full member? What was the outcome of those steps?

Answer

First of all, the Commission would like to thank the honourable Member for his question which allows an explanation to be given to Parliament concerning the downgrading since the beginning of the year of the Commission's status at meetings of the Interim and Development Committees. This downgrading is very worrying because apart from indicating a failure to recognize certain of the Commission's powers, particularly in trade matters, it has also happened at an especially crucial stage in international monetary, financial and trade discussions.

It is true that when the IMF's Interim Committee and the World Bank's Development Committee met in Washington on 17-19 April procedural arrangements resulted in the partial exclusion, contrary to practice hitherto, of observers and hence of the Commission. However justified the concern which led to this decision (desire for genuine discussion, informality, etc), the Commission felt that the treatment it received was unsatisfactory for at least three reasons. Firstly, part of the talks in the Development Committee were to touch on trade matters involving fundamental interests of the Community for which the Community itself is responsible and for which the authority of the Commission to act is clearly acknowledged. Secondly, the exception made in the case of the Secretary-General of GATT confirmed, in a particularly discriminatory fashion, that trade matters were high on the agenda. Lastly, the committees were apparently going to discuss in detail a series of related economic matters which involved Community interests.

On 18 February the Commission had asked Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council, to draw the attention of the Member States to this matter and to contact the chairmen of the two committees in order to change the Commission's status before the two meetings. Although these efforts were supported by the Council Presidency on behalf of the Community, nothing could be done for the meetings in April this year.

More recently, the problem arose again during the preparations for the Development Committee meeting which has just been held in Seoul. The Commission was not allowed to attend informal meetings of the committee. The Commission feels that in this instance, as in April, there is no justification for this. The Commission raised the matter again at the beginning of August in a letter to the Prime Minister of Luxembourg, Mr Santer, in his capacity as President-in-Office of the Council, and it also brought up the matter at the informal meeting of Finance Ministers in Luxembourg on 20 and 21 September. It was once again clear that the majority of Member States shared the Commission's indignation over the arrangements for the forthcoming Development Committee meeting and it was agreed to approach the chairman of this committee again. This was done but nothing came of it.

Also, the recent meeting of the Finance Ministers provided an opportunity to mention the preparations for the meeting of the Interim Committee in spring next year. A large part of this meeting should be devoted to matters concerning the improvement of the international monetary system and the meeting is scheduled to be informal and restricted. The Commission took the opportunity of making quite clear that its exclusion from this meeting would be unacceptable.

The Commission does not intend to accept its exclusion from meetings of the Interim and Development Committees. It believes that its attendance as a full observer is justified both by virtue of its powers and on account of the importance of the matters to be discussed. The Commission will be unstinting in its efforts to ensure that the status which it was granted in 1974 is accorded to it again without delay.

*
* *

Question No 22 by Mrs Jepsen (H-259/85)

Subject: Community aid for farmers' environmental efforts

Many farmers want to help to prevent the groundwater pollution that is allegedly caused by the use of modern agricultural production techniques and fertilizers. Can the Commis-

sion state how widespread the problem is in the Member States and does it intend for instance to provide special aid for farmers who want to combat pollution on their land?

Answer

The Commission is aware of the possible effects of modern agricultural methods on the environment. It has, moreover, referred to the matter in a communication to the Council and Parliament entitled *Perspectives for the common agricultural policy*.¹

If modern techniques are used, groundwater pollution is reduced when fertilizer is applied on several occasions instead of only once and on the basis of actual crop needs at the moment of application. This is also true in the case of liquid fertilizers which are especially dangerous when they are applied in disproportionate amounts outside the period of growth. However, it must also be pointed out that groundwater pollution is caused by a variety of non-agricultural factors as well. The Commission does not have complete information on the deterioration of the quality of water in the various Member States. It must be stressed that the situation changes considerably from one region to another within the Member States.

Measures to adapt farming practices to the needs of environmental protection may receive aid under the terms of Regulation (EEC) 797/85 of 12 March 1985 on the improvement of the efficiency of agricultural structures.²

*
* *

Question No 24 by Mr Adamou (H-301/85)

Subject: Protection of woodland in anticipation of the summer

Greece has, proportionally, the smallest wooded area (18%-19%) of any country in the Community. The area planted each year with new trees (4 000-5 000 hectares) is insufficient to make up for the area — five times greater — devastated mainly by fire, during the same period; in addition, the hot, dry climate in Greece is not conducive to the steady growth and conservation of woodland.

What practical measures has the Commission taken in anticipation of the hot summer weather in general, and in the case of Greece in particular, in response to the European Parliament's numerous resolutions on this subject?

Answer

Damage caused by forest fires in the Community this summer has resulted in heavy losses of human life and injury to many people, as well as extensive damage to forests and property. Despite this the Council of Ministers has still failed to agree the Commission's proposal for a Council Regulation, introducing a Community scheme to provide forests in the Community with increased protection against fire and atmospheric pollution (doc. COM(83) 375 final). The Commission deplores this inertia. It will, however, continue to press Ministers to reach agreement.

On 25 July 1984 the Commission decided to launch a series of preparatory schemes for the protection of woodlands against fire and atmospheric pollution. These schemes, totalling 4.5 million ECU, of which 3.5 million ECU are earmarked for the protection of woodlands against fire, include the financing of 50% of the cost of schemes such as the creation of tactical fire-fighting centres, the setting up of automated fire-detection centres, operational centres, surveillance from the air for early detection and fire prevention through information of the public.

¹ Doc. COM(85) 333 final (Green Paper).

² OJ L 93 of 30 March 1985.

The preparatory schemes also include coordination measures entirely financed by the Community. Reference should be made in this respect to a large-scale exercise involving airborne and ground-based resources for fighting fires involving several Community countries which took place recently in France in the Florac region in the Cévennes.

In Greece, the current preparatory schemes include the setting up of a coordination centre for forest fire protection and a broad-based campaign to inform the public about fire prevention. The coordination centre's activities include drawing up fire-fighting contingency plans, forming and training teams to fight and prevent fires and coordinate in the case of a fire. The information campaign, by making the public aware, and inviting it to take an active part in the protection of woodland, constitutes a vital factor in fire prevention. It is aimed at providing the public with more information about forests, making it aware of its role, its advantages and the dangers which threaten it and informing it of the consequences of the destruction of its woodlands.

The Commission is aware of the urgency of the problem raised by forest fires in Greece, where on average 22 500 ha of woodland are destroyed by fire each year.

*
* *

Question No 25 by Mrs Crawley (H-317/85)

Subject: Financial effect of the entry of Spain and Portugal

What financial effect will the conditions agreed by the Community for the entry of Spain and Portugal have on the allocation of assistance from the Social and Regional Funds to industrial regions such as Birmingham and the West Midlands in the UK, given the suspicion that limited EEC resources will increasingly be directed towards the Mediterranean regions of the Community at the expense of the industrial north?

Answer

The Commission has proposed a revision to the ERDF Regulation as a result on the entry of Spain and Portugal. This indicates, among other things, a revision of the ranges of upper and lower limits of the ERDF resources which may be used by each Member State. At the same time the Commission is also proposing an increase in the resources available within the Fund so that, on balance, it is expected that there will be no decrease in resources, in real terms, available to the existing members of the Community.

As regards the Social Fund, the Commission in its preliminary budget for 1986 has also made provision for an increase in expenditure to take into account the likely volume of demand from Spain and Portugal, according to the information available to the Commission.

The establishing of the likely level of demand from Spain and Portugal permits an estimate of the amount of the fund that will be allocated to the regions of absolute priority. This allocation is at present 40% of appropriations and goes to Greece, the French Overseas Departments, Ireland, the Mezzogiorno and Northern Ireland. The Commission will submit proposals to the Council in order to add Portugal and some Spanish regions to the list of absolute priority regions, and consequently to modify the percentage level of the allocation reserved for these regions, so as to maintain funding equilibrium between the absolute priority regions and the others. The Commission in its proposal will try to maintain as far as possible the existing conditions of assistance for the different categories of regions.

*
* *

Question No 26 by Mr Rogalla (H-324/85)

Subject: European postage stamps

What steps has the Commission taken since the adoption of Parliament's resolution on the introduction of European postage stamps or what proposals has it submitted to the Member States and when, in its opinion, will the first European postage stamp come into general use in the ten Member States? Leaving aside what has been achieved so far, is the Commission prepared to give priority to the introduction of a European postage stamp, for standard letters at least, in connection with the consolidation of the internal market as a means of increasing public awareness of European cooperation?

Answer

A European postage stamp would require a common rate to be set and a common system of charging for international postal services. Repeated discussions with national experts since Parliament adopted its resolution have shown that this would be very difficult in the absence of harmonized postage rates within the Community. The Commission does not therefore consider it practicable to propose introduction of such a stamp. The *ad hoc* committee on a people's Europe did, however, recommend that national postal authorities should consider issuing stamps on a common pattern and highlighting the Community as a way of enhancing public awareness; and also that those which had not yet done so should extend their internal letter and postcard tariffs to all Community destinations. The Commission has already held a first meeting in July with the postal authorities to pursue these matters and a useful positive consensus was reached on most points.

*
* *

Question No 28 by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-396/85)

Subject: Reducing atmospheric pollution by motor vehicles by reducing long waiting periods

The limited results attained by the Council of Ministers as regards reducing the pollution caused by motor vehicle exhausts are a consequence of the opposing interests in operation in the various countries, these taking precedence over environmental concerns. It would be much more useful, therefore, to consider as well ways of reducing pollution by removing the obstacles to traffic, which are a major cause of considerable extra fuel consumption, and engine wear as also of economically wasteful delays and a deterioration in human relations, particularly at certain times of the day and certain periods of the year. The most blatant examples are the motorway toll booths where long queues of vehicles frequently build up, and junctions controlled by traffic lights or car parks, which slow down or hold up traffic, causing a sharp increase in pollution.

Has the Commission ever considered that pollution could also be reduced by speeding up traffic in various ways, possibly by abolishing motorway tolls, and that studies and consultations could be directed towards this end with a view to taking decisions which would attract a broad consensus?

Answer

The agreement reached by the Environment Council in March and June 1985 on vehicle emissions necessarily represents a compromise between the many important interests at stake, including those of the environment. Its implementation will undoubtedly lead to a substantial reduction in pollution caused by motor vehicles over a period of time.

Whilst traffic jams in town are no doubt one of the many causes of increased air pollution and fuel consumption, other parameters, such as traffic density, weather conditions, street configurations all play an important part. However traffic patterns inside cities are so dif-

ferent from one city to another that measures to reduce congestion must be taken at local level. In planning such measures, the authorities concerned may obtain international research data and information through bodies such as the OECD's Road Transport Research programme. Moreover the Commission is currently sponsoring two studies on the energy and other effects of improved traffic flow in and outside urban areas, one of which will include the effect of congestion at motorway toll stations. The results of these studies will be made available to the honourable Member.

In view of the essentially local nature of the problems, however, and the priority required by the Common Transport Policy to be given to transport between the Member States, the Commission does not plan to make specific proposals in this field.

*
* *

Question No 29 by Mr Pearce (H-403/85)

Subject: Impurities in German beer

In the steps which it is taking to end the unlawful discrimination against foreign beer in Germany by operation of the Reinheitsgebot, is the Commission taking account of allegations in the Stern magazine of 7 March 1985, that products such as bromacetic acid, phosphoric acid, ascorbic acid and tannic acid have been used in beer manufacture in the Federal Republic of Germany on a fairly wide scale and that in the provinces other than Bavaria and Baden Wurtemberg certain chemicals may lawfully be added to beer for export (allegations which make nonsense of the Reinheitsgebot)?

Answer

The question of whether the 'German purity law' for beer can be used to prevent imports of beer from other Member States which do not comply with that German rule is pending before the Court of Justice.

The fact that the German legal provisions on beer might not be respected in practice by domestic producers is a matter for the German authorities. It is not in itself directly relevant to the question of the compatibility of those rules with Articles 30 to 36 of the EEC Treaty.

*
* *

Question No 30 by Mr Pitt (H-409/85)

Subject: Chemical colour tartrazine E102

Would the Commission comment on research which has linked the chemical colour tartrazine E102 with food allergy problems and hyperactivity in children? Would the Commission also like to explain why it has not considered banning this additive?

Answer

The Commission has long recognised the problem of allergic reactions to certain foods or food ingredients, including some food additives, and established a special working group to review and report on hypersensitivity. The report of the working group which appeared in 1982, accepted that there is evidence linking some food additives, including tartrazine, to allergic or idiosyncratic reactions involving the skin and the respiratory tract. On the other hand, the report states that there is no good evidence to support suggestions that dyes, preservatives and other additives could be responsible for hyperkinesis.

It is always difficult to assess the exact frequency of food allergy and intolerance in the population, but it is certainly very low. The working party suggests a possible range of frequencies of 0.03%-0.15%. The Scientific Committee for food endorsed the Working Group's conclusions on adverse reactions to ingested additives and it did not advocate a general lowering of present levels or any ban on additives. In the Scientific Committee's opinion a substance should only be banned if the effects observed are particularly severe or are widespread in the population. This is not the case for any additive used in the Community, including tartrazine. The Commission does not see any reason to diverge from the Scientific Committee's view at the present time.

Additional protection is provided for the consumer by the labelling requirements. The addition of E102 is clearly indicated on containers and this allows doctors, parents and patients to refrain from using it.

*
* *

Question No 31 by Mr Simmonds (H-414/85)

Subject: Animal welfare

Bearing in mind that the Commission has frequently claimed that it does not have the staff to ensure that existing legislation on animal welfare is implemented properly, recalling that Commissioner Andriessen told Parliament in July that he would take steps to ensure that existing regulations were observed and regretting the fact that he refused at the same time to establish a unit with specific responsibilities for animal welfare, I should be grateful if the Commission would tell me how it proposes to fulfil its commitment to the House.

Answer

As I stressed at the sitting of 11 July I shall continue with the efforts of my predecessors to achieve whatever progress is possible within the scope of our powers in this important field of animal welfare.

Although we have taken a number of internal administrative measures and are attempting in this way to use the available resources as effectively as possible, it is not possible, owing to lack of staff, to set up a special department for animal welfare within the Commission.

The Commission hopes, however, that the number of posts it has requested from the budgetary authority for 1986 will be approved and that it will at last be able to tackle the animal protection issue with all the zeal and concern it deserves.

*
* *

Question No 32 by Mr Wurtz (H-417/85)

Subject: Appropriations for financial cooperation with Turkey

Five million ECU in payment appropriations were entered against Item 9 630 of the 1984 budget for the Third Financial Protocol with Turkey (which was signed on 12 May 1977 for the period ending 31 October 1981). Claiming that extra appropriations were required to meet the Community's commitments, the Commission requested 46 million ECU in its preliminary draft supplementary and amending budget No 1/84. This request was rejected by both the Council and Parliament. However, on page 169 of the report on the implementation of the budget of the European Communities to 31 December 1984, it is stated that the Commission side-stepped this double refusal by the budgetary authorities and entered 22.57 million ECU against Item 9 630 by means of a transfer within Chapter 96,

alleging that it had to meet binding deadlines. Does not the Commission consider that it overstepped its rights in taking this decision?

Question No 37 by Mr Alavanos (H-450/85)

Subject: Third Financial Protocol with Turkey

Within the framework of the Third Financial Protocol with Turkey, the Commission allocated to Turkey sums of 32.4 million ECU and 29 million ECU for 1983 and 1984 respectively, although the Community budget for the years in question had provided for only 5 million ECU in respect of each financial year. In 1984 the Commission granted the above aid to Turkey after two previous attempts to increase the sum provided for in the Protocol had been blocked by the competent budgetary authorities, namely the European Parliament and the Council.

Would the Commission state why it has increased approximately sixfold aid for Turkey under the Third Financial Protocol, thereby disregarding the political considerations behind the decision by the competent budgetary authorities and also the wishes of the European Parliament, which in amendments adopted in 1975 had called for all financial aid to Turkey to be frozen in 1984 and brought to an end in 1985, and what guarantees can it offer that it will not pursue a similar course of action in the current 1985 budget?

Joint answer

The Commission would remind the honourable Members that at the time when the European institutions decided not to enter into any further commitment with Turkey the Third Financial Protocol with this country had already been completed. This means that expenditure since October 1981 has been the result of unavoidable contractual agreements.

It must also be remembered that payments effected by the EIB are to European undertakings and are in no way destined for the Turkish authorities.

In subsequent budgets the Commission has submitted proposals for the appropriations which are needed to meet its obligations. For technical reasons — the Community is not the sole source of capital; the EIB administers the funds which are granted; payments are made as works progress — it is difficult to forecast accurately the amounts of the EIB's calls for funds. For this reason and because of the slow start of certain projects, the budgetary authority did not want to include in the 1983 and 1984 budgets the amounts which subsequently proved necessary to meet the Community's obligations. The Commission therefore had to propose a transfer of appropriations in order to increase funds.

As for the Council — which as budgetary authority is responsible for compulsory expenditure — it has continued to enter payment appropriations under this heading. Its opposition to the transfers which were proposed in 1984 was based on the source of the appropriations and not on political reasons. It even asked the Commission to submit a new transfer proposal, preferably within Title 9 of the budget. In fact, the Commission had found the necessary funds within Chapter 96 and there was no need to approach the budgetary authority again. The Commission was able to increase the funds under its own authority in accordance with the provisions of Article 21(3) of the Financial Regulation of 21 December 1977. The Commission does not feel therefore that it exceeded its powers.

In restricting itself to payments in connection with commitments made before the end of October 1981, the Commission has complied with the political desire of the Community not to enter into any new commitments with Turkey.

*
* *

Question No 33 by Mr Balfé (H-457/85)

Subject: Levying of customs fines by authorities in France and Germany

Calling to mind the ruling in the case of Horvath v Hauptzollamt Hamburg Jonas on 5 February 1981 which read as follows:

'THE COURT (First Chamber), in answer to the question referred to it by the Finanzgericht Hamburg by the orders of 15 January and 8 July 1980,

HEREBY RULES:

The introduction of the Common Customs Tariff no longer leaves a member State the power to apply customs duties to drugs which have been smuggled in and destroyed as soon as they were discovered but does leave it full freedom to take criminal proceedings in respect of offences committed, with all the attendant consequences, including fines';

can the Commission state what steps they have taken and propose to take to end the practice of the levying of customs fines by authorities in France and Germany?

Answer

The Horvath case, to which the honourable Member refers, makes it quite clear that member States have complete freedom to take criminal proceedings in respect of any smuggling, including the imposition of fines. The extract from the judgment which the honourable Member quotes says so in specific terms. It follows, therefore, that the levying of fines by the Customs Authorities to which the honourable Member refers does not contravene the Treaties and the Commission has, therefore, no power to intervene.

*
* *

Question No 39 by Mr Seefeld (H-456/85)

Subject: Impact on the employment situation of the European programme of investment in transport to combat unemployment

In its report of April 1983 on a European programme of investment in transport to combat unemployment, the European Parliament called on the Commission to act in consultation with the competent Member State representatives and the relevant employer and employee organizations in order to ascertain the direct and indirect effects on employment which might be expected from the implementation of measures of Community interest relating to transport infrastructure.

What results have been forthcoming from the investigation and what conclusions have been drawn for the purpose of practical policy making?

Answer

The Commission is fully aware of the contribution which a programme of infrastructure investments could make towards reducing unemployment in the Community. The honourable Member will recall that since 1976 the Commission has made a series of proposals on infrastructure. Since the resolution in question, the Commission has presented no less than five proposals and communications to the Council, and we expect to present another proposal in the very near future. Moreover, as the honourable Member knows what success the Commission has had in this field owes much to the efforts of the Transport Committee of this house, of which he was the first and very successful chairman.

Research studies suggest that undertaking transport infrastructure investments will have a beneficial effect on unemployment because they tend to use a significant amount of labour in their construction phase so that there is a good ratio of jobs to money invested. Furthermore, such investments contribute significantly by reducing costs to unifying the internal market, strengthening industrial competitiveness, integration of the peripheral regions and stimulating new technologies, all of which contribute towards greater prosperity and greater overall employment levels.

The Commission is also working on a system of comparing transport infrastructure projects and evaluating their level of Community interest: the employment effect is a major

criterion. It is hoped to develop this system further and explore the problem of employment in general and how this may be improved by investing in infrastructure.

Furthermore, because of the effect such projects would have in stimulating demand within the Community, and as announced in its programme for 1985, the Commission is examining whether and how the Community's borrowing and lending instruments can be of assistance in developing infrastructure investments of common European interest in all fields, whether transport, telecommunications or environmental protection.

*
* *

Question No 40 by Mr Romeos (H-460/85)

Subject: Delays in financing the olive register

Would the Commission state why payments to finance the olive register have been delayed, a delay which is unjustified since 2.5% of the aid granted to producers continues to be withheld?

Answer

Financing of the olive register is proceeding normally in Italy and France where much progress has been made on the register. The delays in the case of Greece are due to the impossibility of implementing for the moment the method laid down in Regulation (EEC) 2276/79. This method is based on the use of a land register which in Greece currently covers less than 20% of the area. The Greek authorities want to produce a land register at the same time as an olive register, and this is adding to the expense. The Commission departments, the Joint Research Centre and the Greek authorities are working together to solve the technical and financial problems which have arisen and to make a start as soon as possible on the compilation of the olive register.

*
* *

Question No 44 by Mr Le Chevallier (H-475/85)

Subject: Imports of American maize into the Community

In July of this year Dutch dockers unloaded one million tonnes of American maize at the port of Rotterdam, at a time when there were 1.8 million tonnes of French maize for which no purchaser could be found. How does the Commission view this state of affairs?

Question No 45 by Mr Stirbois (H-476/85)

Subject: Dutch imports of American maize

The Commission is not unaware that in the summer the Netherlands obtained large supplies of maize from the United States of America, even though large quantities were available in another Member State. Does it believe this action to be incompatible with the principle of Community preference?

Joint answer

Total imports of maize into the Community have fallen steadily since the 70's when the Community imported between 14 and 20 million tonnes of maize per annum to about 3.5 million tonnes in 1984/85. Self-sufficiency has increased from 55% in 73/74 to about 90% in 84/85.

Prices for maize, compared with other cereals, have been firm and on no occasion has there been selling of grain into intervention.

Maize continues to be imported into the Community because there remains a shortfall in supply from Community farmers particularly in certain quality categories. By and large, maize imported into the Community is destined for the manufacture of starch. Maize qualities for starch production are not available in sufficient quantities from domestic sources at certain times of the year, particularly towards the end of the maize marketing year in August and September. Furthermore, quality is variable from one year to the other, and the 1984 harvest was not considered one of the best for starch production.

The Commission should not, and does not, seek to prevent the imports of maize into the Community. It does defend the threshold price by fixing a daily import levy. In answer to the question of Mr Stirbois (H-476/85), the Commission does not consider that it has violated the principle of Community preference.

With regard to the French maize, the Commission does not accept the view that there are 1.8 million tonnes 'looking for a taker'. End of year stocks in France have varied between 1.2 and 2.0 million tonnes over the past four years. It is not anticipated that the situation at the end of 84/85 is different from previous years.

*
* *

Question No 46 by Mr Ephremidis (H-479/85)

Subject: Subsidies and imports of fertilizers into Greece

In its answer to Oral Question No H-752/85¹ by Mr Adamou on subsidies and imports of fertilizers into Greece, the Commission states that it 'is well aware of the difficulties which the latter (the Greek Government) encounters in the application of Regulation No 37/81² and that it 'is at present considering whether an authorization of a particular measure by the Council, on the basis of Article 42 of the EEC Treaty, would constitute an appropriate solution to the problem'.

Does the Commission intend to prolong the arrangements for protecting fertilizers and their circulation, which is necessary owing to the state of the Greek agricultural economy?

Answer

The Commission is planning to ask the Greek Government to end aid for the supply of reduced-price fertilizers to the agricultural sector.

*
* *

Question No 49 by Mr Elliott (H-487/85)

Subject: Non-European mother-tongue language

Bearing in mind that several million residents in the Community speak a non-European mother-tongue language, such as Punjabi, Urdu, Arabic, etc., would the Commission be willing to ensure that its information offices in the Member States make available informative literature and general publicity material in at least the most commonly used of these languages?

Will it also ensure that in its press statements and advertising use is made of the many minority language newspapers and magazines?

¹ Debates of the European Parliament No 2-324 of 13 March 1985, Annex.

² OJ L 3 of 1 January 1981, page 1.

Answer

The information material distributed through the Commission's press and information offices is available in the present seven official languages of the Community, and will soon be available in nine official languages.

Translation work represents a considerable item of expenditure and requires the services of considerable numbers of staff.

Owing to budgetary constraints, it is not possible for all information material to be translated in all cases into other languages. The example of Punjabi and Urdu cited by the honourable Member illustrate how difficult this task would be, given that 217 different languages are spoken in India alone.

The Commission can give the honourable Member every assurance that its press and information offices in third countries take all the necessary and appropriate steps to ensure that information material, press releases and publicity material are made available to users in languages other than official Community languages.

*
* *

Question No 51 by Mr Iversen

Subject: Indiscriminate use of penicillin in agriculture

It is thought that Danish consumers eat 500 000 kg of meat contaminated by medicinal products each year. This was shown by a spot check carried out in 1984 when 10 003 animals were tested and penicillin residues were found in 3 pigs, 2 sows and 2 head of cattle, which amounted to 925 kg of meat, containing penicillin residues. In Denmark 15 million animals were slaughtered and an estimate on the basis of the tests suggests that a total of 500 000 kg of meat contained penicillin residues.

In the light of this, can the Commission indicate how many animals were slaughtered in each of the Ten Member States in 1984 and how many of these animals are thought to have contained residues of medicinal products and what conclusions does it draw from this information?

Answer

The number of animals slaughtered in each Member State in 1984 was as follows:

| | Bovine | Porcine | Ovine | Caprine | Solipeds |
|---------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|----------|
| FR of Germany | 5 139 281 | 38 652 203 | 1 333 540 | 5 653 | 26 113 |
| France | 4 913 895 | 20 776 082 | 8 778 691 | 325 814 | 100 370 |
| Italy | 3 675 243 | 11 447 391 | 7 543 934 | 503 544 | 255 570 |
| Netherlands | 1 246 323 | 15 511 277 | 352 556 | 38 504 | 9 021 |
| Belgium | 737 634 | 8 328 914 | 342 864 | — | 25 843 |
| Luxembourg | 33 378 | 126 103 | — | — | — |
| UK | 4 163 297 | 14 906 184 | 14 851 281 | — | 26 004 |
| Ireland | 1 388 799 | 2 224 499 | 1 682 899 | — | 7 000 |
| Denmark | 1 004 399 | 14 785 383 | 24 700 | — | 3 600 |
| Greece | 351 300 | 2 261 700 | 7 308 871 | 4 190 109 | — |

The Commission has no information on the amount of residues which are present in animals slaughtered in each Member State. However, in its proposal for a Council Directive on the examination of animals and fresh meat for the presence of residues¹, the Commis-

¹ OJ C 132 of 31 May 1985, page 5.

sion provides for an information system according to which Member States have to inform the Commission and the other Member States yearly about the tests carried out and the results thereof. This proposal also provides for a control system which is common to all Member States, and files the number of samples to be taken by the competent authorities.

*
* *

Question No 54 by Mr Fich (H-505/85)

Subject: British seiners

What is the system for monitoring the sale of herring to Russian and other mother ships from British seiners and how do the Community's fishery inspectors ensure that it works?

Answer

The direct purchase and trans-shipment of all pelagic fish by Soviet and other vessels from British fishing vessels is controlled by national measures supplementing the Community logbook. Under these control arrangements, national inspectors are able to monitor individual trans-shipments and all associated paperwork.

The Commission's fishery inspectors monitor the application of national and Community measures in this field in the course of their overall activities under the relevant Community legislation.

*
* *

Question No 55 by Mr Clinton (H-508/85)

Subject: Agricultural consultation

In view of recent statement by Mr Andriessen requesting increased consultation and dialogue with the farm organizations of Europe, would the Commission not agree that it is imperative to increase the number of seats on Agricultural Advisory Committees in order to take account of the enlargement of the Communities? Would the Commission not further agree that any reduction in the number of meetings with the various Agricultural Committees would have a serious adverse effect on the long-standing consultative process?

Answer

The honourable Member will doubtless recall the situation the Commission encountered when it first addressed itself to agricultural matters. On 1 February 1984, in response to the report by Mrs Boserup, the Commission decided to reduce the size of the various advisory committees to 20 members. This was a decision applicable to all advisory committees, including the agricultural advisory committees. The decision, which was, moreover, coupled with the abolition of a number of advisory committees, was welcomed by the European Parliament¹.

As the implementation of the decision posed certain problems for the agricultural sector, I asked the Commission to review this matter. Like the honourable Member, I believed that it was essential to maintain a productive dialogue with farm organizations.

The Commission duly accepted my argument and agreed not to reduce the size of the agricultural advisory committees (and indeed of the committees of non-governmental

¹ OJ C 127 of 14 May 1984, page 56.

experts operating in other sectors), on the understanding, however, that there would be no increase on the occasion of Spanish and Portuguese accession.

What is more, following the necessary representations on my part, meetings of the agricultural advisory committees may now be convened more frequently than was the case in the past two years.

*
* *

Question No 56 by Mrs Boserup (H-510/85)

Subject: The effect of the falling dollar on the Community's 1986 budget

Will the Commission state what effect the falling rate of the dollar will have on efforts to keep to the agricultural expenditure forecast in the 1986 budget?

Answer

The dollar has recently depreciated quite considerably against the ECU.

In preparing the preliminary draft budget for 1986 the Commission worked on the assumption that \$ 1 = 1.20 ECU. This assumption corresponds more or less with the current rate of exchange.

*
* *

Question No 58 by Mr Mallet (H-513/85)

Subject: Establishment of links between the EEC and Libya

Last July the Libyan authorities confirmed their interest in establishing closer links with the EEC and their willingness to open negotiations. In spring the Libyan Foreign Minister made initial approaches to this effect to the Commissioner with responsibility for Mediterranean policy and North-South relations, Mr Claude Cheysson. Can the Commission confirm this statement and what response does it intend to make?

Answer

On 19 July the Commission received a formal request from Libya for the opening of negotiations for a cooperation agreement with the Community. During talks which had been held earlier with Libyan representatives, they had stated that Libya would like to have closer links with the Community, including a cooperation agreement. At the practical level, mention had been made of cooperation to combat desertification — with the regional approach it would be advisable to take — and also the possibilities of co-financing in developing countries.

When it laid down the principles for an overall Mediterranean policy in 1972, the Community envisaged that cooperation agreements might be negotiated with all the countries of the Mediterranean. However, the actual conclusion of such agreements depends on the particular relations which the Community has with each of these countries. In the case of Libya, since it has now made a formal request to start negotiations for a cooperation agreement, consideration will have to be given to every aspect of the effect that such an agreement might have on the Community's Mediterranean policy, while bearing in mind the Community's desire to contribute towards stability in the region.

*
* *

Question No 59 by Mrs Van Hemeldonck (H-520/85)

Subject: Repayment of state aid

Can the Commission give me the exact date of repayment of Bfrs 550 million of Belgian Government state aid to Beaulieu for taking over Fabelta Zwijnaarde (the subject of my Written Question No 2442/84)?

Answer

As already pointed out in reply to the honourable Member's Written Question No 2442/84, the Belgian Government has informed the Commission by letter of 21 November 1984 of the complete withdrawal on 5 October 1984 of the state participation in the capital of the company in question amounting to Bfrs 550 million and which had been paid in August 1983.

*
* *

Question No 61 by Mrs Quin (H-523/85)

Subject: EEC drinking water Directive 80/778

In the Commission's view, which Member States, if any, are satisfactorily implementing EEC Directive No 80/778 on drinking water?

Answer

Directive 80/778/EEC on drinking water has been implemented in the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, France, the United Kingdom and Ireland. Infringement procedures under article 169 of treaty have been instigated against the remaining Member States for failing to comply with the directive.

As far as effective implementation of the directive is concerned, the Commission's services are preparing an inquiry to check whether maximum admissible concentrations (MAC) of the directive's parameters are respected. Only the United Kingdom has submitted a special request for a longer period for complying with lead MAC and applying the directive's MAC's in private water supplies. This request is currently being considered. Ireland has also notified the Commission of its intention to submit a special request of this kind.

*
* *

II. Question to the Council

Question No 64 by Mr Boutos (H-366/85)

Subject: Looting and destruction of archaeological treasures in the occupied territories of Cyprus

The very important report presented to the Athens Academy in May 1985 under the title 'Cyprus: the works of 9 000 years of civilization are being looted' presented masterpieces of art which have been 'repatriated' since the invasion of Cyprus, having been bought by the Cyprus Government on the Western European markets. The same report included the enlarged photographs which bear mute testimony to the scale of the damage sustained at the hands of the occupying army by churches, cemeteries, archaeological sites and museums in the occupied territories of Cyprus, as a result of looting, sacrilege and deliberate destruction.

Since these masterpieces of art, which belong, of course, to the Republic of Cyprus, are art works forming a part of Europe's cultural heritage, will the Council say what steps or decisions it has taken, on the one hand, to put pressure on the Turkish army of occupation, with whose complicity the looting and destruction are being carried out, to oblige it to present a detailed report on the present state of all the monuments, museums, churches and archaeological sites in the territories it is occupying, and on the other, to enable itself to keep a check on the art markets in the Member States when the exhibits on sale are the products of this kind looting?

Answer

The situation described by the honourable Member concerns two States which are not members of the European Community; the Council therefore has no control over the matter.

*
* *

Question No 67 by Mr Wijsenbeek (H-413/85)

Subject: Recruitment procedures for Community officials

Can the Council indicate how its recruitment procedures could be coordinated with those of the other Community institutions?

Answer

The Council acknowledges that, generally speaking, there are considerable advantages in improved coordination of recruitment procedures and is willing to cooperate as far as possible with the other institutions in achieving this aim. Nevertheless, it recognizes that any progress along these lines would require the prior agreement of all the institutions to harmonize various practices which concern the problem of recruitment, such as budgetary policy and estimates of staff requirements, the operation of joint committees and the development of careers.

*
* *

Question Nr 69 by Mr Marshall (H-236/85)

Subject: EEC/Cyprus Association Agreement

Can the Council indicate what progress is being made in negotiating further stages of the EEC/Cyprus Association Agreement?

Answer

On 19 July 1985, the Commission forwarded a communication to the Council with a view to opening negotiations with Cyprus on the transition to the second stage of the Association Agreement, which should lead to the gradual setting up of a customs union between the Community and Cyprus.

The Council bodies started their examination of that communication at the beginning of September with the aim of opening negotiations with Cyprus before the end of 1985, in accordance with the statements made by the Community at the last EEC-Cyprus Association Council and confirmed again by the Council on 30 March 1985.

Question No 70 by Mr Deprez (H-290/85)

Subject: Spain's purchase of large quantities of milk from the United States

Spain will become a member of the European Community on 1 January 1986 and will then have to comply with the fundamental European principle of Community preference.

It is therefore surprising to learn that Spain has just bought 25 000 tonnes of dried skimmed milk for animal feed from the United States, which will cover its feed milk requirements up to mid-1986, in other words for six months after its accession to the Community.

This is all the more surprising since the Community has been setting limits on the milk produced (milk quotas) by its own farmers for more than a year.

What does the Council think of this, and how could Spain be made to reverse its decision?

Answer

The concern expressed by the honourable Member regarding the recent purchase by Spanish operators of 25 000 tonnes of dried skimmed milk for animal feed from the United States has been noted by the Council.

The Council would, however, point out that this purchase was made at a time when Spain was not bound by the obligations arising from the Treaty of Accession. From the entry into force of that Treaty, the principle of Community preference will have to be applied in accordance with the provisions thereof, as already indicated by the Commission on 11 July 1985 in its reply to an identical question from the honourable Member.

*
* *

Question No 77 by Mr Andrews (H-447/85)

Subject: Famine in Africa

Following the agreement reached at the European Council on 3 and 4 December 1984 to take concerted action to overcome the effects of an unprecedented drought and the ravages of malnutrition and famine in Africa, and more specifically the decision to provide 1.2 million tonnes of food aid, is the Council satisfied that the aid provided by the Community has reached the people most in need, and is it satisfied that the need has been met for improved coordination between the Community, its Member States, other donors and non-governmental organizations, in order to increase the efficiency and pace of emergency aid measures?

Answer

Even before the full extent of the tragedy became apparent the Community was sparing no effort to come to the aid of the victims of drought and famine in Africa. It supported international initiatives, particularly at the United Nations Conference on the emergency in Africa. It also, in its own right and in collaboration with the Member States, took a series of measures culminating in the adoption of the emergency plan by the European Council in Dublin. As you are aware, the objective of that plan, which was to supply 1 200 000 tonnes of cereals or cereals equivalent to the worst-hit countries in Africa before the 1985 harvest, has already been achieved and even surpassed.

There were admittedly some difficulties in coordinating the unloading of aid consignments and routing the aid onwards to the starving. That is why, in the light of the statement by the European Council in Milan on the famine in Africa, further measures have recently been adopted and should soon be producing results. For example, early warning

systems have been improved and delivery of consignments speeded up, thanks to more financing and better technical facilities for transport.

In a number of Resolutions adopted in 1984 and 1985 the Council invited the Commission to hold regular coordination meetings with the Member States in order to anticipate food shortage situations wherever possible. A coordinated response could therefore be organized whenever the need should arise. According to the information which the Commission has forwarded to the Council these meetings have been well worthwhile. The Community and its Member States also coordinate with other aid donors. The Council's information is that this coordination too is operating satisfactorily, despite frequent practical difficulties.

Lastly, the European Council in Milan stressed the importance of setting up a general coordinated strategy against short- and long-term drought. This requires efforts to redirect food security policies along the lines of those already provided for in the new ACP-EEC Convention of Lomé.

The Council welcomes this contribution, now and in the longer term, to coping with a tragic situation which we must make every effort to ensure never happens again.

*
* *

Question No 84 by Mr Seligman (H-491/85)

Subject: Renewal of the ban on imports of seal products

Having regard to the answer given by the Council of Ministers on 3 September 1985 will the Council please give the present situation on the indefinite extension of the ban on the importation into the EEC of seal products, which was introduced on 1 October 1983 and expires on 1 October 1985?

Answer

At its meeting on 27 September 1985 the Council agreed to extend for four years (i.e. until 1 October 1989) the ban on the importation into the Community of certain seal-pup skins and derived products.

*
* *

Question No 86 by Mr Iversen (H-509/85)

Subject: Creation of an EC Central Bank

The Danish economic experts write in their new report on monetary policy, 'Danish monetary policy in transition', that it will be difficult in future for Denmark to pursue an independent economic policy.

Since the Council has on a number of occasions discussed the establishment of a Community monetary union, it is asked what progress has been made with the plans to set up a common central bank system for the Community as part of the move to form a currency union and whether it agrees that such a linkage of economic policy in the 10 Community countries will make it difficult for Member States to pursue independent policies?

Answer

The Council affirms that economic convergence continues to be a fundamental objective of the Communities. To this end, long-term prospects for monetary cooperation within

the European Monetary System (EMS) have been discussed at recent meetings of the ECO/FIN Council. The Council reaffirmed that such cooperation is a fundamental component of the European integration process and that progress towards the strengthening of the EMS is possible if approached pragmatically and with an eye to long-term objectives. Further action to improve the convergence of economic policies, the liberalization of capital movements and the strengthening of the role of the ECU are of major importance in this process.

The two competent Committees — the Committee of Central Bank Governors and the Monetary Committee — have been asked to continue examining the potential for further developing the EMS and to report back to the Council.

The more specific aspects referred to by honourable Member, such as a common central bank system or EEC Central Bank, are not on the Council's agenda.

*
* *

III. Questions to the Foreign Ministers

Question No 88 by Mr Marshall (H-376/85)

Subject: Plight of Esther-Rukhil Tepper and Ilya Vaitzblit

Have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation discussed the plight of Ilya Vaitzblit and Esther-Rukhil Tepper who, despite being pensioners, are prevented from leaving Russia to join relatives in Israel? Will they please bring pressure to bear on the Russians to allow Refuseniks to leave for their spiritual home in Israel?

Answer

The case of Esther-Rukhil Tepper and Ilya Vaitzblit raised by the honourable Member has not been specifically discussed by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation.

It is common knowledge that the Ten have on many occasions expressed their concern to the Soviet authorities at the plight of Soviet Jews and members of other ethnic minorities wishing to emigrate from the Soviet Union. They will continue to make representations, individually and jointly, to the Soviet authorities to remind them of the importance they attach to compliance with the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and the closing document of the Madrid follow-up conference, which were freely approved and signed by the Soviet Union.

*
* *

Question No 89 by Mr Emphremidis (H-480/85)

Subject: Statements by President Reagan

How do the Foreign Ministers view recent statements by President Reagan in which he attempts to exploit certain acts of terrorism in order to impose the state terrorism of the USA on countries such as Nicaragua, Cuba and North Korea?

Answer

The statements to which the honourable Member refers have not been the subject of discussion by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation.

*
* *

Question No 90 by Mr Wurtz (H-400/85)

Subject: Peace proposals by the Contadora Group

What is the reaction of the ten Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation to the latest proposals by the Contadora Group and, in particular, have the ten Ministers adopted a position on the attitude of the United States towards Nicaragua, when the *International Herald Tribune* has just revealed that the US had plans to bomb the Managua region in June 1985?

Answer

The Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation have supported the aims and efforts of the Contadora Group since the outset. They believe that the peace initiative which the four members of the Group have been pursuing since 1983 represents the best hope for an overall negotiated settlement which comes from the region itself, which can be freely accepted by all involved and which will bring to an end the crisis in Central America.

The Ten continue to support the Contadora Group's efforts for a peaceful settlement on the basis of the Contadora proposals which were reiterated by the members of the Group when they met in Panama on 21 and 22 July 1985.

*
* *

Question No 93 by Mr Flanagan (H-443/85)

Subject: Rockall

Will the Foreign Ministers indicate the status in Community law or in international law of the decision that was reached on 12 June 1985 by the Planning Committee of the Western Isles' Council to grant personal planning permission to adventurer Tom MacLean for the erection of a survival shelter on Rockall, which is a small uninhabited island in the Atlantic 265 miles from Donegal, Ireland, bearing in mind the fact that in 1980 Ireland and Britain agreed to submit the delineation of the continental shelf to independent arbitration?

Answer

The honourable Member's question does not fall within the province of European political cooperation.

*
* *

Question No 94 by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-451/85)

Subject: Expulsion from Hong Kong of 13 female Chinese boat people

The Hong Kong Government, which in 1980 closed its doors to all illegal immigrants from China, recently expelled 13 female Chinese boat people, thereby compelling them to leave their families, including their children. The wives of fishermen and male boat people who married in China after that date are allowed to enter Hong Kong, although they are obliged to live on the water and are not able to set foot on land, since they have no identity cards. The expulsion of the 13 women, which has distressed the Chinese boat people, already suffering badly from their living and working conditions, could be repealed by the Hong Kong Government if it so wished, a request made repeatedly by social workers and missionaries.

Can the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation intervene to end this violation of the human rights of the family unit which, according to the UN Declaration, has the right to remain together?

Answer

The honourable Member's question does not fall within the province of European political cooperation.

*
* *

Question No 95 by Mr Alavanos (H-482/85)

Subject: EEC involvement in 'star wars'

In view of the position of certain governments of EEC Member States, such as the United Kingdom, and in view of the bilateral contracts which the US Administration is signing with major companies in EEC Member States providing for their participation in research for the 'strategic defence initiative', the EEC is essentially already involved in the star wars project.

How do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation view this alarming development, which is taking place shortly before the meeting between Presidents Gorbachov and Reagan, precisely when Western Europe should be taking initiatives against the militarization of space and nuclear weapons and in favour of peace and disarmament?

Answer

The question tabled by the honourable Member refers to the military aspects of security which — as is known — are not discussed by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation.

*
* *

Question No 96 by Mr Adam (H-484/85)

Subject: Iran

When was the situation in Iran last discussed by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation and what representations have the Foreign Ministers made to the Iranian Government regarding the improvement of human rights and greater religious freedom in Iran?

Answer

The situation in Iran with regard to human rights and fundamental freedoms is regularly reviewed by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation. As far as the persecution of religious minorities is concerned, for instance, of the Bahai's or Armenian Christians, the Ten have made representations to the Teheran authorities.

These representations, as well as the action of the Ten in other international bodies such as the Commission on Human Rights, are a measure of the concern with which the Member States of the European Community view the problem of human rights in Iran.

The Ten will continue to monitor developments in this matter with the closest attention and will miss no opportunity to raise the subject in their contacts with the Iranian authorities wherever they deem it appropriate to do so.

*
* *

Question No 97 by Mr Ulburghs (H-493/85)

Subject: Conviction of Mr Van Den Bogaert

Can the Ministers indicate what representations have been made to the authorities in Zaire in order to secure the release of Mr Van Den Bogaert, as requested in a European Parliament resolution adopted on 12 September 1985?

Answer

The question of Mr Van Den Bogaert's trial has been discussed by the Ministers meeting in political cooperation. In this case as in others the Ten are anxious to see that the rights of defence are safeguarded. Assistance was given to the representative of the European Parliament's Socialist Group during his recent visit to Kinshasha at the time of Mr Van Den Bogaert's trial.

*
* *

Question No 99 by Mr Iversen (H-511/85)

Subject: Appeal to banks to stop sales of South African gold

In Denmark all the major Danish banks have now decided not to sell the South African gold coins known as krugerrands. Can the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation indicate whether they have discussed an appeal to all banks in the Ten Member States to stop all sales of South African gold coins in order thereby to bring pressure to bear on the South African apartheid régime?

Answer

At their meeting on 10 September 1985 the Foreign Ministers of the Ten and of Spain and Portugal decided to maintain pressure on South Africa and to this end to harmonize their positions on a certain number of measures both restrictive and positive in nature. In accordance with the statement of 22 July this year, the Ten and Spain and Portugal reserve the right to reconsider their position if tangible progress is not made within a reasonable time. The question of other measures, including sanctions, has not been excluded.

*
* *

Question No 100 by Mrs Van den Heuvel (H-515/85)

Subject: Execution of Indonesian trade union leaders

What steps have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation taken in response to the resolutions adopted by the European Parliament on 12 June 1985 and 12 September 1985 to prevent the Indonesian Government from carrying out further executions and are the Foreign Ministers prepared to suggest to the Indonesian Government that Sukatno

and others, who are due to be executed soon, should be offered asylum on humanitarian grounds in one of the Member States of the Community?

Answer

The Ten have from the start paid close attention to the situation of those sentenced to death in Indonesia. In this connection, and on humanitarian grounds, they made representations last June to the Indonesian Government on behalf of those under sentence of death. It was with great disappointment that the Ten learned on 27 August 1985 of the execution of three prisoners. The Ten have not been able to obtain any definite information on the fate of the other prisoners, including Mr Vidgayasastra and Mr Sukatno, but they are monitoring the situation closely.

*
* *

Question No 101 by Mr Pranchère (H-516/85)

Subject: Situation in the territories occupied by Israel

Are the Ministers meeting in political cooperation aware that 15 Palestinians were expelled to Jordan on 15 September 1985? Do they know that another three Palestinian residents on the West Bank are also threatened with expulsion, and have they made representations or do they intend to make representations to the Israeli authorities to persuade them to discontinue these violations of human rights (and of the Geneva Convention on the occupied territories)?

Answer

The respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms in all countries is of constant concern to the Ten.

In this context, the situation in the territories occupied by Israel is regularly discussed in the framework of European political cooperation and the Ten have not been lacking, and will not be lacking, in raising these matters during their contacts with the Israeli authorities.

The specific case to which the honourable Member refers has not, however, been discussed by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation.

*
* *

Question No 102 by Mr Pearce (H-518/85)

Subject: Formal recognition of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

Have the Foreign Ministers given consideration to the formal recognition of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus since the election of President Denktash as its president and, if so, what conclusions did they come to?

Answer

In answer to this question, I should like to draw the honourable Member's attention to the answer given at the September part-session to the Oral Question with debate No 0-75/85 by Mr Adamou.

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 10 OCTOBER 1985

Contents

1. *Topical and urgent debate*
 - Earthquake in Mexico — Motions for resolutions by Mrs Tove Nielsen (Doc. B2-982/85); Mr Romualdi and Mr de Camaret (Doc. B2-984/85); Mr Tripodi and others (Doc. B2-985/85); Mr Prag (Doc. B2-986/85); Mr de la Malène and others (Doc. B2-994/85); Mr Langes and others (Doc. B2-1002/85); Mr Linkohr and Mr Arndt (Doc. B2-1016/85); and Mr Cervetti and others (Doc. B2-1021/85).*
 - Mr Cheysson (Commission); Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Prag; Mr Langes; Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr Arndt; Mr Cheysson*
 - Geneva summit — Motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1001/85) by Mr Poettering and others*
 - Mr Poettering; Mr Dankert; Mrs Larive-Groenendaal*
 - Termination of service of officials — Motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1029/85) by Mr Rothley and others*
 - Meeting of the finance ministers in New York — Motions for resolutions by Mrs Tove Nielsen (Doc. B2-981/85); Mr Bonaccini and others (Doc. B2-989/85); and Mr de la Malène and others (Doc. B2-1028/85)*
 - Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Bonaccini; Mr de la Malène; Mr Visser; Mr von Bismarck; Mr Cassidy; Mr Andriessen (Commission)*
 - Intergovernmental conference — Motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1004/85) by Mr Herman and others*
 - Mr Herman; Mr Sutra de Germa; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Romeo; Mr Christensen; Mr Lomas; Mr Cheysson (Commission)*
 - Lebanon — Motions for a resolutions by Mr d'Ormesson and others (Doc. B2-992/85); Mr Nordmann and others (Doc. B2-1011/85); and Mr Guermeur (Doc. B2-1025/85)*
 - Mr Almirante; Mr Deniau; Mr Guermeur; Mr Baget Bozzo; Mr Mallet; Mr Pannella; Mr Cheysson (Commission)*
 - Human rights — Motions for resolutions by Mr Langes and others (Doc. B2-999/85); Mr Marck and others (Doc. B2-1003/85); Mr Glinne and others (Doc. B2-1017/85); and Mr Boutos and Mr Mouchel (Doc. B2-1024/85/rev.)*
 - Mr Langes; Mr Marck; Mr Glinne; Mr Baudouin; Mr Kuijpers; Mr Pordea; Mr Cheysson (Commission); Mrs Ewing; Mr Eyraud*
 - Israeli raid in Tunisia — Motions for resolutions by Mrs Heinrich (Doc. B2-1008/85); and Mr Cervetti and others (Doc. B2-1022/85)*
 - Mr Mallet; Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mr Pajetta; Mr Adamou*
 - Damage to agriculture due to bad weather — Motions for resolutions by Mr Provan and others (Doc. B2-980/85); Mr Stirbois and others (Doc. B2-990/85); Mrs De March and others (Doc. B2-993/85); Mr de la Malène and others (Doc. B2-995/85); Mrs Ewing and others (Doc. B2-997/85); Mr Debatisse and others (Doc. B2-1005/85); Mr Maher and others (Doc. B2-1010/85); Mr Saby (Doc. B2-1014/85); and Mr Eyraud and others (Doc. B2-1018/85) 174*
2. *Common market for broadcasting — Report (Doc. A2-102/85) by Mr De Vries*
 - Mr De Vries; Mr Schinzel; Mr Beumer; Mr Cassidy; Mr Barzanti; Mr Van der Waal; Mr Collins; Mr Hahn; Mr Toksvig; Mr Filinis; Mr Seal; Mr Marck; Mr Alavanos; Mr Ripa di Meana (Commission) 197*
3. *Dairy quotas — Interim report (Doc. A2-85/85) by Mr Woltjer*
 - Mr Woltjer; Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Thareau; Mr Früh; Mr Simmonds; Mr Gatti; Mrs Jackson; Mr Cheysson (Commission); Mrs Martin; Mr Christensen; Mr Wetzig; Mr Borgo; Mrs Jepsen; Mr Brøndlund Nielsen 209*
4. *Votes*
 - Mr Collins; Mr Cassidy; Mr Kuijpers; Mrs Péry; Mr Seal; Mr Cassidy; Mrs Larive-Groenendaal; Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken; Mrs Daly; Mrs Crawley; Mr Filinis; Mr*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>Maffre-Baugé; Mrs Pantazi; Mr Filinis; Mr Klepsch; Mrs Veil</i> 220</p> <p>5. <i>Dairy quotas (continuation)</i> <i>Mr Stevenson; Mr Clinton; Mrs Jackson; Mr Maher; Mrs Daly; Mr Cheysson (Commission); Mrs Jackson; Mr Cheysson</i> 224</p> <p>6. <i>Jamming stations in Europe — Report (Doc. A2-103/85) by Mr Habsburg</i> <i>Mr Habsburg; Mr Christopher Beazley; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Pordea</i> 229</p> | <p>7. <i>Substances having hormonal or thyrostatic action — Report (Doc. A2-100/85) by Mr Collins</i> <i>Mr Collins; Mr Eyraud; Mr Mertens; Mr Sherlock; Mrs Squarzialupi; Mr Van der Lek; Mr Chiabrando; Mr Simmonds; Mr Iversen; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mr Raftery; Mr Dalsass; Mr Ferruccio Pisoni; Mr Maher; Mr Cheysson (Commission); Mr Elliott; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz</i> 232</p> |
|--|--|

IN THE CHAIR: MR ALBER

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)¹

1. *Topical and urgent debate*

Earthquake in Mexico

President. — The next item on the agenda is the joint debate on eight motions for resolutions on the earthquake in Mexico:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-982/85), tabled by Mrs Tove Nielsen on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the earthquake in Mexico City;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-984/85), tabled by Mr Romualdi and Mr de Camaret on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on the earthquake in Mexico;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-985/85), tabled by Mr Tripodi and others on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on the risks to Mexican works of art in the aftermath of the recent earthquake;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-986/85), tabled by Mr Prag on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the recent earthquake in Mexico City;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-994/85), tabled by Mr de la Malène and others on behalf of the

Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the earthquake disaster in Mexico;

- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1002/85), tabled by Mr Langes and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the earthquake in Mexico;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1016/85), tabled by Mr Linkohr and Mr Arndt on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the earthquake in Mexico;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1021/85), tabled by Mr Cervetti and others on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the earthquake in Mexico.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, the Commission would never miss the opening of a debate, in particular when its subject is the terrible suffering that the Mexican people have had to endure as a result of the earthquake.

When the news of the disaster was received the Commission released an appropriation of 500 000 ECU, which became available a few hours later. The following day the independent organization Médecins sans Frontières requested help from the Commission and this was also given so that an aircraft was on its way within a few hours of the news of the earthquake. Médecins sans Frontières having meanwhile repaid the Commission the amount advanced, the 500 000 ECU could be sent to the Mexican Red Cross through the agency of the League of Red Cross Societies and the Geneva Red Crest. This money has been used for drugs and other small medical supplies and other urgently needed material.

The motions for resolutions tabled by the members make reference to Commission involvement in the rebuilding programme. I would remind the House that Article 930 of the budget has provision under the Disaster Fund heading, to participate in the reconstruc-

¹ *Approval of minutes — Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council — Documents received: see Minutes.*

Cheysson

tion. This being the case, the fund has been primarily used in the past to help the poorest peoples struck by disaster whereas in the case of Mexico reconstruction work will centre on public buildings. The Mexican Government has not, as yet, requested our assistance.

Mrs Tove Nielsen (L). — *(DA)* Mr President, I shall be brief. When we in the Liberal Group heard of the tragic events following the violent earthquake in Mexico, we realized immediately that the Community countries naturally have a joint responsibility to help, for we are all citizens of the world we live in. Therefore the Liberal Group immediately tabled a motion for a resolution with a request for urgent debate.

Several motions for resolutions have been tabled by the various political groups. We cannot support them all, since there are some proposals and ideas which we do not fully sympathize with. But as far as the Liberal Group is concerned, the crux of the matter is that we believe the Mexican Government did what it could as promptly as it could. We share the grief of those who have suffered, including those who were trying recently to reach a child who had been heard making a noise for two weeks, but who were forced to abandon the attempt in the end. We feel for the family who has to stand by and watch the bulldozers raze to the ground the house in which they know their children are buried.

We should like the International Monetary Fund to provide economic aid, to grant the necessary funds to help as much as possible, since this is an enormous economic catastrophe. But we also consider it an economic necessity that, in intervening, we should ensure that the infrastructure is changed. We cannot, of course, guard against fresh earthquakes, but we can do as much as possible to make sure that the infrastructure is constructed in such a way as to minimize the consequences of natural disasters. It is in this field that we think the Community has the best prospect of stepping in to help those people who live in areas of the world prone to such disasters.

Mr Prag (ED). — Mr President, I shall be very brief indeed. I would like particularly to draw attention to what the Community has done and also to what individual Member States have done, the teams that have been sent to Mexico City and the specific tasks, such as the repair of the central telephone exchange, which have been carried out by teams from Member States and which have played a part in restoring the essential services of the life of a great city like Mexico City.

At the same time I would like to draw the attention of this House to the fact that there is a limit to what we in Europe can do and to the key position held by the United States in the commerce and financial situation of Mexico. The fact is that Mexico needs a very large loan. The fact is that Mexico already has debts of \$96

billion, which is a colossal sum, and it is absolutely clear that some very substantial financial arrangements will have to be made if Mexico is to recover.

I am doubtful about the proposal in the Socialist resolution for continuing development aid to be given to Mexico. I do not think that is the answer. I think emergency aid is right. I think that, as in the past, the Community should concentrate its development aid on those countries which have a very low income per head. But the fact remains that the Community must do all it can. We, as a group, welcome the statement made by Mr Cheysson a moment ago and we very much hope that a very substantial emergency effort, considerably greater than that which has already been made, will be agreed by the Council.

Mr Langes (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, allow me to make two comments which are connected with the remarks made by Mr Prag. First of all, though, I would like to extend my warmest thanks to the Commissioner, Mr Cheysson, for what he has said. However, I feel that there are two things about which there should be no confusion.

In providing assistance immediately after a severe earthquake, we Europeans — the Member States as well — have only been doing our duty. The only question remaining, in fact, is whether we have done enough. One of the Community's most important tasks is to provide help immediately whenever it is needed. However, the question should be asked, Mr Cheysson — and not only by the Committee on Development and Cooperation but also by the entire House — whether Mexico is still one of the countries which should receive development aid. I feel that in this field we ought to draw the dividing lines more clearly. We should use Mexico as an example to make it clear how much more important it is to discuss the question of debts together and to consider jointly with the International Monetary Fund how aid can be supplied.

When we consider that the devastated areas of Mexico will have to be replanned and reconstructed and new homes will have to be built, it is quite obvious, that even with Europe's help, workable financial arrangements will have to be made. However, I do not altogether agree with the way in which the Community has so far operated its development aid programme.

I think we need to use Mexico as an example to make it clear once again that, although immediate aid is called for, we should still be asking ourselves to what extent development aid is needed. We would also like to ask the Commission to state its position with regard to the problem of rescheduling debts.

Mr de Courcy Ling (ED). — Mr President, on behalf of my group I would just like to say that the significant

de Courcy Ling

ance, in our view, of the earthquake in Mexico City is that it compounds two other chronic problems. One is the worst urban deprivation in the whole world and the second is the problem of long-term debt, of indebtedness, on which Mr Cheysson will no doubt have interesting things to say.

As far as debt is concerned, we very much welcome the statement this week by the United States Secretary of the Treasury, Mr James Baker, in Seoul that the US Government is inclined to increase the capital of the World Bank in order to deal with the long-term debt problems which have hitherto threatened the banking system, although I must say that the Western banks — particularly the European banks, the German and British banks, the French banks — have dealt with the problem with extraordinary flexibility.

However, I do think that a response from the European Community is required to the initiative by Mr James Baker. It is time to consider again the transfer of some of this long-term debt from US dollars into European currency units. It is time for the ECU to become a reserve currency — not only a trading currency but a reserve currency — which will make it possible for the European banks and the European currencies to take their share of the burden which now falls on the US dollar.

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, several things have coincided in Mexico. This is a country which, we have to admit, was in serious trouble even before the earthquake. After a catastrophe of this kind it is naturally to be welcomed that there are offers of help from all sides. But we should also bear in mind that help immediately after such a disaster is not enough. We should recognize that Mexico, a country which is in many respects linked to us culturally, also has many other serious problems.

Mexico's situation otherwise is at least as serious as the colossal damage caused by this disaster. My group is therefore trying to link emergency aid to the question of Mexico's debts — and of course to the debts of the other Central and South American countries. Our motion for a resolution on the earthquake thus attempts to establish such a link to make it clear that the concrete aid which we are now providing would be useless if we did not at the same time achieve a political solution to the debt problem.

That is why we attach so much importance to paragraphs 3 and 4 of our motion, and we would be grateful to this House if it recognized the need to link Mexico's debt with the present emergency in Mexico City and voted accordingly. We believe that the catastrophe in Mexico City should encourage us to rethink the whole situation and to help that country to overcome the effects of the disaster, and also to ensure that the industrialized nations of the West also help to improve Mexico's present economic situation on the basis of a political solution.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, please excuse me for asking to speak a second time. My first speech outlined what the Commission had been able to do, on behalf of the Community, to offer immediate assistance to the victims of the earthquake. However, I felt it inappropriate at that time to refer to what we are doing to tackle the problems facing countries in Latin America, in particular Mexico. Some of the members' comments were to me a little surprising in this respect since they forgot to mention that the Commission, and therefore by extension, the Community, was the first to express an opinion on the debt problems, the first to enter into a dialogue with the countries of Latin America individually — the Mexicans came to see us to discuss this problem three months ago — and collectively — we are the only ones who have had talks with the group known as the Cartagena Group on the whole range of economic topics affecting the debt.

We have also been warmly congratulated by the member countries of the Cartagena Group in a declaration adopted at Lima last July.

I am thus surprised by those members who are now calling on us to decide to take some action. We have been taking action for some considerable time now, well ahead of the Americans, in particular.

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted resolutions Doc. B2-982/85, Doc. B2-986/85, Doc. B2-994/85, Doc. B2-1002/85, Doc. B2-1016/85 and Doc. B2-1021/85 and rejected motions for resolutions Doc. B2-984/85 and Doc. B2-985/85 by successive votes)

Geneva summit

President. — The next item is the debate on the

— motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1001/85), tabled by Mr Poettering and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the invitation from the President of the United States to the seven leading industrial nations to meet him in preparation for the Geneva summit.

Mr Poettering (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in November the American President, Ronald Reagan, and the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr Gorbachov, will be meeting in Geneva for vital discussions on disarmament and arms control. The world is looking forward to the conference with great expectations, and we in Europe have a particular interest in the outcome of the talks between Mr Reagan and Mr Gorbachov and in how the talks in Geneva between the United States and the Soviet Union develop.

Poettering

We have very high expectations of the discussions, and we are particularly pleased that the American President, Ronald Reagan, has invited to New York the main allies — if that is the right term — that is, the six participants at the world economic summit, in order to prepare for the summit with Gorbachov. We welcome this move, but we note with regret that, although the Community is represented at the world economic summit by the Presidents of the Commission and the Council, the US Government has not invited the Community to the New York conference. We regard this as a serious error, which detracts from an otherwise welcome development.

(Applause)

On 8 May of this year, the 40th anniversary of the end of the war in Europe, the US President made a fine and noteworthy speech before Parliament.

I would remind you of what he said:

I am here to tell you that America remains, as she was 40 years ago, dedicated to the unity of Europe.

He also described Europe and America as the twin pillars of the Western alliance. Since the US President has said that, we demand — this is a request but also a demand — that the President of the European Council should also be invited to the conference in New York in the context of European Political Cooperation.

I would remind you of Parliament's resolution of July of this year, when for the first time it discussed matters relating to security policy with the Council of Ministers, represented by the Luxembourg Foreign Minister, Mr Poos. On that occasion the Council President made it clear that security policy would be playing a more prominent role in the Community. My group therefore takes the view — and I hope that it will be shared by a large majority of this House — that no precedent should be allowed to be set for the exclusion of the Community from important voting and discussions in the Western alliance.

If the Community were excluded now, a precedent could be set for the future. The Group of the European People's Party says that this must not happen! The Council President, the Luxembourg Prime Minister, Mr Santer, must be represented in New York! We call on the three major Member States which will be going to New York — the United Kingdom, Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany (France will not be attending) — to press for the admission of the Council President, Prime Minister Santer.

As far as the content of the talks between the Soviet Union and the United States is concerned, we must insist on the establishment of a stable balance between East and West and on the reduction of nuclear weapons to as low a level as possible. In particular, we ins-

ist that the medium-range missiles threatening Europe be removed. We also expect any arms race in space to be made impossible in accordance with the agreement reached between Shultz and Gromyko on 8 January. That must be Europe's position. I appeal to the House to vote in favour of this motion for a resolution, to which no amendments have been tabled.

(Applause)

Mr Dankert (S). — *(NL)* As I see it, Mr President, the motion tabled by Mr Poettering and his colleagues is unfortunately one in which an abundance of good intentions is unusually badly expressed. Admittedly, this is not his fault since the President of the United States has put us in a highly unusual situation by inviting, in preparation for his discussions with Mr Gorbachov, on strategic arms limitation, those countries with which regular discussions are held on economic and monetary problems. That's the root of this problem.

Were it an economic summit conference, it would indeed be quite appropriate to invite the presidents of the Council and the Commission — as Mr Poettering has quite rightly pointed out. If, however, we go on from there to say that President Reagan must invite the President of the Council because this body is becoming increasingly important in political cooperation, then we Europeans are making exactly the same mistake as the Americans made in preparing for the discussions with Gorbachov. One would then have no reason not to invite Delors, even though I cannot see any connection between Delors and strategic arms limitation. We then have the peak of confusion — and this is what I object to — with the text's insistence on prior consultation within NATO. This kind of confusion is unacceptable because it creates vague relationships whereas it is precisely clear relationships that we require in Western Europe and we know quite well where security policies are coordinated.

Mr President, I would again like to stress that those tabling this resolution have really been seduced by their own good intentions. They mustn't confuse an economic summit with NATO nor the EPC with the Community. Nevertheless, there is extremely little difference of opinion on the substantive issue of whether or not Europe should be more active in decision-making on security issues affecting Europe.

There can be no doubt that the Reagan-Gorbachov talks are therefore extremely important and that they directly affect Europe. It seems possible that they can be exploited to achieve breakthroughs in the negotiations on strategic arms limitation and on medium-range rockets — breakthroughs that are essential if the world is to remain safe for mankind. Once again, we are in agreement on the four substantive items though we would perhaps have liked to see them expressed rather differently.

Dankert

Nevertheless, many of us will abstain or even vote against the resolution, precisely because the text has been so carelessly expressed, because there must be no confusion between institutions and because the problem of participation by the European Parliament is not solved by inviting only the President of the Council — I should say the President for political cooperation — since it is quite impossible for the members of that body for political cooperation to give him a mandate to contribute to the American discussions. The NATO countries involved must therefore be invited. It is unfortunate that we have not made more progress in achieving political cooperation, in enhancing the influence of Europe, but that is the current situation and it cannot be improved by suddenly taking another tack. Non-existent structures cannot be conjured out of thin air and it isn't the role of this Parliament to do so. Once again, as far as I am concerned the substance of the resolution is acceptable but the careless and hasty way in which it has been expressed is damaging to the standing of this Parliament.

Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L). — Mr President, I am very surprised by what Mr Dankert said and I will explain why I do not agree with his speech. In 1962 President Kennedy called for the establishment of the twin pillars of the Atlantic Alliance, North America forming one of the pillars, Europe the other. That concept, although not fully developed, remains valid today. The Europe of the Ten, so soon to be Twelve, is the greater part of one pillar. At his meeting with the Soviet leader, Mr Gorbachov, in Geneva in six weeks time, President Reagan will be mainly concerned with questions of security deterrents, arms control and disarmament. These are the harsh and hard substance of NATO-Soviet relations. They have great economic and technical implications so that they fall, at least in part, within the formal sphere of the interests of the Community.

It is also, of course, true, as paragraph 1 of the Poettering resolution says, that the Community is playing an increasingly important rôle in foreign and security policy through European political cooperation, Mr Dankert. Given also the long and sometimes tumultuous political arguments which have raged over the deployment of missiles in the Member States of the Community and which are still a matter of fierce debate in my own country, the Netherlands, I find it surprising, to say the least, that the smaller States of the Community will be unrepresented at the meeting in New York. Simply by observing the by now almost traditional practice of other summits of the free world's leading industrial States, they could have had a voice in the person of a high official of the Community: in this case, in view of what will be discussed, the President of the Council rather than of the Commission. Great and literally vital interests will be involved at Geneva. It is unfortunate that the White House's well meant offer of consultation with allies gives the impression of old-fashioned diplomacy rather

than of recognition of the growing reality of the European Community.

On our Community's success already much of the prosperity and soon much of the security of the Western world will depend. The European pillar, which is greater than the sum of its parts, must not be neglected if the security of the West and peace in the world are to be assured.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

Termination of service of officials

President. — The next item is the debate on the

— motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1029/85) by Mr Rothley and others on the proposal for a Council regulation on the termination of service of officials.

Mr Rothley (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, next week the Council intends to adopt a regulation on the termination of service of officials. The proposal, which was submitted to the Committee of Permanent Representatives of the Member States, differs substantially from the Commission proposals and also from the opinion adopted by Parliament on this matter.

The proposal also contains new elements on which Parliament has not yet been able to express an opinion. I would remind you that Parliament has already dealt with this matter in considerable depth and has discussed it at two plenary sessions. We discussed the problem with the Commission and tried to find a solution on which we could all agree. What is now being proposed differs in two essential respects from what the Commission and Parliament agreed was the right approach. Firstly, there is the question of whether the early termination of service is to be a permanent regulation or whether it will apply for only a limited period. The Commission and Parliament were always in full agreement that the regulation should be applied permanently. The possibility of a limited period of application was never discussed. This alone makes it essential for Parliament to be consulted on this matter.

Secondly, the Commission and Parliament were in complete agreement that the question of how many and which officials can leave the service early should be decided by the budgetary authority, which means that Parliament would also have a say. Hence the non-compulsory nature of the expenditure. The present proposal that the Council itself should decide how

Rothley

many officials per year should terminate their service early — including Parliament officials — is an intrusion into our sphere of competence. Personnel questions are after all budgetary questions, and Parliament should therefore be able to influence the decision-making.

These two points — the permanence of the regulation and the non-compulsory nature of expenditure — are crucial. It is beyond dispute that Parliament — as we pointed out in our motion for a resolution — must be consulted on matters arising out of the Treaties, which means that Parliament must deliver an opinion on all major aspects of a proposal. The present proposals are so recent that Parliament has so far been unable to express an opinion on them.

It is also consistent with the legal practice of the European Court of Justice that Parliament must be consulted in cases of substantial deviation. Our motion for a resolution calls for Parliament to be consulted on this matter. This is an institutional issue and is not a matter of the rights of officials.

The motion for a resolution is addressed to the Council, since we are demanding that Parliament should be consulted. We are also calling upon the Council to accept our proposal to extend the regulation to officials with at least 25 years' service.

However, our motion for a resolution is also addressed to the Commission. What the Council is now proposing also differs in certain important respects from what the Commission has proposed. We point out in our motion that the Commission may, under Article 149(2) of the EEC Treaty, withdraw its proposal before the Council reaches a decision if the decision is substantially different from the Commission proposal. If the Council does not comply with Parliament's request and with the motion for a resolution, we urge the Commission to make use of that right.

(Applause)

Mr Price (ED). — Mr President, my group were in favour of the proposal made by the Commission for early retirement for two reasons. Firstly, it is the only way to admit an adequate number of Spanish and Portuguese officials without adding unnecessarily to the overall size of the Commission's staff and the staff in the other institutions.

The other reason is that it was proposed in a way which would give flexibility in the future to the running of the administration in the institutions. For those reasons we were in favour of it.

Today we support the motion proposed by Mr Rothley because not only does it deal with the important issues of substance but it deals with a very important constitutional point, and that is the consultation rights

of this Parliament. That is something that we must never neglect. It is at the heart of the existing legislative powers of the European Parliament. If the Council is now going to take decisions which are out of accord with the proposal made by the Commission, without any further reconsultation of the European Parliament, then we must make sure that the Commission stands up for our rights and insists that reconsultation does take place. I am sure that Parliament will ensure that that reconsultation takes the minimum possible amount of time in order to get the proper regulation enacted as a Community instrument and in order for it to become operative by the time of accession.

I hope that the House will support the motion proposed by Mr Rothley.

Mr Prout (ED). — Mr President, the isoglucose and chemipharma cases establish that where the Council intends to adopt a Commission proposal which differs substantially from that upon which Parliament was originally consulted, Parliament must be consulted. The Commission is the guardian of the Community order under Article 155 of the Treaty. It is therefore under a duty to ensure that Parliament is consulted in such circumstances, whatever the attitude of the Council. Normally, we have been — I am sad to say, through our own negligence — unaware of the situation until the Council has adopted the legislation and the two-month period for legal action has elapsed. However, Mr Rothley, like a world-class batsman in our own sport of cricket, has seen the ball extremely early. The Commission, therefore, should have no difficulty in fulfilling its constitutional obligations. If it does not, it may well be faced early in the new year with an action in the courts that will destroy the whole purpose of its legislation.

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(NL)* Mr President, the Commission has of course noted with great interest the draft resolution that has been tabled and the debate that has just taken place. I am not going to comment on the long history behind this proposal since we have conducted extensive earlier discussions with this Parliament prior to reaching a common accord.

The Commission amended its proposal in the light of the debate and brought up powerful arguments to defend it in the Council. Let us look particularly at the two points now at issue, i.e. the decision-making procedure on the number of officials eligible for early retirement every year. As you know, we proposed that this figure should be fixed annually as part of the budget procedure. I would also point out that we proposed extending the measure, and this was the second point, to include all officials with 25 years of service.

So far, of course, the Member States have not been prepared to accept the amended Commission propo-

Andriessen

sals and you will know that the EEC Treaty allows the Council to change such proposals provided it is unanimous. What one now has to decide is whether the Commission should withdraw its proposal, as is urged in the motion, or whether the aim would be better served by continuing with the proposal.

I would like to point out — in line with statements made during the debate — that the Commission considered it extremely important that an early and successful start be made next year in the recruitment of Spanish and Portuguese officials. We are all aware that this recruitment will be difficult and will therefore require careful preparation. This time, with this enlargement of the Community, we have tried to learn from the mistakes of the past. One such lesson is that recruitment must begin as soon as possible after enlargement and the Commission therefore considers it extremely important that recruitment conditions, and particularly the early retirement provisions, be finalized well before the end of this year.

For this reason, I do not think it is wise to withdraw the Commission's proposal at this stage since, given that we are dealing with an institutional problem, the essence of the proposal has not, in the Commission's view, been affected. For these reasons, I cannot recommend that the Commission withdraw its proposal however much we regret that the Council is not prepared to accept the agreement reached between the Commission and Parliament. It goes without saying that, when debate on this issue is resumed, the Commission will still do all it can to persuade the Council that the proposal as tabled is the only sound one.

Mr Prout (ED). — Mr President, Members are entitled to ask the Commissioners questions in the course of any debate in this House, including urgencies. I simply want to say to the Commissioner that he has misunderstood the point of Mr Rothley's motion. What Mr Rothley is asking for is reconsultation. Mr Rothley is not saying that if we are reconsulted, we will block what the Commission has had to do. He is not saying that in the end we will not agree with the compromises the Commission has had to make. That is not the point. We are asking simply to be reconsulted. I do not think the Commissioner addressed himself to the problem.

Mr Rothley (S). — (DE) Mr President, there is a point I should like to make. You spoke about the need to recruit Spanish and Portuguese officials, Mr Andriessen, but what we are discussing here has nothing at all to do with that. The regulation on the early termination of service has nothing to do with the matter of recruiting Spanish and Portuguese officials, and we have no objection at all to that regulation. Spanish and Portuguese officials can be recruited from next year in accordance with the regulation. But here we are discussing the termination of service of officials.

Mrs Veil (L). — (FR) On a point of order, Mr President. This is a fascinating debate which is starting up, and I am happy because I think it can influence the way we vote and because it is an important matter. However, I should like the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to be asked whether it is in order to have discussion between the Commission and Members during a topical and urgent debate.

President. — I agree with you entirely. But since we have said one thing we should perhaps give the Commissioner an opportunity to say another, if he so wishes.

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) I shall of course comply with Parliament, but I think there are two misunderstandings I should like to clear up. Firstly, let me say that this resolution contains two parts, one of which is fresh consultation with Parliament and the other is a request for the Commission to withdraw the proposal. This was again made quite clear by the author of the motion for a resolution. I confined my comments to what was asked of the Commission — to withdraw the proposal — and I defended the Commission view that it is not sensible to do so . . .

(Cry from Mr Prout: *It is a misunderstanding!*)

There is no misunderstanding about that; you can read it in the last paragraph of the resolution.

My second remark is the following. It is of course true that the regulation in question also has a structural significance. I do not deny that. But it also really has to do with the policy which the Commission must now follow with a view to recruiting Portuguese officials. I mean by this that we urgently need this regulation and it is thus my view that it is not advisable to withdraw the proposal at this time.

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

Meeting of the finance ministers in New York

President. — The next item is the joint debate on three motions for resolutions:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-981/85), tabled by Mrs Tove Nielsen on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on monetary stability;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-989/85) by Mr Bonaccini and others on the meeting of finance ministers of certain countries in New York;

President

— motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1028/85) by Mr de la Malène and others on the meeting of the five ministers for finance in New York on 22 September.

Mrs Tove Nielsen (L). — *(DA)* Mr President, international monetary instability is a major reason why the international economy is now under greater threat than for many a year. This increasing protectionism and the international debt crisis are factors which all contribute to reducing the potential for the growth we need so badly in both the industrial and developing countries.

The increasing recognition of the role of the ECU in both inter-bank and commercial transactions demonstrates that the European Monetary System ensures monetary stability and is hence an instrument that contributes to the achievement of the common internal market and European integration.

There is thus reason to regret that two Member States still do not participate fully in the European Monetary System. Here, the European Parliament should strongly urge both countries — in particular the United Kingdom — to become full members of the EMS without further delay.

As regards the motion tabled by Mr Bonaccini and others, I would say that the meetings recently held between five industrial countries with a view to reducing the overvalued exchange rate of the dollar have been extremely interesting. Notably because they demonstrate that the American administration, perhaps also forced by circumstances, now acknowledges its responsibility for the unstable monetary situation of recent years. This is an entirely different attitude from that held by Mr de la Malène and others, which is also the reason why the Liberal Group cannot support their motion for a resolution. However, we of course support our own motion together with the Bonaccini resolution.

We nevertheless consider that the European Communities should be represented at these meetings. Such steps are extremely necessary in order to stabilize the international monetary situation, and they cannot be put into effect without the participation of the Community. Here, the Commission should indicate what concrete initiatives it intends to take in this connection.

I will conclude by saying that it is essential that those Member States that continue to maintain them should lift monetary restrictions. Consequently, we in the Liberal Group accept and give our full support to the amendment tabled by the European Democratic Group.

Mr Bonaccini (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, on the general subject of international monetary balance and

the role of the European Monetary System and of its money — currently a 'basket of currencies' — the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs is preparing a resolution which, I believe, will be put before the House in the November session or, perhaps, in the December session.

The aim of the urgent resolution is, instead, more restricted. I am tabling it on behalf of the entire committee on economic and monetary affairs — it is not just a whim of mine. It relates to the meeting in New York and to the irregular manner in which it was held as well as to the fact that the European Community, and in particular its Commission, have been pushed to one side.

Now as far as the manner in which this meeting was held and the results that it produced are concerned, judgement still has to be passed. Its importance was stressed by all members of our committee, even though it is generally felt that market reactions should be studied in more depth.

I read only yesterday in various newspapers containing articles on the subject of what can only be described as doubtful prospects for the future. However, it is not our job to predict the future and we should simply direct our attention to what has happened and ask, as we are asking here and now, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, that the Commission give us its assessment of this event and tell us what steps it intends to take in the immediate future in this matter.

Mr de la Malène (RDE). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, our motion for a resolution should be seen both as a warning and as an expression of concern.

We are, of course, not opposed to the idea of a low dollar. We would simply like to point out that should the dollar fall significantly we would then have very low rates and this, I should remind you, has given rise to concern in this House. Feelings should not be given free rein and this is what our resolution is aiming at.

Nor have we ever opposed the idea of joint discussions of the world's monetary problems — far from it! On the contrary, we have always stressed the great importance we attach to all efforts to achieve monetary stability.

Having stated that we were not against the fall of the dollar and that we favoured monetary agreement, we cannot but express our concern regarding the meeting of the Five in New York.

We firmly believe in the efforts of the European Monetary System but realize that it is still in its infancy, is incomplete and fragile. Incomplete because a number of currencies are not included and fragile

de la Malène

because it is something requiring constant care and attention.

Of course we would like to see the ECU extended but because we believe in the European Monetary System, and because we wish to see it stronger we are keen to defend its principles. When the European Monetary System was launched it was agreed that the development of exchange rates *vis-à-vis* the dollar and the yen were to be discussed within the system and not outside it.

Inside the system means that the Europeans agree jointly on a position to adopt with regard to the dominant currency, the dollar and also the yen.

However, this is not what we have been seeing. What we have seen is that a number of countries gathered in New York, that the Community was not there, that there had been no preliminary meeting of other members of the European Monetary System and that consequently instead of jointly discussing the problems of exchange rates they were discussed in some sort of connection with the dollar and this, we feel, was the wrong approach.

We feel there must be joint discussions, first of all with the Community then once a common position has been adopted the discussion will of course include the dollar and the yen. What happened was exactly the opposite and this is what our motion for a resolution is designed to demonstrate. We believe in the EMS but we think that if dollar exchange rates are to be discussed the EMS unfortunately will not develop as it should.

Mr Visser (S). — (NL) Concerning the meeting of five leading Western industrial nations on 22 September in New York, I and my Group have somewhat ambivalent feelings as regards both the results and the procedure that was followed.

First the results. Both as the Community and individual countries, we have consistently criticized the monetary and financial policy of the United States. You are aware of its characteristics: an unstable dollar, high budget deficits, flight of capital to the United States, high interest rates, effects of the debt problem on developing countries and the rise of protectionism. However, there were also a number of associated advantages, such as our high exports, increased employment and high economic growth. Nevertheless, we have consistently agreed that the drawbacks of the unstable dollar are greater than the benefits. Consequently, we are also in agreement with what was decided at the New York summit.

Worth noting is the fact that the United States has for the first time in recent years been prepared to discuss its own economic and financial situation, which is in itself a gratifying state of affairs. It is not enough,

however. We must face up to the consequences of the decisions taken, and this requires a number of measures to be introduced in the Community. We will be forced to rely less on growth arising from developments in the United States and will need to boost our economic growth ourselves. This requires a package of stimulatory measures. Imports to the Community are likely to rise, while our exports will fall. This will have an impact on employment, which remains our uppermost priority. Consequently, the Community needs to take action to offset this. In two months' time in November, we will be discussing this question at our annual debate on the economic situation, so I do not want to say too much about it, but we should not content ourselves with fine words or intentions. The decisions taken in New York will need to be put into effect. We have heard many fine promises in the past.

We therefore need to follow developments closely. We realize that actual results will not become fully apparent for perhaps one to one and a half years. We also note that the pressure for protectionist measures in the United States continues to be strong. If no results are forthcoming, such as a lower dollar, lower interest rates, stable exchange rates and a halt to our capital exports, we as the European Community will then have to consider taking additional steps to ensure that our economic situation and our exchange rates are less dependent on those of the United States. This requires greater monetary and economic unity. I would therefore like to hear the Commission's opinion on this point.

Now, as regards the procedure, Mr President, that was not so nice. Five countries, including three Community members, were at the meeting. The decisions taken have considerable consequences for the other Member States. They also have considerable consequences for our own monetary situation, the EMS and the ECU. We, as the Community, should therefore have been involved. Unfortunately this did not happen, in contrast with the earlier meeting in Bonn. This is very much to be regretted. We therefore fully support the views expressed recently on this point by Mr Delors. We have therefore addressed a number of questions to the Commission and are looking forward to hearing its answers today.

The questions are as follows: what effect will the New York decisions have on the position and development of the EMS and the ECU? What are the consequences for those Member States that were not involved in the New York consultations? What were the precise commitments made in New York? What are the economic consequences for the Community? How can these be handled? What concrete steps is the Commission considering? What concrete action will the Commission take? I look forward to the Commission's reply with great interest.

We are fully in agreement with the resolutions tabled by Mrs Nielsen and Mr Bonaccini, though not with Mr de la Malène's resolution.

Mr von Bismarck (PPE). — (*DE*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to add some more serious and very much more critical remarks. Mr Bonaccini expressed himself very elegantly in his question to the Commission and in his criticism of the Council. But what is in fact happening is that we are forced to stand by while the Commission, which we had confirmed in office and which only we can dismiss, has been pushed aside by the Council. The Council will be going to New York with a few ministers — not as an institution, though they will really be representing the Council. It will be discussing the crucial issue of European currency, a question we are wrestling with here, and will be leaving the Commission at home. This is scandalous when we consider the tasks which the Commission has to carry out in Europe, Parliament must give the Commission its support and remind the Council clearly of its responsibilities. I call on the Council representative — who will hear that all the groups have supported the motion for a resolution by Mr Bonaccini — to tell the Council that the situation is becoming very dangerous. People must be able to believe that the EMS will benefit Europe. We know this to be true. But how can they believe it if the Council does not let the Commission join in? The national finance ministers will not be speaking on behalf of the Council or the Commission or — worse still — with the authority of Parliament. This is a matter which we are discussing for reasons connected with economics, integration and the common market, but we have to admit that this is deliberate. In Seoul the Commission's status was also very low — that of observer at a plenary meeting — and it was not allowed to have a say in the proceedings, as it had requested. That was deliberate policy. Europe is constantly being let down by the Council and it is losing its authority and credibility throughout the Community.

If we want more than is in the Treaty, how are people to know what to say to their Members in this House? The Council is belittling Europe, and we are expected to support it. How can we support the principle, negotiated in Milan and now again under discussion, that each Member State's sovereignty should be transferred to the Commission, if the Council publicly belittles European authority? This is indeed a very serious matter.

In a few years' time, when we again face elections, we shall see how Europe's authority has been devalued by the Council. And no one will be held responsible! Will it be the Council, the Councils, or small groups within the Council? No! This is a matter of responsibilities, and I would ask you all to take it very seriously.

It was my generation's experience in a large country after the First World War that responsibilities were always passed on to others, so that in the end no one was responsible. Make no mistake, people already have a deep-seated mistrust of Europe! If the Council does not change this, if the Commission does not lend

its support and the Commission President does not take up his rightful place, then we are all to blame. I warn you not to treat this matter lightly. This motion for a resolution is very high-sounding, an impression which is completely belied by its content and methods — it is a denial of the Commission which we must most firmly oppose.

Mr Cassidy (ED). — Mr President, I rise to speak on the motion standing in the name of Mrs Tove Nielsen on monetary stability and, in particular, in support of the amendment put forward by my group.

As many Members of this House will be aware, the European Democratic Group is firmly in favour of the pound sterling becoming a full member of the European Monetary System by associating itself with the exchange-rate mechanism. In this respect we like to think that we are a little in advance of our own government. Our Prime Minister has repeatedly said, and indeed it was repeated yesterday by our Chancellor of the Exchequer at the Conservative Party Conference in Blackpool, that the United Kingdom Government has no objection in principle to sterling belonging to the exchange-rate mechanism 'when the time is ripe'. The European Democratic Group's view is that the time *is* ripe, and indeed has been so for some time.

However, the absence of sterling and the Greek drachma from the EMS is not the only factor of which we need to take account. We need to take account for example — and this is the purpose of our amendment — of the continued maintenance by certain Member States, notably France, Italy and Belgium, of exchange controls. The European Democratic Group's view is that exchange controls have no place in a European monetary system. In my country we do not have exchange controls. The Federal Republic of Germany does not have exchange controls. It is intolerable that other countries continue to maintain exchange controls within the EMS. There might be an argument for those countries abolishing their controls within the EMS and, if they wish, maintaining them solely with regard to transactions with countries outside the European Community. There might be some sense or logic in that. But within the EMS there is not.

Another factor which needs to be taken into account and is drawn attention to in our amendment is the fact that one particular Member State still forbids the use of the EMS. The Federal Republic of Germany still refuses to permit the use of the ECU for private purposes. Many German Members of this House are unhappy about that, and that is why we hope to have their support for our amendment when the vote is taken at the end of this debate.

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (*NL*) Mr President, there is no disagreement between

Andriessen

Parliament and the Commission on the desirability of strengthening and extending the EMS and the desirability of achieving much closer monetary and political integration within the Community. The fact that this has not yet come about is partly the cause of the events discussed here today.

In fact, it should be unthinkable for global monetary questions to be discussed without the direct participation of the world's most important trading bloc.

(Applause)

I therefore agree with all those who have said that, both procedurally and as a matter of principle, it is simply not on for a group of, undeniably, extremely important countries to discuss affairs that concern us all. I have no hesitation in endorsing most emphatically, on behalf of the Commission, Parliament's criticism of the course of events.

Fortunately, Mr President, there are a number of international bodies that discuss monetary, economic and commercial affairs in which the Community is represented. I shan't name them all. You are familiar with them: GATT, OECD, Unctad, Group of Ten, etc., but the Group of Five does not formally exist as such, and that is the reason why the Community as such does not and cannot have any say in what happens in this group.

I do not really see what else we can do to change this situation other than to insist on the importance of Community participation. What has been said here is completely correct. In the Group of Five, the three Community countries present do not speak on behalf of the Community but on behalf of themselves, since they are in fact invited individually and not on behalf of the Community. That is the reality of the situation. This does not mean that what happened at these talks cannot in itself have a positive impact on the world economy and also the economic development of the Community. I believe, as has indeed been rightly noted in this debate, that we should also look at the positive side.

Clearly, the fact that two major currencies in the EMS are directly affected by the activities of the Group of Five has repercussions for the Community. I do not think that we can say that the interests of the Community as such have been or will be neglected here.

Recently, Parliament and the Commission have repeatedly and forcefully argued that the world needs more realistic exchange rates and that a precondition for this is a realignment of the dollar. Such a realignment would in itself, I think, be a development that could be regarded as positive, although — and here I agree with Mr Visser — it would of course also have negative consequences for the world economy and also the economic situation in Europe.

Evidently, if the Americans correct the dollar rate and hence improve their export prospects, this will perhaps reduce or at any rate affect the export prospects of the Community and other countries. It is thus clear that there may be negative long-term consequences for economic growth in the Community and other regions. Now, I have been asked to set out in detail already at this stage what all these consequences will be!

In the first place, I think that an answer to this question would go beyond the scope of this urgent debate. I have understood from Mr Bonaccini that we are to hold a fundamental debate in the very near future here in the European Parliament on monetary policy and in particular the EMS. I think that would be the appropriate time to answer the questions rightly asked by the honourable Member.

Finally, Mr President, speakers here have argued forcefully for greater Community involvement in world monetary affairs. In particular, Mr Bismarck has strongly emphasized that the Commission should play its part with the support of Parliament. I am grateful for this backing for the Commission. I believe that here as in numerous other areas Parliament and the Commission are allies in the endeavour to bring about improvements.

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted resolutions Doc. B2-981/85 and Doc. B2-989/85 and rejected motion for a resolution Doc. B2-1028/85 by successive votes)

Intergovernmental conference

President. — The next item is the debate on the

— motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1004/85), tabled by Mr Herman and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the Intergovernmental Conference.

Mr Herman (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the 180 co-signatories and of the almost unanimous House which voted yesterday on the motion for an urgent resolution on the intergovernmental conference I should like to remind you of the full implications of this resolution.

The European Parliament has been trying to become involved in the work of the conference for some considerable time. The conference itself has in fact already made provision for Parliament's involvement and this in principle is a cause for some satisfaction. Our president has already expressed our collective appreciation. We will have an opportunity in the following debate to return to this point.

Herman

Let us not be naïve, however, for we must ensure that this Parliament's involvement has a real part to play in the decision-making process before the decisions are taken and not after. The political control exercised by a Parliament worthy of the name should never be applied retroactively in all cases. In these affairs where, gathered around Altiero Spinelli, this Parliament was and still is the only one at the root of the process of *aggiornamento* or of bringing matters up to date, our role as catalyst is primarily preventive by nature and should be exercised from start to finish.

'In season, out of season', as St. Paul once said.

(*Laughter*)

While on this subject I should like also to thank the Commission which, up to the present moment, has been alone in making constructive proposals. We have just received an important document setting out the Commission's views on the role of this Parliament. Since the Commission is unfortunately restricted with regard to its proposals and since it is endeavouring to establish a concensus, it is only fair and normal that it should be tempted to submit a proposal for compromise between the positions of the Member States.

This is why we regret so much that Member States which claim to be most in favour of the building Europe have hitherto been so cautious and reticent in making proposals based either on the findings of the Dooge committee or on the Parliament's draft. We deplore this. And it is for this reason that before it is too late we are urgently calling upon these governments to show courage and boldness and practise what they preach.

Parliament should not miss a chance, however small, to push national governments in the direction of European union. It is better to shut the stable door before the horse bolts.

(*Applause*)

Mr Sutra de Germa (S). — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my Group will support Mr Herman's resolution. Yesterday he queried the appropriateness of having an urgent debate today since we would have a major debate on this subject during the next session. In keeping with what we said yesterday, we approve the substance of the motion and consequently are giving it our support today.

We are similarly supporting Mr Lomas' amendment No 5 which is nothing more than an addition. On the other hand, we do not support and we will vote against amendments Nos 1, 2, 3 and 4, which bring institutional action into conflict with what is generally known as firm action.

This flies in the face of the statement issued last April by our union of socialist parties of the European Com-

munity which said that European socialists have always shown that they are not opposed to the essence of European union and the common policies which will be involved when more democratic and more efficient institutions are established. For us these two changes must go hand in hand and consequently Mr Lomas' amendment No 1 which opposes them cannot enjoy our support.

As I said before, we shall support Mr Herman's amendment to his own resolution and, dare I say it?, not before time, Mr Herman. Considering what a well-informed person you are, we were not expecting you to produce a motion for a resolution in the form of a text which confuses Coreper with the Dondelinger Committee. However, we know that it was not an innocent mistake and that there are people who do not want it made public that it is Coreper which is behind the committee. We shall accept the first text with all due care and with it the amendment, as this is indispensable.

However, Mr Herman, I must direct a word of criticism to you and your co-signatories for I cannot but wonder whether the PPE Group, the Christian Democrats, are burning today what they worshipped yesterday? Has the draft disappeared? Not a word of mention whether it still exists. I would point out that at the Milan summit the Heads of State or Government in launching an intergovernmental conference made reference to the Parliament's draft, but did so no doubt in terms which we all considered inadequate. It did not form the basis of the work but was nevertheless welcomed. I would add that the Luxembourg Presidency did likewise but it did at least make a specific reference to the Parliament draft which was presented by our friend Altiero Spinelli as rapporteur. However, in the presence of such a long, detailed, precise and meticulous motion for a resolution as that of the Christian Democrat Group, which makes not even one reference to a draft issued by the European Parliament, I can but wonder whether this is a top class funeral. In any case not even one flower, and the least that could be said is that you have not exactly buried it with an avalanche of flowers! Allow me to digress at this point to consider the attitude of the French socialists. At that time we voted for the Spinelli report expressing reservations which concerned much more the form than the content. We were dismayed by the legal form chosen for a motion for a resolution from a committee which was presented entirely as purely and simply a draft treaty on the lines of a constitution. Today I think we are thinking more clearly. We feel that this draft, which is not a take-it-or-leave-it issue, cannot be the basis for the work of the intergovernmental conference. But what did we have to listen to when we voted against it! Basically it contains some elements which are extremely important in our opinion. It is thus no basis for the work of the conference, either in its entirety or in part.

Is it not too early, however, to return now to the pattern laid down by the conference itself without having

Sutra de Germa

a shot or two of ammunition in reserve? The only text available — and in this motion you refer to the drafts of the Member States — is that submitted by the Federal Republic and that draft has disastrous implications for the powers of the European Parliament, let us not forget that. Mr Herman has just said on this very point that the Commission draft is clearly not quite so bad with regard to the European Parliament but unfortunately it reflects exactly the same unacceptable argument as the draft from the Federal Republic of Germany.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, let us re-establish our priorities. Let us state clearly what the European Parliament thinks and wants and let us establish as much in the major debate of the coming session. I have no wish to look too far ahead and shall stop at this point, Mr President, but in tactical terms I feel it would be a mistake to . . .

(The President asked the speaker to conclude)

One last comment, Mr President, to close. Let us not be too hasty in burying that which the Parliament itself has produced. Let us keep some ammunition in reserve, at least tactically, because difficult days are ahead between now and the Luxembourg summit in December.

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — Mr President, I would like simply to comment briefly on Mr Lomas' amendments. He says that the governments should consider how they can help to solve the problems of mass unemployment and poverty in the Community. The governments have considered that. They have proposals which were agreed at the Milan Summit for the removal of all barriers to trade which exist at the moment between willing buyers and willing sellers in the Community. It is the view that that is the best way of getting people back to work, that if we increase trade within this enormous bloc of 320 million people we will get far more people back to work than if we try to do it through deficit spending, which, I think, is the Labour group's point of view.

Now there is no alternative proposition from the left to replace that. So there is a proposition, it is a serious proposition, and there is no alternative at the moment to it. None that can be produced in time and this is desperately urgent. I entirely agree with Mr Lomas on that.

Secondly, he says that institutional matters are of no benefit to the people of the Community. The fact is that we have got to have a hard institutional framework if we are to remove those barriers. You cannot remove those barriers, without a change in the institutional framework, particularly in Article 100. That is the view of the Commission. It is certainly my view. If Mr Lomas has a different view, he might let us know what it is. Every time the Labour group get up to make

a point of order they are relying on an institutional framework. Every time they call on the Council to do something, they are relying on an institutional framework. Every time they want action they are relying on an institutional framework. The institutional framework is inadequate for the action that we need to get 13 million people back to work. It is no good relying on gentlemen's agreements. I am sure Mr Lomas is a gentleman and we can rely on gentlemen's agreements from him and he no doubt from us, but the fact is that if you have 12 governments arguing with one another in a council, you ought not to have to rely on gentlemen's agreements. You ought to rely on the law, and the law ought to be there to make sure we get our 13 million people back to work.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Romeo (L). — *(IT)* Mr President, the news that we are receiving from the intergovernmental conference is vindicating the concern and discontent of those who strove to organize the conference. The topics which have so far been proposed are really considerably scaled down compared with the ambitions of an international event which was to tackle the basic problems of the Community. We know that even on the basis of these scaled-down proposals there is within the conference major disagreement which is serving as a pretext for the lack of progress. In the light of this there is a case for recalling the draft approved by this Parliament which provides for the creation of a European union to which governments cannot react by proposing an agenda such as that which we have seen discussed at the conference.

It must also be said that the call to the Commission in Mr Herman's motion is justified because the Commission's own proposals appear totally insufficient, at least so far, in view of the scale of the question which is for discussion. The outcome of an intergovernmental conference lasting several months cannot be simply to produce a few improvements to the Commission's powers of management while the Council continues to keep hold of the policy decision-making power as in the past.

Basic issues on which Parliament really cannot and must not give way are those at least which led to the improvement of the decision-making process and, second, Parliament's own powers for we cannot continue to exercise powers which are mainly consultative and only in a few very limited cases real decision-making powers. Consequently, our view is that Mr Herman's motion be given strong support and we feel that this is also the best way for tackling the real problems such as the employment to which Mr Lomas referred because only more effective action by the Community will allow us to face these problems in a more active and more effective manner than that displayed by the governments.

Mr Christensen (ARC). — (DA) Mr President, the Danish People's Movement against the EC intends to vote against this interference by Parliament in the intergovernmental conference. As I have pointed out on earlier occasions, Parliament has no competence whatever in this field. Paragraph 1 of the motion calls on the Member States to respect the commitments they entered into when agreeing to take part in the intergovernmental conference. I would like to emphasize that the Danish Government has not entered into any commitment whatsoever to take part in this conference. It has decided to take part even though the agreement was rushed through with three countries, including my own, voting against holding the conference. If the Danish government has entered into any commitment at all, it is to respect the decisions of the Danish people — namely to maintain the right of veto and not to tamper with the distribution of power between the institutions of the Community.

It is in that light that I wish to declare our intention of voting for the first four, and incidentally very sensible, amendments tabled by Mr Lomas.

Mr Lomas (S). — Mr President, I am opposed to this motion because of the whole tenor of the thing. It endorses, indeed insists, that the intergovernmental conference should yet again be discussing these institutional matters and so-called European Union instead of getting down to the real problems facing the Community, namely, mass unemployment and poverty. Now, I understand those who want European Union. I understand those who want unity in Europe. I want unity amongst the peoples of Europe, but I certainly do not want this kind of European union which, first of all, is not European as it is so arrogantly and impudently described, since two-thirds of the countries of Europe will not be affected by it, and it is certainly not a union for the working people of Europe. It is in fact a union, a paradise indeed, for the multinationals, for the financial spivs who will be free to move their capital and their goods anywhere in Europe wherever it will bring the highest profit, never mind whether it meets any social need. It is a charter for the continuation of the exploitation of working people in Europe.

Mr President, there is mass unemployment. It is growing daily. In the United Kingdom we have again just had a dramatic increase in the number of people out of work. In the common market as a whole it is now at least 15 million, and we all know that with those not registered it is probably nearer 20 million. 40 million people in this Community are now living in poverty after 30 years of a Community with institutions that has totally failed to do anything on behalf of the working people of Europe. This intergovernmental conference ought to be dealing with those problems. Let us have less of the Euro-drivel and let us have some action at last on behalf of the workers of Europe.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, as a number of speakers have already pointed out, the major debate on this topic will be held during the next Parliamentary session. The President of the Commission will of course then present a detailed account of the positions adopted, any concern we may feel and the ambitions we harbour.

In this preliminary debate, if I may call it that, I shall, with your permission, make a few remarks here and now. One comment would have concerned the preamble had not Mr Herman's amendment corrected the couple of errors that had found their way into the text and which moreover related only to the name of the committee responsible for preparing the intergovernmental conference.

One paragraph of the resolution tabled by Mr Herman and his friends does in contrast merit comment by us for we are amazed that the Commission proposals have been denounced as being only short-term. This is anything but the case, Mr President. It has already been said that the Commission has hitherto been alone in submitting overall proposals and these are all medium and long-term measures, in other words geared to the future which we want — European union. The indivisibility of the treaties and institutions features strongly in the Commission document. We have already stated how little we support the idea of setting up a political secretariat and having a separate treaty to cover this field.

The Commission's documents relate to what we call the four pillars of Community integration: the internal markets to be created by 1992 and the associated institutional measures; technological development by intra-Community cooperation using the institutions wherever possible and desirable; enhanced cohesion between the countries of the Community and this implies coordinating the various policies to which we are attached; and lastly as we have already announced, a fourth important document that would relate to monetary acts.

Four documents which, I repeat, are medium and long-term documents.

I would add that a final document — and just a short while ago one of the speakers, Mr Herman himself, was kind enough to acknowledge that the Commission's proposals were significant — was submitted on Monday, 7 October, in other words three days ago, and relates to the powers of the Parliament. I would call upon Members of Parliament to examine it very carefully and Mr Delors will later explain the underlying philosophy. But may I remind you that, as of now, the Commission proposals provide for four baskets as this now seems to be the generally accepted term.

The first basket recommends mandatory consultation of Parliament on all the legislative clauses of the Treaty and the second, more importantly, relates to

Cheysson

the establishment of the consultation currently allowed for on pragmatic grounds formally in the Treaty and extend it to other major fields. The third basket, which we shall call the cooperation basket, assigns to Parliament a major role because Parliament's approval will be essential in the transition from agreement by unanimous voting to agreement by qualified majority voting. You will appreciate the implication of this proposal for a number of subjects to which we attach maximum importance, for example the internal market. Finally one basket will cover those articles where co-decision making is called for, in other words where the opinion of Parliament must be consistent with whatever is decided by the Community.

These are the four baskets — an arrangement which strengthens in a unique manner the powers of the European Parliament and the Commission is totally convinced that such a step is necessary.

May I repeat, Mr President, that all of these measures are medium and long-term measures. More precise details and the underlying philosophy of these proposals will be set out by Mr Delors at the forthcoming session.

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

Lebanon

President. — The next item is the joint debate on three motions for resolutions on Lebanon:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-992/85), tabled by Mr d'Ormesson and others on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on the situation in Lebanon;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1011/85), tabled by Mr Nordmann on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the murder of hostages in Lebanon;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1025/85), tabled by Mr Guermeur on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the situation of the Christians in Lebanon.

Mr Almirante (DR). — *(IT)* Mr President, the document in support of which it is my honour to speak and which bears as first that prestigious signature of Mr d'Ormesson, is self-explanatory or, more accurately, has been explained dramatically by events over the past few days.

In our document there are extremely bitter while at the same time extremely courageous references to the

pusillanimity of the West. The word is doubtless a strong one and it is so bitter primarily because the West in terms of civilization as well as in terms of moral and political responsibility is represented by all of us. How is it possible not to speak of pusillanimity if the West is unable to take the initiative to safeguard its own human values, to safeguard christian values, and if the West pretends not to notice that in the eastern Mediterranean, not too far from the coasts of Europe, a situation has arisen which can truly be called Cuban although it is much more serious than the risk constituted by the presence of a Soviet Cuba on the doorstep of the United States.

One reason is that in our case there are two Fidel Castros whose names are those of the two most dangerous criminals and terrorist leaders in the world today. I am referring to the thug Ghaddafi and the thug Arafat and all their hooligan following who, as seems to have happened in the hijacking of the Italian cruise liner *Achille Lauro*, are outside the control or pretend to be outside the control of their leaders, sowing the seeds of terror everywhere and making a laughing stock of a Europe which does not exist and of a European Community that does not exist.

Our motion relates in particular to the Lebanon and the Christians in the Lebanon, those Christians who for years have day after day been experiencing the fate of Christ and of a Christ who cannot rise again from death and who cannot ascend from the cross into Heaven because those who should be their apostles and prophets have fallen asleep or, what is worse, and this is the case with the Foreign Minister of my own country — are negotiating with these advocates of evil.

Given the essentially Christian informative spirit of our resolution I have no difficulties in stating our willingness to vote in favour of the two other resolutions — the Nordmann resolution and the Guermeur resolution even if they are less clear and less drastically worded than ours. The Christian cause in the Lebanon is too important to accommodate factional dissension or self-centred partisan propaganda. There can be no liberty without courage as our President Mr Le Pen recently stated and the Christian cause, the cause of the Christian Lebanon, calls for courage and unity of intent from us all.

Mr Deniau (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, I would like to present the motion for a resolution drawn up on the basis of an amendment tabled jointly by Mr Nordmann and Mr Guermeur on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance and of my own group. This House has very often had occasion to express condemnation of events in Lebanon, and condemnation has been often necessary and sometimes useful. I believe that condemnation is no longer appropriate — saving lives is what matters now. We have already often discussed the horrors of the situation there.

Deniau

Unfortunately, there are so many people responsible on so many different levels that it is not always easy to establish who is really behind the massacres — only those who actually carry them out can be identified. I should mention at least one of the people responsible — Mr Walid Jumblatt, Vice-President of the Socialist International: all the reports indicate that he has ordered the massacre of nearly 3 000 Christian civilians.

I myself heard him say on French television that the 'Christians must be killed'.

Condemnation is appropriate under these circumstances, Mr President, but we also need to save lives. There are French and American hostages. I have a list of the hostages and of the large number of prominent Israelis in Lebanon who have been kidnapped, some a very long time ago, and of whom we have since heard nothing.

We therefore have a job to do — and that is not just to condemn but to take action to try to save what can be saved, which means the hostages and virtually the entire Christian community, which is scattered, hemmed in, slaughtered and forsaken. The Community has emergency procedures which should make it possible to send food, medical supplies and other forms of humanitarian aid very quickly, preferably before winter, so that these people in their terrible plight can be helped to survive.

Procedures exist, Mr President, and these should be applied via the responsible non-government organizations to ensure that it is the victims who benefit. That is the task which we should set ourselves, and that is the real emergency.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Guermeur (RDE). — *(FR)* Mr President, it is to Parliament's credit that it has given priority to this debate on Lebanon, more particularly on the situation of the religious communities being martyred for their beliefs. I wish to express my thanks for this to the group chairmen. It is sadly to the discredit of our nations, which have grown up in a tradition of humanism, that they have shown complete indifference to a small country which has a civilization going back as long as our own.

It took the intervention of foreign political organizations, military aggression, and terrorist attacks masterminded from outside to devastate by war this country which for centuries has been a model of religious and cultural tolerance. The situation has now become extremely serious. Every mission returning from Lebanon brings reports of the most horrifying slaughter. The villages in the Chouf region have been systematically obliterated: the churches, among the oldest in the world representing a heritage of inestimable value,

have been torn down. One particular terrorist leader, it seems, is building up a private collection of bells which have chimed through the lives of Christian families for centuries.

Villagers who have been unable to flee have been brutally slaughtered. Words cannot describe the subtle cruelties to which the civilian population has been subjected.

True, the Christians are resisting bravely amid the ruins and constant bombardments, but for how long? Are we, Mr President, going to wait passively until the last Christian is killed in Lebanon before Europe shakes off its spineless indifference and exerts all its influence to secure peace? Are we going to leave thousands of refugees who are our brothers and are crying to us in anguish without help, care, medical supplies, housing and schools?

It is time the Council launched a peace initiative for Lebanon and secured universal respect for the cultural values and freedom of others. We urgently need to send aid to those in distress, and it is vital that they should receive this before winter — I am referring to medical supplies, hospitals and shelter.

I hope that for once the governments of the Member States will take account of the resolution adopted by the elected representatives of the European people. It is not our interests which are at stake today, Mr President. Neither is it a political squabble — it is a question of honour!

(Applause from the centre and the right)

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN*President*

Mr Baget Bozzo (S). — *(IT)* Mr President, the 'Lebanon' problem is cultural and political rather than humanitarian and I am amazed by the superficiality with which it is discussed. First, the Lebanon was ravaged in the wake of the Israeli invasion and the balance in favour of the Christians which existed at that time was shifted by the Israeli invasion with responsibility to some extent being assigned to Bechir Gemayel's Phalange. From that moment on the Lebanon has never again experienced peace. It should be remembered that in other situations the Christian Lebanon has been saved by Syrian intervention and I am thinking of the tragic events of Tall el Zaatar. Remember, too, that in the overall Lebanese and Syrian problem complex Syria is in a very particular situation as it represents a heretical group within the Sunnite majority and for this reason is interested in a multi-religion Lebanon so that we have had the para-

Baget Bozzo

dox of Syria intervening repeatedly and still doing so at the present time, in defence of Lebanese Christians.

We must also remember the dramatic splitting of the Lebanese Christians which also lay at the root of the massacre of the Frangié family. The leader of the Gemayel faction of the Lebanese militia is currently negotiating with Frangié, the very man whose family was killed by the Christians, he himself being a Christian, and the basis of the negotiations is the agreement with Syria.

When we discuss these problems there must be greater knowledge and less superficiality. We should not forget that we have divisions within the Community and we should remember that it is true that the Druse were responsible for the Chouf tragedy. We should also remember that the Druse living in that part of Palestine which is now in Israel were supported in that plan by the same Israelis who by moving out of Chouf without informing their allies, the Christian militia, set the stage for the attack by the Druse militia. Consequently it is an extremely serious, delicate and complex area. Prejudice of any kind is harmful — pro-Palestine prejudice, pro-Syria prejudice but also pro-Israel prejudice, which is the commonest of all. This Parliament can help the cause of Lebanon and, Mr Almirante, the cause of peace in the Mediterranean by refraining from draconian utterances and judgements and agreeing to judge these facts in their entirety and not referring as thugs, before a knowledge of the fact, to political subjects active in the area in question. It is only by respecting words that I hope that one day the respect for life may be possible.

Mr Mallet (PPE). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, for Europeans and — if I may say so — especially for Christians, the tragedy of Lebanon and the inaction or powerlessness of Europe in the face of this tragedy arouses feelings of grief, indignation and even shame. We cannot remain indifferent to the fate of that country, which has for centuries been closely linked to democratic western Europe.

It touches our hearts to hear of the sorrows, sufferings and despair of the Lebanese, both Christian and Moslem, who still hold the identity, freedom and unity of Lebanon very dear and see that their cousin, Europe, is doing nothing or can do nothing to save it.

Everything is possible today in that unhappy country, where conflicts of all kinds are increasing and all grievances being avenged. The situation in Lebanon is constantly explosive, and diplomats wearily complain that Lebanon means trouble for all who set foot there.

We cannot resign ourselves to this situation without self-betrayal. Our problem is to work out a political solution and take political action going beyond an expression of feelings and in addition to the emergency measures to which Mr Deniau has referred.

The events in Lebanon were largely caused by the fact that the divisions were imported from outside. There are two factors behind these splits — the persistence and indeed, over the past few weeks, the hardening of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the rise of Islamic fundamentalism. If we add to that the effects of the Palestinian problem, which has still not been resolved, the splits among the Palestinian groups and the backward-looking fanaticism of certain parts of the Moslem world, fortunately condemned by many Moslem countries, and you have a conflagration which could set the entire Middle East ablaze, even North Africa and part of black Africa. Then there is Syria's desire for domination: adopting a policy of divide and rule, Syria is trying to convert Lebanon into a protectorate of Damascus, in effect to annex Lebanon, which will at the same time serve the interests of the Soviet Union. Such a policy — and I should warn you of this danger — could lead to the establishment of a Soviet base in the port of Beirut.

The only way to achieve a peaceful solution which ensures that Lebanon survives as a multi-party, democratic and independent state is by international negotiation — this would tackle at least one of the causes of the Lebanese situation, the only one on which we can take action. This would provide Lebanon with internationally guaranteed neutrality. That was why we suggested that Parliament should issue a statement setting out a medium and long-term European policy to smooth the path towards a negotiated solution to the Lebanese problem.

Recent events have sadly made this objective more remote, but there is no alternative to negotiation. An escalation of violence would create, just on our doorstep, further tension which would be extremely dangerous and would have unforeseeable consequences.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Pannella (NI). — (FR) Mr President, I think that the reasonable Left, which I would like to be able to support consistently, is unreasonable when it allows, or even forces, other political groups to monopolize the taking of responsibilities while there are principles and realities at stake which this reasonable Left should, in its tolerance and unwillingness to compromise, be the first to defend.

I shall be voting for the three motions for resolution, and not only out of provocation. Indeed, these are the only three motions which refer to our duty to intervene. I do not share all the views expressed in them. I feel it important to emphasize — and here I address my friend Baget Bozzo — that one false belief which must be abandoned is that to die by Israeli, or allegedly Israeli hands, without any proof of responsibility, is to be murdered. Now that people are dying daily under the yoke of Assad and his followers — throughout the Middle East, not just in Lebanon —

Pannella

and they have killed more Syrians in one year than the Israelis have in twenty, and now that more and more civilians are being killed, not only Kurds but also among the Druse community and other groups, how many people have been killed by their leaders? Yes, how many?

I do not accept this casuist game being played in the Chouf region, where people are juggling with minor truths and untruths. Certain accurate assertions may distort the truth, since if we only hear about part of the situation, we ignore the context. That is why, Mr President, for the sake of the rights of the Lebanese and Arabs and the rights which other groups wish to uphold, groups which have the same rights as the Christians and which also have reason to quarrel with their leaders, I shall be voting in favour of any interventionist policy by Europe and the Community. I want us to be present there. We shall perhaps make mistakes in the beginning, but we shall be able to put them right there and then. I say no to the Pontius Pilate approach — non-intervention would be worse at this level — advocated by the progressive sectors of this House.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, it is to Parliament's credit, as Mr Guermeur said a moment ago, that it returns constantly to the subject under discussion today — the intolerable sufferings of the Lebanese people, the despair which has overtaken this nation ravaged by civil war, occupation, oppression and division over the past ten years since 1975, when the civil war started. Yes, it is to Parliament's credit that it repeatedly brings this subject up and reminds Europe of its duty as a civilized and humane society not to remain indifferent while its neighbour and cultural ally is suffering.

In my present capacity it would be inappropriate for me, Mr President, to adopt a stand on political statements, to react to parts of resolutions which call for political initiatives, or to comment on the idea — which I personally find very interesting — put forward just now by Mr Mallet regarding the possibility of guaranteed neutrality for Lebanon as a means of restoring its unity.

I will say, however, that the Commission, which is the Community's instrument and which is present in Beirut and will of course remain there, has provided substantial aid since 1975. Over 50 million ECU has been sent to Lebanon in the form of humanitarian aid directly to the government and via non-government organizations, and the aid was intended for all the Lebanese people without exception. Mr President, I cannot overemphasize the danger of making statements which might be interpreted as drawing a distinction between the sufferings of one group and those of others, since in Lebanon people of every group,

whether Christians or Moslems, Arab or non-Arab Lebanese, or foreigners living in that country, have at some time or other been the victims of massacres, murders, bombings and humiliation. We must help them all, since our policy is to affirm Lebanon's unity and its sovereignty within its frontiers in the interests of the Lebanese people. Let us not help to sow discord among them.

This year in particular, Mr President, we have already intervened several times as a result of the deteriorating situation. In March, emergency food aid in the form of 5 000 tonnes of cereals, 1 000 tonnes of vegetables and 500 tonnes of sugar worth 2 million ECU were dispatched. In late June and early July three operations were launched, the first involving 70 tonnes of milk worth 70 000 ECU which were supplied through non-government organizations, the second involving 2 000 tonnes of cereals and 300 tonnes of sugar worth 362 000 ECU, and the third, launched around the same time, involving 500 000 ECU in cash sent via the International Committee of the Red Cross and the UNRWA.

In the same period the normal food aid programme for Lebanon of course continued to operate. This year 1 720 000 ECU has been spent on 8 000 tonnes of cereals and 500 tonnes of milk powder. This year, as part of the humanitarian aid programme — and of course I am not referring to the operation of the Financial Protocol — 2 650 000 ECU has been sent to Lebanon in the form of food aid or as funds for non-government organizations and for a US organization working for the people of Lebanon.

President. — The debate is closed.

By successive votes Parliament

— *rejected motion for a resolution Doc. B2-992/85;*

— *adopted Amendment No 1¹ seeking to replace motions for resolutions Doc. B2-1011/85 and Doc. B2-1025/85)*

Human rights

President. — The next item is the joint debate on four motions for resolutions on human rights:

— motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-999/85), tabled by Mr Langes and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the abduction

¹ Amendment No 1 tabled by:
Mr Coste-Floret on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance; Mr Habsburg on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party; Mr Prout on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Donnez on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

President

of Ines Duarte Duran, daughter of the President of El Salvador;

- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1003/85), tabled by Mr Marck and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on cooperation with the Gulf States and freedom of religion;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1017/85), tabled by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the situation of Pedro Fernandez Lembach, detained in prison in Chile;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1024/85/rev.), tabled by Mr Boutos and Mr Mouchel on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the CSCE and the freedom of the press.

Mr Langes (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, the Group of the European People's Party has tabled a motion for a resolution on the abduction of the daughter of the President of El Salvador, Ines Duarte Duran. We call on the entire House to support it.

We are seeking this young woman's release. But we also want to ensure that the peace process initiated in El Salvador through the influence of, among others, Napoleon Duarte, the Catholic Church and the guerrillas, can be continued.

As we all know, President Duarte has been going through a difficult period. He knows that he is under threat both from the right-wing death squads and from the Communist guerrillas. He was once held captive by the right wing and suffered violence at their hands, and now he finds that the left-wing guerrillas have abducted his daughter and killed two men in the process.

Parliament has always regarded abduction as a criminal act, and for that reason we also supported the motion for a resolution on the situation of the left-wing trade unions in Chile. To be quite frank, I am disappointed that the Socialists, who otherwise always proclaim their concern for human rights, have had nothing to say on this matter. I hope that the Socialist International, using its special link with the FMLN and operating via clandestine channels, will do what it can. I hope it will act, but I am not sure whether it will. I am disappointed that the Socialists have not tabled a motion for a resolution or any amendments.

I feel only contempt for the amendments tabled by the Greens, especially for Amendment No 3. This implies, in fact, that it is not the abductors who are to blame, but the person abducted. If this is the morality and political reason of this House — and thank Heaven this view has been expressed by only a small group — then all I can say is that we had better say goodbye to this Parliament's grand aims!

I call on you, therefore, to support our motion for a resolution.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Marck (PPE). — (NL) Next week negotiations are due to start on an agreement between the European Communities and the Gulf States. Although we support such an agreement, we would nevertheless like to draw the attention of both the Council and the Commission to a fundamental aspect that has hitherto been neglected by the Commission. This concerns the religious freedom of employees of construction companies and other firms temporarily or permanently stationed in the Gulf States. The number of adherents of religions other than Islam is difficult to estimate. There are probably between 400 000 and 500 000 catholics, largely from India and the Philippines, working for foreign firms.

Until recently, the countries concerned, where Islam is the state religion, provided certain facilities. Religious services were allowed on industrial sites, and Christian children were not obliged to attend Koran instruction. Under the influence of fundamentalist movements in the Islamic world, these extremely limited facilities have been withdrawn. Priests have been expelled from the country or restricted in their activities, religious services on industrial sites have been forbidden and Christmas celebrations disrupted. The Christian religion has been attacked in the press, bibles and religious books have been removed from bookshops and the import of such material prohibited or restricted. In brief, religious worship has been made impossible, and this at a time when a large mosque is being built in Rome with the agreement of the Vatican and at a time when all countries in the European Communities unreservedly accord Islam equal treatment with the religion of the majority of the population. We are now seeing an entirely opposite development in the Gulf States. We thus call on the Council and Commission to incorporate a reciprocity principle in relations between the Community and the Gulf States.

Freedom of religion and worship is a fundamental human right. The negotiations on the agreement with the Gulf States offer the best opportunity to put this into practice and protect these foreign employees. We should thus like to hear the Commission and in particular Mr Cheysson express themselves more clearly on this point than has hitherto been the case.

I note that no amendments have been tabled to my motion for resolution. I thus assume that Parliament will adopt this resolution unanimously.

Mr Glinne (S). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the motion for a resolution which I have tabled together with three colleagues from the Socialist Group is quite explicit.

Glinne

The Chilean citizen Pedro Fernandez Lembach was arrested on 8 May 1980 by the secret police. He was subjected to brutal treatment which severely, and apparently permanently, damaged his health, and it was not until 1983 that he was sentenced on charges of possessing and manufacturing explosives, although the Chilean Commission on Human Rights considers the charges to be entirely without foundation. In December 1983 the government of the United Kingdom offered him a visa and a residence permit for Great Britain.

If Parliament votes for this resolution — and this is our ardent desire — his defence request for the prison sentence to be commuted to exile will have a much greater chance of success. He could then leave Chile instead of spending years and years in prison.

Mr Baudouin (RDE). — (FR) Ladies and gentlemen, I am speaking on behalf of my colleagues Mouchel and Boutos, who tabled the motion for a resolution concerning journalists' free movement and access to certain documents, all in conjunction with the 10th anniversary of the Helsinki Accords on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

It should be pointed out that we, for our part, do not believe in denouncing the Helsinki Accords, but we must always — whenever the occasion arises — demand their full application, in particular of what is known as the 'third basket', on which the Soviets took a lot of persuading and accepted in the end, but which they do not apply.

The fact is that journalists have been recently attacked as irresponsible by representatives of the highest Soviet authorities; this happened again recently in Paris, when Mr Gorbachov made it quite clear that he would not allow certain requests nor grant access to certain documents, even going so far as to bang his fist on the table, which is not in the current new style of the Kremlin boss.

I believe we must undertake unremitting but patient efforts to make it clear that we want this third 'basket' — which is written into the Helsinki Accords — to be respected, in particular as regards journalists, who constitute the prime medium, the first channel of information, which without any doubt makes for the kind of freedom we here all respect and want to see triumph.

Mr Kuijpers (ARC). — (NL) Mr President, I would like to take this opportunity to draw attention to the work of the Flemish priest, Ghislain Peeters from Haacht, who has been engaged in pastoral activities in Chile for 12 years. At the moment, he is working under Archbishop Fresno in La Legua in Santiago de Chili. He is subjected almost constantly to all kinds of harassment in the course of his evangelical work.

Recent attempts to stop him performing his pastoral duties have been made in the form of death threats, to be carried out on 12 October, his birthday. We should like to ask Commissioner Cheysson to take immediate action to save the life of this socially committed man, and would like to ask everyone here in this House to urge the government of Mr Pinochet via his or her own channels to protect him.

Mr Pordea (DR). — (FR) Mr President, the main features of Communism are repression and disinformation. Communism manipulates people in order to subjugate them, dehumanizing them and making them conform in the process. Individuality goes against the grain of the Communist system since it would foul up the works.

Homo sovieticus must, therefore, be deprived of freedom of expression, and that is what happens. In this I detect more than the dread common to all totalitarian regimes, I see here the double certainty — carefully disguised in the echelons of the central committees and *nomenklaturas* — consisting, on the one hand, of the falsity of Marxist-Leninist dogmas, the cogwheel workings of the Communist system and its objectives, and, on the other hand, of the veracity of dissenting opinions.

The Communists' violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms clearly testifies to their own lie.

Needed in order to shore up the frail party-state structure, Communist disinformation is both carried out actively via official propaganda and passively via a large number of official bans.

The denial or curbing of press freedom are part and parcel of passive disinformation methods, which fall into two categories: those involving the Soviet pseudo-press, i.e. news channels run exclusively by the supreme power — unique, monolithic, infallible — and against which nothing can be done, and those which affect the free world's right to information, and this is something which demands our full attention.

What we have here, in actual fact, is just one more in a long series of attempts — each more perverse than the other — to destabilize the free world. Thus, our democratic world, which respects human dignity as one of the fundamental values of Western civilization, cannot stand idly by and say nothing.

I believe this to be the true import of the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Boutos and Mr Mouchel, calling to mind as it does the indivisibility of freedom, something we cannot emphasize too strongly.

By condemning, by denouncing the non-observance of the provisions of the Helsinki Accord on Cooperation and Security in Europe, by condemning the restrictive practices of the Soviet Union and the Communist

Pordea

countries in this field, and by demanding that the flow of information, direct access to information sources and free expression of the most divergent opinions be guaranteed throughout the world by the appropriate means, the European Community will be fulfilling one of its cardinal duties: to provide a constant reminder of inter-state ethics and human rights standards, and to aid and defend the captive part of Europe against the reprehensible practices of Soviet Communism.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, the Commission is always very happy to line up with Parliament on issues concerning human rights, whether this involves people whose lives are at risk — and the Commission supports what has been said and what, I think, will be adopted in connection with the abduction of the El Salvador President's daughter — or the treatment inflicted on Pedro Fernandez Lembach in Chile. I will, of course, be happy to transmit the message which Mr Kuijpers would like to see sent in connection with this priest in Chile whose life is threatened.

In addition to supporting Parliament's stand on human rights, we also willingly give our support to full application of the Helsinki Accords. The remarks made in this House come at a time when Comecon, the grouping of East bloc countries, is — with reference to the Helsinki Accords — making overtures to us about entering into talks and signing a joint declaration.

Mr President, during this part of the debate a direct appeal was made to the Commission by Members of this House over the respect of certain elementary human rights in the Gulf.

Allow me, therefore, to take up this point.

The resolution refers — quite rightly in my opinion — to the Universal Islamic Declaration of Human Rights of 1981 which, basically, rejects discrimination on religious grounds and guarantees freedom of religion. This is, by the way, a common thread running through the teachings of the three revealed religions, the three religions of the Book, if I may use the Islamic expression, which is to recognize the intrinsic value of these monotheistic religions and to encourage respect for them.

The restrictions mentioned by the Members do not apply in all Gulf countries, but only in two of them with a very puritanical movement called Wahhabism. We ourselves have known such puritanical, austere movements in our own religions, and these have even led to terrible excesses in Europe itself. When entering into closer cooperation with certain countries with revealed religions we must endeavour to make them understand through our cooperation, through our close relationship, that they should revert to the essential elements of the teachings they espouse. Rest assured that this is what we intend to do in all coun-

tries with which we have cooperation agreements. We might have one with the Gulf in the future, but Members are jumping the gun somewhat in saying that negotiations have already started or will start next week. This is not yet the case, although a cooperation agreement is on the cards. You may rest assured, Mr President, that the Commission — and I think I can say the Council, too — will make sure these agreements allow us to raise the matter of human rights, as we do everywhere else.

Allow me, in conclusion, to thank Parliament for reminding us of such matters over and over again. This gives us — i.e. the Commission, since we have no direct political powers — a capacity for action and intervention, which would not exist without this Parliament.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the four resolutions by successive votes)

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — Mr President, I want some guidance on the series of disaster resolutions on which all the groups are agreed and have compromised and have said there will be no speaker. There is no abstention and there is no one against. Can you confirm that you will allow Item IX to be voted on?

President. — The order in which the motions are called was decided by the House itself. I can see no way to change it.

Mr Eyraud (S). — (FR) Let me take up what Mrs Ewing just said, Mr President. I should just like to ask you, before you adjourn the sitting and after we have considered Item VIII, to put Item IX to the vote without a debate. I shall be grateful.

President. — We shall see how things turn out.

Israeli raid in Tunisia

President. — The next item is the joint debate on two motions for resolutions on the Israeli raid in Tunisia:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1008/85), tabled by Mrs Heinrich on behalf of the Rainbow Group, on the Israeli air raid in Tunisia;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1022/85), tabled by Mr Cervetti and others on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the Israeli attack in Tunisia.

Mr Mallet (PPE). — *(FR)* On behalf of Mr Bersani and myself, Mr President, let me say that our good faith has been abused. We put our signature to a text (B2-1008/3, B2-1012/13 and B2-1022/3) which was tabled as having the support of our group and in which certain passages are absolutely unacceptable.

As far as I am concerned, I was distracted in the middle of an electronic vote and asked to sign the document. Paragraph (d) completely absolves the PLO of all blame for recent events, and this is quite unacceptable to us. If I had read the text more carefully, I should have realized that it did not reflect our views. I admit my error, Mr President, but it will not happen again.

President. — Your statement is noted.

Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, following the Israeli air raid against Palestinian civilians at Hammam Beach our group decided to table a motion for a resolution condemning this vile and criminal act.

At the time we could not have known that the United States Government had been notified on 28 September — this is not what I say, it is what Israel Radio itself said on 4 October — i.e. prior to the raid, and that the US Government bears a heavy responsibility for this aggression against civilians and against a friendly and traditionally peaceful country, Tunisia.

On the other hand, we were convinced that the least the European Parliament could do today was to condemn this raid as strongly as the Council of Ministers has done.

My two colleagues from the European People's Party and myself met Mr Arafat in Tunis on Monday night and assured him of our full support for the Council declaration. We also indicated to him that a similar condemnation would, in all likelihood, be adopted by our Parliament today.

Anxious to see this condemnation take place, my group accepted — albeit reluctantly due to the documents' minimalist tone — to submit to Parliament a compromise amendment tabled jointly with the Socialist and Communist Groups and Members of other Groups, but now we can count on Mr Mallet, because of what he said just now. Given these circumstances, I deplore the fact that this text does not clearly condemn the United States' stance, because it is a fact that the United States helped Israel to carry out this raid, whether at intelligence level — by providing the Israeli Government with satellite photos — or whether at logistics level — and here I can provide certain information about how the Israeli planes were refuelled in flight.

We are talking about a country which is Europe's friend and ally, and we must at the very least demand an explanation from it.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Pajetta (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I would like to begin by saying that no one has been taken advantage of. I thought we were all big enough to look after ourselves; no one has been hoodwinked, in this case someone has been lying to justify not being able to read.

We want to state that we are, and always have been, opposed to any form of terrorism. I say that as an Italian Communist who has lost his own colleague Guido Rossa, a communist-party worker, in a terrorist assassination. We are against all forms of terrorism. While there is no justification whatever for terrorism, nor is there — and one should be aware of one's responsibilities here — any reason to exasperate it or to provoke it in order to turn it to one's political ends.

The attack carried out at Tunis was a violation of all international law as well as a savage attack on the territory of a neutral country and we have welcomed the denunciation and condemnation of this attack just as we welcomed, and have now noted in our document, the denunciation by Yasser Arafat, the President of the PLO, of those terrorist acts which have been committed. I would like to point out, as proof that we are not a sectarian group, that in my capacity as opposition member in the Italian parliament, I yesterday listened to the words of Mr Andreotti and found myself very much in agreement with them. I feel this demonstrates that members from different parties can jointly condemn, in the name of justice and not for electoral popularity, the same crimes, whoever commits them, without these being justified — as has been done in some quarters — when committed by a state which must however feel the need for universal recognition as does the state of Israel. The attack was therefore launched in violation of all international law. Do you want peace for Israel? Well then, if you want peace for Israel and you want — we at least want it — peace and the right of statehood for the Palestinian people, then we must abandon the escalation of tragic events which has led to this form of open war and look at the question of the PLO as one of great topicality. On this point, Mr Andreotti, the Christian Democrat Foreign Minister, has stated that if the Italian Government — and, I would add, Italians in general — had not maintained the links that we have with the liberation movements, it is quite likely that other attacks would have taken place and perhaps the act of piracy — an act which we condemned as soon as we heard of it — would have ended tragically. That is why we do not view the PLO as outlaws but rather believe that the legal structure must allow it to have some authority — which it has to some extent shown that it possesses — to stop the spread and increase of a terrorism which

Pajetta

will otherwise become its only possible form of struggle.

As if the Israelis don't remember that! After all, when Israel was seeking statehood, they shrank from no form of terrorism and no form of shooting war in defence of this right. Now these former terrorists, today Ministers, must know that they cannot think of calming this wave of crimes if they do not make it possible for one of those people they are now unjustly condemning to become Minister of a Palestinian State.

Israel is a State. It should respect international law — without exception. That is what we demand. There can be no justification. It must respect that universal law, and in conflicts with any party whatever, as do all who value the rule of law.

These are the reasons for our general condemnation of terrorist acts but also of our specific condemnation of the savage, unjustified and unacceptable attack by a State which is recognized by Italy and by ourselves — much as we sharply criticize its policies.

President. — The situation is as follows: it is now 12.56 and there are still seven Members down to speak. Assuming they keep to their speaking time, that would take 18 minutes. This means that if the debate continues there will be no vote on these motions for resolutions, nor will it be possible — as was proposed — to vote without debate on the motions for resolutions on the damage to agriculture due to bad weather.

I therefore propose that the debate be closed.

(Parliament agreed to the proposal)

Mr Adamou (COM). — *(GR)* Since we cannot speak, Mr President, I would suggest that those who were down to speak should be allowed to submit their speeches in writing for inclusion in the verbatim report of proceedings.

President. — I am sorry, Mr Adamou, but that is not allowed by the Rules of Procedure.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 3 seeking to replace the two motions for resolutions with a new text)¹

¹ Amendment tabled by:

- Mr Hänsch, Mr Glinne, Mr Dankert und Mr Saby on behalf of the Socialist Group;
- Mr Segre, Mr Valenzi, Mr Chambeiron and Mr Alavanos on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group;
- Mrs Heinrich and Mr Roelants du Vivier on behalf of the Rainbow Group;
- Mr Price, Mr Marck, Mr Wedekind, Mr Antoniozzi and Mr Flanagan.

Damage to agriculture due to bad weather

President. — We shall now consider the following motions for resolutions:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-980/85), tabled by Mr Provan and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the catastrophic harvest in Scotland and the North of England;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-990/85), tabled by Mr Stirbois and others on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on the disastrous drought in France and Italy;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-993/85), tabled by Mrs De March and others on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on emergency measures to benefit drought-stricken areas;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-995/85), tabled by Mr de la Malène and others on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the dire consequences of the drought in France;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-997/85), tabled by Mrs Ewing and others on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the crisis in agriculture in Scotland;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1005/85), tabled by Mr Debatisse and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the consequences of the drought in France;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1010/85), tabled by Mr Maher and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the drought and agricultural problems;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1014/85), tabled by Mr Saby on behalf of the Socialist Group, on forest fires in Portugal;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. B2-1018/85), tabled by Mr Eyraud and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, on Community aid for the French departments affected by drought.

(Parliament adopted by successive votes:

- *Amendment No 1¹ seeking to replace motions for resolutions Docs. B2-980/85 and B2-997/85;*
- *resolution Doc. B2-990/85;*

¹ Amendment No 1 tabled by:

- Mr Provan on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- Mrs Ewing on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance.

President

— *Amendment No 1¹ seeking to replace motions for resolutions Docs. B2-993/85, B2-995/85, B2-1005/85, B2-1010/85 and B2-1018/85;*

— *resolution Doc. B2-1014/85)*

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

IN THE CHAIR: MR DIDÒ

*Vice-President*2. *Common market for broadcasting*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A2-102/85), drawn up by Mr De Vries on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, on the economic aspects of the common market for broadcasting (COM(84) 300 final).

Mr De Vries, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, the frontiers must be opened up, not just for persons and goods but also for television. That is the message that the European Parliament has today for the Council of Ministers, a call on behalf of all those Europeans for whom Europe is not yet a living entity, for those who do not know what Europe means to them because they do not receive any information about Europe.

Transfrontier television is a powerful means for bringing Europe closer to its citizens. The figures speak volumes. Europe has 125 000 000 households, of which almost 120 000 000 have television. In every Member State, nine out of every ten households possess at least one television set. In the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom, every second household has two sets or more. Television viewing has become one of Europe's major leisure activities. At any given moment in the evening, half of the population in every Member State is watching television. Over the average week, 80% watch television at least once, while the average adult watches between two and four hours a day.

It would be a tremendous step towards a closer-knit and more democratic Europe if people could be better

informed via television about life in neighbouring countries, if Europe were to be brought into the living-room as it were. What a challenge it would be for programme-makers to devise new programmes, more cosmopolitan and less nationalistic, for an international public. Finally, what a boost it would be for European industry to have a single common market for broadcasting. The satellite, cable, electronic, and space industries are all leading industries, technological showpieces in a Europe which appears to be losing the industrial battle with Japan and the United States.

Let us take a good look at the facts. The current industrial revolution in electronics and telecommunications is the first that has its origin not in Europe but in Asia and America. Not because Europe is technologically inferior — in many sectors we are equal and in some we even lead — and not because Europe does not invest enough money in research and development. We spend about the same as the US and twice as much as Japan. Our fault is that we do not have a homogeneous domestic market. We compel our industry to produce for separate national markets too small to guarantee profitable sales.

Mr President, the importance of a uniform, free internal market for the European economy can hardly be overestimated. This applies particularly to those sectors in which Europe has a technological lead. The satellite industry for example. Europe built the first direct broadcasting satellites, and was first for example in the cable industry, broadband cables and in particular optical fibre networks. These are the building blocks for the infrastructure of tomorrow's Europe, just as important as the construction of the railways was for yesterday's Europe, the Europe of the first industrial revolution. The Community is aware of this importance, as demonstrated, for example, by the telecommunications research programme RACE.

However, research without marketing opportunities amounts to a waste of money. The cable and satellite industries must be able to profit from an internal market. An open internal market does not yet exist, in particular because media legislation differs widely between the Member States. Each government has its national media system, surrounded by a forest of regulations, injunctions and prohibitions. In many cases, such provisions do not serve any high ideals such as the encouragement of cultural diversity. Rather, they exist exclusively to serve low political interests, that is to say party political influence on radio and television.

Television is political. The Commission has therefore wisely not set itself the aim of eradicating this forest of national regulations root and branch. This would clearly have been counterproductive. The Commission's sole aim is to cut away the dead wood so as to clear the way for an open internal market.

Our film industry and our satellite and cable industries need to be given room to develop, both literally and

¹ Amendment No 1 tabled by:

- Mrs De March on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group;
- Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance;
- Mr Debatisse on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party;
- Mr Maher and Mrs Martin on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group;
- Mr Eyraud on behalf of the Socialist Group.

De Vries

figuratively. Consequently, the Commission quite rightly included all of its broadcasting proposals in the white paper on the internal market, which met with a favourable reception at the European Summit in Milan. I call on the Luxembourgish and future Dutch Presidencies to include a separate item in each agenda of the Internal Market Council on the implementation of the white paper, including the broadcasting proposals. This will undoubtedly speed up work in the Culture Council, which of course meets much less often.

Mr President, the Commission's proposals, incidentally prepared at the behest of Parliament, are based on a solid legal foundation, namely the Treaty of Rome and the European Convention on Human Rights. Article 10 of the latter accords each European the right of freedom of expression. Literally, it states that 'this right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers'. The relevance of this article to today's discussion is crystal-clear.

The second cornerstone of the Green Paper on television without frontiers is the EEC Treaty, in particular Articles 56 to 66. These govern the freedom of services within the Community, which include broadcasting. Normally speaking all restrictions on the freedom to broadcast programmes across frontiers between the Member States are in breach of European Law. Exceptions are only possible to a very limited extent, and in any event must conform to the European Convention on Human Rights. The exceptions allowed by the Court of Justice in its *Debaue* and *Coditel I* rulings apply only until the national provisions in this field have been harmonized. Such harmonization is the goal of the Green Paper and the aim of the reports submitted by Mr Hahn and myself to Parliament.

Contrary to what is claimed in Denmark, there is thus no question that culture comes under the Treaty of Rome. An open market for radio and television has just as firm a legal basis as the market for other services. I would go even further, Mr President. The Maginot lines around the national broadcasting systems must be dismantled precisely for the sake of cultural policy. If the European film industry is to survive, a European market is of crucial importance. A great number of obstacles currently stand in the way of both the production and distribution of programmes across intra-Community frontiers. I refer you to the discussion earlier this week on the Fajardie report concerning European film and television policy and to the recommendations made by Mr Beumer as draftsman of an opinion on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy. The national Ministers of Culture would do European culture a disservice if they were to deny the film industry in the Member States a European market. Hollywood would be the only one to benefit. The success of the European cable and satellite industry moreover depends to a large extent on the availability of suffi-

cient programme material. Thus more than enough reason to speedily discard the conservatism and official narrow-mindedness with which the Green Paper has been received in some capitals.

Mr President, the revolutionary technological changes we are currently experiencing in telecommunications should not be seen as threats but as challenges. The cold feet some have towards television via satellite and cable makes me think of the reaction at the end of the last century to the arrival of the telephone. The then British Postmaster General said in 1895, and I quote 'There is a great distinction between telephone companies and gas and water companies. Gas and water are requisites for every inhabitant in a district, but the telephone cannot, and will never be, an advantage which can be enjoyed by large masses of the working classes.'

This prediction has not come to pass. It is up to us to ensure that it will not come about for television without frontiers either.

Mr Schinzel (S), draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology. — (DE) Mr President, I shall first speak for the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology and then for the Socialist Group.

In order to avoid any confusion I shall say when I am speaking for my group.

Through the resolutions it adopted in 1980 our Parliament made sure that Europe's political bodies were roused from their media policy slumbers, and following the stimulus given by Parliament at that time — it was, as we know, a joint resolution — the Commission submitted the 'Television without frontiers' Green Paper.

The Commission's Green Paper proceeds from the technological facts created in the meantime and the resulting possibilities of wideband cabling and satellite technology, and — looking at these new developments from economic and legal angles — to harness them for the benefit of European integration, on the basis of the existing Treaties of course.

Most criticism of the Green Paper came from the cultural community, because it was claimed that not enough attention had been paid to the cultural aspect. I shall go into this later when I speak for my group.

Our Committee welcomed this Green Paper for the most part, but it did raise several questions which I would like to go into now. To start with, it must be noted that the course for technological developments was set in the 1960s and 1970s, mostly without the participation of broad sectors of the populace, i.e. without any discussion in society, which would have made it possible to bring in at the right time those peo-

Schinzel

ple mainly affected. The decisions were made mainly on technological and economic grounds, often by — passing the members of the various parliaments who, as representatives of the people, should have been involved in making these decisions.

For this reason, it often seems as if politics trails far behind developments in the media field. This is not a false impression, and it is not only true of the European level but for most national levels, too. We are finding it difficult to subject the whole complex to the necessary democratic decision-making processes, and then to set these in motion as required or to influence them.

The Committee on Energy, Research and Technology believes that this approach must not become the rule when introducing new technologies, but that in future the consequences of introducing new technologies should be evaluated beforehand so that responsible policy decisions can be made.

We support the creation of technological preconditions enabling each citizen to receive the other Community countries' programmes, and making it possible to receive a common multilingual European television channel produced by a European broadcasting company. But it is important here that such a company is also subject to corresponding democratic controls, of course.

We are in favour of greater cable penetration on the basis of optical fibres, and of satellite technology being pursued further. We proceed from the premise that Europe's future media structure will be based on an integrated wide-band telecommunications network and simultaneous use of satellites. In this connection I must voice some criticism of developments hitherto in the Olympus project. As the Americans have found out, the development of direct broadcasting using powerful satellites is very expensive, and channel operators will not be able to afford it. For this reason the Americans have switched to less powerful communication satellites and have dropped their projects involving direct broadcasting by powerful satellites. It is only we Europeans who are continuing to work in this field after having invested thousands of millions already. I fear that this project, once it gets going, will simply be a white elephant. The negotiations between French Television and RTL show that channel operators cannot be expected to pay the necessary costs and fees. However, we should see Olympus through as a demonstration project after having invested so much money in it.

We are in favour of having a European media convention regulating access to satellites, and we would like to see the European Community applying to the WRAC for a common frequency allowing it to broadcast to the whole Community area, and thus provide this common European television channel with a lasting basis.

Similarly, we think it is necessary to introduce common standards for satellite transmissions, and we strongly hope that the Commission manages to prevent individual member countries from possibly adopting different standards, which would rule out a common channel or at least make it more difficult to achieve. Moreover, subsequent harmonization would be very costly.

Finally, our Committee believes that we should pay special attention to common and effective Community data protection regulations to prevent our ending up — via greater cable penetration — with totally cabled citizens under continuous surveillance in their private lives too. For this reason we demand effective data protection!

And now the opinion of my group. In general the Socialists are in favour of a European media policy. For us broadcasting is part and parcel of cultural development, is very important in shaping awareness and opinions, and also has a major role to play in European integration. We are for a European television environment which, we believe, should include the following: firstly, the possibility to receive national channels from all Member States, and secondly, the creation of a multilingual European television channel as part of a European broadcasting organization. At the moment no-one can predict the exact form such an organization would take, but it should be one with a democratic watchdog body whose editorial independence must be guaranteed.

Thirdly, we are in favour of promoting the European programme industry and safeguarding the high standards of public broadcasting, which has made an important contribution to cultural development in our individual countries in the Community. We want to see safeguards for cultural diversity and freedom of information, and for this reason we want to avoid monopolized media and opinions in the Community. Finally, we favour harmonization of general programme principles, e.g. protection of minors, no glorification of violence, etc. We want to see technical standards and legal provisions harmonized under a European media convention. This concept is sometimes incorrectly understood. We believe that the Community should have binding guidelines for all sectors where regulation is necessary.

Mr De Vries's report does not live up to our expectations. We had thought that as part of the economic aspects of the common market for broadcasting something would have been said on the question of jobs, the economic importance of this sector and its prospects. But the report says nothing on this score, although provision is made for the Commission to deal with the matter. Thus, the report limits itself basically to new ideas in the field of advertising.

I have to say on this that we Socialists are not in favour of viewing the broadcasting sector mainly, or

Schinzel

even exclusively, from a commercial angle. We cannot accept the common broadcasting market being opened up to a free-for-all, with more or less uncontrolled advertising around the clock, interrupted now and then by news along the lines of 'stay cool — the next ad is on its way'. We will not stand by and watch European culture being finished off in this manner.

However, I also think it is unrealistic to say we don't want any advertising, just as it is unrealistic to say we don't want any private TV channels. And for this reason we say there is nothing wrong with advertising or private TV channels, but they have to be within reasonable limits. We cannot have advertising becoming the dominant element in our broadcasting sector. We consider broadcasting to be part and parcel of the individual countries' cultural development, a part of European and national identity. This is something we want to keep and we will not let it be destroyed. On the contrary, we want to make room for more creativity, for more European productions. It is our job, as Members of this Parliament, to create more opportunities and chances in the European Community for those working in the cultural field. That is what we should be doing! We cannot sacrifice European culture to an international, financially strong media steam-roller which will crush our diversity into insipid pap. Just look around and you can read it in the papers almost every day: mammoth marriages are in full swing. This isn't good for us and we will resist it!

All of us in this Parliament should jointly lobby for European culture and not have a hand in sacrificing culture to commercial interests! With this in mind we will table some motions for amendments to the De Vries report concerning, *inter alia*, quotas, advertising time curbs and the broadcasting authority. We consider these to be important and we expect them to be adopted. Only then can we vote for the De Vries report.

Mr Beumer (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, unlike the Hahn report, the De Vries report on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy looks at the Commission's Green Paper much more from an economic and legal standpoint, which is understandable since these were the terms of reference. Therefore I think the rapporteur did not find it too difficult to approve of the Green Paper, since it also concentrates on the economic and legal aspects. During the debate on the Hahn report, I already said that we consider that the cultural policy aspects in particular are underrepresented in the Green Paper. Perhaps I could emphasize once again that our approach, the Christian Democrat approach, may be seen as a combination of both the Hahn and De Vries reports.

I would like to repeat what we Christian Democrats see as the basic principles of media policy, also at European and international level. For us the social and

cultural dimension is paramount. This does not mean that we consider the economic aspects to be unimportant, on the contrary, they may indeed influence and help to promote quality, but they should not dominate. Accordingly, we attach great importance to public service broadcasting and consider that the Commission must create minimum guarantees to ensure its continued existence. Taking commercial broadcasting as the starting point does not meet with our approval, although we do not reject advertising.

Our second basic principle is the importance of variety. This refers to both the range of programmes offered and those for whom these programmes are intended, which means that minorities in particular should be catered for, which is far from always being the case.

A third important point is independence. The range and content of programmes should not be excessively influenced by either government or commerce. Where socialists or liberals place too much emphasis on one side or the other we must reject this.

The fourth point, Mr President, is openness. We advocate as a matter of principle the maximum possible freedom to receive and broadcast, limited only by the principles I have just mentioned. In addition to national channels, we also advocate a European television channel that approaches and looks at news relevant to Europe from a European, as distinct from a purely national, standpoint. We feel this requires a European structure, and we fail to see any sign of such a thing, in particular in the Commission's Green Paper. We therefore call for appropriate suggestions in an amendment. We think it would be useful if the European Broadcasting Union were to be involved as well. Such a channel is also important, Mr President, in order to stimulate a European consciousness, because at the end of the day no convergence of any kind, whether in economics or the environment, will be possible without the creation of a European consciousness.

Comparing these basic principles with the De Vries report prompts the following comments. In view of the primacy of social and cultural aspects over the economic and legal aspects, questions of cultural policy thus assume importance. We think that the Council of Ministers has a definite task in this field. On the basis of Article 239 of the EEC Treaty, it could for example lay the foundations for a certain degree of quality protection. I recall an American report that appeared recently on the performance of the three major American television companies. It concluded that there is indeed too little variety in terms of catering for all sections of society and that the range of programmes offered is too uniform and narrow. This should be a warning to us. In consultation with the European Broadcasting Union, the Council should also examine what the financial basis could be for both public and non-public broadcasting.

Beumer

As far as advertising is concerned, it seems to us premature to talk about quantities at this point in time. We therefore do not feel inclined at this stage to go along with the maximum of 20% suggested by the Commission or other percentages mentioned in amendments. We will come back to this subject when we have the directives before us. In any event, however, we would say that the maximum of 20% appears to us to be much too high, and we do not think that this squares with the formulation adopted in the De Vries report, which talks of a balance between advertising and programme material.

Mr President, when talking of variety, we must also consider the effects of the proposed policy on the other media, newspaper and magazines. We therefore consider that a study should be made of the impact on, for example, the revenue of these media. This request has now been included in the De Vries report.

As regards independence, we would like to emphasize again how important it is to set up a European editorial body, which of course must be linked with a European structure, and we call upon the Commission to make provision for this as well.

Another question that should be looked at is whether, once European policy has gathered momentum, there should be a European body to examine broadcast licences, for example. I can imagine this becoming necessary when the number of European broadcasts increases.

As regards copyright, we feel that a voluntary licensing agreement with provision for arbitration is the best approach, better than that proposed by the Commission. In addition, we would also ask the Commission to give its opinion on the current differences in the degree of cabling, and the short-term impact that a free broadcasting zone would have on those countries with a high level of cabling.

Finally, Mr President, we agree with those amendments stating that it would be a good idea to have a lot more European productions, but for the 50% mentioned, we would say that rather than setting a minimum it would be better to provide a certain leeway by using the words 'around' or 'approximately'. I hope that the Commission will present directives in the near future, as called for by the De Vries report, directives that also clearly reflect our views.

Mr Cassidy (ED). — Mr President, on behalf of my group I welcome the De Vries report, particularly for its refreshingly unregulatory approach to the challenge of satellite and cable television. It is refreshingly different, if I may say so, Mr President, from the tone of some of the amendments put down by certain members of the Socialist Group.

Mr De Vries has realized something which has escaped many people both in this Chamber and in the

world outside: that the world of television has changed. In my country — and I have no doubt it is true in other Member States — people who work in the existing semi-monopolistic conditions of television in Member States have an attitude bordering on contempt towards the average television viewer and towards mass taste. That is not my opinion, it is the opinion expressed by the television correspondent of the *Financial Times* who attended the Edinburgh International Television Festival recently, where the assembled multitudes who work in television arrive and spend their time criticizing the programmes which are the most popular on our television channels.

I therefore welcome not only Mr De Vries's report on behalf of my group but also the document, weighty though it is, submitted by the Commission, because both Mr De Vries's report and the Commission Green Paper acknowledge the fact that the television world will never be the same again. Speaking on behalf of the consumer, the voter, the viewer, I say that fact is a welcome fact.

Unfortunately, we politicians have an unhealthy love-hate relationship with the media — all media, but particularly the electronic media. It is unhealthy because, after all, it is only television and people who work in television that realize that there are other demands on people's time.

Because of the technological revolution, we shall shortly be facing the prospect of a thousand flowers blooming — not my phrase, Mr President, but that of a well-known Conservative, Mao Tse-tung. Let us not in the Community try to thwart the blooming of those thousand flowers by trying to put the regulatory cart before the technological horse!

Depend upon it, Mr President — and I say this through you to the Commission — that though we may try to control it, technology will outpace us. Some of the recommendations made in amendments put forward by certain members of the Socialist Group will, I am afraid, be made nugatory by the fact that the Japanese will shortly invent — if they have not already done so — a television satellite receiver which will enable people to tune and switch programmes with the facility that we at the moment do with the dial of a radio set.

Some Members of this Parliament, I am afraid, Mr President, have never come to terms with plurality in the media. I would go so far as to say that had certain Members of the Socialist Group been alive when the printing press was invented, first of all not only would they would have been trying to control its development in the way that Mr De Vries described earlier when he read out an extract from a speech by a 19th century British Postmaster General, but I venture to say, Mr President, that certain members of the Socialist Group, notably the members of the British Labour Party, would probably have been campaigning to pro-

Cassidy

protect the jobs of those monks employed in copying manuscripts in monasteries.

We are still at that stage in the middle of the 20th century when certain people who should know better will try to control the access that the citizens of Europe are entitled to have to the richness and variety that technological change can bring to them in television.

I use the parallel of the press. We have an unparalleled richness and variety in the press in Europe, let us try to keep that richness and variety in television.

Mr Barzanti (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, the issue which we are discussing — not only on the basis of the extremely interesting report submitted to us but also on the basis of the Green paper and the report by Mr Hahn, which we discussed at the last parliamentary session — is without doubt of major importance and strategic value.

I should like here to draw your attention only to those aspects which we feel are of particular importance.

First and foremost we feel that there is no clash or gap between the economic objective of creating a design for European television and the protection of cultural values. These two sets of questions are to be seen in a context which unites them, thereby establishing a suitable relationship — as expressed in the resolution before us — between the commercial dimension of European television and the industrial dimension.

This reciprocal relationship must not be considered with diffidence or scepticism but with a genuine and realistic feeling of responsibility.

We feel that the problems associated with the promotion of European television and cinema programmes should be identified so that this plan can be given its due weight. If this is not done, and we wish to stress this point, no process of liberalization, understood purely and simply as the harmonization of standards and as a means of facilitating exchanges, can solve the question facing us, i.e. to produce more and produce better quality by stimulating the varied potential of European culture. This should be an aim to be pursued no less intensely than those relating to commercial harmonization and the scope for new markets offered by European television.

As far as advertising is concerned, we do not wish to see a directive containing excessive analytical or oppressive measures. This question must also be evaluated realistically to control distribution and programme quantity and so avoid damaging fragmentation of programmes and provide appropriate scope for selected sponsoring, prohibit the advertising of some products and, in general terms, ensure that advertising does not have a negative effect by lowering the quality of the programmes themselves or introducing imbal-

ance in the use of this source of revenue on the part of various mass media as this would doubtless be counterproductive.

I repeat, it is not detailed and oppressive regulations that we need but, along the lines of what is proposed in a number of amendments, an effective and well-balanced regulation.

Lastly we would like to stress that the basic issue is a far-reaching transformation to which we must also contribute of national and European-level television systems.

We believe in the need for a guarantee, which should be applied with increasing stringency and also be effective in the technological sense, to ensure reciprocal provision for transmission and reception beyond frontiers, which are now nothing more than an anachronism. We also believe firmly in the need for public systems and public authorities to boost programme quality and become a general frame of reference for European and national hybrid systems in which private undertakings and public bodies can play their part in the process of democratizing information and liberalizing communications which are important if we are to build a Europe which is truly a Europe of the people.

Mr Van der Waal (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, during the debate on the report by Professor Hahn, we asked whether a common market for broadcasting is a subject the Commission should concern itself with. This question also applies to the report by Mr De Vries. In our view, the legal bases mandating the Commission to intervene in this matter under the Treaty have not yet been convincingly demonstrated.

Evidently the Treaty is concerned with economic cooperation between the Member States of the Community. So only a one-sided economic interpretation of Articles 59 to 61 in particular can provide the Commission with a justification for intervening in the media. However, even assuming that this justification is valid, the question still remains as to whether this provides a basis for a European media policy. For a fully fledged media policy goes somewhat further than just the economic aspects of a common broadcasting system. In making these comments, we do not wish to fight a rearguard action but to press for clarity concerning the legal basis of the Commission's proposals. This clarity has namely not yet been achieved even by the rulings of the Court of Justice on this matter.

Leaving aside now the interpretation of the Treaty, I would like to make some comments on the report by Mr De Vries. To start with concerning the level of advertising allowed. Although the report expresses a number of reservations on this point, Article 19 in the motion for a resolution in fact mentions no quantitative limit. This means that the De Vries report offers even greater scope for advertising than the Green

Van der Waal

Paper. This proposes a limit on advertising time to 20% of total air time, but in our view even this figure would lead to a staggering amount of advertising. In most countries 5 to 10% is currently the norm. Would such a high level benefit the consumer? Would it be desirable or even responsible to expose people to such a large amount of advertising? In our view, what is required is not just a purely market-oriented approach — we also need to ask ourselves what our objectives are with this proposed media policy.

Consequently, we wonder whether this figure of 20% in the proposals put forward by the Commission and the rapporteur takes sufficient account of what is currently happening in the field of advertising. A station such as Sky Channel already offers advertisers in the Netherlands ample opportunities and even more favourable conditions than can be obtained from the official Dutch agency governing broadcast advertising.

Finally, I would like to say that in our view the Commission's proposals, and to a certain extent also the reports by Mr Hahn and Mr De Vries, place too much emphasis on the rapid expansion of advertising in order to stimulate the European economy and European unity. We believe that the European dimension of advertising and transfrontier television is a matter that should primarily be discussed within the Council of Europe and the European Broadcasting Union, on the basis of the recommendations they have already prepared. The starting point here should be the existing situation in the various Member States as regards the media. This report pays insufficient heed to this point in our view, whereas this is not the case with the European Broadcasting Union.

Mr Collins (S). — Mr President, I speak as a member of the Socialist Group who has bothered to attend the meetings of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, and has actually taken part in the debates and moved amendments on each of those occasions. I am very grateful to Mr Cassidy too for pointing out to the whole Assembly in this debate that he represents only three people in the European Community, that is to say, in his own words, the consumer, the voter and the viewer. Now we had always thought that he did not represent very many people but it is nice to have it from his own lips. Personally, I think it is still an exaggeration.

However, coming on to the substance of the debate, I think that one of the major problems that confront us is the financing of future television developments in the Community. Whether one likes it or not, if we want to produce high quality programmes and a high percentage of domestic, that is to say European programming, we are likely to be highly dependent on advertising revenue. Now, of course, many people will

not like that; some people will like it, but I think, nonetheless, it is something we have to accept.

Of course, we have lived with radio without frontiers for many years. Radio Luxembourg has broadcast all over Europe for many years and nobody has found that a particular problem. Nonetheless, I do think that in the context of television we need to have some kind of European framework for advertising, and the work of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and of the members of the Socialist Group serving in that committee has been directed towards that end. Now the problem is that there are already good, adequate national provisions for the control of advertising in many of the Member States. And there are good national provisions for the control and guidance of television broadcasting itself in the Member States. It is not always a good thing to solve a problem simply by elevating it to a European level. Cultural variation has got to be maintained in Europe. Italy must remain Italian. Germany must remain German. And we do not help this by having some kind of European intervention masquerading as homogenization. That will not solve anything at all, and we delude ourselves if we believe that European culture is that unified. The beauty of European culture is, in fact, its internal variety and variation. Anybody who preaches anything different is riding for a fall.

Therefore we do need a framework to compel those Member States who do not already have proper and good practices to adopt such practices in broadcasting and advertising.

Now I yield to no one in this House in my belief in the future of European cooperation, but I reject entirely and completely at this stage any suggestion of a European broadcasting authority and I reject entirely and completely any suggestion of a European advertising standards authority because in both cases they would be clumsy, inflexible and slow to respond to the problems that arise in these areas. It would be precisely the opposite of what is required. What we need is to allow the development of cultural variation in programming and in advertising alike. My own committee, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, in the Hahn debate suggested one or two things that might be done. We are clear that we need to separate advertising from programming content. We need to establish flexibility in the frequency and timing of advertising. We do not want one country to be compelled to take advertising blocks and another to take advertising by natural breaks — that should be left to the practice in the Member States. We do believe that there should be a total ban on the advertising of tobacco and that there should be strict controls on that of alcohol. We do believe too that the content of advertising should be based on the principles of honesty, decency and good taste.

But overall, Mr President — and I conclude on this point — we reject entirely the notion that we can solve

Collins

this problem by harmonizing and homogenizing all of these cultural variations at a European level. We demand at least that from the directive this year.

Mr Hahn (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of the European People's Party welcomes and approves Mr De Vries's report. It sees no contradiction between it and the report I submitted about four weeks ago, which we discussed in detail then. These are different aspects of the same extremely complicated subject. I fully agree with Mr Schinzel that there are still certain things not dealt with yet, and further additions are of course conceivable.

This discussion comes at a good time, in a week when we are discussing modern technologies in Europe which it is our joint task to develop. It would be silly if, on the one hand, Europeans got together to develop joint industries in these areas but at the same time wanted to develop a media policy which cuts off nations from one another and which is nowadays still particularist to some extent. I would like to reply to Mr Collins by saying that European solutions would not necessarily harm the diversity of European culture in any way, and that it is precisely through joint programmes or through receiving other nations' programmes in our homes that we can experience this diversity and this richness. The European Music Year showed us how much we can stimulate one another, something that should be possible in this area as well.

In the short term the two reports and the motions for resolutions have the same aim. They want to prompt the Commission — and I am now directly addressing its representatives — to submit the directive mentioned in the Green Paper before the end of this year if possible. We ask you to submit this directive to the Council, and we would draw the Council's attention to the preamble to the European Treaties, which notes the determination to lay the foundations of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe. What could bring us closer together than a media network in which we can meet one another and through which we are able to see our differences but also the things we have in common, the problems we have to solve jointly, thus allowing a European consciousness to crystallize? I would remind the Council of the Solemn Declaration on European Union which it made in Stuttgart:

European Union is being achieved by deepening and broadening the scope of European activities so that they coherently cover . . . a growing proportion of Member States' mutual relations and of their external relations.

Thus, the Council has clearly pointed the way ahead and should not now simply purse its lips, as it were, but also really whistle, i.e. take action and bring about unity in this field too.

I would like to ask the Commission, and especially Commissioner Ripa di Meana, not to forget the Com-

mission's interim report on a European television channel, as various speakers have already pointed out. We consider this to be a very important issue and would ask you to persevere and press ahead with this matter.

The De Vries report focuses on the economic side of things. I need not repeat its extensive contents, which go even further than the Green Paper. It talks of things which will probably not yet appear in the directives because they are almost still pie in the sky. For example, it says we should have an integrated wide-band telecommunications network using glass-fibre technology, and in so doing is one step ahead of technology which is not yet so far advanced. A whole series of other fields are mentioned which are also ahead of their time. However, it is important that an indication is given of these prospects and of the stimulating effect of establishing a common market in this field. Thus, a whole series of tasks is outlined about which we should already be thinking today. I, too, believe — as my report says — that it is vital to bring technical standards for direct broadcast television satellites into line. A new element is that the second generation of direct broadcast satellites should be tackled now, because the first generation will be no use at all if it is not immediately followed by the second.

The report understandably dwells on advertising. Since Mr Beumer and other speakers have said a lot about this already, I would just like to add a few words on copyright. We have, in actual fact, now moved away from the proposal contained in my report because it came in for heavy criticism and a number of governments, especially the French Government, would not agree to it and no directive would be forthcoming then. We have, therefore, decided to stick to the current basis for negotiations for the time being, in the hope that this will make it easier for the directive to materialize.

(Applause)

Mr Toksvig (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, this is now the second time during a debate on transfrontier television that I have had the pleasure of hearing Mr Hahn, and like last time I agree with him to a very great extent. He has said sensible and sound things this evening, and there are also sound and sensible things in the De Vries report. Both have run into a hail of amendments, a veritable blizzard, because everyone is by definition an expert on television and radio. There is no European who cannot put together a better evening programme than all the existing television companies together. So both Professor Hahn and Mr De Vries have written reports that have exposed them directly to not just a hail of amendments but also a fair share of knocks.

In line with the concerns of the rapporteur and the committee, the De Vries report has noted the indus-

Toksvig

trial advantages and the entire development process now starting with cable networks, the integrated broad band network and fibre optics — and he could have added earth stations and broadcast and reception standards. As ever when an industrial development is set in motion, there are considerable advantages, advantages that create jobs, and for that reason alone worth supporting.

As in the Hahn report, there are repeated calls for freedom. However, every time these two reports talk about freedom of the air and freedom to produce transfrontier television, I with my 30 years experience in European television am disturbed at the references to existing machinery. When I last spoke on these matters, I recalled that the EBU, the European Broadcasting Union, is and remains a cartel. It is the cooperative body linking together the existing monopoly institutions, and nothing is changed by describing them as guarantors of freedom. When the television monopoly held by the BBC for many years was broken in the UK, and ITN was set up, for me the most important step of all, namely an independent new service, ITN had to wait for years before it could share in the exchange of news film that takes place every day under the auspices of the EBU, because the establishing power, namely the BBC, which I deeply admire in all other areas, wanted to defend its monopoly.

In the De Vries report there is a reference to the EBU which sounds quite innocent. Paragraph 5 calls on the Commission, after consulting the European Broadcasting Union, to seek the agreement of the Member States on a common project for the development of the second generation of direct broadcasting satellites. The way this clause is formulated contains a number of dangers and risks connected with the structure of the monopolies. First, consultations are to be held with the EBU in Geneva, then an agreement sought with the Member States. Member States that have monopolies and are members of the EBU will pass this invitation directly on to the EBU, which has already taken a decision, so the process will then suddenly come to a halt. In my view, it would be far better to approach the ESA, the European Space Agency, and ask them: 'can you develop a second generation of direct broadcasting satellites with the aid of industry and offer them to the cartels or to those able to make use of them?'

Mr Collins spoke of the need for regulation to preserve national identities. I would to say to Mr Collins that the public will see to it that these identities are preserved. As far as I can see, there is no question that the British, Irish, French and Dutch public would rather watch programmes about things that are of relevance to them than have faceless bureaucrats draw up rules as to what they should watch at home in the evenings.

Personally, I intend to vote for the two reports, but there are points which I intend to vote against.

Mr Filinis (COM). — (GR) Mr President, in our view Mr De Vries has tabled an excellent report on the economic aspects of the common market for broadcasting. Indeed, the rapid technological advances in this field will soon enable the Community Member States to receive interference-free radio and television broadcasts transmitted from anywhere in the world, mainly via the American satellite systems, and this will have all sorts of unfavourable consequences for the countries and the peoples of the Community. This means that we must create as soon as possible a common democratic European policy and a common market for satellite and cable broadcasting.

I should like to clarify my opinion on the following: since it is very likely that there will be increased concentration in the field of cable transmission, it will be very important for the public sector in the Member States and private initiative to be properly associated as regards radio and television broadcasting.

We consider that the main preserve of private initiative will have to be the consumption and use of information products, whereas the basic structure and the basic choices will have to belong to the public sector, which must, however, be democratically controlled by democratic public bodies, such as parliaments, trade unions, local authorities, political parties, women's organizations, cultural organizations etc. We think that in this way it is possible to militate against any kind of monopoly or authoritarian set-up which runs counter to the public interest and benefits either private monopoly interests or uncontrolled state bureaucracy.

Mr Seal (S). — Mr President, this report by Mr De Vries is like the curate's egg; it is good in parts. My main interest in it is the effects the proposals it makes will have on jobs in the Community. With 15 million people unemployed we need to create jobs wherever possible. In broadcasting we can create jobs. We can create jobs both on the technical hardware side, providing we have common standards, and on the creative programme side.

I very much support the proposals made by Mr Beumer to improve and encourage the European cultural content of European broadcasting. I believe that it is essential that we encourage European programmes in preference to some of the cheap and nasty American productions that have been imported into the Community. We have got to use the facilities and resources we have to try and stimulate the creation of programmes in the Community, particularly for small independent film and TV makers.

However, I do not agree with Mr Beumer or the report when it comes to talking about some kind of central controlling body. That is something that we certainly cannot have. I agree with the last speaker: what we need is democratic control, but in my opi-

Seal

nion, control at the Member State level.

We do need agreement. We need agreement on technical standards. These, however, must be agreed and not imposed. We need agreement, particularly now that we are going to get more and more satellite broadcasting. We need agreement on all aspects of satellite broadcasting. But, once again, we have got to have agreement and not imposed controls.

I won't say too much about advertising because a lot of this has been covered by previous speakers. Let me just reinforce one particular point. Whilst I believe that advertising must be controlled and restricted — and I certainly support a ban on all tobacco and alcohol advertising on television — I do feel it must be done at a national level and not by some kind of overall enforced European control.

Mr President, there is one aspect that I feel I must cover that has not been covered by other speakers but is in the report and is a very important part of the report. That concerns CB — citizens band radio. We have got to achieve — and the Commission should take note of this — some common standards for citizens band radio. We have got the ludicrous situation now where drivers of large trucks who go to West Germany, for example, equipped with CB radios that are quite legal in the United Kingdom are arrested, fined and have the equipment confiscated because it does not conform to the regulations in Germany. This is something that we have got to sort out, and I ask the Commission to sort it out as soon as possible.

I will finish now, Mr President, but I would just like to say that Mr Cassidy seems to have started reading Mao Tse-tung. Perhaps that is the influence of being a member of the GLC, and I congratulate him.

Mr Marck (PPE). — (NL) I wish to confine myself to the question of advertising. The Commission wants to fix certain minimum standards in a directive allowing programmes that meet these standards to be broadcast freely throughout the Community. In this way, the fundamental question as to whether to allow broadcast advertising is answered in the affirmative without much in the way of justification. Accepting this standpoint means that the Member States will have to introduce advertising in one form or another. Advertising time will then be limited to a maximum of 20% of air time.

This statement of principle and the proposal for implementing it in practice nonetheless raise questions regarding equal treatment in all the Member States. The situation in the various Member States in fact differs widely depending on the existence of a well-established cable network and the coexistence of public and private broadcasting. For example, Sky Channel receives equal treatment in Germany, but privileged treatment in the Netherlands on account of the satel-

lite two-way cable system. The Commission will have to monitor equal treatment.

On the other hand, the existence of cable carries with it the danger of the massive proliferation of advertising. At the moment, this situation exists only in Belgium and the Netherlands. New transnational channels are bound to suck these markets dry, mostly at the expense of public broadcasting services and the press. As the national public broadcasting services cannot compete on an equal footing with the transnational channels, the Commission will be creating a situation of unequal treatment. If we wish to secure the existence of the free press and public broadcasting, we will have to tread very carefully. The 20% norm is unacceptable. A gradual transition, or even a stricter limitation, will at all events be required in view of these inequalities.

Furthermore, broadcasting is not a purely commercial enterprise; information and cultural education must continue to play an important part. There can therefore be no question of advertising totally dominating. It must be confined preferably to fixed time slots so that other programmes are not interrupted.

I would strongly urge a differentiated approach to the problem so that the aspects of information, education and culture continue to play a more important role than commercial interests.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, I think that financial circles and large private concerns in Western Europe have recently been very active in trying to ensure that television broadcasting is organized along American lines and, above all, that the national networks are demolished.

In our view certain initiatives within the EEC to create a common market for broadcasting also form part of this attempt, since such a market means the privatization of the broadcasting media, and this will lead to the predominance of profit-making rules in an area which is vital for the cultural, spiritual and entertainment needs of every people as well as for its national character. We speak about freedom of competition, but in reality this leads to the creation of information monopolies, and typical of this is the fact — which is, by the way, mentioned in the explanatory statement — that of the 5 000 cable systems in the USA, ten control 40% of the market, or there is the domination of Silvio Berlusconi in Italy or the penetration of press monopolies, such as that of the publishing magnate Murdoch with Sky Channel, in the field of broadcasting. Let us not forget either, when we speak about the pluralism of information which a common market for broadcasting can provide, the criticism made by the Chairman of the BBC to the effect that we give people what they want, but when we ask them what they want, they reply on the basis of what we give them.

Alavanos

We consider that the problem of advertising should be similarly tackled. In our view, the consequences of these proposals on advertising will be that television channels are prisoners of their revenue and prisoners of the advertisers' wishes. A typical example is that of Greece, where, while the Greek Government is supposed to be struggling to restrict imports, Greek television advertises almost exclusively imported products, and an attempt it made to advertise domestic products resulted in the Commission bringing it before the European Court of Justice.

In our view, the problems of broadcasting can be dealt with by a policy other than that which is dictated by the profit motive in broadcasting, namely a policy which is based on an association between the utilization of new technologies, popular democratic choice, balanced inter-governmental cooperation and support for the development of the cultural and spiritual needs of the peoples.

Mr Ripa di Meana, Member of the Commission. — (IT) With its study of the Commission's Green Paper — first in the form of Mr Hahn's report on the definition of a general mass media policy then in the form of the De Vries report, which dealt more specifically with the economics aspects, the European Parliament has, in my view, completed an excellent piece of work.

On 12 September Lord Cockfield was here to represent the Commission at the debate on the Hahn report and he rightly and vigourously stressed the all-embracing and integrating nature of television which as he said, affects the whole of humanity and represents a linchpin between the needs of culture and art and those of the economic and industrial sector. Today I can confirm the letter and spirit of those statements which represent an irrevocable standpoint of the Commission. Nobody will be surprised, however, if I say that personally I am particularly sensitive to the joint existence of these two aspects of television and at the same time I am very aware of the function, not always harmonious, of the linchpin element between art and industry, between economics and culture. Television, as Mr De Vries pointed out, is a sector of strategic importance to the service economy of the European Community. Comments made following the presentation of the report all confirmed this assessment.

The swift transition of the radio and television sector from a purely national to an international, and consequently European, phenomenon, prompted by the debut of satellites and cable TV, entails fast and far-reaching changes in two areas. In the economic and industrial area there is in addition to the creation of new or almost-new factors such as satellites, receiving aerials, optical fibre cables and all the associated electronics, a need for production structures and programmes which take account of the unified market. This calls for the setting up at European level of production and distribution bodies, as well as the agencies

responsible for distribution and production loans so that the European audiovisual industry can finally be turned into something capable of comparison and of establishing negotiations on an equal footing with the non-European giants. In the area of art and culture the divisions are less clearly drawn and less self-evident. The necessary solutions which in spite of their complexity are, in economic terms, relatively clear, are less obvious here. However, this is the area where the stakes are highest and an area in which the European identity, contribution and future will immediately be determined. In this venture the game can be lost quickly in the wake of a few bad moves or missed chances; on the other hand, total victory will never be certain and whatever we are able to win can be lost again at any time.

What has to be done can therefore be based on a simple premise: every television programme must henceforth be seen not as an international programme which sooner or later will be followed by the whole of Europe. This is the purpose of the Commission's Green Paper, which is an attempt to identify the ways and means of setting up the common television market or, put more accurately, rather than setting up such a market it is a question of backing up its launch and initial development with whatever is necessary in terms of community legislation and with any other necessary measures, and nothing more, to remove obstacles, prevent distortion and guarantee that the interests at stake are fairly matched. The Green Paper therefore represents the legislative or regulatory momentum of the Community action which is required under the Treaty. There is however another momentum for this action which I would define as a positive political momentum intended to ensure that the legislative framework includes the essentially European values for which it was conceived.

I should like now to consider two aspects which I feel cannot be separated without running the risk of failing to understand the long-term objectives of the action project or the tools essential for their implementation.

It is important to remember the linchpin function of the audiovisual industry to which I referred earlier. Mr De Vries approves of the Commission's initiative aimed at setting up the common market for radio and television broadcasting and the intention of submitting a proposal for a directive to harmonize some aspects of national regulations in the field.

The Commission's Green Paper, which is based on a complex series of economic and legal considerations contains specific proposals which were examined by the national authorities and the professional groups concerned. A series of meetings provided much more material for consideration and possible incorporation in the proposed directive. The main area for the proposal harmonization is television advertising which, as Lord Cockfield pointed out a month ago, is one of the most difficult problem areas and as this debate today is

Ripa di Meana

showing, one to which reactions vary. The proposed solutions also vary in line with different reactions.

As Mr De Vries points out in his resolution, the level of advertising must not be detrimental to the value of the programmes which are a vehicle for information, education and entertainment. This requirement must be set against the advertising potential of television which justifiably is an extraordinarily attractive field for much poorly utilized European capital and which represents tremendous potential for economic expansion. A number of speakers, among them Mr Seal, have today already stressed the importance of the expansion of European television in terms of checking and improving the situation of the unemployed in our countries.

In an attempt to take account of these two aspects the Community directive should include the principle on which advertising will be permitted in all the Member States at least on one television channel. In terms of quantity, as I mentioned earlier, advertising should be limited to the scale indicated by Mr De Vries, in other words kept to a level which does not harm the cultural and artistic merit of the programmes.

I feel, however, that I must make one reservation, although there is a case for supporting the opinion of Mr De Vries. This reservation relates to a general provision for national programmes without however fixing a maximum percentage. Instead, in order to make legal provision for the passage of a programme from one country to another, the Commission considers that the fixing of a maximum time is desirable. An exact limitation of this type would prevent the otherwise inevitable formation of a contentious international grouping and possibly also the occasional blocking of this or that programme owing to differences in the interpretation of the regulation. The respect of a maximum limit also makes controls easier and simplifies intervention procedures. Clearly, a decision concerning the actual setting of the limit is a sensitive one and that indicated in the white paper should be seen only as an initial guide and nothing more than a hypothetical limit. A time limit could have major positive and negative consequences. It will have to achieve, in a television stretching throughout Europe and thus displaying Europe's own image, the difficult but necessary balance between economic and cultural requirements.

As regards the complex problem of interrupting programmes for advertising, there is a need for an in-depth study of this aspect so that solutions can be found which will safeguard within Europe free competition and the rights of authors regarding the continuity of performance of their works.

Another important aspect covered by the Green Paper concerns the arrangements for copyright. This is a very sensitive area and one which has without doubt produced the most heated argument and even violent

reactions throughout the Community. In my capacity as Member of the Commission with responsibility for cultural policy I have been particularly exposed to it and also feel personally a special duty to safeguard the values at stake. Nobody can deny the logic of the white paper in the future scenario of European television in which tens, possibly hundreds, of programmes by thousands of different authors, actors, directors can be exchanged every day from one television to the next or from one country to the next, from a satellite to a cable network and vice versa. The current arrangements concerning copyright, which are dominated by authors' prohibition rights, seems at least in appearance, to be an intolerable sword of Damocles over the smooth operation of the system. It is however also clear that authors attach great importance to the retention of the current system, which is currently undergoing major modifications in the United Kingdom, Denmark and Austria. Here, in the face of such conflicting viewpoints, the Commission recognizes the clear advantage of a system of voluntary control freely negotiated between the parties concerned as being preferable to any legislation. The Commission however reserves the right to make provision in its directive for recourse to legal licensing only as *ultima ratio*, in other words when it is proved that the agreement is not practicable and there is a serious risk of interruption to intra-Community exchanges.

Allow me in conclusion to speak briefly on that which I earlier called the 'other momentum' or the positive momentum of Community action — the framework to be set up within the legislative provisions. As the person responsible for cultural policy and communication in the Commission the problem affects me directly. I also said earlier that no discussion of the means and structures for the audiovisual market can be meaningful if the final objectives are disregarded. The problem is one of promoting, in a unified and open market, the birth of new creativity, not the sum or a blend of national creativities with which we are fortunately blessed but a cultural approach directed to make an impact on the European public — a communication effort beyond national boundaries and language barriers which have hitherto been the only horizon of our television producers. What is more, for decades the cinema in Europe has shown that it has learned, in its better efforts, how to be understood; appreciated and loved beyond the confines of national boundaries.

The advent of transfrontier television is therefore a good opportunity and one which is not to be missed. With the powers available to it the Commission intends to encourage any initiative aimed at producing common television programmes. I should like to reassure Mr Hahn on this point to which he made express reference in his speech. These programmes will be intended for a Community-wide public and will thus be produced in various languages and will make use of the new scope and technical standards set by satellite transmissions.

Ripa di Meana

The Commission is also intending to support co-productions, both in the cinema and in television, and an appropriate draft regulation has been submitted to the Council. What is more, last Monday the Parliament in its debate on the Fajardie report witnessed a largely positive reaction to this project. Finally, attention must quickly be given to the distribution sectors and cinematographic financing so as to tackle the central problems facing the European audiovisual industry. As you see, all this represents a lot of work and I do not wish to dwell here on the ability of our resources to achieve the desired results. I am confident of Parliament's support in the future, both in the conceptual and design phase as well as in the implementation of the project and I thank Parliament for that support.

I should like briefly to reply to Mr Beumer, who raised the problem of differences in the level of 'cabling' in the various Member States, pointing out that the more 'cabled' countries would be favoured as regards the importing of programmes. The reply which we can give is that it represents an advantage for viewers in the countries which are more organized in the field of cable transmissions. The Treaty of the Community is moreover based on a principle of reciprocity and it would be paradoxical if the application of the liberties provided for in the treaties undermined the benefits which might be derived from certain more advanced areas, in this case in cabling, until a situation similar to that for example in the Netherlands today exists everywhere.

As regards the question raised by Mr Seal, which concerned citizen band, I should like to inform him that the Commission is gathering final facts from a survey carried out in the Member States on the subject of the application, at national level, of the TR 20/02 recommendation of the Conference of European Post and Telecommunications Administrations so that a standard application of that recommendation can be achieved. Subsequently the Commission will decide on its own position in the light of the replies received and the highly unsatisfactory state which this branch of radio communications is currently in will also be reviewed. Our proposals will then be submitted to you for your views.

IN THE CHAIR: MR SEEFELD

Vice-President

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

3. Dairy quotas

President. — The next item is the interim report (Doc. A2-85/85), drawn up by Mr Woltjer on behalf

of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, on certain aspects of implementation of the dairy quota arrangements in the Community.

Mr Woltjer (S), rapporteur. — (NL) This report is not merely that of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food but rather a joint report from the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food and the Committee on Budgetary Control, as was proposed in a Parliament resolution in September 1984 which requested both committees to study the implementation of the quota regulations. That was our brief and we accepted it because the Commission itself had submitted that it would carry out an evaluation only after three years and because everyone felt at the time that a Parliament committee should study the whole problem. Our brief was therefore *not* to philosophize about what should happen after 1990, when the quota lapsed — we had specifically restricted our terms of reference to the implementation of the quota regulations as approved in principle by the Council in 1984. That must be explicitly stated because it meant that we could avoid a lot of discussion that would otherwise have had to have been handled by the committee. After all, the Commissioner's Green Paper contains plenty of justification for a discussion on the more distant future. Nevertheless, we have not tackled this issue.

I would first like to make a comment on the effectiveness of the measure. If there was one point on which we were all agreed, it was that the measure had definitely proved its effectiveness. In just one year, production has been cut from 104 million tonnes to 98.2 million tonnes, thereby even falling short of the quota by about 250 000 tonnes. Those, at least, are the conclusions to be reached on the basis of the figures available to me. If we then further consider that there was a growth of 1.5 to 2% last year, we have in fact succeeded in cutting production by 7.5% at a stroke. That is a very vital point of considerable significance. This proven success means that we can therefore clearly reject all the criticism, voiced in the past, that the regulations would not be effective and would be impossible to administer.

One can, of course, make a number of comments on the way the regulation has been implemented and the speed with which this was done. If, however, we read the ombudsman's report on this matter in the Netherlands, we see that almost all Member States were faced with the same problems as action suddenly had to be taken and that numerous mistakes were made in consequence. The Member States were unprepared, even though the matter had been discussed for a number of years, so that many complaints — as has already been pointed out in this Parliament by the Commissioner — were indeed the result not of the regulation itself but of the manner in which it was introduced. In effect, after lengthy Council decisions it was suddenly introduced in the Member States although they had made no

Woltjer

preparations whatever and the regulation was barely formalized on paper — though they must have known that it was almost inevitable. That was how it all came about in 1984 — with consequent difficulties for a great many farmers.

Over the past year there have been more than 12 amendments to the regulation. Some of these are quite logical, for example, the agreed postponement, to the end of the milking year, of collection of the levy. This change is understandable because a number of the administrative issues had been badly handled at the time of the quota's introduction and it was hardly fair to ask farmers to pay before their quotas had been determined and, for example, when it was still not certain whether they qualified for treatment as a special case.

In this context, however, I have a very heartfelt question to the Commission: why has the quarterly levy now been abolished? What were the grounds for this step? After all, the quarterly levy was intended as an indication to farmers of the impending level and now it has suddenly been abolished. Why? The administrative difficulties now lie behind us and it seems fair to say that it must be possible.

The other changes are less clear-cut and their advisability is open to question. I would like to mention one of these: the deferment, for a period of three years, of determination of the reference period for Italy. The question that now arises is a simple one: what is going to happen in Italy over the coming two years and is the Commission sufficiently confident that the quota will not be exceeded? I consider two regulations to be completely unacceptable and the Commission has also pointed out that those may cause major problems.

The first of these is equalization. The Ministers decided — perhaps in itself quite understandably — that equalization between regions was permissible. What has this now led to? The text has been interpreted in such a way that one Member State (the Secretary for Agriculture in Belgium was the first but was followed by his counterpart in the Netherlands) suddenly declared: 'we haven't exceeded our national quota, i.e. some farmers have exceeded their quota but others have produced too little milk and we will equalize this at a stroke so that those farmers exceeding their quota will be excused payment of their super-levy.' The consequence was a great deal of bitterness particularly among farmers who had complied with the regulations since they saw themselves as the victim of a double injustice. Firstly because they had sold off their cows when required to do so, although meant prices were low, and then because if they had continued milking they would have been able to make additional income over and above their quota and be better off than they now are because they complied with the quota regulations — since those farmers not complying have in fact done nothing but benefit from their misdemeanour.

And then there is another major problem. What happens next year? What approach should farmers adopt next year? I am specifically asking the Commissioner what he thinks will happen next year. Equalization can again be carried out next year because the regulations are for a two-year period. What does the Commissioner think will happen then? I can tell him: every farmer, all those with cattle, will exceed their quota. That is the inevitable consequence of the system because no one wants to be taken advantage of again, that's the problem. I can tell you that the figures are already worrying — this is because equalization is now being so generally applied that one cannot really continue to talk of a quota regulation.

A further problem that I would like to mention, and in fact a consequence of the preceedings one, is that although the basic regulations stipulated that money collected under the super levy should go into the EEC's coffers, the Council has decided to refund Member States all levy monies over and above those needed to compensate for exceeding the national quota and to permit the Member States to use them to implement their national intervention programmes. Two problems then arise. Firstly, there are clear budgetary consequences. This action is obviously at the expense of the EEC budget because EEC money is being used to finance it. Parliament has never been consulted on this measure and that is unacceptable to an institution jointly responsible for the budget. Secondly, the Ministers to whom the monies have been refunded may implement national intervention programmes. The milk purchased through these national intervention programmes — if indeed they do prove effective — can again be redistributed. In other words, quotas are maintained and at some considerable expense to the EEC.

The Commission, and not just the Council, has therefore clearly been found wanting in this matter. This was a quite unsuitable approach. I am not denying that some kind of measure had to be adopted but not in this way and not using this procedure. In view of the extreme significance of this matter, I would like to take this opportunity of asking the Court of Auditors to examine it thoroughly in its annual report next year. After all, we as a Parliament cannot just let this go unchallenged.

The quota regulations have proved effective but, nevertheless, there is still considerable excess production. The 97.2 million tonnes of milk we produce are still far more than we can sell and therein lies the problem. In other words, we have a quota system, but the quotas are still too high and significant modifications to the quota system are still needed. Quotas will have to be cut by at least 5% and there are a number of possible ways of doing this. As a committee, we have not either favoured or opposed any one method. All we are saying is that the quotas must be further reduced and we welcome that fact that the Commission has since stated that it is studying the matter and

Woltjer

is preparing proposals for a European intervention system and/or an incentive payment for those farmers temporarily ceasing to produce milk.

We have made a third suggestion in our report and I would like to recommend it to the Commission. You all know that, after discussion, it was decided last year to reduce by 1 % both production and the co-responsibility levy. You must really be complimented on getting the Council to agree to the programme for next year, since it is not all that common to see the Council suddenly modifying one of its decisions from the previous year, but in this case you have indeed managed this feat. The Commission deserves some praise for achieving what is no simple task.

However we still have a 2% co-responsibility levy and I would therefore like to ask the Commission why they do not consider the feasibility of taking the same action next year — and when studying this you could also examine farm incomes. That would give you a linear reduction in the quota while it would entrain no reduction in farmer's incomes because it would be possible to compensate them through the co-responsibility levy. This proposal is well worth another look.

Indeed, there are a great many complications associated with a European intervention system. I will list a couple of them. In Ireland we have applied an extra-Community quota, in effect an increase. If you then introduce an intervention programme, do you not think you will be using it to take away what you have just given Ireland in the form of an extra quota? In effect, this kind of programme will have a contrary effect by coming into play in those areas where farmers do not actually achieve optimal production.

I have another question on this point. Italy — as I mentioned a moment ago — has still not been attributed a reference period. What is going to happen if you institute an intervention programme in Italy? I would very much appreciate the Commission's answers to these questions.

I would also like to ask whether you do not agree with me that a European intervention programme can conflict with a national one to the extent that this is concerned with problem cases and therefore with the redistribution of quotas. I would like to hear the Commission's response to that.

It is often stated that the quota system is incompatible with structural policy. I must agree that this is possible provided no measures are taken and we state that in this report. However, it need not necessarily be so. It would be advisable — and in the report we discuss this in detail — for the Commission to provide Member States with criteria for the establishment of national reserves that fulfil the provisions of structural policy — in other words, using redistribution criteria to link structural policy and quota policy.

One further point. It is very damaging to the credibility of the Community — and we have indeed heard many complaints about this — that it is not fulfilling prior obligations such as the one towards those farmers who in 1977 accepted incentives to cease production. My question to the Commission's is whether it does not believe, as I do, that account must be taken of the production of those farmers who have wanted to exercise their right to recommence production after four or five years — something that hasn't been done in a number of Member States.

Now for the final point. Our committee believes that checks should be more stringently carried out since supervision of the quota is vital. For this reason, our report contains an urgent call to the Commission to improve monitoring. We have also requested the Court of Auditors to give priority to issuing a special report on this matter. Everywhere there is talk of fraud and while I cannot judge the accuracy of these reports, fraud can upset the entire quota system. The Commission must therefore act now and not later.

Mr President, those are the points I wanted to discuss today and they are examined in detail in the report.

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, Parliament is aware that I do not usually speak early in a debate and prefer to do so at the end since this makes it easier to respond to comments that have been made. Unfortunately, I am obliged to travel to Copenhagen this evening to discuss the Green Paper with Danish Farmers' Organizations and am therefore compelled to speak at this stage in the debate.

Agreements made within the Council require the Commission to report on the success of the milk quota system after three years. Of course, this doesn't rule out an evaluation at some other time. In fact, one has to recognize that the Commission has done little else than evaluate the system ever since it was instituted. When Mr Woltjer points out in his report that we have made twelve amendments to the basic regulation over the past year, that really just goes to show that we are constantly evaluating the system.

The Commission welcomes the report now being discussed as an important and constructive contribution to the evaluation of the system that we have introduced. Furthermore, I would like to congratulate Mr Woltjer, on behalf of the Commission, on the quality of his report. On one thing at least we are in complete agreement, the quota system has had a real effect on the production of milk and milk products in the Community. I also think that we are all pleased that the painful impact in farming circles of this system has had the positive corollary that the problem of the milk production is now somewhat more manageable. In just one year, butter production has fallen by approxi-

Andriessen

mately 11% and skim milk powder by no less than 20%. Nevertheless, we have to recognize— and I believe that Mr Woltjer has already pointed this out — that milk production is currently running at the level of the quota and even a few percentage points above the annual average. Here I feel that I must make use of this opportunity to tell producers quite categorically that if it is true, as Mr Woltjer has said, that everyone will exceed the quota, then this is going to cost everyone money. I admit that the changes we have made to the system have tended to emphasize collective responsibility at the expense of individual responsibility. That is correct and I do not hesitate to say that this is regrettable. To that extent, there is not much that I can say in response to the report's criticisms on this point. What I would like to say is that although we have been forced to institute a number of temporary measures to cope with difficulties in introducing the system and that these have given the quotas more of a national character than the individual one they originally had, it is important to consider that the system is continuing to work in the case of the superlevy. I believe this is an appropriate opportunity, and an appropriate time in the sales season, to make this point quite clearly in relation to this report.

We were indeed forced to make a number of changes. Some of these changes are approved of by the rapporteur and others not. Let me say quite clearly that I do not completely agree with all the changes proposed by the Commission and accepted by the Council. I would personally have preferred to have had these sums being paid quarterly but I did not consider a different payment system to be an inseparable problem. After all, we are dealing with perfectly capable adults in an emancipated society and, secondly, it is of course possible for quarterly payment of the super levy to result in a payment for one quarter and equalization in the next one — with consequent administrative disadvantages. For these reasons, at a time in which there was great pressure to do something about it, I gave my agreement because it would not affect the essence of the system. A more significant point is that of equalization. That is temporary and specifically instituted for a second year by the Council, acting on advice of the Commission. Moreover, I want to tell this Parliament that I am in no way convinced that such an equalization system need be continued for the rest of the period. That is an issue that deserves separate examination at the appropriate time.

I admit that at first sight it seems very strange to enable national intervention programmes to be financed from money raised as a super levy and this has been pointed out by the rapporteur. I would just like to note that, within the whole framework of changes being discussed, it was very difficult to approve equalization for one Member State and then not to find some other solution for another Member State which had already collected the levy.

I see that the rapporteur can at least understand how I came to my conclusions; I think that in political terms

it would have been very difficult for the Commission to act in any other way. That is an additional reason to take great care with interim changes to a system such as it was originally planned. I am quite prepared to take personal responsibility for this conclusion by the rapporteur.

I would now like to comment on the intervention system because this has been examined and because the Commission believes that this system could be an important and acceptable way of reducing milk production to a level that more or less matches consumption within the Community and external markets. Let me begin by saying that I have a less pessimistic view of total markets than the rapporteur does but we will have to await future developments. I think he is rather pessimistic in his estimates here but it is quite clear that we produce too much and the Commission agrees with the rapporteur on this point.

I intend to propose to the Commission, in the course of this month or perhaps early next month, the introduction of an intervention scheme aimed at major cuts in production. The cheapest way of solving the butter problem is not to produce it. That is as plain as a pikestaff. The intervention scheme does indeed give rise to a number of problems, one of them being the structure of certain Member States. We should not forget one thing, however. Political bargaining in the Council of Ministers, where a given Member State feels it must have a certain macro-quantity of milk production to cover its needs, is not the same as the individual freedom the farmer has to use or not use the quota allocated to him. I want to say quite clearly that, in my opinion, we have to maintain a system in the Community whereby Member States negotiate about macro-situations and farmers can decide in micro-situations. That seems to me the only way to achieve a sound agricultural policy in the Community. In saying that, I do not want to rule out the possibility of applying a Community intervention system even in a country which has presented major problems with respect to the total macro-extent of the quota. I am not saying that it is essential but that it must be possible, depending on the decisions taken by individual farmers.

A further problem that was quite correctly pointed out is that of the national intervention schemes. Some of these schemes will already have finished by the time the Community, accepts, as I hope it will do, the Community intervention scheme. Where this is not so, we will have to find practical ways of structuring the Community system so that it does not conflict with existing national systems. Internal discussions I have so far had on this subject have convinced me that the problem is not a simple one but that it is certainly not insoluble. In the case of Italy, we will undoubtedly be able to define a reference period compatible with the introduction of the system.

Mr President, I would like to comment on the 1977 outgoers scheme. I believe this is indeed a serious issue

Andriessen

and not an easy one to solve because the scheme prevents us from determining a reference quantity. Nevertheless, I want to assure Parliament that I will again give this problem serious attention to see whether it is possible to give those concerned a better deal.

My final comments concern supervision. In the Community, monitoring is both an extremely difficult problem and an unavoidable duty, whether we are dealing with milk, vegetables and fruit, fish or whatever. The problem is that we in the Community have still not managed to achieve clear supranational Community responsibility for verification. That is the central problem and, in my view, all other issues are subordinate to that. What I will, of course, attempt to do is to see that optimal verification occurs within the framework of the limited means at our disposal. That is no easy task. I am quite prepared to admit that the form of our quota scheme makes it important if not vital to have more detailed, on-site Community supervision. Unfortunately, I have to say that I cannot see our current resources giving us any real chance to do substantially more than is now done. I think that this should be a long-term task, primarily for the Commission but we would welcome the support of the European Parliament, to convince the Member States to accept, both judicially and by supplying resources (in the form of personnel), that wherever supranational legislation has to be monitored, that it is essential to do this on a supranational basis.

Mr Thareau (S). — (FR) Mr President, the mandate of 30 May 1980 committed the Commission, and then the Council, to take restrictive measures in certain agricultural markets. Some of these revolved around intervention levels and mechanisms, as was the case for beef, others involved price levels, as in the case of cereals this year, while still others centred on restricting production, which gave birth to the dairy quotas. All these measures have had a serious impact on agricultural income.

The interim report submitted by Eisso Woltjer is a hard-hitting analysis of quota application methods in the various countries. Milk producers, forced to step up production in order to maintain their income, have not found it easy to accept a freezing of the existing situation. Although production volume controls were inevitable, the mechanisms chosen have not made it possible to reduce inequalities.

The strongest criticism is reserved for the fact that the quotas are national ones and the systems vary, being based on holdings in some cases and on producers in another. Thus, the rapporteur underlines how farmers in an identical situation are treated differently, depending upon the kind of purchaser they supply or which country they are in. Injustices exist and are growing because certain major producers have not paid the specified levies, and this serious matter might

render the system useless, since producers who have made great efforts cannot accept their neighbours taking an easy approach.

Production limits per country exist, but we must work for more justice between producers so that the penalties and available quota allocations are based on the same logic. There has been much criticism, and rightly so, of the cumulative effect to two restrictive measures: since quotas now exist, the co-responsibility levy should be dropped.

Despite the large amount of criticism — often justified — of the quotas, we have to admit that the production curve has dropped off appreciably, leading to a slight rise in milk prices. Nevertheless, this has not been enough and any further development presupposes clearance of stocks — it should be recalled that 45% of the one million tonnes in stock are over 18 months old. No one likes to see things sold off cheaply, but costs are growing as the weeks pass by. If the production and consumption curves converge we must work for better control of our purchases, and imported production must be subjected to at least the same levies as other kinds. Finally, we must improve our commercial set-up and organization in order to sell more.

The basic issue which the policy-making bodies and professional agricultural organizations face is both difficult and simple at the same time: we either pursue a policy of 'laissez faire', which will mean our products costing too much and our saying goodbye, to guaranteed prices, or we go for guaranteed prices as set out in the Treaty of Rome, and in order to do this we have to control production. If we plump for this latter aim we can arrange for better distribution of available quotas, allow new farmers to start up, prevent distortions between farmers, and ban quotas from being traded. The mechanisms are not inflexible, because we are talking about five successive twelve-month periods, and so we can do better from next year onwards.

The Socialist Group will vote for the Woltjer report in the hope of seeing, from the end of 1985 onwards, an own-initiative report containing binding commitments for future years.

Mr Früh (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, let me begin by expressing my regret at the fact that the Commissioner must leave. I fully understand this. I know how urgently Europe's farmers want to see the person who is to map out future agricultural policy in the form of a Green Paper. Therefore, I am not blaming you, Commissioner, although you know that we postponed this report for a whole month because you were not available and had said you wanted to take part in the debate.

I blame someone else, and now I am addressing the President of Parliament. Is it really impossible, when the Commissioner's schedule is known, to have the

Früh

agenda altered by the Bureau or the administration, or whatever, so that we can start dealing with the report at 15.00 and then listen to the Commissioner at our ease after he has had a chance to hear the various speakers and Groups? This is the only way for Parliament and Commission to have a sensible discussion and to avoid any ambiguities. I deeply regret what has happened, and I would like to appeal to our President to make sure that it doesn't happen again in future. The next report didn't have to be included in the night session! Please forgive me these preliminary remarks, which have only wasted my time.

We have a difficult procedure here. As Mr Woltjer knows we are a Working Party — Mr Aigner is giving me a pensive look — with two fathers, and it is not easy to do the right thing when you have two fathers. This is why it has only turned out to be an interim report, mainly because we did not have all the documents. I mention this because there has been criticism in my Group, in particular, of the report's interim nature. However, I do not think it was possible to produce a full report in such a short space of time.

I would like to stick to the essentials. I believe that we have really broken new ground with this regulation. So far — in the case of milk in particular, but for many other products, too — we have always tried to find some way of curbing overproduction. For years all we had was the co-responsibility levy; we were never really quite serious, acting according to the slogan: wash my skin but don't get me wet! This was doomed to fail because farmers are clever people who know all about life. They knew that a regulation would be forthcoming at some time, and they wanted to be in a good starting position. Since we made it easy for them to push up milk production — regardless of acreage — by the use of feed substitutes, that is what they did, causing us great difficulties until this solution came along, which was probably the last chance to hold back production in the dairy sector.

The Community is made up of ten countries, some of which have a milk deficit while others have a surplus, and this makes things extremely difficult, not only for the countries as such but also for the individual holdings which were in various predicaments. We had holdings to which we had given investment advice under enterprise development schemes, and these later constituted the difficult cases which we were obliged to protect and had to give additional quotas. But there were also genuine cases of hardship where things started badly: for example 1981, when we started out, was a bad year, the head of the holding became ill, and so on and so forth. Then we had the young farmers who, needless to say, wanted the prospect of being able to further develop their holdings. Despite all these things we managed to have the quota adopted. And now please allow me one comment, Commissioner — I am not blaming you for the 12 amendments — but it is just that the amendments are extremely difficult for those they affect and who had no way of

foreseeing them. However, I would like to view these 12 amendments as an expression of goodwill on your part. You wanted to streamline this system as much as possible and rid it of any sharp edges.

As far as I know, it was *one* Minister in particular who fought a long hard battle for this regulation, and who was out on a limb for a long time, but he had his way in the end. Perhaps you are thinking: 'This regulation is being praised because, although it hurts, it did have positive results.' May be you should see to it that in other circumstances, e.g. when grain is involved, this Minister's views are looked at more clearly before simply moving on to the agenda, thinking: 'Well, what's the worst that can happen? Eight to two, or nine to one or whatever; I'll survive.'

That's something I would just ask you to note, Commissioner, because I really believe you when you say you want to knock European agricultural policy into shape, something which has not been done for years and years. This wasn't Parliament's fault; it was due to the simple fact that no headway was made in the Council. I admit quite openly that we have a problem in our Group, where many are saying: 'You can't have quotas plus co-responsibility, this is just senseless duplication. We must change the situation.' But our ideas have developed to a stage where we say: 'As long as we have such surplus production we can support this measure politically, but we must also strive to dismantle co-responsibility.' You yourself have suggested dismantling co-responsibility on a differential basis one day. That's something we would be only too happy to accept. This could be done on the basis of holding size, less-favoured regions, mountain areas etc. I hope that in your ingenuity you come up with the correct solution, and that you don't measure everything by the same standards, so that dissatisfaction with this agricultural policy does not grow any further.

I see that my allotted time is coming to an end. My chairing of this working group was no easy task. I would now like to thank the rapporteur, the Groups, which cooperated very well in this Committee, my colleagues, but also the Commission and the Council, which provided us with good news and also with documents, and I would like to assure all those I have mentioned that the next report will be a final one based on more experience, and especially on the reports of all Member States, right down to the individual German *Länder*. Not least of all I would also like to thank the national authorities which did not let us down.

(Applause)

President. — Mr Früh, allow me to comment on the gentle rebuke you addressed to the Chair or to the Bureau at the beginning of your speech. You all know that the agenda is drawn up in advance by the

President

enlarged Bureau. The chairmen of the parliamentary groups attend the meeting. You also know that before the start of each part-session the group chairmen get together on Monday with the President, Mr Pflimlin, in order to consider what has come out of the groups' preliminary meetings, and you also know that in the final analysis the House has the last say.

We decided on the order of this agenda all together, and there should be no criticism of the President after the event. I am quite happy to give you a chance to speak in reply, but things are as I have explained them.

Mr Früh (PPE). — *(DE)* No rebuke was intended, Mr President, and I only wanted to make an appeal to you. In situation of this kind, is it not possible to ask the House at the end of the sitting around one o'clock whether the agenda can be changed by switching two reports, on account of the situation with regard to the Commissioner? That was simply my question.

President. — The circumstances are now as they are, but your statement is noted.

Mr Simmonds (ED). — Mr President, on behalf of my group I would like to congratulate Mr Woltjer on his interim report and most particularly on the wealth of information in his explanatory statement. Let us remember in our debate this afternoon that this is an interim report and that it deals with the effects of the introduction of milk quotas. It is his subsequent report that will deal with future policy.

I believe that it really is important to recognize the precedent that Parliament set when the panel to monitor milk quotas was set up, to monitor the day-to-day progress made on Commission proposals. The work of that panel has not been made very easy by the slow and late submission of information by some Member States. But those delays should not deter Parliament from repeating this precedent of monitoring panels on other issues.

My group is very concerned about two issues in particular. Firstly, despite quotas the Community is still producing about 12 million tonnes more milk than we can either consume or sell at a price which reflects the cost of production or, indeed, incorporate into a proper sensible aid programme.

That is why, Mr Andriessen, we wait with impatience for details of the Commission's scheme to encourage more farmers to give up or to reduce milk production. Likewise, we are anxious that those countries, like the United Kingdom, which have reduced production below their established quota will not be penalized unfairly when lower quota levels are fixed. I really would like your assurance on that particular matter, Commissioner.

Secondly, my group wants to see a system of quota transfer, not just to help the smaller producer but also to prevent stagnation in an important industry which is stuck at the moment in the time warp of 1981 or 1983 production figures. Let me assure you, Mr Commissioner, that we do recognize that any transfer of quotas will slow up and make more difficult the implementation of an outgoers' scheme.

There are a number of amendments which my group will support this afternoon to provide further guidance to the Commissioner in his work. I am particularly sorry that the authors of some of those amendments are not present this afternoon, especially from the benches opposite. I am very concerned that the newly-appointed chief whip of the Socialist Group is in danger of turning himself into a masochist in that tonight he is only going to be able to whip himself.

However, to return to the significant amendments which we choose to quarrel with, we really cannot support an amendment which calls for special Community redundancy payments to be made to farm workers, for the very simple reason that there already exist national provisions in the Member States to take account of this very important problem.

Likewise, we believe that national measures have already been taken to assist many smaller and distressed producers to help them get back to pre-quota production levels. That is why we encourage the Commission to withhold quota which they obtain through the outgoers' scheme and not to reallocate it.

Finally, may I say to the Commission that we have been frustrated not a little by the delay in the presentation of formal amendments to the quota scheme. Much of that delay is not attributable to the Commission, we know. But I do hope that Mr Andriessen will do everything in his power to speed up the offending Member States so as to ensure that quotas are implemented fully and fairly whilst allowing the dairy industry still to provide a fair living for those who choose to remain in it.

Mr Gatti (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, Mr Andriessen, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group I should also like to express our appreciation to Mr Woltjer for his excellent report and above all for the facts which he has provided on this important problem of the dairy sector.

This report by the Committee on Agriculture contains important statements on the application of the quota arrangements in the dairy sector. It is my hope — now that we have heard the Commissioner talk about a constructive contribution — that these points will be taken up by the Commission for incorporation in a Green Paper which can then be considered and discussed here in Parliament. These points regarding the dairy sector are important because — as Mr Woltjer

Gatti

said — they concern not the theory but the system of quotas to be extended to other sectors. The idea is to rectify a principle which was adopted in 1984 and which we opposed at the time, as we still do now. The Communist Group is strongly opposed to production quotas for European farms.

I should like to say at this point to Mr Woltjer that we have never talked about the effectiveness of quotas. It was always our contention that they could not be implemented and the facts have unfortunately borne out the truth of this. It was an easy prophecy to make because — quite apart from the overall drop in production within the Community — Mr Woltjer, Mr Andriessen and the rest of you know that the system has not yet in fact been implemented in any Community country.

We were happy that Mr Andriessen, after studying the advantages and disadvantages of a quota system, came to the clear conclusion in his Green Paper that quotas are only, in his words, a palliative and that as a result they in no way solve the problem of surpluses.

If this is true — and it is — we have to tackle the problem of determining a fair reduction of surplus production in the Community. The way to do this is not to set quotas for farmers because this would mean — as you all know very well — curbing agricultural development for all farms, both those in Italy as well as the dairy farms in Germany and the Netherlands. Everyone has his hands tied, and this is definitely not the principle which the Commission evokes when it talks about a farm sector which has to produce for the market.

We welcome the Woltjer report and shall vote for it because, in considering Community and national reserves and the use of quotas for the least-favoured regions, the report stresses the need for these regions to be able to produce and to have an economic and social future.

That is why we say that this is the decision which has to be borne in mind by the Commission next year when — as Mr Andriessen mentioned — it has to submit its report. We have to get away from the rigid off-and-on idea of quotas. That is definitely not the way to tackle the problem of surpluses in the Community and to reduce the heavy burden on the Community. We need a strategy which takes an overall look at production planning within the Community and gets through the barrier of quotas so that there is a future for every country.

In view of what I have said, the Communist and Allies Group will be voting in favour of the Woltjer report.

Mrs Caroline Jackson (ED). — Mr President, I wanted to make some points about the attendance of the Commission. I can see that one of my points has

already been raised by the appearance of Mr Cheysson in place of Mr Andriessen.

We have already had a situation where a number of speakers have actually put direct questions to the Commission. My point of order is that I would like to know what arrangements are going to be made at the end of this debate for the Commission to reply to the questions which we raised during it. If there are not going to be any replies from the Commission, there is very little point in holding the rest of the debate.

Mrs Martin (L). — (FR) Mr President, before broaching the main issue, I would like to add my protest to those expressed by the speakers before me. I think it is a very good thing that a Commissioner takes the trouble to go to his country to listen to the professionals, and I hope he really listens to what they say, but I find it strange that when the dates for our meetings are known over one year in advance, and our agendas are fixed, this Commissioner does not take the trouble to listen to those who have been elected to put forward their constituents' problems. I believe that his is a real snub to our Parliament.

Now, as regards the main issue, a lot has already been said about the quotas, which have prompted lots of campaigns. They have been, and remain, very difficult to apply, and it has basically, been a useful exercise to sum up their results and consequences after one year in operation. Of course we have to note that they have been successful in slowing down production, although I would say that this is the only positive point. But they have also had adverse affects, which the rapporteur also stresses, and we must correct these, because if we do not we run the risk of seeing the common agricultural policy being renationalized under relentless pressure. Braking production has also meant braking incomes which were already fairly low, especially in the less-favoured regions. And this cannot continue *ad infinitum* without leading to serious repercussions, especially in regions or on holdings where there are no, or hardly any, conversion opportunities.

The co-responsibility system has also continued to operate at one and the same time. I myself, like my Group, am in favour of co-responsibility, by which I mean *real* co-responsibility which is not solely financial in nature. But linking this system to physical curbs on production boils down, in actual fact, to penalizing producers twice over. And we must choose: we either do away with co-responsibility and keep quotas, or we get rid of quotas and keep co-responsibility.

Furthermore, as was to be expected, the quota system was unwieldy and difficult to apply, and required repeated adjustments which completely threw producers. In particular — as the rapporteur underlines, and as I myself and my Group warned on several occasions — the quotas exacerbate the differences between well-developed regions and farmers on the

Martin

one hand and those, on the other hand, who — for various reasons — are not so well developed, and because the quotas freeze the situation the latter have no way of catching up now.

Added to this is the fact that the quotas make it extremely difficult, even impossible, for newcomers to start up, which — in a profession where the average age is already very high — especially in the dairy sector — entails a lot of problems at a time when economic circumstances call for revival and dynamism through an infusion of fresh blood.

This analysis leads me more than ever to reject a system as restrictive as the quota system, although I recognize the need to get a grip on production. For this reason I shall abstain on the Woltjer report as I have already done on the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food.

The real solution, which must be found as part of the measures to reform the common agricultural policy, will come from restructuring, re-orientating production and a real commercial and export policy. If there has to be less dairy production, we must ask ourselves whether this cannot be achieved by changing the size and quality of the agricultural population and, in my opinion, by encouraging older people to give up such activity and encouraging young people to take their place.

Although we have surpluses in some areas we also have quite large deficits in others. We must orientate producers towards such deficit areas in order to ensure a maximum of producers and preserve our rural environment. I might add that I am happy to see the Commission launching a phased scheme to eliminate butter stocks, but why — in view of the sums involved — did we have to wait such a long time for this programme?

Similarly, we must insist on there being measures which will really encourage good-quality production, so that producers and industry are encouraged to go primarily for ever better quality instead of higher yields. I do not contest the fact that we have certainly put a sorely-needed brake on yields, but nowadays we have to provide producers with attractive prospects, with a future, by focussing attention on these new possibilities.

Mr Christensen (ARC). — *(DA)* Mr President, unlike several Members here in this House, I think that Commissioner Andriessen will be making the best possible use of this time by going to Copenhagen to talk with Danish farmers' leaders rather than sitting here and listening to the same views repeated for the 117th time.

The present report on the dairy quota arrangements documents in my view the collapse of the common agricultural policy. By not wanting to allow market

mechanisms to apply while at the same time recoiling from a fully planned economy, it gets the drawbacks of both systems without the advantages. It wants uniform guidelines for the Community as a whole, while knowing this is impossible. It does not wish to handicap efficient and young producers, but neither does it want to abandon the less-efficient producers with antiquated farms. The report wants effective administration and control, but time after time it acknowledges the impossibility of achieving this. It realizes that the system freezes the present structure, but in general it is unable to come to any conclusion other than that 'the relationship between structural policy and quota policy is extremely important'. In general, the only solution it has for the surplus problem is to give farmers incentives to switch to other products in which the Community is not self-sufficient. This is a primitive policy of autarky. What will we do when surplus problems then arise in the new production sectors?

Danish farmers were told that the milk quota arrangements were only provisional. This report confirms yet again that there is no intention of giving up this system, and that Danish farmers can give up any illusions of a system of agriculture in the Community which places producers on an equal footing and offers marketing opportunities to the most efficient without regard to nationality. Danish farmers can also expect the quota system to be expanded to other production sectors — likewise to the detriment of Danish agriculture and in flagrant breach of the preconditions for Danish membership of the Community.

I do not want to give any advice on the common agricultural policy; it has been in operation now for 23 years, and never has it been further away from a free market. Never has it been more entangled in protectionism, planless planning, bureaucratic and arbitrary regulations together with illegal and national aids. Never has it been more expensive for taxpayers and consumers, never has it been closer to plunging the Community into trade wars with friendly countries. The common agricultural policy has never been more industrialized and poisonous to the environment, all in order to achieve absurd production objectives fixed by sky-rocketing subsidies. You can keep such a policy! Our efforts must be aimed at demonstrating to Danish farmers that they have a better chance of survival with an independent Danish agricultural policy free from EEC control.

Mr Wettig (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are dealing today with Mr Woltjer's interim report on implementation of the dairy quota arrangements, and one does not have to be a prophet to say that the next few years will see more reports on application of the dairy quota arrangements, and that this will become a recurring topic in the European Parliament.

Wettig

When the quota arrangements were at the door we repeatedly voiced our worries about this scheme. When reading the Woltjer report, and especially its very detailed explanatory statement, we have to note that nothing we said in the past about the workings of a quota system has subsequently turned out wrong. Neither is it any consolation, in my opinion, to note that the quota system has reduced production. If it had not done so, then why bother introducing it in the first place? However, there is little point — and all the speakers have stressed this — in opening up the basic issue again; in the next few years we shall have to live with the quota system, and deal, in particular, with the problems it brings.

This means, to begin with, that we will have to deal with the injustices created by the quota system. It is possible, as the Commissioner has done, to describe the changes as an upgrading or improvement of the system, but it is my impression that in quite a lot of cases the whole scheme has not led to an improvement but — as we Germans say colloquially — has 'improved things for the worse'. Nothing has become better and things are worse in certain fields.

We must also live with the numerous administrative problems caused by the quota arrangements. I believe that the rapporteur's comments on this in his report should find Parliament's full support, so that some action is forthcoming in the near future and that at least the worst problems in administering the scheme are overcome.

We strongly support what the rapporteur, Mr Woltjer, has to say on this score. And since I followed this problem in the Committee on Budgets, I would like to draw attention once more to the budgetary use aspects of the super-levy. The quota issue is not simply an agricultural matter but also touches upon a central issue concerning the European Parliament's budgetary rights. The regulation now adopted does not tally with Parliament's position and we cannot accept it in the long term. We will have to thrash this matter out with the Council of Ministers and the Commission and have the super-levy fully included in the European Community's budget.

Finally, I would just like to mention two basic issues. Experience with the quota scheme clearly shows that it can only be applied to a limited field. When discussing changes in the agricultural policy we should not allow ourselves to be tempted down the road of introducing quotas for other products. Our experience with the quota scheme should deter us from applying it to other sectors.

Secondly, we still have to struggle with considerable surpluses. In its devised form the quota did not get rid of surpluses in the dairy sector, and we will have to get down to working out how to eliminate the existing surpluses, which fluctuate between 10 and 12 million litres a year. I believe that, in view of the income situa-

tion in the agriculture sector, a further reduction in quotas in the next few years is unthinkable, and other ways will have to be found. It would be useful if we were to pursue this further in connection with the debate on the Green Paper.

Mr Borgo (PPE). — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report on the implementation of dairy quota arrangements which we have to vote on today is an interim report which seeks to provide a provisional review of the implementation of the interim measures which were adopted by the Council on 31 March 1984. I stress the word *interim* because that is what we want these measures to be, in the effort to restore balance to the dairy sector which has been accused of running up enormous surpluses, thus increasing the burden of support spending in the Community budget.

The report tackles the aims of restoring balance in this sector, a balance which the European Parliament through its working party seeks to achieve. Conditions for this are that the implementation of the system is closely monitored, to ensure that the arrangements do not lead to any distortion of the market, and that the Commission is promptly informed so that any changes to the current legislation can be swiftly put to the Council.

The report starts off by saying that the Community rules have succeeded in cutting milk production after little more than a year of the new system but it also makes no secret of the concern among dairy farmers who are confused by the new legislation which has caused them to slaughter considerable numbers of dairy cattle. These are serious concerns because no Community plan has been drawn up to counter the negative effects of the present measures.

The situation is particularly difficult in the sense that farmers are being penalized twice over, with the controversial fixed quota arrangements and with the co-responsibility levy. It makes you wonder in fact about the legitimacy of these measures.

No consideration was given to the situation in less-favoured hill areas where there is unfortunately no alternative form of farm production and it would seem that these areas need to be exempted from the measures to cut production.

While realizing that measures to curb production has to be adopted, one cannot fail to criticize the storage policy which has been followed hitherto. The result has been to encourage the growth of industrial herds, another reason being the uncontrolled policy of importing substitutes for the traditional forage crops.

Another factor which has deepened the crisis in the dairy sector is the indiscriminate stockpiling of unsold surpluses, which has been encouraged by the annual increase in intervention prices at the Community level.

Borgo

This has benefited low-quality production to the detriment of typical high-quality dairy products.

As far as intervention procedures are concerned, there is practically no check on the sale of powdered skimmed milk for livestock use with the result that it can be easily recycled on the market for human consumption. It was for this reason that we tabled an amendment — which the House had incorporated in the Pranchère resolution on farm prices — calling for a tracer in powdered milk for agricultural use, so that its final destination can be checked and in order to prevent fraud and forms of adulteration.

While appreciating that Mr Andriessen has other commitments, I am sorry that he is not here with us because it is at this time, when the Commission through its Green Paper is taking a second look at the reform of the common agricultural policy, which seems to be the right moment to stress the importance for a Community forage policy, aimed at making the best of Community production, to be properly highlighted when the time comes for the Commission to submit its reform proposals to Parliament.

In this context, while complying with Community policy for the dairy sector, we also need to identify the right strategy for channelling the current surpluses to third countries and, furthermore, to ensure that attention is given to the countries which are subject to structural deficit so that the right balance of jobs and income is not upset. We also have to be more careful in protecting the land and conserving the environment, and this can be achieved only through proper animal husbandry.

The proper management of dairy quotas cannot avoid the inescapable issue of the continued existence of family-run farms, and this is also true in the case of young farm workers, whose career in farming must be given priority consideration in any future action under the common agricultural policy.

(Applause)

Mrs Jepsen (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, this bulky report gives us an idea of what happens when bureaucratic arrangements are introduced in such a vast system as the European Communities. As early as paragraph A in the resolution, the rapporteur feels obliged to emphasize that the quota arrangements have made a vital contribution to the reduction of milk production. Of course they have! These rules have after all been imposed on enlightened and well-developed countries, which are naturally able to administer such systems, if required.

However, there is no denying — not least in this report — the inconvenience and uncertainty connected with such administration. It is clear that bureaucracy is having a field day here. It has been con-

stantly necessary to change and adapt. Monitoring has remained the watchword, because the Member States have neither the inclination nor the ability to comply with the rules — perhaps because they have not been flexible enough.

This report should serve as a deterrent and warning against introducing quota arrangements later in other sectors. Although it is intended to take stock of what has happened in recent years, I feel that we should already be looking to the future and using the time available to create the necessary conditions for a free milk market. Our aim is to gradually reintroduce free market forces in the years up to 1990. These forces have of course been out of action.

The Community's milk policy should not be left in perpetuity to politicians and bureaucrats. It should be allowed to develop freely and healthily. A quota system will always act as a brake on free development and progressive marketing attitudes on the part of producers. We Danish conservatives therefore oppose such arrangements. A better solution would be to try and increase world consumption. We should market and develop our products, produce quality goods and teach the world to consume more of these healthy and nourishing foods. But it takes time to teach people better habits, so we should start now, ladies and gentlemen, and not in five year's time, for in another five years it will once again be a pleasure to be an efficient and effective producer. It will not be like today, when it is virtually a crime to be an efficient farmer.

Mr Brøndlund Nielsen (L). — *(DA)* Mr President, naturally I also regret that Mr Andriessen is unable to attend this debate; however, I think it is a good idea for him to go to Copenhagen, where the Commission's Vice-President can, amongst other things, see how an efficient dairy industry has cooperated in administering the quota arrangements with the result that Danish farmers have helped to bring milk production under a certain degree of control. I would also like to take the opportunity to thank Mr Andriessen's staff for the cooperation we have had in the Working Party on Dairy Quotas. The arrangements have been subject to an ongoing assessment and a series of modifications have been carried out. These have been administered in such a way that we in the Working Party, and hence Parliament, have been kept well informed. The officials dealing with these matters have become acquainted with the practical views we have heard from the farmers affected. On occasion, we have had to argue with these officials, but I think our work has been extremely fruitful.

On the whole, it is a question of principle as to the extent to which a political body should become involved in day-to-day control of administration, but I believe that it has functioned well in this case. We know that this is politically a very controversial issue, so it is good to have had such cooperation between the

Brøndlund Nielsen

administration and the elected representatives of the people. I am pleased about this and would like to express my thanks.

Looking at the arrangements themselves, I cannot go into detail here, but I think that the Woltjer report and the motion for a resolution very accurately reflect the existing approach. There are things we may disagree with to some extent, and things to which attention is correctly drawn in my view. But all in all, the report shows that the day-to-day problems have been tackled in a business-like manner, ensuring that actual results have been achieved. One of the problems is that while there are no national quotas as such the administration of such arrangements — partly because the boundaries of dairy industries usually follow national frontiers — is carried out within the individual countries. This balance between non-national quotas and a sensible administration of the arrangements has I believe been resolved satisfactorily.

It remains to be seen whether we can succeed in maintaining the good balance we have achieved in the first years of the quota arrangements for milk production.

In addition, I would also call for efforts to introduce further adjustments and developments in the milk sector, for efforts to reward milk quality to a greater extent for encouragement for quality products and support for dairy undertakings that attempt to market their products themselves without simply trying to sell into intervention. There are many ways of achieving such quality, both through monitoring of the milk itself and through objective production criteria, for example the speed with which milk is cooled and other factors that will improve the quality of milk.

I would also advocate an increased drive to boost milk consumption. The statistics show that consumption per inhabitant in the different countries varies widely. Here is an especially healthy and good food — it should be possible to expand consumption in some countries.

These are some ideas that could be taken up, and I look forward to continued constructive consideration of these matters by the Working party, the Committee on Agriculture and Parliament. This is a question affecting a large number of people, both the consumers, who receive a healthy and good product, and the many producers, who are playing their part to ensure that we in Europe will never lack good and healthy foods. I look forward to the continuation of this work; the Woltjer report is a step in the right direction, and I support it.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

President. — Since we have now reached voting time, we shall adjourn this debate which will be resumed after the votes.

4. *Votes*

Report (Doc. A2-75/85), drawn up by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on a framework regulation for a European media policy based on the Commission's Green Paper on the establishment of a common market for broadcasting, especially by satellite and cable (COM(84) 300 final)

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 12 — after the vote on Amendment No 24/rev.

Mr Collins (S). — Mr President, although Amendments Nos 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27 carry my name in the English version, I wish to make it clear that I did not sign them and do not support them.

Explanations of vote

Mr Cassidy (ED). — Mr President, once again this Parliament has deliberately flown in the face of the interests of the people of Europe. Among other things, while we have been going through the tedious business of voting on this report, we have voted to impose a whole series of restrictions which are bound to stunt the growth of a new medium. Furthermore, Mr President, we have actually made nonsense of the regulations in some of our own countries, because in adopting Amendment No 4 we have voted in favour of a ban on all advertising of all forms of alcohol.

(Applause from the left)

Given the importance of the wine industry in Europe, given the importance of the beer industry in Europe and given the necessity of freedom of choice, it is a quite ludicrous thing for us to have done and I will certainly not be voting in favour of this report.

Mr Kuijpers (ARC), in writing. — (NL) The Commission's Green Paper on broadcasting is based on the idea that a European television market must be established as quickly as possible. I cannot help feeling that there is more of an effort to establish a single TV advertising market. Everything has been done to get rid of the national barriers which have stood in the way until now. I feel that this is a dangerous idea which merits further study. Moreover, the positions outlined in the Green Paper concentrate too much on the economic objectives, and the cultural aspect which to my mind deserves a central role in the discussions has been relegated to a secondary role. I shall therefore abstain from voting.

Mrs Péry (S), in writing. — (FR) The emerging power of new media, especially television, has led to the widespread viewing of films at home, with the simultaneous result that cinema audiences have dropped tremendously and finances have been hit. The phenomenon has been made worse by the emergence of cable television which provides subscribers with programmes from abroad. There is an imperative conclusion: cable television must in some way contribute to the financing of productions, otherwise cable television is just another word for pirate TV. The practical solution which international committees have come up with is for joint negotiation between the cable television company and a managing body consisting of producers and worldwide copyright owners. Agreements of this kind already exist with cable companies in Belgium and the Netherlands in the EEC, and also in Norway and Sweden. It is what one might call a negotiated licence.

Amendment No 14, by Mr Hahn, introduces two new ideas: legal authorization for cable transmission and the intervention of an arbitration body linked to a compulsory licence. The statutory licence means that the law of the country of reception allows transmission by cable network companies on payment of a fixed fee, which is often derisory. The author has no say. The compulsory licence is a variant of this.

The general introduction of such agreements would cut the resources for production to such an extent that film-making would disappear in Europe, with all the cultural, political, economic and social repercussions that can be imagined.

The House has rejected statutory authorization of transmission, but intervention by an arbitration body remains. That is why I shall abstain.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Report (Doc. A2-102/85), drawn up by Mr De Vries on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, on the economic aspects of the common market for broadcasting (COM(84) 300 final)

*
* *

Paragraph 19 — after the adoption of Amendment No 19/rev.

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 7–9, 12–15, 21/rev., 2, 24/rev., 25/rev., 28, 29 and 32;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 18, 19, 23/rev., 26/rev., 30 and 31.

Mr Seal (S). — Mr President, I can understand you as President allowing split votes, but when we get down to voting sentence by sentence and even part of a sentence, we get to the stage when we might as well vote word by word. Now you have already said it is not possible to amend an amendment here in the plenary sitting. But by voting like this we are actually doing that.

Could you therefore submit the whole matter of split voting to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions so that we can have a sensible, logical approach to this, because we are getting into a non-sense situation by taking separate votes on parts of sentences.

(Applause)

President. — The fact is that these split votes were proposed by the rapporteur. Split votes are allowed by the Rules of Procedure. Whatever I may think, I am obliged to follow the Rules of Procedure.

Mr Seal (S). — With respect, Mr President, I asked you to take this matter — because it is an important matter — to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions for them to look at it again. Can you give me a reply to that request: either 'yes' or 'no'?

President. — Mr Seal, it is up to me whether I give you a 'yes' or a 'no' or whether I decide to give you a longer explanation. I am not in court here.

(Applause)

Paragraph 23 — after the adoption of Amendment No 26

Mr Cassidy (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President. In the interests of consistency, having adopted Amendment No 26 to this report which agrees that alcohol advertising would be permitted in cross-border advertising, how do we reconcile that with our vote on Amendment No 4 in the previous report?

I await your guidance, Mr President.

President. — I have no personal opinion to give. In the circumstances it is perhaps better if I refrain from offering any personal opinion.

(Laughter)

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 5, 6, 20, 27 and 31;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 2, 7, 10–18, 21, 28 and 29.

Interim report (Doc. A2-96/85), drawn up by Mrs Salisch on behalf of the Committee on Women's Rights, on the impact of microtechnology on job opportunities for women

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2 — Subparagraph (0) — after the vote on Amendment No 24

Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L). — (NL) I want to point out that there is a mistake with regard to the Larive-Groenendaal amendments tabled on behalf of the Committee on Women's Rights. These amendments were tabled in my own name, and not on behalf of the Committee on Women's Rights.

President. — Thank you, Mrs Larive-Groenendaal. It will be noted in the minutes.

Explanations of vote

Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken (PPE). — (NL) Our Group will vote in favour of the report because many of the warnings it contains are real. But we cannot help feeling that it is too negative. It is not by relying on new technologies that we can secure jobs for women. We therefore hope that a new report in the future will show the other side of the coin and tell us just how women can secure as big a share as possible in the new world of technology and in the jobs in this sector.

Mrs Daly (ED). — My group will vote in favour of this report, although, like Mrs De Backer-van Ocken, we are very concerned about its negative attitude. We are only voting in favour because a number of Mrs De Backer-van Ocken's amendments were adopted and a number of Mrs Salisch's were rejected. I notice that there are a number of young people in the gallery today. I do think that unless we insist that the whole question of microtechnology be looked into in more depth, we will not, in fact, be helping young people like them for the future. Only because we have received an assurance that it will be looked into in more depth can we possibly support this report.

Mrs Crawley (S). — As we spend this week among the new technology signposts to the future, the message that comes across to many of us is that computers wear trousers. Even the robot that has been wandering around this place is called Charlie.

This is an excellent report by Mrs Salisch. It draws our attention to the positive aspects of new technology, with which none of us would disagree. More impor-

tantly, it draws our attention to the negative aspects that are particularly related to women's employment. We must be careful that for women the brave new world of new technology does not become the familiar old world of low pay, segregation, exploitation and non-unionization. 70% of women are in the service and clerical sectors of employment, and it is these sectors that are exoceting jobs very quickly through new technology. We have to be positive — I quite agree with my colleagues. We must also be very careful that women have the same access to this new technology and the prosperity it brings as men have.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Filinis (COM), in writing. — (GR) We shall vote for the excellent report by Mrs Salisch, but we should like to make the following comments.

It is well known that in the field of data processing a large majority of computer operators are women, while only a small number of women are engaged in research. This means that the familiar social stereotypes have started to be reproduced in the new technologies. What is required here is an intervention with a double objective: to provide those women whose jobs are at risk as a result of the introduction of new technologies with the necessary training, and to make it easier for women to gain access to training in advanced technology.

It is essential to retrain women and to improve their career prospects if we wish to counteract the deliberately cultivated tendency to confine women to domestic tasks.

Women will also have to participate in decision-making on the application of new technologies by being represented at all levels, and particularly in the bodies which study the introduction of new technologies and the readaption which they entail. The trade unions will have to be particularly attentive to this point, since there are a disproportionately small number of women in the trade union movement.

Lastly, I should like to stress how important it is to lay down ergonomic models and to protect the health of those who work at terminals. The strain that is caused, the exposure to radiation and to static electricity, and the isolation from colleagues require that the number of working hours spent in front of such machines should be restricted. There will have to be special regulations for the protection of women, who are the main victims of the introduction of new technologies.

Furthermore, this need to reduce the number of working hours for health reasons is perfectly in line with the more general aim of reducing and reorganizing working time, which is the only radical way of counteracting the social consequences of the introduction of new technologies.

Mr Maffre-Baugé (COM), in writing. — (FR) Although I welcome the report drawn up by Mrs Salisch, I regret that certain points have not been brought out clearly enough.

There is not doubt that we are now witnessing incredible advances holding out the prospect of new horizons for women in the further training and employment sectors.

However, all too often employers do their damndest to turn this progress against women employees, making new technology synonymous with unemployment and deteriorating working conditions. Nevertheless, new technology does provide women with a great opportunity because, by eliminating the factor of physical strength, it opens up jobs to them which were hitherto a male preserve, making it possible for women to enter the occupations of their choice. There is an enormous demand for technicians, and women have a rightful place among them.

Of course, this will not happen without suitable vocational training. This should come, on the one hand, from training given at school and career guidance, with young girls being channelled towards jobs based on new technology, instead of being closetted away in traditional tertiary sector jobs, which are — into the bargain — less affected by the advent of new technology. Moreover, there should also be further training opportunities for working women, with the time spent studying being treated as time spent at work.

There is one point on which, in my opinion, the Salisch report does not dwell sufficiently, i.e. the risk of employers using the new telematics technologies to force women back to poorly paid home employment with no fixed working week nor any social security cover.

We shall vote for the Salisch report because it is a step in the right direction.

Mr Pantazi (S), in writing. — (GR) As has already been repeatedly stressed, new technologies, and particularly microelectronics and data processing, have made deep inroads into the administrative and the economic activities of the European Community.

At the same time we see that these rapid changes are not accompanied by a similar development on the employment front and that it is women who will suffer most since they are the most vulnerable section of the workforce. There are a very limited number of places available in sectors where women traditionally predominate and in the jobs where women have always worked in large numbers.

In Greece there is traditional industry and the service sector is not very developed, with the result that new technology is imported without any accompanying

training, it is mainly young women who are affected and the already high rate of youth unemployment is increasing. I should like to stress on this point that the European Social Fund will also have to help to plan and implement a uniform training scheme, as well as special courses and further vocational training to ensure that men and women receive equal treatments regards access to training for new technologies.

I would particularly refer to the need for financial support from the Community for national training programmes in the Community's run-down regions i.e. on the periphery, where the problem appears to be most acute.

I should like to thank Mrs Salisch for the report she has tabled and state that the PASOK Members will vote for it.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-98/85), drawn up by Mr McMahon on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on new information technologies and the school systems in the European Community — Work programme for the period 1985-1987 (COM(84) 722 final)

Explanation of vote

Mr Filinis (COM), in writing. — (GR) I should like to express our satisfaction with the very comprehensive report by Mr McMahon. We also referred to the technological imbalance between the Member States during the debate on the report by Mr Longuet. But what strikes us is that we are adopting resolutions on new technologies which, however correct they are in principle, nevertheless take on a very different significance in each Member State. Many of the new technologies will be applied and developed in certain technologically advanced and wealthy Member States. The rest are unable to keep up for economic reasons and for reasons of technological know-how, with the obvious result, as is also stressed in the motion, that the imbalances will become greater.

A typical and appropriate example is the spread of data processing in schools. Those partners who have the know-how and the financial means have already launched ambitious programmes as a result of which

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 3, 5, 10, 12, 15-19, 21-23, 27 and 28;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 2, 8, 11, 13, 14, 20, 29-31 and 33-42.

Filinis

the younger generation will become accustomed to the computers which are already indispensable, while the relevant industry will get a considerable boost. But for certain other partners, the implementation of such programmes is financially difficult if not impossible. I think that we shall have to concern ourselves far more with this subject and that we should ask the Commission to study ways in which the isolation and stagnation of the less-developed Member States can be avoided. The use of computers in schools increase the scope for exchanges of educational programmes and consequently provides hitherto unknown opportunities for the peoples of the Community to know and understand each other. We would point out, however, that particular care will have to be taken in the use of computers in education since it concerns the vital area of the production and dissemination of knowledge and culture. The use of computers must broaden the horizons of young people and give them more to think about and must not lead them to one-dimensional thinking and to the uncritical acceptance of particular views.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I should like to move that we do not vote on the Linkohr report until tomorrow morning. We assume that there will be no problem with time. The colleagues who are shouting their disagreement from the back perhaps want to leave us tomorrow morning. I suppose it is someone's birthday, but I cannot do anything about that. I would ask the House to think about it, because otherwise there will be barely a hundred of us for the vote.

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, let me point out that it will take time if we vote on the Linkohr report tomorrow morning, and the result will be that there will be no one left to vote on the Woltjer report.

President. — I put Mr Klepsch's proposal to the vote.

(Parliament rejected the request)

Report (Doc. A2-94/85), drawn up by Mr Linkohr on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the establishment of a European Parliament Office for Scientific and Technological Option Assessment: adopted²

(The sitting was suspended at 7.50 p.m. and resumed at 9 p.m.)

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 2 and 3;
— AGAINST Amendment No 1.

² The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 3, 5, 29 and 30;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 4, 6–14, 16–19, 23, 28 and 31.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PLASKOVITIS

Vice-President

5. *Dairy quotas* (continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the interim report (Doc. A2-85/85) by Mr Woltjer.

Mr Stevenson (S). — Mr President, we are, of course, dealing here not with the principle of quotas but with how the system has been applied, although there are many of us who believe that quotas alone will not solve the problems that have been created as a result of the common agricultural policy.

This question of consistency of application must cause concern to us, because it is clear that it has not been achieved throughout the Community. At least one State has ignored, for the time being in any case, the quota regulations. Some other States have been over their quota but have had retrospective increases. There have been some others where the regulations have been strictly applied. My own particular country, the United Kingdom, has been prominent in strictly applying those regulations.

The report does indicate very clearly that since the quota system was introduced there has been a fall of no less than a quarter of a million tonnes in milk production in the Community. But within that figure there are clearly also wide disparities and the whole of that reduction has been accounted for by two States — Belgium and the United Kingdom. That situation clearly sows the seeds of discontent, especially when we are still faced with very severe hardship for small producers in particular.

I am sorry to say that I have seen little in the report that deals with these very severe cases of hardship. I have heard some people say: why should any producers worry? In business if someone says that he will buy 90% of your production and guarantee the price, you should not worry about the other 10%. Well, Mr President, when that other 10% can mean the difference between being in business and not being in business as is the case with the small producer, then we are talking of a very different situation indeed.

The small producers have been given no time at all to plan the changes that may be required as the result of the implementation of quotas. They find themselves caught in a trap. Yes, it is true to say that reserves have been used, but many hardship cases still remain, and there is little or no hope for those hardship cases. Indeed, in my own country, particularly in my own constituency of Staffordshire East — and I know this

Stevenson

applies elsewhere, in Dyfed in South Wales too — there are situations where small producers have still had no quota allocation at all. There must be further urgent provision for this particular situation that is being faced at the sharp end of the production scale.

There is some debate in the report as to whether national or Community reserves should be the order of the day. I believe personally that we shall have both. But whatever happens, there must be top priority given to any reserve that is available being used to provide for the small producer.

So, we do not require, it seems to me, a central control by the Commission. What is needed urgently — and I welcome this in the report — is more effective monitoring, more effective checks. The need for that, I believe, has been well established. This interim report provides an important base from which our final attitude towards milk quotas will be reflected in a future report. But it is vital that we state now that the apparent success in reducing production has also left us with very severe problems of hardship, particularly for the small producer.

Mr Clinton (PPE). — Mr President, this report is, of course, about the implementation of the quota system for milk. It has been produced by a Member of this Parliament who has tried to be reasonable but has to contend with a situation where he is under extreme pressure from some of his political colleagues who blame the common agricultural policy for all the ills of the Community and refuse to listen to reason.

On the other hand, he seems to have been overinfluenced by commercial interests which are trying to boost margarine sales at the expense of milk products. I am fully aware that in the country he represents, Holland, butter and margarine are both regarded as important products. But I have to say to Mr Woltjer: You cannot ride two horses at the same time. I have no difficulty in deciding where I stand. I am definitely on the side of butter — the superior product and the one which can be produced on indigenous feeding stuffs. The rapporteur has to be given credit for putting a good deal of effort and research into finding solutions to problems still remaining in the milk sector. However, even though the quota system has brought about a sizeable reduction in milk production, there are still a number of problems to be solved. Production is still too high and ways will have to be found to reduce supplies without further reducing quotas, for example, by providing incentives for getting people out of milk production. And this could and would, of course, cost less than the disposal of surpluses through normal channels. This could cause certain problems in some areas where processing units could be left without a sufficient supply of milk and the entire economy in such areas would be seriously upset. Therefore rewards for getting out of milk production will have to be carefully pitched in order to avoid such situations.

At the same time it has to be said that not enough work has yet been done on alternative land-use policies and new uses for dairy products. In this sector, as indeed in many other sectors, insufficient research and development has been taking place. The rapporteur is extremely critical of the adjustments and easements made by the Commission in the first year of the scheme's operation. This criticism, in my view, is less than sensible because the move over to the quota system has caused serious problems and led to substantial losses for some farmers and it was inevitable that some flexibility would have to be introduced.

Now, however, the time is ripe for a firmer set of practical rules that must apply all round. As I see it, the only way the quota system can be efficiently and effectively operated is on a Member State basis with a national quota with certain guidelines giving special consideration to family farms and new entrants to farming as well as unfortunate cases of disease eradication and one thing or another of that kind.

Having set up such a system, the responsibility for operating it must rest firmly on the Member State. If quotas are exceeded in any country, the country must be held responsible and meet the cost.

It should be quite obvious that a quota scheme cannot be run from Brussels, but of course strict monitoring must be carried out by the Commission. Now that a quota system has been introduced for a period of five years, I feel it is going to be very difficult to change over to some other system for controlling surpluses at the end of this period. In any case, chopping and changing in farming is not good practice. I am saying this though I am aware that agricultural expansion has been brought to a standstill in Ireland by limiting production in this way, because exceptionally we are essentially a livestock producing country with few other options. Operating a common policy cannot be equitably done in the absence of special measures and special considerations. I hope this will be kept in mind when the hardship and losses involved in restructuring and limiting agricultural production have been properly calculated. I am thinking particularly in my own case of the worthwhile forestry policy and the development of inland fisheries coupled with developments to encourage facilities for tourists.

Throughout this report the rapporteur has emphasized the need to help small producers, and this has an echo also in an amendment put down by Mrs Barbara Castle seeking help for small family farms. I am all for helping family farms, but a small farm in the United Kingdom would be about 170 acres and that would be looked upon as a ranch in Ireland. So this term needs clarification. We need also to look at jobs outside the farmgate in processing and at the viability of these units. If they depend only on very small producers, they will cease to exist.

In conclusion, Mr President, I want to say that there is no overnight solution possible without causing very

Clinton

serious problems. I want also to draw attention to the fact that while Community producers are being punished, imports of milk products are not being penalized, imports of oils and fats are not being taxed, imports of feedingstuffs are not reduced or taxed. Finally, we must never lose sight of farmers' incomes and jobs outside the farmgate.

(Applause)

Mrs Caroline Jackson (ED). — Mr President, we in this group welcome the Woltjer report because it provides proof that the European Parliament can perform the sort of watchdog role on quotas that many of us tried to outline to some of our irate dairy farmers during the 1984 European election.

However, we have to face the fact that the rapporteur is actually reporting on a deeply unsatisfactory situation. It is true that production has been reduced but, as he says in his report, the evasion of the quota system by various means is still going on. Certainly in my country there is an atmosphere of suspicion about how the quota is applied in other countries. We believe that there must be much greater transparency about how the quota is applied and absolute fairness. We agree with the rapporteur as well that there needs to be more action by the Commission to monitor the system effectively and to police it. We support particularly the idea that the Court of Auditors should report upon it.

There is an unsatisfactory situation for the producer because of the lack of flexibility in the system. This has been noted by a number of speakers. This means, for example, that in my country, quota being tied to the land, it is underused on some farms and wanted in vain by other farmers. That is why in Amendment No 19 we call on the Commission to make proposals as soon as possible to alter the regulations so that existing producers in a Member State may lease quota not required by other producers. A workable system has already been set out by the Milk Marketing Board. The Commission must know about it, and we want to see it brought in. Such a system would only relate to wholesale quota and would be based on the determination of a single price at which the maximum amount of quota can be released.

The Commission's objections to this are presumably similar to its objections to proposals for allowing the sale of quota, that is, that leasing or sale institutionalize the quota system. In the case of leasing for a fixed period, I simply do not believe this is true. Also the Commission should be very careful in tying themselves to the idea that quotas are temporary. Many farmers in my constituency in Wiltshire, in the heart of England, believe that the quota system is a good thing. It gives them stability and certainty — although they do not like the way it was brought in.

As for sale of quotas, my colleague, Mrs Daly, will be dealing with that point. However, I would point out to

the Commission that, even if it sets its face against the idea, it does need to recognize that land with quota already has a higher value in my country than land without it.

Finally, as the Woltjer report makes clear, the system is unsatisfactory to consumers. We have an 11 million tonne surplus paid for by taxpayers and — and this point has not been made — the system has not produced lower prices for consumers and will not, therefore, promote consumption. We welcome the idea of the Community outgoers' scheme. We look forward to hearing more from the Commission about it. But we would like to hear from the Commission what its view is on the prospects for better control and what its view is on the prospects for greater flexibility to allow leasing of quotas.

In conclusion, may I say how nice it is to have the Commissioner here and how appalling it is — I think I am right in saying, although I do not have very good eyesight — not to be able to see the rapporteur present for this debate.

Mr Maher (L). — Mr President, I too, like other speakers regret the fact that it was not possible for the Commissioner for agriculture to be present for this debate. I assure Mr Cheysson that no disrespect to him is intended. In this age of communication and high technology, surely it should be possible for the services of both institutions to make sure that this kind of mix-up does not take place in future.

The Woltjer report is a factual report spelling out what the situation is in relation to the application of the quotas. I would like to compliment Mr Woltjer in that respect. The report high is up to his usual standard. However, I was a little bit disturbed by the general tone of his introduction, just as I was disturbed by some of the things that the Commissioner said. They were inclined to clap each other on the back as though we had achieved something very wonderful: we now have a quota system in place and it is working. But I must confess that I have travelled around about the Community over the last 12 months and I have not seen any farmers jumping up and down for joy and welcoming this great new system. In fact, if anything, they are quite disturbed about this.

Could I say, without appearing to be too much of a pessimist, that the worst is yet to come. The initial years are not the worst, because as production is pegged back — indeed the Commissioner suggested that it will have to be reduced still further — what can dairy farmers do to cover their costs? Their costs are increasing all the time and production is being held down. Coupled with inadequate price increases, this hardly gives them any reason to be joyful. I would warn them that the difficulties that they have so far experienced are nothing like what they are going to have to experience in the future.

Maher

I was, on the other hand, a little bit more optimistic in relation to some of the details. I welcomed what the Commissioner said on what he described as the 'macro' and the 'micro'. If I understood him correctly, he was saying that it is up to the Community to elaborate on the scheme and to administer what each country would do, but inside the Member Country there would be the maximum flexibility. I support the last speaker and others who talked along these lines, particularly on the policy of tying the quotas to the land. I think that will have to be made more flexible. Otherwise, we are going to make the system unnecessarily rigid and create hardships for farmers that they should not have to endure.

I would also say that farmers living in the disadvantaged areas should not have to abide by any quota at all. My claim is that these farmers produce so little milk anyway and have such little capacity for increased production that even if they were able to use their farms to the maximum, the amount of milk they would add to the overall production would be absolutely negligible. But it would be very important to them nevertheless in a situation of considerable difficulty.

In this connection I should like to say a word for the farmers in the north-eastern part of my country, that part still controlled by the UK. A specific application was made on their behalf to get some increase in the quota, as we succeeded in getting in the Republic — which, of course, was very well deserved. What did the British Government do when it got the increase (and, in all justice, the Commission did give it)? They distributed it among all the farmers of the UK, which meant, of course, that the farmers in the North of Ireland got very little. It would be worthwhile for some of the Members at my back who are shaking their heads to go to the North of Ireland and talk to some of the farmers there, as I did. They are quite irate at the treatment they have received from what they call their own government. Maybe they would receive better treatment from the government in the South! I am sure they would.

I also argue that co-responsibility and quota systems do not fit together. I can understand that initially it would be difficult to phase out the co-responsibility levy. However, if farmers abide by a quota, why should they have to pay a tax not only on production above that quota but even on production below the quota? I do not think that makes sense, and I believe it is a contradiction. The co-responsibility levy should be phased out. It would help in a certain way to give farmers that little extra bit which has now been denied to them by preventing them from increasing production.

I want to emphasize again what other speakers said — including Mr Clinton, I think — that we should not be negative. We should be talking not only about trying to keep production at a reasonable level but also about increasing the sales of basic milk in whatever form we

can increase them. I often think that the dairy industries of Europe are far less cohesive than the multinationals who produce substitute products that are competing with dairy products. We badly need greater cohesion so that the dairy industries can participate together in research projects and not continue duplicating research across the board. I think that would enable us to find new or better products and so increase consumption of what Mr Brøndlund Nielsen said was the healthiest product of all — the one that, after all, we all started life on.

(Applause)

Mrs Daly (ED). — Mr President, I welcome the Woltjer report on dairy quotas but, like Mrs Jackson, regret the fact that the rapporteur is not present to hear this debate.

The report, together with the amendments tabled by Lord O'Hagan, Mr Debatisse and Mrs Castle, illustrate clearly many of the problems arising from the quota system which we have been pursuing in the past year with both the Commission and the British Government. I represent many dairy farmers — indeed many small farmers — in Somerset and Dorset and must record that the hurried introduction of dairy quotas has presented them with tremendous difficulties in the past year. I am particularly pleased to know that information is being collated on the ways in which Member States have dealt with the cases of hardship amongst small-scale producers and young milk producers.

In my own area probably the greatest grief has been suffered by those in the so-called exceptional hardship category. There was tremendous confusion as to what exceptional hardship actually meant and 90% of applications for help fell at the first hurdle. No guidance was ever issued on this point. It appeared to be the rule that if an appellant had been given secondary quota, even if it was only one cow, he automatically debarred himself for exceptional hardship quota. This is quite ridiculous.

The delay in advising farmers of the outcome of their appeals has also meant increased worry and uncertainty for those involved. It is not at all clear that the tribunals in the area I represent were working to Community regulations, so I await the results of the survey with great interest and hope that action will be taken if it is found that people have suffered as a result of failure to obey the Community rules.

Having said this about hardship cases, let me quickly turn to the general subject of quotas. The farmers in Somerset and Dorset believe that until the Commission comes up with something better, quotas are the fairest way of dealing with surplus production. What they do not want is a return to chaos in 1989/1990. We want more flexibility in the system and the speedy

Daly

introduction of a Community outgoers scheme. We need some of the quota released for hardship cases and for new entrants.

One other very important issue in the United Kingdom is that of ownership of the quota. Next week a group from my constituency are coming to talk to Mr Andriessen's cabinet about this, as they feel very strongly that it is quite wrong for the quota to belong to the landlord in cases where it has, in fact, been the producer who has made the largest contribution to the farm. When improvements to the quota system are being considered, I want to see some consideration given to this point to ensure equity in the treatment of both landlord and tenant. My farmers would also like to see the abolition of the co-responsibility levy. We do not accept that it is being used for its original purpose and, as other speakers have said, it would certainly be helpful to small farmers not to have to pay this levy for nothing. That is what is happening — it is just a tax on dairy farmers.

Finally, Mr President, I support the leasing of quotas but only as second best. What I really want looked at is the sale of quotas through a central agency like the Milk Marketing Board with rigid safeguards against blackmarketeering. I would welcome the Commission's views on these serious points.

(Applause)

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, when my colleague, Mr Andriessen, had to leave to attend a meeting — planned quite some time ago — with farmers who are directly affected by this problem and, which I daresay, is better attended than this Parliament ...

(Laughter)

... I heard murmurs of disappointment, which I can fully understand.

However, his trip was planned a long time ago. Mr Andriessen himself made an initial statement. He has had many opportunities, and will have many more in the future, to present the situation to the Members of this Parliament and to discuss their main concerns in connection with the application of a difficult policy — which has come somewhat too late, but which, as several people have acknowledged in this House, probably at least meant we could make the best of a bad job at this time in the dairy sector.

As regards the operation of the system I would begin by reminding you that in mountainous areas the producers were virtually exempt, i.e. the aids were maintained and the co-responsibility levy did not apply, whereas it does apply elsewhere and, I think, should continue to do so as long as we have surpluses, even though our aim was to establish a balance between

production and marketing outlets for dairy produce, which would one day permit the co-responsibility levy to be discontinued.

As we have already been reminded, this is intended only as a temporary arrangement. It has been adopted provisionally for five years, although we are hoping that it will be possible to reduce this period and, once a balance has been established, that it may be maintained without any special measures or constraints as imposed by the present arrangements. This, I think, is what Mr Jepsen and Mr Christensen wanted to hear and in line with what other Members have already pointed out.

The system — as many people have acknowledged — works. I must stress this for the benefit of those, such as Mr Christensen, who have expressed doubts on this score. If we look at the figures for 1985 compared with 1984, we see a reduction of over 4%, corresponding to a production level which is lower than the quotas. Thus — and I am thinking again of Mr Jepsen here — I do not think any of us have anything to worry about. This is clear from the statistics already contained in the Green Paper and I would point out for Mr Gatti's benefit that the Commission intends to supplement them, after which the Commissioner responsible will report to you.

Many people have pointed out that this system left a great deal in the hands of the national governments. The Commission may have had overall control, as Mr Andriessen stressed in his account, and many Members of Parliament have acknowledged the need for this. However, the governments were allowed a certain room for manoeuvre in the actual administration of the system so that they could adapt it in the interests of the smallest producers, Mr Stevenson, or particular parts of the country concerned — for example, Northern Ireland in the case of the United Kingdom, Mr Maher — or in order to buy quotas and transfer them, particularly to the youngest farmers, as Mrs Martin and Mr Früh have stressed.

Indeed, the Commission intends — as the Commissioner for Agriculture has already informed you — to buy a number of quotas itself. On the other hand — and I must repeat the comments already made by the Commissioner for Agriculture — we are not in favour of encouraging producers themselves to buy quotas since we think this would benefit the high-productivity regions at the expense of the less productive regions, whereas all the Members who have spoken on this point have made it clear that if we are unfortunately stuck with a quota system, a certain preference should be given to young farmers and those least favourably placed in this field, since we are particularly afraid that young people setting up in this sector will be getting very heavily into debt with virtually irreversible consequences. Thus we are not in favour of transfers involving direct purchases by one producer from another.

Cheysson

Other very important aspects were brought up in the course of the debate. It is not only a question of reducing quantities: better advertising — or should I say an information campaign — should enable us to increase consumption both within the Community and in third countries. As you know — and I am saying this particularly for Mr Nielsen's benefit — the Community has embarked on a substantial campaign of this kind, to which 35 million ECU have been allocated.

We also attach great importance to improving the quality of dairy produce. I can assure Mr Jepsen and Mr Nielsen that financial aid has been granted.

Thus, as I have already pointed out, the system would appear the best, or at least the least harmful, under the circumstances — and I see that Mrs Jackson, Mrs Daly and others have recognized this fact. As Mrs Daly quite rightly pointed out, it must be adapted if difficulties arise and I grant you the producers are not exactly delighted. However, in the face of the need to try and adapt production potential to the internal and external markets, this was probably the best course of action. It is just a pity that it came a little late.

As for the future, other problems are worthy of attention. In the Green Paper, we will propose alternative production in sectors currently showing a deficit, as Mrs Martin rightly insisted. Similarly, when we talk about management of stocks and selling vast quantities of basic products which we currently have in stock, we must obviously not restrict ourselves to dairy products such as butter, but give some fundamental thought to all the stocks which are such a burden on agriculture, have such unfortunate implications for prices on the world markets and the Community budget and bring the whole idea of the common agricultural policy into disrepute. Having only yesterday attended an initial discussion on this matter in the Commission, I can assure you that we decided to tackle this problem head on, however difficult it may be and however far-reaching the budgetary decisions it will necessitate, with a view to working off the surpluses we have accumulated over several years.

Mrs Caroline Jackson (ED). — Mr President, I wonder if I could just possibly rise on a point of order. Our debates have very little point without the rapporteur. They have even less point if the Commission does not answer some of the most important questions raised in the debate. I did specifically ask the Commissioner whether he could possibly comment on the possibility of introducing the leasing of quotas as a means of getting greater transferability. Would he like to comment on that?

President. — Mrs Jackson, Mr Cheysson has already spoken on this subject, and so did Mr Andriessen before him. What is more, I do not think that this is a

point of order since there is no provision in the Rules of Procedure for such a debate.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (FR) I shall be very happy to reply, Mr President. Leasing is a method which allows transferability. I pointed out the Commission position as regards present opportunities for transfer and as regards the advisability of making certain transfers easier, either through governments or — perhaps in the future — through the Commission as intermediary. The question, when it comes to transfers, is whether the leasing procedure will be more used than that of buying and selling. This is a complicated technical problem which is being studied at the moment, as my colleagues indicated. But let me state that this is a procedure and not the basis of a policy. I think I have been quite clear in stating the policy we intend to follow and which we intend to recommend with regard to quota transferability.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

6. Jamming stations in Europe

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A2-103/85), drawn up by Mr Habsburg on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on jamming stations in Europe.

Mr Habsburg (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, the international situation has rarely been more suitable for the discussion of the question of jamming stations in Soviet Europe than today following the visit of the Secretary General, Michail Gorbachev, to Paris, since this first visit by the new dictator in the Kremlin was obviously aimed at creating an impression in Western Europe that he was not only bent on talking about *détente* but also on making genuine efforts to put it into practice.

Whether we believe his words or not, it is time we put them to the test by means of concrete proposals, particularly since the President of the United States has also pointed out in his recent statement that the time has come for practical negotiations for the reestablishment of a balance in the world as a whole. History clearly shows that talks alone have never led to disarmament — and this is not surprising if we bear in mind that weapons in themselves are neither good nor evil: it all depends on the person who owns or uses them. Mao Tse Tung was quite right to say that he was not interested in his adversary's weapons but only in the views of the man standing behind them. Thus, disarmament has always come when the various peoples could no longer see any point in the unproductive expenditure. In a word, trust must come first and then

Habsburg

disarmament can follow. If there is no trust there can be no real disarmament.

It was therefore right that the greatest emphasis should have been placed on confidence-building measures in the Final Act of Helsinki. If a convincing number of such measures had been forthcoming, more progress would long since have been made in Geneva. Unfortunately, however, the Soviet Union has maintained the atmosphere of international distrust not only through its aggression *vis-à-vis* Afghanistan but also through its continuing massive infringements against human rights and its non-fulfilment of the commitments entered into in Helsinki — not least the refusal to accept inspection of its own disarmament measures and continuing rejection of the American 'open skies' proposals.

The free exchange of information and opinions has always rightly occupied a prominent position among the Helsinki resolutions. Freedom of information is the prerequisite for any democratic development, since only a well-informed citizen can genuinely have a say in decision making. Despots have always tried to prevent their subjects having access to any information, except what they themselves wanted them to know. It's quite rightly said that knowledge is power and for this reason, States wishing to monopolize power simply cannot survive without total control over information. The weaker an undemocratic regime, the more intensive are the efforts to gain total control of or block all sources of information. Hence the admirable observation made by the BBC at the beginning of the Second World War when many people were calling for Hitler's broadcasts to be jammed. The BBC said 'anyone who jams broadcasts is admitting that he is serving a bad cause. He has a bad conscience. He is afraid of the truth. This fear is unknown in our country'.

In spite of the conference at Helsinki and the signing of the Final Act, the Soviet Union continues in its efforts to prevent its own population from listening to broadcasts from the democratic world — and it is not alone in this. The same is true in Poland, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria. However, since jamming signals cannot be strictly localized, this practice on the part of the Soviet Union is also affecting areas of Western States where reception of certain broadcasts is rendered fairly difficult. It is significant that neither Hungary nor Rumania feel the need to jam broadcasts in their own languages.

Far too few people in the West realize that jamming signals costs a lot more than simply transmitting them. The energy consumption alone is enormous: the Soviet Union uses some 1 000 million kW/h per year for its jamming station. As I pointed out in my report, this would be enough energy to produce 375 000 lorries, 500 000 tractors or 11 000 000 tonnes of cement. If one considers the difficult position in which the Eastern Bloc finds itself, it becomes quite clear what

this must mean to the already crippled economy. Certainly, it is small beer compared with the gargantuan amounts spent on armaments but it is surely just as obvious that all this money for energy which is literally being pumped into thin air could, if used more responsibly, go some way to relieving the heavy burden on the population and the plight of the people of Poland, for example.

Here we come up once more against the observation at the beginning of the report. The new boss in the Kremlin has tried to give the impression that he wants to create an atmosphere of trust which will permit a new start to be made. This would be a perfect opportunity, since he has always said that his regime is based on the principle of the republic. Why does he need jamming stations then? This is a very specific area in which Mr Gorbachev could, off his own bat, make a genuine confidence-building measure more or less immediately. If he would close down the jamming station in view of the Soviet signature under the Final Act of Helsinki, he would not only be doing his own people a favour but he would be giving the world an indication that his assurances were meant seriously. Obviously, he will not be able, from one day to the next, to create the confidence which his country has so frivolously destroyed throughout the world by its acts of aggression from Poland to Afghanistan and its attempts to destabilize the West, but he could demonstrate by means of a tangible example that he wishes to adopt a new political approach and negotiate in good faith. Nor would this step involve major internal problems, unless his regime is much weaker and unpopular than he claims.

Peace cannot be achieved overnight, but an initial small step would be welcomed with a sigh of relief from the world as a whole. This should be one of the main points in this Parliament's motion for a resolution, since it is easy to talk of peace but infinitely difficult to establish it. This is a possible step in the right direction and we can only hope that not only will this initiative gain the full support of this House — and this appears likely in view of the unanimous vote in the Political Affairs Committee — but that the rulers in the Kremlin will understand its deeper implications since a refusal to fall in with this wish of the people of Europe — and I am sure this includes those currently under Mr Gorbachev's rule — would also have a deeper and somewhat unfortunate implication. We can only hope that this requirement contained in the Final Act of Helsinki concerning the open access to information can soon be regarded as fulfilled.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Cristopher Beazley (ED). — Mr President, on behalf of the European Democratic Group I would like to associate the group's position very closely with what Mr Habsburg has just outlined, and indeed with the whole of his report. I hope that when the House

Cristopher Beazley

comes to vote on this report — a short and concise report — there will be broad agreement throughout the entire political spectrum of this House. Commissioner Cheysson referred rather disparagingly to one or two empty sections of this House. I am sure that this is because of that unanimity of feeling. Members did not feel that they necessarily had to come and argue the case.

This is a question which has to be raised by the European Community, not only on its own behalf but also on behalf of other Europeans who at the moment are not in a position to put it to their Soviet overlords. It is no good attempting to persuade Western Europe and the whole of the free world that the good faith of the Soviet Union is genuine unless, when it comes to discuss nuclear arsenals and the reduction of tensions, it is equally open and equally anxious to discuss the question of open access to information.

It was made quite clear, as Mr Habsburg said, in Paris when the new Emperor of Russia, Mr Gorbachev, gave a rather western-style press conference. He appeared very suave, very sophisticated and very low-key until one journalist asked why there were still restrictions on travel and on movement in the Soviet Union which did not apply in the West. Suddenly the tyrant's image was reinforced, the smile disappeared and we were informed that the Soviet Union could not be addressed in that fashion and that this was a different political organization.

If there is going to be give and take in these negotiations, it cannot be on the basis that it is the Soviet Union that does the taking and the free West that does the giving. We support this motion in its entirety and we look forward to unanimous adoption tomorrow.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC). — *(NL)* I completely agree with Mr von Habsburg's report where it states that jamming transmitters are quite abhorrent. Jamming demonstrates an unbelievable mistrust in the truth, objectivity and credibility of one's own regime. The Helsinki accords condemn such practices and call for confidence-building measures; jamming stations being completely excluded.

What are the concrete expectations of this report? It is possible to increase its political significance and I hope that this will be done. Not all free radio stations are of the same quality. Voice of America has a budget of 1 000 million dollars while the next five years will see the renewal of transmitters and new transmitters being sited in Israel. This information does not seem credible.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty employ 1 000 people and their budget is approved annually by the American congress. Their statutes contain a provision

forbidding them, and I quote, to act against the interests of the United States. Then we have the BBC which transmits in 37 languages and is exceptionally neutral. Their world news has regrettably few listeners in the Soviet Union but a considerable number in Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

Mr President, we need a more differentiated approach to all these different stations. We must replace the cold war mentality by an active policy of peace. Helsinki has shown how this can be done. The system of jamming transmitters is repulsive and abhorrent. I will vote for the report but I believe it could be made politically more effective by a greater degree of differentiation.

Mr Pordea (DR). — *(FR)* Mr President, it is not all that very long since Albert Camus said that we are living in an age of premeditation and the perfect crime, when criminals have an unimpeachable alibi in the form of a philosophy which can be used for any purpose whatsoever — even to change murderers into judges. This is an age in which dictatorship has been declared democratic, subversion has turned into a means of education, concentration camps have become a form of humanitarian aid and political executions are simply preventive measures. There are widespread attempts to camouflage abuses and atrocities and this phenomenon is gradually coming to affect a large proportion of humanity — peoples reduced to starvation and fear. Despite all this, some people do not hesitate to deny the entire horrifying truth about Europe behind the iron curtain and in a whole of other places such as Central America, Vietnam and Ethiopia.

As well all know already, the events in Afghanistan are nothing more than a peaceful peace-making process undertaken peacefully in the name of peace. From Warsaw to Addis Abeba and from Managua to Saigon atrocities are presented as so many conquests in the interest of human happiness.

The technique of jamming radio broadcasts, Mr President, has been designed, practiced and perfected with the aim of silencing any external information which tends to contradict this official propaganda on the part of the Communist party so that in the long term their lies would be accepted as the truth. Viewed in these terms, jamming of broadcasts is on a par with piracy and terrorism. It is like a gun pointed at the head of democracy in so far as it is an indirect element in the overall Soviet strategy aimed at breaking up the Atlantic Alliance by nobbling the western media and the intelligentsia of the democratic world.

Is there any need to repeat that this is both morally and legally indefensible, and flies in the face both of international commitments solemnly subscribed to by the very persons guilty of these actions and of fundamental values of civilization, without which human life is meaningless and the organized community pointless.

Pordea

We should therefore stress once more that the jamming of broadcasts on the one hand confirms the double dealing on the part of the Soviet Union and the countries in its thrall and, on the other hand, the naivety of the West at the signing of the Helsinki Agreements and so many previous acts.

As we know, it will not be long before we can use satellites to flood Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union with broadcasts which will be impossible to jam, but in the meantime we must nevertheless condemn jamming and the attitude of the States which practise it.

I therefore wholeheartedly and unreservedly support this clear and outspoken report which has been submitted to us and which, in the final analysis, condemns the entire policy pursued by the USSR and recommends the appropriate ways of combatting it in an area of great political and cultural significance.

We can only hope that the European Community will make a point of applying these methods through a respect for the ethical principles which information entails and of course with a view to keeping up the hopes of the European and non-European peoples under the totalitarian yoke by means of the voice of a world which is free and intends to remain that way.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

7. *Substances having hormonal or thyrostatic action*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A2-100/85), drawn up by Mr Collins on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-359/84) — COM(84) 295 final) for a directive amending Directive 81/602/EEC concerning the prohibition of certain substances having a hormonal action and of any substances having a thyrostatic action.

Mr Collins (S), rapporteur. — (GR) Good evening.

(The speaker continued in Danish)

Mr President, this report raises a number of problems.

(The speaker continued in French)

For several months the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection has been dealing almost exclusively with hormones.

(The speaker continued in German)

We discovered that this is not merely a problem of regulation but that hormones are also dangerous to man.

(The speaker continued in Dutch)

The Committee on the Environment is therefore asking for a ban.

(The speaker continued in Italian)

And so ...

President. — You are giving a wonderful performance, Mr Collins, but in order not to confuse the interpreters, I would suggest that you continue only one language.

Mr Collins (S), rapporteur. — Mr President, there is nothing in the Rules of Procedure which says that any Member has to speak in only one language.

(Applause)

If I have chosen, or been compelled, to stay until this hour of the night to speak to this lonely echoing Chamber, then I think I have the right to try to lighten the burden of those people who have stayed with me.

As I said, and as you probably understood, we have been considering this matter for a great many months and have looked at it very carefully. The background, as you are probably aware, is to be found in the problems discovered in Italy round about 1980, when it was discovered that the use of Diethylstilboestrol — and I am speaking in my own language now — was found to cause problems in baby food and in the consumers of that baby food. As a result, the Commission proposed a ban on stilbenes at that time and Parliament supported that ban. Since then, we have found pressure from the whole of Europe for further action on one or two substances which were not banned at the time, notably Oestradiol 17 B, Progesterone, Testosterone, Trenbolone and Zeranol — and again I am speaking in my own language.

The Commission has brought forward proposals that Trenbolone and Zeranol should be banned and the other substances allowed. We have considered this very carefully, and I think it has to be looked at extremely carefully by Parliament before we come to a decision. This is one of the classic areas of disunity between the scientific community on the one hand and the political community on the other. We, as elected representatives, have to lend an ear to what the public are saying to us. There is no question whatsoever but that the public right across Europe is saying that they do not want to see hormones used in meat production. I do not think there is any doubt about that. If you go out into the highways and byways of Strasbourg

Collins

tonight and ask the people whether they want to buy meat that has been produced using hormones, they will say unequivocally. 'No'. The fact of the matter is, however, that the same people you have asked, if they go to buy meat tomorrow, will in fact be buying meat which has been treated with hormones unknown to the public, to a very large extent.

We recognize that there are doubts surrounding the use of hormones. We recognize that there are doubts about the substances concerned. We also recognize that some of the substances — the so-called natural hormones — have a legitimate use for therapeutic purposes — that is to say, it is perfectly reasonable that if one wants to regulate the menstrual cycle of animals, the natural hormones may have to be used. Similarly, in certain modes of production of beef, it is perfectly reasonable to use hormones to regulate animal behaviour, and we are not against that. What we are against is the use of hormones to promote rapid and, in our view, unnatural growth in the animals. We believe that this poses certain dangers for consumers and we believe therefore that it would be better not to proceed.

The committee has considered the evidence very carefully, and I must say to you that the scientific committee of experts set up by the Commission some considerable time ago has looked at the evidence and has not yet produced a response. This week, I understand, there has been a note circulating in Strasbourg from a consumer organization in Italy alleging that this scientific committee has been somehow or other pulling the wool over our eyes. Perhaps this is significant because the chairman of the committee is a Professor Lamming — and I suppose if we are going to have anything pulled over our eyes, it would be wool in this particular case. They are alleging this. However, I must say that I do not believe this at all. I think that Professor Lamming has been leading a responsible committee. He has been confronted with very difficult problems, and I think he has been doing his best.

Along with the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, I regret very much indeed that it has taken so long to produce a conclusion.

I am defending Professor Lamming's committee. I think that it is a great pity that he has been unable to come up with a solution and a view which he can put to this Parliament, the Commission and the Council. I reject entirely the idea that somehow or other he is dragging his feet, that somehow or other this committee is blocking progress.

The scientific evidence is very difficult to assess. We recognize in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection that so far as the natural hormones are concerned there are problems of identification and measurement. But the view that we have taken after assessing the evidence and

after a great many debates is that it would not be right for us in the European Community to expose our citizens to substances which we cannot prove to be safe and which we cannot prove to be without problems.

These substances may have problems and therefore we would prefer to see them banned entirely except for therapeutic purposes.

Having said that, we have to look very carefully at the inspection system. We have set out in our report the kind of inspection system that we would like to see. Again we are very sorry indeed that the Council has taken the action that it did in the last few months. This Parliament is important; this Parliament's view is very significant and indeed central to this whole debate. Unlike the scientists — with respect to Mr Hogben and his colleagues — we are responsible directly to the electorate and we hear what the consumers of Europe are saying to us. The consumers of Europe, however you might measure them, would not want to buy meat if hormones were being used in its production. I must say to you finally, that we have got 800 000 tonnes of a beef mountain in Europe. The use of hormones would do nothing at all to reduce that and, indeed, is perhaps a significant contributor to its very existence.

I am sorry for the trouble with my microphone. I do not think that is entirely my fault, although perhaps you were surprised at the language being used. Maybe that is the cause of it all.

I think it is significant that if you look at the amendments that have been tabled to this resolution — there are 15 in all — 14 of them are mine, and there are none at all from the rest of Parliament except one from Mr van der Lek who is a Green. And as a Green — I am sorry about this — you cannot expect them to be in favour of meat.

Finally, I would close by saying to those of my Irish colleagues who have bothered to stay thus far *go raibh maith agaibh*.

Mr Eyraud (S). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, after Mr Cheysson's comments just now on the Woltjer report, I find the absence of Mr Andriessen during this debate somewhat less regrettable, especially because he now is surrounded by far more farmers than Parliamentarians. Nevertheless, I wonder what he is going to say to these farmers if they have come from the South of France because of the drought there or from Ireland to discuss the harvesting difficulties Irish farmers have encountered. I particularly wonder what he would have told us after the statement he made on the radio this morning which was an advanced plea relative to the resolution voted this morning by Parliament. I would have liked to have asked him that question but let us get back to hormones!

Eyraud

I am not going to subject you to a scientific discourse on Diethylstilboestrol, Oestradiol 178, Trenbolone, Zeranol, Progesterone, Testosterone and goodness knows what else.

All I am saying is that there are doubts, even in the case of so-called natural hormones, of their harmlessness. The evidence of experts is contradicted by other expert evidence, leaving you with a massive but interminable quantity of learning.

Doubt is a sufficient reason to forbid the substances concerned, both natural and artificial, but I feel there is something rather frustrating about justifying legislation on the basis of not being able to obtain facts.

Allow me therefore to look at two other aspects of the issue: quality and economy, where consumers and producers, who are taxpayers as well, share the same interests.

Let us first look at quality. An attractive fillet of veal, cut from hormone-treated meat, shrinks and becomes hard and woody when cooked as it loses the excess moisture it contains. The hormones have done their job by holding more water than protein in the muscles. The first consequence of the use of hormones is undeniably to fool the consumer who is buying water at the price of meat — even if the purchase is at a lower price than normal. This is a serious issue involving fair dealing and the confidence consumers have in producers. The boycott of veal in a number of Member States, particularly France, has shown how economically damaging such a campaign can be.

Clear and objective information must be available to both the consumer and the producer. This includes the listing of production methods, and the promotion of quality labels so that the purchaser is always able to calculate value for money.

Looked at just in the short term, it is true that the use of hormones can help to raise productivity but the hormone race leads to all kinds of black-market dealing and fraud of the kind seen in the press in recent years. The sale of cheap synthetic hormones of proven danger to human health has made this situation considerably more serious and now no-one knows any longer what they are selling or eating.

At an economic level, a general ban on growth hormones could, of course, result in increased meat prices. In reality, hormone-treated meat and meat without hormones should be regarded as two completely different products both qualitatively and quantitatively: even if the consumer ends up paying more it would at least be for more meat and less water.

Furthermore, everyone knows that there is not necessarily a direct link between the price paid to the producer and that paid by the consumer.

Denunciations are also in order for what seems to me an absurdity: lumbered as we are by all our stocks of meat, are we to accept the use of substances that contribute to further increases in production and thus to stocks? Where is the logic in that?

That kind of logic is, however, to be found in the Commission's proposal for controlled use. It's an attractive idea, I grant you, but we do not have the financial and manpower resources to apply an effective system. An entirely new organization would have to be established and this at a time when the Council has already, in its first reading, pruned budget item 38.1 concerning the application and verification of veterinary directives. If existing work is already threatened, what will be the fate of future checks?

Undoubtedly, the best solution would be a pure and simple ban on the manufacture of hormones except, of course, for therapeutic purposes. It has the merit of being realistic, simple and efficient. It would, without doubt, be supported by consumers but one must not lose sight of the therapeutic use of hormones and such a measure would need to take this into account.

Whatever else, there is an imperative need to harmonize legislation in the Member States to avoid fraud and unfair competition. Barriers, resulting from differences in legislation, to the free movement of meat within the internal market severely disrupt the market at the expense of producers. There is a fall in the price paid for lean beasts without any corresponding decrease in the price paid by the consumer for fattened stock.

For this reason, the Commission could perhaps have put forward a regulation rather than a simple directive. I would like to add that Community measures, whatever they are, must apply to imports from third countries.

Mr Mertens (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. I feel I must begin my speech on behalf of my Group by making one particular point — that hormones are extremely important substances and part of a vital bodily system. Without hormones, there could be no human nor animal life. In addition to underlining the importance of the hormone balance, this is a positive statement.

We can look at this issue in two ways. Everyone knows that people are fully aware of the importance of hormones and no small number of them go into chemists shops or shady businesses to pay good money to enrich or improve their hormone balance under the impression, and in the hope, that this will make life more enjoyable. On the other hand, many people have had such experiences as to have developed a kind of psychosis in which they see hormones as an untrammelled evil.

What we have to recognize in this discussion is that events, such as those pointed out by the rapporteur,

Mertens

involving the administering of dubious medication and hormone treatments with the complicity of unscrupulous profiteers, have resulted in an acceptance of the need for change. In 1981, both Parliament and the Council tackled this issue but the Council was too inconsistent with the result that individual countries adopted completely different practices. Some have again permitted hormones while others have continued to ban them. This has in turn led to irregularities, or more exactly scandals. One such major scandal emerged a few months ago in Belgium and also involved Luxembourg since the major warehouse involved was in the latter country. Similar cases have occurred recently in North Germany. What I want to say is this: people are very sensitive about this issue and are afraid that hormones in meat will prove harmful. They are particularly convinced that hormone-treatment endangers babies and that it is a potentially carcinogenic form of medication.

That has already happened and, as elected representatives, we must draw the necessary conclusions. After all, the people want us to protect them! On the basis of the conclusions reached by the Commission's specialist sub-committee, the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food concluded that the findings of the Laming Committee indicated that there was no valid objection to the use of natural hormones since they were quite harmless. In fact, it had been intended to postpone any assessment of artificial hormones. At that point some then urged approval for the use of natural hormones — something we have opposed from the very beginning. I would like to remind Members of what my colleague Joachim Dalsass declared in the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food: since people do not want hormone-treated meat, it shouldn't be on sale. That way they cannot buy it. Producers are, however, dependent on it being bought. That tipped the balance of opinion and we came to the conclusion that there were only a few countries, for example the UK and Ireland, which favoured the use of these hormones. Most of the others were opposed to their use. And yet at a European level a common code is required. I am quite prepared, for example, to admit that my Irish colleagues find this difficult to accept since they have different ways of doing things and a completely different history behind them. My colleague, Professor Raftery, will put his point of view later on and state that the stock being fattened in Ireland are oxen rather than bulls. As everyone knows, that's a very fine distinction and one indeed related to the hormone balance. That is, however, not his only argument and he can stress the positive aspects of the use of natural hormones. Unfortunately, that doesn't get us much further. The real problem is the psychological state of the people. They simply do not want these hormones.

That being the case, we as a Parliament should also reject them. That is our position and one we have defended in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection as well as in

the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. It is a stand we will continue to take. We do not want people to feel unsafe and to eat without any appetite. We want them to enjoy their meals and not to live in fear. Surveys indicate, however, that people are more afraid of some kind of poison or undefinable substance in food than, for example, of the Atomic Bomb. We have to bear that in mind.

We therefore reject both natural and artificial hormones and want hormones to be used only, as has already been said, for therapeutic purposes. Yes, of a course we also need to use them to ensure animal fertility but this should also be supervised.

That brings me to a very important and very difficult issue, namely supervision, which will undoubtedly also be discussed by later speakers. We have recognized that it is easier to identify a hormone balance or indeed any level of hormones than to monitor differences between natural and artificial hormones. That poses both a difficulty and a danger and is something we want to avoid. Let me go on to refer to another difficult matter, our trade with countries wanting to supply us with meat. The United States, Australia and other countries are saying 'what on earth do you want? We have always used hormones and want to continue doing so'. We therefore have to discuss with them how this can be organized and set up adequate checks to ensure that no hormone-treated meat is sold here. I would like to add that we do not, of course, want to restrict scientific research into hormones since we believe that they will probably also be important in the future.

We hope that a broad majority of this Parliament will vote in favour of the motion tomorrow and wish to say already that we will vote for the amendments tabled by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection since they are in complete accordance with our own views.

We would also point out, though, that we will not be voting for the amendment tabled by Mr Van der Lek on behalf of the Rainbow Group because its aim is to restrict people's diets to vegetables, muesli and similar things.

We want to let people decide for themselves whether they eat a hefty chunk of meat or are quite happy to eat just vegetables.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ALBER

Vice-President

President. — Thank you, Mr Mertens, especially for your detailed biology lesson.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — You will rejoice, Mr President, having recently taken the Chair, to find that I have my claqué with me. I hope that I can deal with them, because I at least am within striking distance and, like Mr Mertens, am a red-meat eater.

My first comment must be to regret the indecent haste which yet again has resulted in many of the difficulties we have had to face regarding the use of hormones and their analogues in the fattening of livestock. On another late night a few years ago when we last discussed these problems, the Commission agreed to consult its scientific committees and report back to the Council as soon as possible on the conclusions reached concerning the five substances therein mentioned. These conclusions are still not available. So why this rush when we might reasonably have waited just a little longer?

I must congratulate our polyglot rapporteur for the care and skill he has shown in steering us through the complicated maze of problems, many of which could have been avoided by a little patience. Wisely, he has left open a window for therapeutic use and tried to guarantee its safety by methods of inspection. I only hope it works. I am very, very doubtful.

His recommendations also leave open to reconsideration the whole subject, should Professor Lamming's committee eventually, one fine day, demonstrate reconsideration to be desirable. I reiterate, at the risk of boring you, colleagues ...

(Cries of 'Hear', 'hear' from the European Democratic benches)

... only these considerations have led me to recommend to my Group that they should support the Collins proposals. That support is far from enthusiastic.

('Hear, hear!')

It has virtually no rational, no scientific, no intellectual basis whatsoever. It is only because of the Committee's amendment and the hope of a second bite at this particularly nutritious problem that we have marginally agreed to give our votes in support.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* If you ask me, Mr President, Members of the European Parliament have a lot of patience. We are showing it again this evening as we address the Commission — that same Commission which four years ago was asked specifically to ban oestrogenic and anabolic substances in livestock production.

The Commission appeased consumers with a directive which banned the use of stilbenes and their derivatives. Three substances could still be used, however — Oes-

tradiol 17 B, Progesterone and Testosterone — along with two others, Zeranol and Trenbolone. They are difficult names, which have also been forced on us.

In the meantime, scientists took a look at these substances and they were forced to realize in the end that it was not clear what happened at the molecular level as a result of using these substances. In view of the uncertainty, any decision-making body should have slapped a ban on the use of these substances, but the Commission in its uncertainty came up with a directive which allowed the use of three doubtful hormones and banned only Zeranol and Trenbolone. It seems ridiculous and it is also alarming: an extra pound of meat on the scales would seem to be worth more than human health. And all this at a time when surplus stocks of beef and veal have reached 800 000 tonnes! What it means is that the Commission has tried to keep substances on the market without knowing how they affect the animals they are administered to and, as a result, without knowing what the repercussions are on the health of consumers.

Another point of discussion concerns the residues of these substances in meat when they produce the maximum yield in weight: after four weeks in the case of calves and eight weeks for adult cattle. These substances have a life of 70 days or more, and it is not at all clear how you can eliminate them and have the maximum weight when you slaughter the animals at the indicated times. We could go on like this, repeating what has already been said many times by consumers and by consumer groups and also by MEPs.

We are calling for a ban of the use of hormonal substances except for strictly therapeutic purposes, and we are also asking for every effort to be made to prevent the clandestine use of prohibited substances by banning their manufacture, because it would be rather difficult to put a policeman on every farm.

We can only reject the directive put forward by the Commission because the meat produced under this directive could damage health, since hormones do not improve the quality of meat but makes it considerably worse. There is already too much meat on the market, so much so that there are not enough refrigerators and there is already talk of perpetual cold storage for surplus meat. There is one last question to which we should like an answer: What is the reason for this draft directive? The fact is that a little bit of realism would not go amiss, because the consumer does not want to be used as an animal for laboratory tests and he wants only to eat meat which is tasty and has the right nutrients which are in line with the price he has to pay.

(Applause)

Mr Van der Lek (ARC). — *(NL)* Mr President, we are delighted that the deliberations both the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Con-

Van der Lek

sumer Protection and the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food have resulted in this unanimous opinion. The rapporteur did at one stage put forward another proposal in our Committee but we are very happy that this proposal is a clear reflection our original attitude, both in the motion and in the amendments.

There must be a ban on treating meat with additional hormones. Why? Mr Sherlock has pointed out that the Lamming Committee will quite possibly come to the conclusion that since these hormones are identical to the ones the body itself produces, they cannot harm the consumer provided — and that I feel does need to be said — they are administered correctly. Mr President, I am enough of a scientist to recognize that this is quite possible but that is no reason whatever to go ahead and approve the use of these hormones. There are quite enough counter-arguments.

Firstly, there are other artificial hormones whose harmlessness is not so clearly established. If some are permitted, it is quite likely that cocktails will be administered and supervision of this is impossible — particularly since Community supervision is currently totally inadequate.

Secondly, we are dealing here with substances quite properly classified as medicines and which must be administered exclusively by vets. Is it not ridiculous to use medicines merely to obtain higher profits?

My third reason is this. It is said that hormones allow animals to grow faster with less food: production up 10%, better fodder conversion. Looked at this way, animals are nothing more than a meat factory. We regard this kind of attitude to animals as ethically unacceptable. This is the approach of the entire bio-industrial system and of intensive stockraising; animals must not move, nor must they go out into the open air since either would impair good conversion rates. Now they have to be administered a whole range of medicines to keep them healthy under such unfavourable conditions. We believe that mankind is debased by treating animals purely as a production factor.

The final consideration, Mr President, has already been pointed out by Mrs Squarcialupi — we already have surplus meat production. Why should that surplus be increased? Who can that help? It doesn't help the consumer, since it is certainly not going to be cheaper, and not the farmers because if it does indeed get cheaper it can only be at their expense. We have already seen this happening in other sectors with surplus production. A great deal too much meat is already being produced in the so-called finishing industry. This is at the expense of food production in the Third World where other kinds of food could be grown on land now used for livestock fodder. From the land-use point of view, this form of meat production is also inefficient. Eating a lot of meat is seen as a sign of prosperity but it is unnecessary and even unhealthy.

Mr President, we have also tabled an amendment urging not only that the meat surplus not be enhanced by permitting the use of hormones but also that active publicity measures be taken to encourage reduced meat consumption. Yes, Mr Mertens, I specifically said less meat. We do not want to turn all Europeans into grass-eaters — that is completely unnecessary — but as we all know, a lot less meat would be quite sufficient.

I hope that the rapporteur will also welcome the amendment and that it will be supported by Parliament since that would then allow us to make better and more sensible use of the land. We are aware of the objections that third countries now supplying us with meat do not yet have these rules, but that cannot ever be grounds for refusing to introduce sound principles here. On the contrary, I think our action could set a good example. For that reason, I think it is extremely important that Parliament reach a unanimous decision and I hereby urge the European Commission to withdraw its proposal and to act as we have suggested.

Mr Chiabrando (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the problem of hormone use in livestock production is of great interest to producers and consumers alike. Unfortunately, however, the problem has been with us for too long now and it is causing concern among people and confusion and difficulties among farmers.

Instead of coming to terms with the matter, the EEC authorities are making it worse with proposals — like this latest proposal of 18 June last year, which we are now discussing — concerning the partial use of these products, a use which is extremely difficult to apply and impossible to check. Many Members of the European Parliament, and not least my Group, have tabled questions and motions for resolutions calling for clear and urgent measures in this area.

The report we are discussing this evening was approved unanimously by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and I hope that it will also get the very widespread approval of this House. As we see it, and as we have requested, it must now be followed without delay by a clear measure banning throughout the Community the use of hormones in meat production. What is the point of wishing for a united Europe — which is what we want — in all respects, if we allow each country to do what it wants, even to the detriment of the other Member States, in this important area? People are protesting about this, and I go along with them in their protests. Let me explain why.

Firstly, people's health must be a major objective in what we do and it has not yet been shown that the various types of hormones, whether they are natural or artificial, are not harmful. Secondly, there is surplus meat in the EEC and the cost to the public purse of

Chiabrando

withdrawing the surplus stocks is going up. Thirdly, there are no simple, quick and efficient ways of checking the health of treated animals so that consumers can at least know which meat has been treated and which has not. Fourthly, the differences in existing regulations in the Member States encourage flouting of the rules banning use where they exist, as in Italy. Fifthly, there is unfair competition between treated meat — and I disagree with an earlier speaker in that, to my mind, it costs less — and the meat produced by farmers who comply with more restrictive regulations. Lastly, my protest stems from the conviction that the clear and resolute stance which I and my colleagues take is shared by the vast majority of farmers and by all consumers without exception.

In conclusion, Mr President, let me ask the Commission and the Council to withdraw the vague and impractical proposal of 12 June last year and, by 31 December this year, to arrive at a final and straightforward decision banning completely the use of hormonal substances. This decision should not be in the form of a directive, as proposed, but in the form of a regulation which will thus be immediately effective.

Mr Simmonds (ED). — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, may I start by expressing my unbounded admiration for Commissioner Cheysson, who is here this evening. When I first got to know Commissioner Cheysson, he was the Commissioner for Development. Then he was Foreign Minister of France. Now here he is tonight, spokesman on hormones. Surely the crowning of his career!

(Laughter)

This week I greatly welcomed Parliament's splendid initiative in the promotion of the Europe 2000 exhibition and the encouraging debates we have had on the new technologies. That progressive attitude earlier in the week is in vivid contrast to the report before us now, which seeks to ban the use of science for negative and unsubstantiated reasons. It is manifestly stupid to ban growth promoters for use in beef cattle on health-risk grounds just because we have a surplus of beef. If we follow that argument, we should ban tractors on smoke-emission grounds because we have a surplus of grain.

The fact is that growth promoters encourage the production of leaner beef at lower cost. Leaner beef should please the health-conscious, lower cost should please farmer and consumer alike.

It is nonsense for the EEC alone to condemn products that have been in use for 15 years in more than 50 countries. These same products have been tested and approved by regulatory authorities in every major country. It is ridiculous to propose to ban them on emotional grounds alone, even before the Scientific Committee under Professor Lamming has reported.

The proposals in this report are based on whipped-up emotions and not on scientific fact. That is not a proper basis for parliamentary decision, certainly not responsible parliamentary decision. If we decide tonight to ban these products, then we do indeed deserve to be ignored by the Council of Ministers.

(Applause)

Mr Iversen (COM). — *(DA)* Mr President, the report we are discussing here clearly expresses the wishes of the majority of consumers throughout Europe, namely that hormones in whatever form should be avoided in livestock production.

We are again faced with one of those cases where producers have already gone much further in using such substances than is desired by the consumer. Again, the excuse is that we can make scientific progress by using these substances, and we do not know enough about the dangers. As we do not know enough, we should simply go on using them. This argument should be turned on his head: so long as we are not completely certain that there is no risk, we should refrain from using such substances.

This demonstrates that it is extremely difficult to push through solutions that are the only sensible ones as far most consumers are concerned. I will say that, in this as in many sectors that concern our environment in one way or another, any doubt should be acted on to the benefit of the consumer.

I also agree with the objections by consumer organizations in the report that any system of controls in this sector will prove to be ineffective. There is namely nothing to indicate that controls would be easier if certain hormones were permitted than if a total ban were imposed. As for the economic aspects, experts estimate that 50% — i.e. half — of current Community stocks, which at the moment amount to over 800 000 tonnes of meat, can be ascribed due to the use of hormones. It seems completely grotesque for us to continue producing more meat and go on using these hormones.

I will conclude by expressing my appreciation for the considerable work the rapporteur has put into this subject, and I think that the adoption of this report ought to have an influence on the Council's further consideration of the matter of hormones. Any doubts should in my view be acted on to the benefit of the consumer. At all events, consideration should be shown for the uncertainty and doubt that consumers throughout Europe have about hormones.

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC). — *(DE)* Mr President, allow me to preface my speech with a reply to some earlier speakers. I can give them an absolute reassurance: the Greens — including myself — both

Bloch von Blottnitz

eat and enjoy meat, but only healthy meat! Not exactly the same thing.

At such a late hour I do not intend to go at length into the different kinds of hormones but I do want to make it clear what is at stake. I consider these proposed regulations an absolute scandal — a scandal and quite devoid of normal common sense — and it sometimes seems to me that it all comes down to a lack of female hormones on the Commission! After all, we are all quite well aware that the Community is more than 100% self-sufficient and the figure is usually about 105%. We also know that we are saddled with thousands of tonnes of meat and huge storage bills for it. What we are now planning to do is to boost these stocks, by at least a further 450 000 tonnes, by feeding hormones to stock. It seems a totally daft idea to me! Whatever else, it can only harm the consumer and the only possible beneficiary is the pharmaceutical industry. No other analysis is possible. We should all already be aware of the damage caused by anabolic steroids, the fact that they cannot be monitored, that there is a huge trade in them, a black market and continual scandals. And this when we already have continual scandals about impurities in food! There is no end to it and, as a mother, one is already faced with the question, 'what on earth is still fit to give to my children?'. Under these circumstances, it is meaningless to talk of 'artificial' and 'natural' hormones. That too is nothing less than misleading because both kinds of hormones are fed to stock and it is absolutely impossible to prevent misuse, a black market, a grey market, etc. What is therefore needed is a complete ban on both kinds of hormones!

The Commission would have been much better advised not to submit this kind of directive because what is needed is not any kind of harmonization but rather an unconditional ban. What is there indeed to harmonize? If certain things are poorly managed in certain Community countries does that mean we should then ensure that the rot spreads to the rest? Definitely not! Parliament has often said, as have consumers and indeed everyone else, 'we don't want it, it is completely illogical and bordering on the senseless'. I urge the Commission to act accordingly and to take a real step in the right direction rather than fobbing us off with such bits of paper. In my view, it is simply ridiculous!

Mr Raftery (PPE). — Mr President, I accept that there is a wave of hysteria over growth promoters sweeping Europe. It is, I am sad to say, a hysteria based on ignorance, fuelled by fear and fanned by a handful of ill-informed fanatics. And we politicians are running scared. We are hardly worthy to be legislators.

We have a good example of it from the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. By not waiting for the findings of the Lam-

ming report, they are showing quite clearly that they are not interested in the facts, as the facts might interfere with their established prejudices. The supporters of the recommendations in this report are at best naive if they believe that we can enforce a ban and at worst callous and hypocritical about the best interests of the consumers in their hysterical pursuit of political popularity.

These recommendations, Mr President, go against the recommendations of the World Health Organization report of November 1981, some of the conclusions of which I quote from page 13:

To protect the consumer it is necessary to counteract dangerous and illegal practices which may be precipitated by a total ban on their use. It is recommended therefore that the legal and safe use of licensed anabolic agents be allowed under appropriate control. The correct use of natural steroid anabolic hormones poses no known public health problem to the consumer.

The World Health Organization, I submit, is surely a more knowledgeable and objective body on this issue than politicians of this Parliament.

Secondly, these recommendations are contrary to the position taken by the United States — a country with a record second to none in the area of environmental, health and consumer protection. The use of hormones is permitted in the United States under proper supervision and over 95% of all beef is treated with these substances in that country.

Thirdly, the recommendation goes against the Commission's thinking and, irrespective of what we recommend here, the Commission and Council of Ministers will follow, fortunately, the recommendations of the World Health Organization and other expert bodies, thus discrediting this Parliament further by highlighting this Parliament's disregard for basic scientific evidence.

For the benefit of those who do not understand the issue and who have not bothered to read the facts, let me try to explain the situation. There are two types of hormones presently in use: naturally occurring and artificial ones. There is no evidence whatsoever that either of these properly used is harmful. Nevertheless, the Commission is proposing that only naturally occurring agents be permitted and I support that stand. There are hundreds of times more naturally occurring hormones, Mr President, in bull beef than in hormone-implanted steers. There are thousands of times more of these substances in female beef and in milk during certain periods of the breeding cycle of females. And there are millions of times more of them present in the colostrum, i.e., the first milk of human mothers. In fact, one egg contains as many naturally occurring hormones as 75 kg of treated beef. And to the vegetarians on my right, I regret to inform you

Raftery

that vegetables also contain thousands of times more natural hormone equivalents than hormone-treated beef.

Thus if we wish to be logical and consistent, we should also ban bull beef and cow and heifer beef slaughtered at a certain time of the breeding cycle, and milk produced at a certain time of the breeding cycle. I think we are faced now with the problem of whether we poison ourselves with food or starve ourselves to death, or else we have a bit of sense and ignore these fanatics. These proposals simply cannot be implemented because there is no known test to distinguish between naturally occurring hormones produced in the animal body and these naturally occurring hormones that are administered. I repeat that. There is no known test. Such a prohibition would simply drive the practice into the black market and underground, with all the dangers that could pose for producers and consumers. By supporting this report Parliament will be showing that it is ignorant of the facts and unwilling to seek the facts and thus exhibiting a callous and hypocritical disregard for the interests of the consumers in pursuit of political popularity.

Support for such unworkable and nonsensical proposals can only undermine the efforts of this Parliament to get the extra powers it is so urgently seeking.

(Applause)

Mr Dalsass (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President. I will be taking a different stand from that of my colleague Mr Raftery. Directive 602 introduces a common code for the use of hormones in fattening beef, a code that I do not hesitate to describe as unfortunate. It has aroused immediate and considerable misgivings as well as unease on the part of consumers. Although it requires Member States to introduce an overall ban on substances having hormonal or thyrostatic action, it leaves open the possible use of natural hormones for fattening livestock. As you have already heard, a number of States have already exploited this possibility while others have continued to observe an absolute ban.

I come from a country where, thank God, the use of such substances is not permitted. I am happy that this is so and would wish it to be the case throughout the Community so as to preserve me — as my colleague Mr Mertens has already said — from having to eat hormone-treated meat since my country has to import a great deal of meat to satisfy domestic demand. This should be the context for a common code and natural hormones should also be banned in spite of certain assertions, such as those we have already heard, that they are not harmful.

Consumers — and I would say the great majority of the population — do not want hormone-treated meat. They have great misgivings as to how these can affect human health and however often one repeats that they

are safe, they will refuse to be convinced. They are made completely uneasy by such production methods. Clearly, some groups have a direct interest in the use of these substances, firstly industry and then the farmers who want to increase the weight of their cattle. However that can and must never be allowed to be the dominating factor. The good of the people must prevail. In addition, we have surplus production of beef — as we have already heard — and have to pay good money to market these surpluses. The estimated surplus production is approximately 450 000 tonnes which we could well do without. I find it pleasing — and I would like to emphasize the point — that the proposal for a total ban on hormones has come from the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food to which I have devoted considerable efforts. If one had followed the original report of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, the result would have been continued approval, based on certain scientific findings, for the use of particular hormones.

I am grateful to the rapporteur that he adopted the proposal of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. I can assure him that the entire population is grateful for his action.

In one recent incident in my country, the South Tyrol, 32 cattle were confiscated in the Bolzano city abattoir because it was shown that they had been treated with hormones. The population was greatly shocked at the news. They don't want that kind of thing. I can assure you that this public confiscation was greeted with relief and can also assure you that a general ban on the use of hormones to fatten cattle, without any exceptions in the Member States, would receive broad support from the entire population of Europe. It goes without saying that strict supervision will be required. I can only hope that not only Parliament — with what I hope will be a considerable majority — but also the Commission and Council, will battle on to make such a decision so that we can ban all hormones.

Mr Ferruccio Pisoni (PPE). — *(IT)* Here we are, Mr President, dealing with this kind of subject at night in an empty Chamber, when in fact it is a topic of interest to everyone because it concerns our citizens who also have to be thought of as consumers.

Someone has warned us that we must not give in to the pressure of those who are keen to describe this process as fairly dangerous. This is what we heard a short while ago from Mr Raftery. We cannot go against progress, and we are naturally willing to get for our farmers the best production conditions and incomes which are as high as possible. However, there are several of us here — as representatives of the Committee on Agriculture and therefore direct representatives of farmers' interests — who are saying that we cannot accept this line of thinking because we cannot be absolutely certain that these substances are

Ferruccio Pisoni

harmless, nor can we be certain that they help farmer's incomes. This means that there is no way we can accept the stance which has already been indicated by the Commission. As a number of speakers have already pointed out, the Committee on Agriculture has made it quite clear that in its opinion the use of both natural and artificial hormones should be banned. If, of course, these hormones are already there in meat in greater quantities than those which are the result of treatment — this is what Mr Raftery said — this is a natural phenomenon and I do not think it has anything to do with us.

The reasons for our position have already been expressed, but I should like to add another two. Even now, there is unfair competition among the countries which produce meat. Our farmers are forced to compete with those who use these products and they thus find themselves at a disadvantage. It is our view that harmonization should benefit everyone and should not be detrimental to the interests and the requests of the majority of producers. Agriculture is blamed nowadays for pollution. We should not like what we are discussing now to be a further cause of blame, with accusations that farmers are concerned only about their incomes and that they pay no heed, as they should, to the support and protection of consumers.

To our mind, the Collins report is inherently contradictory because the explanatory statements should have led to other conclusions. Fortunately, both the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Consumer Protection rejected the motions for resolutions submitted by Mr Collins and Mr Maher. Nevertheless, there is still a contradiction in the sense that the explanatory statements tend to state something else. We cannot accept these statements and we should like people to take the view that they do not exist. We should like the Commission, which has just agreed to redraft the directive, to withdraw it; and we should also like those who want hormones for therapeutic purposes to make their position clear. I challenge Mr Raftery to put labels on the meat produced in his country — even if it has been treated for therapeutic purposes — saying 'hormone-treated meat'. Let him put it on sale and see which kind of meat the consumer prefers. This would be the best proof of what producers and consumers are expecting from the Community.

This said, we shall vote in favour of the Collins report. We feel that it is the least that can be achieved at the moment, although we are not happy with the explanatory statements or with the loopholes it allows with regard to veterinary and therapeutic use.

Mr Maher (L), *draftsman of an opinion for the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food*. — Mr President, I understand that there was some problem about my speaking time. I did prepare an opinion for the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, but I

was told I had no time to speak. I understood I was automatically given speaking time if I prepared an opinion on this report.

I can be brief, because I do not want to repeat what has been said already. I must confess that I will vote against this report now because I believe it is no consequence any more. Logically, if the only recommendation in the report which appears to me to be of any consequence is that this hormonal treatment can be used for therapeutic purposes, then it is nonsense because that cannot be controlled. If we are concerned about banning for growth-promoter use, I do not see how allowing it for therapeutic use is going to serve any useful purpose. I think what the House ought to do is to throw out the report and, in the wake of the final findings from the Lamming Committee, have a new report drawn up taking account also of the Commission's position.

I have to agree to a great extent with Mr Raftery that there is a lot of hysteria. Indeed, we did have a lot of emotion in the Committee on Agriculture when the report was being discussed. I am rather sad about that, because I feel that many Members are reacting to what they perceive as a public view rather than giving leadership to the public along sound and scientific lines. I feel that that ought to be the responsibility of politicians, not to be running after the public but rather giving them some leadership.

I regret that the rapporteur is not here. Rapporteurs seem to be escaping from this Chamber tonight. Mr Woltjer was not here earlier on and now we do not have Mr Collins. Could I say to the Members who sit at the back of the Chamber — the Greens, if I am addressing you correctly — that I am a farmer and that I spent quite a part of my younger life on the farm doing the kind of things you are talking about — farming in an organic fashion, not using any of these materials, even artificial fertilizers.

I kept doing it as long as I could afford it, and then I had to give it up, unless I was paid twice as much for the product I produced. So I am one, at least, who tried it. I wonder if there is anybody else in the hemisphere who has tried it. I do not know, but I tried it. But I could not afford it any longer. I was getting very low production, and that meant I should have to have a much higher price for my product if I was to live. But the consumer wanted lower prices. Therefore, I cannot understand the logic of Mr Eyraud, who says that if we increase meat production it is bad for the farmer and for the consumer. In fact, when you have high production, it is good for the consumer. And what is driving the farmer very often — and please do not make the mistake of arguing from the general to the particular; of course we have surplus meat — to using these more modern and scientific and, I agree, not always good methods is that they are unable to make a living with the prices they are getting. So, they have to use artificial fertilizers.

Maher

Many people argue that artificial fertilizers and other materials are bad, and yet we are using them all the time. If you cut them out as well — and you might as well investigate that if we are to examine the use of growth-promoters — you will soon see what will happen to food production. We are not being very logical. The big problem is — and Mr Raftery has already mentioned it, but I think it is necessary to emphasize it — that there is no known way of identifying whether or not the hormones found in the body of an animal are of natural occurrence or have been implanted. There is no proof, no certain way of finding out. Therefore, in my view, the ban is nonsense, because these materials will be used and used indiscriminately and we have no way of checking. In fact, the correct action to take is what the Commission is saying — namely, use them, control them, make sure you know what is happening. At least then we shall be sure of what we are doing.

My final point is that we must also think of the discriminatory nature of a ban — if a ban could be effected for farmers who farm in that part of the Community where an extensive system of cattlefarming is used. In countries like the UK and Ireland and parts of France, we let the cattle out in the fields. To do that you must castrate them and make them steers, because you cannot control them as bulls. In other parts of the Community they are kept indoors and can be controlled. Those bulls have massive quantities of hormones in them, and what we are doing is giving a few hormones to the castrates to get them to measure up to the development properties of the bulls. If you keep those farmers from using those hormones, you give a clear advantage to the farmers who farm with bulls. That is discrimination, and we must try to discover how we can compensate those farmers who are prevented from using this modern method just because other farmers ...

(The President urged the speaker to conclude)

I have gone a little over my time. The wisest thing for this House to do would be to reject this proposal and see what we can do about constructing a new one when we have better information.

(Applause)

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, despite Mr Simmond's kind remarks, I don't pretend that my expertise extends to substances with thyrostatic effects. Nevertheless, on behalf of the Commission, I would like to assure Members that the subject has been studied very carefully — as has, indeed, been pointed out by several speakers — and that we have followed this debate very carefully because, as has been said, it is an important issue.

It is important for the consumer, who wants healthy food, to know of any possible consequences for his

health, to know exactly what he is buying and whether it is value for money.

It is important for the producer. In particular, one must avoid any risk of unfair competition between the producers of the Community. In the same way, it is important for free trade because it is clearly understood that any regulations would also have to apply to imported products as much as to those of the Community. On this point, we can give an categorical assurance to Mr Eyraud.

It is also important for governments because any legislation must be capable of supervision. This is a field in which monitoring is a complicated matter as has been pointed out by a number of speakers.

Mr President, the rapporteur has adopted a different position from that of the Commission. Your Committee's report contains a number of new elements which differ from the points we have made. The Commission notes your positive suggestions whereby you accept that three natural hormones can be approved for therapeutic purposes provided that supervision is arranged and appropriate conditions of use are observed. These points will require greater activity by the Community which must strengthen the guarantees offered to the consumer. With this caveat, the Commission agrees to, and consequently accepts, Amendments Nos 1, 3, 5, 7 to 12 and 14. We have noted that you do not agree to authorize the use of the same hormones for fattening even if it is shown that their use is without risk to the consumer. This conclusion is quite clearly contrary to the Commission's opinion. It contradicts the findings of the scientific committees that we have consulted. Obviously this means that the standpoint of your Committee is not that of our own proposal. I must therefore temporarily reserve the Commission's position. The Commission will begin to discuss the matter next week, taking into account the doubts expressed by some speakers and the opposing certainty expressed by others.

Finally, Mr President, we do not see that we can accept the amendments calling for systematic involvement by Parliament in the application of agreed policy because that would mean changes at the institutional level giving Parliament powers normally exercised by a management committee. For this reason, the Commission cannot accept Amendments Nos 4 and 13.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

Mr Elliott (S). — On a point of order, Mr President, I wonder if you are aware, regarding tomorrow's agenda, that at least two committees are proposing to hold meetings during the plenary sitting. It is unfortunate that we have had such a vast number of these special meetings this week, but perhaps that could not

Elliott

be altogether avoided. Are you aware that arrangements have been made to hold two of these committee meetings in the same room and at exactly the same time? It seems to me that that will cause some difficulties, and I wonder if it could be sorted out in good time.

President. — The committees meet at half past nine; perhaps the Members can be informed beforehand.

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC). — *(DE)* Perhaps I can put things to right: the Committee on the Envi-

ronment, Public Health and Consumer Protection will meet in Room 2 from 8.45 to 9 a.m.

President. — Since I am a member of that Committee, I am sorry to hear that I shall have to be here earlier than expected.

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC). — *(DE)* I am sorry about that.

(The sitting was closed at 11.15 p.m.)¹

¹ *Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.*

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 11 OCTOBER 1985

Contents

- | | | |
|--|---|-----|
| 1. <i>Votes:</i> <i>Mr Tomlinson; Mr Stevenson; Mr Früh; Mr Pearce; Mr Marck; Mr F. Pisoni; Mr Vande-</i> | <i>meulebroucke; Mrs Jackson; Mr Elliott; Mrs Banotti; Mr Pearce; Mrs Weber</i> | 244 |
| | 2. <i>Adjournment of the session</i> | 247 |

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)¹

1. *Votes*

Interim report (Doc. A 2-85/85) by Mr Woltjer, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, on the implementation of the dairy quota arrangements

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 24 — After the vote on Amendment No 24

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Mr President, that amendment stood in the name of Mrs Castle and others. Before that vote was taken, Mr Stevenson, as one of the others, was trying to indicate to you his willingness to accept the suggestion of Mr Woltjer that it should be an addition. I think it should have been possible for Mr Stevenson's consent to that suggestion to have been heard before the vote was taken.

President. — Excuse me, Mr Tomlinson, your name does not even appear on the list of signatories. It is customary to refer to the first signatory.

Mr Stevenson (S). — Mr President, you may wish to suggest that we refer to the first signatory, but neither the first nor, indeed, some of the other signatories are here. I am present and, as one of the signatories, readily agree to the rapporteur's suggestion to this House that we should have it as an addition. I would hope that you would accede to the request made by Mr Tomlinson, which seems to have the support of this House.

President. — I am sorry, Mr Stevenson, but the vote has already been taken.

Explanations of vote

Mr Früh (PPE). — *(DE)* The Group of the European People's Party will vote for the working party's interim report because it meets the demands. This approval, however, does not imply a definitive judgment on the quota system. The judgment on whether the quota system will also be workable in the future should await the final report of the Working Party on Milk Quotas.

Mr Pearce (ED). — I want to explain my own position on this matter in the light of comments made last night by my distinguished friends, Mr Maher and Mr Clinton. Nobody in this House could accuse me of not

¹ *Approval of the Minutes — Procedure without report — Petitions — Transfer of appropriations — Referral to committees (change): see Minutes.*

Pearce

being a friend of Ireland. I listened with admiration to the eloquent arguments they advanced giving every conceivable reason why the farmers of Ireland should not have to be subject to milk quotas — some were in mountains, some by the sea, some by lakes. Because Irish farmers are often so charming and such delightful people with a pint of fermented Liffey water in one hand and a hundred thousand welcomes in the other, because they are nice guys, maybe they should not have to be subject to quotas.

I think I have rumbled what is actually going on with our friends in Ireland. They want the quota system to be applied in other Member States but not in their country. They feel that the government of that country should be able to pay to the Commission any fine or imposition instead of it actually being a limit on the farmers. This is not on. We in our country, I in my constituency, are the natural party of country people in England. For the sake of our reputation in these matters, I really have to insist that Ireland be limited by the quota as well as us. The same medicine for everybody!

Mr Marck (PPE), in writing. — (NL) As a member of the special working group I shall vote for the report. I should, however, like to lay special emphasis on the problems facing young farmers.

Under the present application of the milk quota system it is the young farmers who face the greatest risks. Yet they are our future farming leaders and everyone is agreed that they must be given every opportunity to develop their farms. Young farmers are liable to become the victims of the considerable latitude allowed to Member States in the way they apply the system. They have too little room for manoeuvre under the present quota arrangements; they have too few opportunities to adapt their holdings; their prospects for the future are not too good. The link between structural policy and dairy policy is unclear and allows the young farmer too little opportunity to adapt his farm to a quota system and make it profitable. Young farmers on holdings with inadequate quotas have no chance of success. Young farmers who have just taken over farms are confronted with financial obligations they can no longer meet.

I therefore ask for special treatment for young farmers comprising permanent arrangements that meet their specific problems. Thus, for example, quotas released as a result of purchase from farmers over sixty might be allocated to young farmers on condition, of course, that a maximum limit be fixed to prevent the formation of mammoth farms and surplus production.

Mr F. Pisoni (PPE), in writing. — (IT) Although we will be voting for the Woltjer report, we wish to stress that we are against all quotas in the milk sector, and indeed all other sectors.

The report should be considered as contingent on all the effects. It describes how the quotas have been applied and, in part, the results obtained, but it in no way states whether or not the quotas are going to be maintained.

The continuation of rigid physical production quotas blocks all research and innovation, sanctions the existing situation, undermines productive capacity and does not allow producers, particularly in mountain regions, to obtain a return sufficient to cover their needs and rising costs.

Finally, approval of the Woltjer report in no way means approval of the quota system.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC), in writing. — (NL) The milk quota system did indeed, during the first year of its application, result in a reduction in milk production. However, I fear that this may just be a one-off thing.

The way the decision is being worked out gives one pause. Farmers who for a whole year have acted like good (European) citizens and closely followed the restrictions laid down are ending up looking foolish since it seems that their fellows and rivals, being less public spirited, were not penalized at all because they did not have to pay the superlevy. One can easily imagine what will follow: the farmers will (rightly) lose their faith in the EEC and the national farm ministers. Mindful of the adage 'Once bitten, twice shy', they will pay little attention to the regulations imposed while hoping not to be penalized. The immediate result will be that production will go up again so that 2 years of sacrifice will have gone for nothing; the Council's irresolute attitude should therefore be condemned. The Woltjer report takes a cautious step in this direction. I shall therefore vote for the resolution.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

Mrs Caroline Jackson (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President. I think we would all agree in this House that some amendments speak for themselves and that others are explained in the course of the debate. We noticed last night that although the Commission had made great efforts to be here, the rapporteur was absent from the recommencement of the debate at 9 o'clock right through to the Commissioner's explanation. It may be that this was for personal reasons, in which case I apologise for raising this point. If it was for some other reason, then I think the rapporteur should apologise to this House for not being present

¹ The rapporteur was
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 11 and 26;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 8, 10, 13 to 23, 25,
27 and 31.

Jackson

for the rest of the debate on his report and for not being here to hear the Commission.

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-103/85) by Mr Habsburg, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on jamming stations in Europe

Explanation of vote

Mr Elliott (S). — I intend to abstain on this report. Since that is a rather unusual action for me, I feel I should say why I am doing that.

I do not approve of the need to jam radio or television broadcasting in principle. Frankly, I believe this report, as it is cast, is so biased, so totally one-sided, as to be something I could not accept. It presumes, for example, in talking about the undesirability of jamming, that one should always allow access to the truth. What is the truth? We are told by some Members that very soon we will have satellite broadcasting that will be able to bombard the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe with a kind of 'Supervoices of America'. What kind of 'truth' are we going to tell those people? Are we going to tell them that the more nuclear weapons we have, provided they have got the Stars and Stripes on, the better for everybody? Are we going to tell them that to destabilize democratically elected governments in South America is a splendid thing to do? Are we going to tell them that it is all right for Israel to attack another sovereign State, providing the United States approves of it? Is that the kind of 'truth' we are going to tell them? Propaganda is not only on one side. I believe this report is so totally biased as to be unacceptable to this House.

(Cries of 'Time, Time' from the European Democratic benches)

I must also say that some Members, like Mr Beazley, tried to give a lilywhite impression of what goes on in their own countries. There is much that can be condemned in countries even within this Community by way of infringement of human rights. I believe that a report as biased as this is one that we cannot properly accept.

(Applause from the left)

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-100/85) by Mr Collins, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the proposal from the Com-

mission to the Council (Doc. 1-359/84 — COM(84) 295 final) for a Directive amending Directive 81/602/EEC concerning the prohibition of certain substances having a hormonal action and of any substances having a thyrostatic action

Explanations of vote

Mrs Banotti (PPE). — I shall be voting for the Collins report, which has had a long and tortuous passage through the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, at the end of which our distinguished rapporteur could be said to be more to be pitied than blamed. As long as there is any ambiguity about the safety of these substances, we must in conscience come down on the side of consumer safety. As long as we lack accessible methods of testing for the presence of growth-producing hormones in our meat we must remain vigilant.

That being said, I am aware of the great dangers of black marketing. However, I feel sure that the consumers will demonstrate their resistance to purchasing meat from any State which permits a black market in these substances to continue.

Mr Pearce (ED). — I want to explain why I will be standing shoulder to shoulder with Mr Maher and the Irish farmers on this issue and with everybody else who is prepared to judge the matter on the facts and not on the mysticism of it.

Even my good friend, Mr Sherlock, the good doctor, stout fellow though he is, has been seduced by the nonsense coming from the environmental lobby, and perhaps by the eloquence of Mrs Bloch von Blotnitz sitting there camouflaged by the erica which I can see over there, which is probably exuding hormones directly at her. I am surprised she is surviving the course!

(Laughter)

This is an absolute nonsense! It is like believing that there are fairies at the bottom of the garden. There is no evidence that hormones cause the slightest damage to people. It is indeed an anabolic nonsense, if I can put it that way, and I hope, now that you have heard the arguments put properly, that all of you who believe in fact and sense and logic will join me and the Irish farmers in rejecting this resolution totally.

Mrs Weber (S), chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. — *(DE)* Mr President, on behalf of my committee I should like as strongly as possible to refute the suggestion that its members based their rejection of hormones on stupid statements, that their information was inadequate, . . .

(Applause)

Weber

to base a sensible decision on. I believe that it is very reasonable, sensible and indeed medically justified to speak out against these hormones. It has nothing to do with fairy tales.

(Applause)

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

2. Adjournment of the session

President. — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.¹

(The sitting was closed at 9.50 a.m.)

¹ The rapporteur was
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1 to 14.

¹ Written declarations (Rule 49) — Forwarding of resolutions adopted during the sitting — Membership of committees — Dates for next part-session: see Minutes.

**Salg og abonnement · Verkauf und Abonnement · Πωλήσεις και συνδρομές · Sales and subscriptions
Vente et abonnements · Vendita e abbonamenti · Verkoop en abonnementen**

BELGIQUE / BELGIË

Moniteur belge / Belgisch Staatsblad
Rue de Louvain 40-42 / Leuvensestraat 40-42
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel
Tél. 512 00 26
CCP/Postrekening 000-2005502-27

Sous-dépôts / Agentschappen:

**Librairie européenne /
Europese Boekhandel**
Rue de la Loi 244 / Wetstraat 244
1040 Bruxelles / 1040 Brussel

CREDOC

Rue de la Montagne 34 / Bergstraat 34
Bte 11 / Bus 11
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel

DANMARK

Schultz Forlag

Møntergade 21
1116 København K
Tlf: (01) 12 11 95
Girokonto 200 11 95

BR DEUTSCHLAND

Verlag Bundesanzeiger

Breite Straße
Postfach 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

European Bookshop
London Business School
Sussex Place
London NW1 4SA
Tel. 01-723 3902

ESPAÑA

Mundi-Prensa Libros, S.A.

Castelló 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
Shiniuku-ku
Tokyo 160-91
Tel. (03) 354 0131

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprise:

- report of proceedings,
- annual indexes.

Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg:

Annual subscription 1984/85 ECU 63.30 BFR 2 900 IRL 46 UKL 36.50 USD 55

Single issue price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

ECU 23.98 BFR 1 100 IRL 17.60 UKL 14.30 USD 22



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

