

Annex

# Official Journal

## of the

### European Communities

No 2-329

**LIBRARY**

English edition

## Debates of the European Parliament

1985-1986 Session  
 Report of Proceedings  
 from 9 to 13 September 1985  
 Europe House, Strasbourg

**General contents**

<b>Sitting of Monday, 9 September 1985</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Resumption, p. 1 — Minutes, p. 1 — Statement by the President, p. 2 — Order of business, p. 2 — Committees of inquiry, p. 3 — Fire safety in hotels, p. 4 — Uranium: Incidence of cancer, p. 11	
<b>Tuesday, 10 September 1985</b> .....	<b>25</b>
Urgent procedure, p. 26 — Common transport policy: Judgment of the Court of Justice, p. 27 — Air transport, p. 43 — Convention for the navigation of the Rhine, p. 61 — VAT relief to German farmers, p. 64 — Action taken on Parliament's opinions, p. 67 — Question Time, p. 67 — Votes, p. 84 — Annex, p. 92	
<b>Wednesday, 11 September 1985</b> .....	<b>98</b>
VAT relief to German farmers (contd), p. 101 — Welcome, p. 104 — Enlargement to include Spain and Portugal, p. 104 — South Africa, p. 125 — Community initiative within the United Nations, p. 148 — Question-time, p. 153 — Votes, p. 167	
<b>Annex to Question-time of Wednesday, 11 September 1985</b> .....	<b>179</b>
<b>Thursday, 12 September 1985</b> .....	<b>220</b>
Minutes, p. 221 — Topical and urgent debate, p. 222 — Welcome, p. 246 — Community initiative within the United Nations (contd), p. 246 — Elections in the would-be State of Mr Denktash in Cyprus, p. 247 — European media policy, p. 253 — Votes, p. 262 — European media policy (contd), p. 264 — Drug abuse, p. 276 — Energy, p. 283 — Development of less-favoured regions, p. 290	
<b>Friday, 13 September 1985</b> .....	<b>299</b>
Votes, p. 299 — Fisheries, p. 304 — Norway pout, p. 307 — Pollution of the sea, p. 309 — Adjournment, p. 310	

## 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, 9 SEPTEMBER 1985

### CONTENTS

1. <i>Resumption of the session</i> . . . . .	1	<i>Mr Dalsass; Mrs Jepsen; Mr Filinis; Mr Varfis (Commission); Miss Tongue; Mr Varfis; Miss Tongue</i> . . . . .	4
2. <i>Approval of the Minutes</i> <i>Mr Tomlinson</i> . . . . .	1		
3. <i>Statement by the President</i> <i>Mr Fich</i> . . . . .	2	7. <i>Uranium (incidence of cancer) — Report (Doc. A 2-80/85) by Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz</i> <i>Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mr Collins; Mrs Banotti; Mrs Faith; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs Lemass; Mr Van der Lek; Mr Paisley; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mrs Lentz-Cornette; Mr Iversen; Mr Linkohr; Mrs Schleicher; Mr Falconer; Mr Muntingh; Mr Adam; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission); Mr Sherlock; Mr Collins; Mr West; Lady Elles</i> . . . . .	11
4. <i>Agenda</i> <i>Mr Arndt; Mr Klepsch; Mrs Veil; Mr Woltjer</i>	2		
5. <i>Setting up of two committees of inquiry</i> <i>Mr Lomas; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Klinkenborg; Mr Anastassopoulos</i> . . . . .	3		
6. <i>Fire safety in hotels — Report (Doc. A 2-78/85) by Miss Tongue</i> <i>Miss Tongue; Mr Lambrias; Mrs Caroline Jackson; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Nordmann;</i>			

IN THE CHAIR : MR PFLIMLIN

*President*

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

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

**President.** — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament, which was suspended on 12 July 1985.

#### 2. *Approval of the Minutes*

**President.** — The Minutes of the sitting of 12 July 1985 have been distributed.

Are there any comments?

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — Mr President, on the approval of the minutes of the Friday of the last part-session: you will remember that during that last part-session Commissioner Ripa di Meana very kindly made a statement on the very urgent situation then prevailing in South Africa on the condition that he was not questioned on his statement because, obviously, he had to prepare it at short notice. I am sure that all the Members of the House who were present were extremely grateful to the Commission for making that statement. But have we had a request from the Commission now to make a detailed statement that can be cross-examined in this House?

**President.** — Mr Tomlinson, I take note of your statement.

*(Parliament approved the Minutes)<sup>1</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> *Membership of Parliament — Request for a Member's parliamentary immunity to be waived — Membership of political groups — Petitions — Transfers of appropriations — Written declarations (Rule 49) — Authorization to draw up reports — Referral to committees — Documents received — Texts of Treaties forwarded by the Council: see Minutes*

### 3. *Statement by the President*

**President.** — Before starting on the agenda, I should like, ladies and gentlemen, to make an announcement. As you know, the Intergovernmental Conference which it was decided to convene in application of the decisions taken in Milan by the European Council in June and of consultations by the Council is opening here today in Luxembourg. I considered it appropriate to send to the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Poos, a letter which I shall now read out to you.

Mr President,

With the Intergovernmental Conference about to open under your Presidency, I should like once again to draw to your attention the resolution voted by the European Parliament on 9 July.

Our Assembly looks forward to the Conference drawing up a single draft treaty which will introduce fundamental institutional reform taking account of the draft it elaborated and approved itself.

The European Parliament was responsible for initiating the process which led via the Fontainebleau Summit, the Dooge Committee and the Milan Summit to the calling of the Conference. It is directly concerned since the increase of its powers, which is necessary if the democratic character of our institutions is to be strengthened, must be one of the essential elements of reform.

It would therefore be irregular if the European Parliament was not invited to make an effective contribution to the work of the Conference. Occasional contacts cannot be sufficient.

I sincerely hope that our Assembly will be able finally to share with the participants in the Conference, *viz-a-viz* public opinion, the political responsibility for an outcome to our work which will relaunch the vitally necessary process of European construction.

**Mr Fich (S).** — (*DA*) Mr President, I should like on behalf of the Danish Social Democrats — and I stress: on behalf of the *Danish* Social Democrats — to make it clear that I disagree with you entirely on the letter's contents, in reference both to the decisions that have been taken and to the request to involve Parliament in the process of elaborating new treaties. I wanted you to be aware of this position; I believe you knew it already, but I did not want your intervention to go unchallenged.

(*Applause from various benches*)

**President.** — It was merely an announcement I made to the Assembly and it is not to be followed by a debate. But the matter will be raised in any case during

the present part-session since one or more motions for resolutions will be devoted precisely to the Intergovernmental Conference so that all Members of the Assembly may adopt a position orally or, possibly, by means of their vote.

### 4. *Agenda*

**President.** — At its meeting of 10 July 1985 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda, which has been distributed.

At this morning's meeting the chairmen of the political groups authorized me to propose a number of changes.

(*The President read out the changes to the agenda*)<sup>1</sup>

Pursuant to Rule 56 of the Rules of Procedure I have received the following requests.

The Liberal Group requests the holding over of the report (Doc. A 2-75/85) by Mr Hahn, on the Commission's green paper on the establishment of the common market for broadcasting, scheduled for Thursday as No 163 on the agenda, until the October part-session, so that Parliament may consider it in joint debate with the report by Mr de Vries on the same subject.

**Mr Arndt (S).** — (*DE*) Mr President, after careful consideration our group has come to the conclusion that the real mistake was made by Parliament: last autumn we proposed an 'own-initiative' report, and then in February we appointed Mr De Vries to draw up a report. These two reports should not be in contradiction with one another, and so I suggest that Professor Hahn's report be presented by its author, debated and then sent back to committee to enable the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy and the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport to coordinate their positions. The debate would then be taken on Thursday but the vote on the report only when the De Vries report was also available.

**Mr Klepsch (PPE).** — (*DE*) Mr President, I was authorized by my group to oppose the Liberal Group's proposal — and for good reason, for we have already twice deferred this report while waiting for that of Mr De Vries. On the other hand, we have our doubts as to whether the latter document will soon be available.

I am, however, prepared to go along with Mr Arndt's suggestion. I think it takes account of all aspects: the debate on Mr Hahn's report, which has now been

<sup>1</sup> See Minutes

**Klepsch**

available for some time, would then be held on Thursday and the vote on the two reports would be taken on some later occasion, after they had been coordinated with one another. I therefore agree with Mr Arndt's compromise proposal.

**Mrs Veil (L).** — (FR) Mr President, if I understood it correctly, Mr Arndt has submitted a compromise proposal, accepted by Mr Klepsch, to the effect that the debate would take place but without the vote. The vote, which would of course be based on the debate, would come later. In any case, the two votes would be taken at the same time. Subject to these conditions, my group can back this proposal and therefore withdraw its request that the debate be postponed, on the understanding, of course, that there will be no vote on the report by Mr Hahn.

**President.** — We shall look into this when the time comes.

**Mrs Veil (L).** — (FR) I felt nevertheless that I should spell that out. In the light of Mr Arndt's proposals and Mr Klepsch's comments, I feel that there is a commitment on the part of all the groups not to take the vote.

**President.** — We take note of that agreement and commitment, which looks like making things run smoothly.

The Socialist Group requests holding over till the October part-session the interim report (A 2-85/85) by Mr Woltjer on the implementation of the milk quota system in the Community, scheduled for Thursday 12 September as No 165 on the agenda.

**Mr Woltjer (S).** — (NL) Mr President, the Socialist Group and myself in my capacity of rapporteur have tabled this request because the Commissioner for Agriculture, Mr Andriessen, is not present this week and his cabinet have let it be known that he would greatly appreciate it if he could be present at the debate.

*(Parliament agreed the request and adopted the draft agenda thus amended)*

##### 5. Setting up of two committees of inquiry

**President.** — At its meeting of 26 June the enlarged Bureau decided to inform Parliament at this part-session of the stage reached in the procedure for setting up two committees of inquiry, one on drugs, the other on acts of repression against trade unions in dispute.

In summary, the situation is as follows, it being understood that two committees of inquiry are involved and therefore two different positions although the enlarged Bureau has considered the two issues at the same time.

By letter of 13 September 1984 the Socialist Group submitted a resolution signed by more than 109 members on the setting up of a committee of inquiry into acts of repression against trade unions in dispute.

Mr Gawronski and others submitted a resolution signed by more than 109 Members on the setting up of a committee of inquiry on the drugs problem.

At its meeting of 10 January 1985 the enlarged Bureau decided that the committee of inquiry on the drugs problem would have 15 members and the committee of inquiry into acts of repression against trade unions in dispute one member from each political group. Parliament was informed of this decision during the sitting of 11 February 1985.

Several political groups informed the enlarged Bureau of their intention not to appoint representatives on these two committees of inquiry until such time as the Committee of Inquiry on the Rise of Racism and Facism had completed its work.

As a result, the enlarged Bureau has not been able to submit proposals to Parliament on the membership of the two committees of inquiry which, under Rule 92 of the Rules of Procedure, would have to ensure a fair representation of Member States and of political views.

Under these circumstances the enlarged Bureau decided to inform Parliament of the facts of the situation.

A decision has yet to be taken on the procedure to be followed. The political group chairmen decided at this morning's meeting that in accordance with the provisions of the Rules of Procedure, the enlarged Bureau, which will be holding a meeting tomorrow morning, should submit a proposal to Parliament which must take the final decision.

The enlarged Bureau will therefore be invited to formulate a proposal tomorrow and this will be announced to Parliament immediately. I propose that the deadline for tabling amendments to this proposal be set at 11 a.m. on Wednesday and that the vote be taken at 7 p.m. the same day.

**Mr Lomas (S).** — Thank you very much for that information, Mr President. It is becoming almost a monthly intervention now to ask about these committees of inquiry. Whatever recommendation is made, there is no doubt that some Members are not going to take part and are being particularly obstructive about

**Lomas**

the setting up of the committee of inquiry on the miners' strike. Whether other groups are prepared to take part or not, or whether or not some committee is still investigating, may I again please urge you to insist that this committee be set up and that its work commence immediately?

**President.** — As I have just said, the enlarged Bureau will be formulating a proposal tomorrow which will be announced to Parliament and Parliament will vote upon it.<sup>1</sup>

**Mr Newton Dunn (ED).** — Mr President, I want to raise a point of order under Rule 100 about the Klinkenborg report which will be debated tomorrow.

Mr President, I had to write to you about this because although the report was agreed last July, it was only circulated last week and I had no opportunity to raise my concern before last week. The Rules of Procedure appear to have been abused in two cases by the tabling of this report by the rapporteur.

First of all, Rule 100(3) says that if requested there shall be a roll-call vote and the report shall indicate how each Member voted. We did have a roll-call vote and the secretariat of the committee wrote down how each Member voted. However, because the vote was so narrow and close I see this has been deleted from the minutes. In fact the vote was 11 in favour, 7 against with 5 abstentions. In other words, a majority did not support the rapporteur. I think this is being concealed so I am very concerned about that.

More importantly, Mr President, Rule 100(2) says the report shall contain a motion for a resolution and an explanatory statement. Mr Klinkenborg's report contains something extra. Besides the minority opinion, which the minority has tabled, it contains an extra annex tacked on at the end which quite simply is evidence submitted by a commercial interest, which was not considered by the committee and has nothing to do with the committee's report. I submit that it is quite simply an attempt to conceal a minority opinion. I would ask you to rule whether the report, as tabled by Mr Klinkenborg, is in fact in order at all.

**Mr Klinkenborg (S).** — (DE) Mr President, two points. First, the report was dealt with and voted on in committee in all due form. Second, Annex D forms part of my explanatory statement. It is an ECAC paper, and the ECAC is, so far as I can see, not a representative of the interests of any company but a European administrative association.

**Mr Anastassopoulos (PPE), chairman of the Committee on Transport.** — (GR) Mr President, Mr New-

ton Dunn is correct in saying that the ECAC declaration was added after the expression of the minority opinion. In this connection I would like to inform you that the Committee's secretariat told me that a problem had arisen about where to include the minority opinion. I then looked to see whether any similar precedent existed, and sought the advice of former colleagues, who pointed out that the minority opinion should follow the rapporteur's explanatory report; this was in fact done.

However, since the matter had created some controversy, the Committee's secretariat considered that the ECAC declaration should not go together with Mr Klinkenborg's explanatory report before the minority opinion, but should come after the latter. That is how this misunderstanding arose.

**President.** — This will satisfy Mr Newton Dunn, if I am not mistaken.<sup>1</sup>

#### 6. Fire safety in hotels

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-78/85) by Ms Tongue, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection,

on a proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM (83) 751 final — Doc. 1-1360/83) for a recommendation on fire safety in existing hotels

**Ms Tongue (S), rapporteur.** — Mr President, for many years now great concern has been expressed about fire risks in hotels in the Member States, provoked by a large number of tragic fires. To name but a few: in the Polen Hotel in Amsterdam, and the Duc de Brabant in Brussels in 1977 when over 50 lives were lost, and in Saragossa in Spain where another 51 lives were lost in 1979.

Such fires and the grisly statistics they have left us with provoked a number of bodies to conduct surveys, one commissioned by the EEC Commission which has led to the formulation of the code we are discussing here today. I am sorry to say that these surveys show that there has been little improvement over the last decade and since the issue was raised by colleagues in this Parliament.

According to the United Kingdom Consumers Association, who have conducted two surveys over the past seven years, 'Fire risks in some European hotels are so appalling as to be the result of profound ignorance of fire hazards or a cynical disregard for the lives of hotel

<sup>1</sup> Deadline for tabling amendments, oral questions, motions for resolutions, speaking time: see Minutes

<sup>1</sup> Directive on roll-over protection structures on agricultural or forestry tractors: see Minutes

## Tongue

guests'. Every study has shown that the majority of hotels investigated present vastly greater risks than they should.

With the increase in tourism and business travel and increasing pressure on hotel facilities, the need for Community action is obvious to ensure that all Member States, including Spain and Portugal, guarantee Community citizens a basic level of protection wherever they travel in the European Community. Action by the Community is essential and urgent if lives are to be saved.

The committee is very grateful to the Commission for the extensive work it has done in drawing up a minimum code for fire safety in hotels in response to requests from some of my colleagues in the last legislature. Having studied in detail the Commission's proposals, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection did in fact contemplate asking the Commission to draw up a code based on the most stringent regulations in operation in Member States. But, given the extensive work already done by the Commission on the existing code, the need for urgent and effective action and finally, given the likelihood of acceptance by Member States governments of a more stringent code, we in the committee came to the conclusion that the Commission's code with a small number of alterations and in the form of a regulation, as opposed to the weak instrument of a recommendation, would have the best chance of speedy adoption and implementation, so crucial if we wish to avert further disasters.

Looking at the surveys by the United Kingdom Consumers Association and the European Office for Consumer Protection carried out on behalf of the Commission, it is clear that there are 4-5 features which appear in hotels which, if absent, or indeed faulty, have proved to be the principal killers in most hotel fires, and still present the main threat to hotel guests today.

1. Open and unprotected stairways which allow smoke to circulate throughout the hotel. It is smoke, and rarely flames, that kills.
2. Blocked or unopenable exits.
3. Inadequate exit from conference rooms, discotheques, ballrooms in hotels.
4. Lack of proper equipment, faulty fire alarms and the lack of emergency lighting or escape signs.

In a recent survey — again by the United Kingdom Consumers Association — of 33 hotels where many of our schoolchildren spend their skiing holidays in Europe, 27 of the hotels investigated had inadequate lights and signs, 26 out of the 33 had inadequately protected stairways and 24 had no adequate fire alarms. I think that is enough said.

Therefore, any code must tackle these points and, as we say quite clearly in our resolution, economics cannot be argued as an excuse for failing to achieve minimum life safety standards.

In point 3 of our resolution, whilst giving support to the Commission code, we outline certain inadequacies of the code which are then explained in full in the explanatory memorandum. For example, there are no clear requirements on the protection of final escape routes. Clause 4.3.3 does not provide for adequate safe escape from public areas. Finally, another example is that the code is illogical in certain places as in Clause 3.5.1 on fire resistance of partitions and access doors.

We ask the Commission to consider our amendments to the code and inform us here today of their willingness or otherwise to make these minor — and I emphasize minor — alterations to tighten up the code.

We express regret in our resolution that the code is limited to hotels of more than 10 people. Only a few months ago a family of four suffocated to death in a squalid bed and breakfast hotel in London. There was not even a light bulb in the stairway socket let alone a fire alarm or protected stairway. We in the committee appreciate that at this moment it would be impractical to include this type of accommodation in the code, but we leave the option open and we encourage the Commission to draw up guidelines for fire protection in smaller hotels as soon as possible.

We emphasize that the code should also be legally binding in Spain and Portugal. These two countries possibly receive more tourists than any other EEC country, certainly from Great Britain, and their fire safety in hotels still leaves very much to be desired.

Another point in our resolution is that of annual inspections being imperative. Without them the code would not be worth the paper it is written on. We feel that the Commission must reinspect hotels by means of a monitoring survey.

We place great emphasis in paragraph 7 of the resolution on the need for an information programme for the benefit of public authorities, tourist agencies, operators, hoteliers and, of course, the general public. As we have often seen with EEC law, inadequate information has meant failure to have the law applied in good time and in all its details. It has hampered the work of Members of Parliament, Members of the European Parliament and interest groups who work to ensure the follow-up to such laws. This code, if it becomes law, will be extremely popular with the millions of citizens we represent, but only if they get to know about it.

Our committee was very much concerned about fire hazards in other public places such as discotheques, underground car parks, sports grounds and camping

## Tongue

places. Very dangerous hazards exist in these places as was evidenced only recently by the tragic fire at Bradford City football ground where over 50 people died in a fire. We therefore ask the Commission, as a matter of urgency, to draw up separate proposals for fire safety to cover all places of public assembly.

Finally, I would just like to make some brief comments on the amendments we have tabled to the Commission text. Amendment 1 — here the committee voted by a large majority for a regulation as opposed to a recommendation. Recommending that governments saved lives, we decided, was not going to get us very far and if we really did mean business and if our citizens were going to have any faith in us whatsoever, then such a measure as that which we are planning to take here today should be legally binding and implemented without changes at national level.

Amendment 2 is purely for clarification. We are talking about differences in type or construction, not paintwork, for example.

Amendment 3 I have already covered. There should be simply no economic let-out clause.

Amendments 4 and 7 need to be taken together. Even as a regulation it should be emphasized that this code will not conflict with national governments who wish to apply more stringent rules. I want to link this as I have said to Amendment 7 because both aim to take out the mention of new hotels which we found confusing on the committee as new hotels become existing hotels once they are built. We therefore felt there was no need here for paragraph 3.4.

Amendment No 5, we feel, is quite obvious. If there are to be modifications to a building then those modifications have to be inspected and a new certificate issued.

Amendment No 6 — the committee felt it crucial that the symbol of conformity with the code should not just appear in the hotel but in all publicity. A holiday-maker surely wants to know whether his or her hotel is safe before he or she leaves and not on arrival at the hotel.

In Amendment No 8 there is actually an error in the text as the only words I wished to delete were 'make every effort to'. It is more logical to have paragraph 7 adjacent to this paragraph and in it again delete the same words. What does the Commission mean by 'make every effort to'? It really is far too vague to leave those words in and hardly shows that we mean what we say when we assert that we want to see such a code implemented.

Finally, I would be grateful if the Commission could tell us at the close of the debate if they are prepared to take on all the amendments or not, and I do emphas-

ize that we on the committee have tried to make only the changes we felt were absolutely necessary.

I would also like the Commission's opinion on the suggested changes to the code contained in the explanatory memorandum.

I would say in conclusion that we do feel that it is imperative that the code be accepted in the form of a regulation if at all possible because the history of many proposed directives does not make for any jubilation. They are still in the deep drawers — many of them — of the Council of Ministers.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Lambrias (PPE).** — *(GR)* Mr President, I agree completely with the rapporteur on the need for a regulation, and not a code or a directive, concerning a matter which creates dangers related to the increase in tourism, and more generally, to the continually increasing movement of people within Europe.

Mr President, colleagues, as the rapporteur has stressed, in many of the Community's countries there is strict legislation, with detailed provisions and regulations that establish all the measures which are supposed to prevent mishaps. In reality, however, owing to the lack of periodic, and even more so continued checks, or because of negligence during the approval stage of architectural planning, the rules relating to fire safety still unfortunately bear little relationship to the way hotels should in fact be operated. The accidents which we have mourned and which every so often arouse our attention cannot unfortunately be prevented by directives and codes. Unless there is a regulation — even one containing the minor imperfections necessarily present in a text that compromises between the respective legislations and regulations — we will unfortunately continue having to debate the matter. I therefore stress the need for a regulation which, among other things, will insist that regular and effective checks should be carried out.

In the light of the amendments, I would also like to emphasize that an expression of regret for the fact that the recommendation, directive, or regulation is only to apply to tourist or hotel units with more than 10 beds, is essential. Smaller hotels too should enjoy minimum standards of safety. The regulations provide that a hotel of 600 rooms will of course be subject to much stricter measures and operating conditions. However, that does not mean that we can allow small hotels or units, and rented rooms in tourist establishments to give the impression that they may not be safe. Consequently, the minimum safety standards should apply to any building in which members of the public are accommodated for payment, and any objection to this specific point is wrong in principle. Let it be noted that in countries with a large tourist intake, a very high proportion of the latter finds its way to just such small



### Lambrias

hotels, dwelling units and boarding houses, in which the hospitality is supposedly 'like home'. Heaven forbid that these large numbers of tourists, who are also among the less well off, should gain the impression that we care little about their safety.

I end by stressing the need for this proposal by the Commission to acquire the authority of a regulation.

**Mrs Caroline Jackson (ED).** — I am very glad to be able to speak for the European Democratic Group in this debate because I think my group can in some sense claim authorship for the proposal. It was back in 1976 that James Spicer — who is still in the House of Commons as a Member of Parliament for West Dorset — put a question to the Commission asking whether it intended to put forward any proposals on hotel fire safety. The answer was a quite clear no. He then produced in 1978 this report on fire safety in hotels which asked the Commission to come forward with a directive and I underline that this was carried on by Mr Sherlock and Miss Hooper in the first directly-elected Parliament.

For a long time the European Commission fell back on two defences against bringing anything forward on this subject. The first defence was that there was no legal basis. They seem to have got over that. The second defence was that national legislation was, on the whole, adequate. Clearly, as the rapporteur has pointed out, this is not the case and, in fact, it is underlined very strongly in the explanatory statement to the recommendation.

Well, now the Commission seems to have had a change of heart, and we are very glad that they have come forward with something. However, we in the European Democratic Group feel that the form of proposal that they are putting forward is too weak. The European Parliament has always wanted a directive on this. We must ask why they have come forward with only a recommendation. The measures that the Commission is proposing, for example, in the field of health and safety at work, are being put forward in the form of directives. It is also extremely detailed for a recommendation, and one wonders whether the Commission in fact lost heart at the thought of putting a directive through having done quite a lot of the work for a directive. If so, I think the Commission should actually rely on us because we speak on behalf of the consumers of the European Community and we are their allies in pushing through something rather more effective than a directive.

Should it then be a directive or a regulation? Well, if the Parliament is going to be really serious about getting to grips with the Council on this matter, then I think that the Parliament has to face up to the fact that it is going to be a lot easier for the Commission and for us to get a directive than to get a regulation through the Council of Ministers.

We do at least need a directive to compel the Member States to act through the compulsory code outlined in the recommendation. We need it for two reasons. Firstly, because there is a state of unfair competition between the hotel trade in the European Community — for example in the United Kingdom our hoteliers have very stringent legislation to cope with — and, secondly, because consumers in the European Community ought to be sure that they can get the same standard of fire protection in the hotels that they visit in other countries as they can get at home.

I hope that Miss Tongue's report is supported by the anti-EEC Members of her own group — British and Danish — in this Parliament because it does show one of the very good things that the European Community can do for consumers throughout the Community.

*(Applause from the European Democratic benches)*

**Mrs Squarzialupi (COM).** — *(IT)* Mr President, we shall vote in favour of the Commission proposal only if it is amended in accordance with the express requirements of the Committee on the Protection of the Environment contained in the report by Miss Tongue.

This serious problem concerns millions, not to say hundreds of millions of people. It is a serious problem because hotel guests for the most part are unfamiliar with the layout of the building they are staying in and therefore in the event of fire, in the event of danger, will have difficulty in getting out.

We ask that this Commission proposal become binding and, for this purpose, the best means is a regulation so that hotel guests, including those from other continents, may expect a satisfactory standard of safety in European hotels.

We also feel that this Commission proposal, in a legal form immediately binding, should be extended to all public places where people come together. We know that the mass deaths caused by fire occur for the most part in cinemas and discotheques, in a word, in public places where people go to enjoy themselves and not to die.

It is true that this Commission proposal poses problems. For example, some hotels have only a small number of rooms. We appreciate this difficulty; but we think that guests in the smallest hotels, which are generally the most modest, are entitled to equal protection and equal safety. We know of course that obligatory action against fire is extremely burdensome, especially for certain types of hotel characterized, by small management, which we should like to see maintained, since they lend themselves to a characteristic form of tourism.

Consequently we feel that a graduated approach should be used in applying community standards,