

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 1-303

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1983-1984 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 12 to 16 September 1983

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Sitting of Monday, 12 September 1983	1
Resumption of the session, p. 1 — Tribute, p. 1 — Request to waive immunity, p. 2 — Order of business, p. 2 — Action taken on Parliament's opinions, p. 4 — Votes, p. 8 — Christmas butter, p. 8 — Mountain farming, p. 14 — Budget, p. 15 — Annexes, p. 19.	
Sitting of Tuesday, 13 September 1983	23
Budget (contd), p. 24 — European Union, p. 27 — Question-Time, p. 77.	
Sitting of Wednesday, 14 September 1983	89
European Union (contd), p. 90 — Topical and urgent debate : objections, p. 116 — Question-Time (contd), p. 117 — Votes, p. 129 — Annexes, p. 131.	
Sitting of Thursday, 15 September 1983	179
Minutes, p. 181 — Topical and urgent debate, p. 181 — Formal sitting, p. 202 — Special committee on economic recovery, p. 202 — MEP statute, p. 206 — Calendar for 1984, p. 209 — Next ACP—EEC convention, p. 213 — Votes, p. 228 — Toxic substances, p. 230 — Next ACP—EEC convention (contd), p. 230 — Vredeling Directive, p. 238 — Pharmacists, p. 250 — Carriage of goods by road, p. 254 — Telephone calls, p. 257 — Mobile trades, p. 259 — Veal imports, p. 262 — Household appliances, p. 263 — ECSC's financial activities, p. 267 — Annexes, p. 269.	

(Continued overleaf)

NOTE TO READER

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

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

Contents (*continued*)

Sitting of Friday, 16 September 1983	279
Votes, p. 279 — Management committees, p. 280 — Adjournment, p. 287 — Annex, p. 288.	

Resolutions adopted at sittings of 12 to 16 September 1983 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 277 of 17 October 1983

SITTING OF MONDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 1983

Contents

1. Resumption of the session	1	6. Votes	8
2. Tribute	1	7. Sale of Christmas butter — Report (Doc. 1-604/83) by Mr Aigner	
3. Request for waiving of immunity of a Member	2	Mr Aigner; Mr Wettig; Mr Kellett-Bowman; Mr Adamou; Mr Delatte; Mr Mouchel; Mr Paisley; Mr Marck; Mr Hord; Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr Aigner	8
4. Agenda			
Mr Aigner; Mr Pranchère; Mr Rogers; Mr Hord; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Andriessen (Commission)	2	8. Mountain and hill farming — Report (Doc. 1-444/83) by Mr Wettig (continuation)	
5. Action taken on the opinions of Parliament		Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Adamou; Mr Tugendhat (Commission)	14
Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Andriessen; Mr Patterson; Mr Andriessen; Mr Moreland; Mr Andriessen; Mr Cousté; Mr Andriessen; Mr Hord; Mr Andriessen; Mr Eisma; Mr Andriessen; Mr Purvis; Mr Andriessen; Mr Purvis; Mr Sherlock; Mr Andriessen; Mr G. Fuchs; Mr Andriessen; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Tugendhat (Commission)	4	9. Budget	
		Mr Pottakis (Council)	15
		Annexes	
		Mr Bombard	19

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

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 8 July 1983¹.

¹ Approval of Minutes — Membership of Parliament — Motions for resolutions (Rule 49 of the Rules of Procedure) — Petitions — Deliberations of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions — Transfer of appropriations — Authorization of reports — Referral to Committee — Documents received — Texts of Treaties forwarded by the Council: see Minutes.

2. Tribute

President. — Since our proceedings were last suspended, our Assembly has lost another two Members.

Our colleague, Mr Hugues Tatillon, died on 24 July 1983.

Mr Tatillon was born on 16 November 1909. Mr Tatillon was deputy mayor of Marseilles from 1947 to 1959, and he was appointed Member of our Parliament very recently, on 27 May.

He was a member of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport as well as of the Committee on Energy and Research.

On behalf of you all I extend my most sincere condolences to his family and to the group of the European Progressive Democrats, to which he belonged.

President

Many of you will be unaware of the death of Georges Spénale, who was president of the European Parliament not so very long ago, from March 1975 to March 1977. He died on 20 August after a long illness, and I am sure that this news was received with great sorrow by most of the Members he knew during the 13 years when he was in turn Member of our Assembly, chairman of the committee now known as the Committee on Budgets, chairman of the Socialist Group and President of the European Parliament.

Earlier on, his administrative work took him to the colonies and I know that, first in Upper Volta and Togo, and later in Cameroon and Ivory Coast, he did his very best to foster the most humane and benevolent aspects of colonization through the spirit of understanding, tolerance and humility that characterized him.

Georges Spénale had another quality, easier to discern, but complex in character: he was from the south.

The senator for the Tarn was born in Carcassonne. He had the expansiveness of the true southern notable, an air of generosity and openness which was never belied by his actions; at the same time, he retained the humility of those who live close to country-people. In a word, he was simple and... very deep.

I was fond of him and respected him and that is why I feel it is so important today to pay tribute to his memory.

He was a vivid personality, never a conformist and he dared to take the most difficult paths, away from the tiresome roads of party politics.

He was a man of the south, in Europe, a happy-tempered Socialist, a man full of solid qualities, for all to see, extended equally to everyone with a tranquil exuberance that was all his own. I would add that he it was who established our budgetary rights and I shared with him my first excitement over the budget in the 1979 procedure.

I owe him a lot and I shall not forget him.

I would ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to observe one minute's silence in memory of our two colleagues.

(The Members rose and observed one minute's silence)

3. Request for waiving of immunity of a Member

President. — On 14 September 1981 the Legal Affairs Committee received a request to waive the parliamentary immunity of Mr Adonnino.

Parliament has since been informed that the Turin Tribunal has fully acquitted all those who were in a procedural situation comparable to that of Mr Adonnino. Having taken note of this decision by the Turin Court, the Legal Affairs Committee proposes that the matter now be closed.

4. Agenda

President. — At its meeting of 6 July 1983 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda, which has been distributed.

At this morning's meeting the political group chairmen authorized me to propose the following changes.

As regards *Monday*:

The report by Mr Aigner on the appointment of six members of the Court of Auditors and the report by Mr Jackson on draft supplementary and amending budget No 2 of the Communities for the financial year 1983 have not been adopted in committee because of a delay in consultation. They have therefore been withdrawn from the agenda.

I would point out that after the presentation by the Council of the draft general budget for 1984 and draft supplementary budget No 2 for 1983, only rapporteurs will be able to speak and they will each be allowed about five minutes.

Furthermore Mr Aigner, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, requests pursuant to Rule 56 of the Rules of Procedure that his report on sales of Christmas butter at reduced prices, scheduled for the Thursday sitting, should be brought forward to this afternoon in place of his other report which has just been withdrawn.

Mr Aigner (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, my overriding desire is the prevention of a state of affairs analogous to that which occurred last year when the Commission stated that Parliament presented its recommendation too late, thereby leaving insufficient time for the development of a new model. I would point out that our report, which is practically a carbon copy of last year's, was adopted with unanimity and has received a very positive reception by the public at large. Community trade unions have, for the first time ever, given the proposed measure a positive vetting. In the event of the Commission having reservations on the matter then at least it should be precluded from passing the buck to us. If the agenda remains unaltered there is a risk that we shall not be afforded another opportunity of taking up the matter in the course of this part-session.

(Parliament adopted the request)

President. — As regards *Wednesday*:

I have received a request from Mr Pranchère and 10 signatories which I was unable to go into with the political group chairmen this morning, for the inclusion in the agenda of a statement by the Commission on the proposals concerning reform of the CAP, followed by a one-hour debate.

Mr Pranchère (COM). — (*FR*) Mr President, you have just informed the House of our initiative. I feel I should add that the Commission's proposals are far-reaching. They are giving rise to all kinds of comments and are fuelling considerable speculation, even anxiety (which we share) on the part of farmers. However, Parliament has not yet been consulted. It would be surprising, to say the least, were a question such as this, drawn up by councils of ministers for the European Council in Athens in December, not to be debated by Parliament. Given our attitude towards the Commission's proposals — that they are highly dangerous and amount to a demolition job on family agricultural sectors — we feel a debate by the House to be indispensable. It is a matter of life or death for the hundreds of thousands of farmers who would be affected by price stabilization or reduction, indiscriminate production quotas, together with a host of other measures we cannot accept.

There is another way of reforming the CAP and we would like to explain it to the House. We therefore consider that Parliament would be making a judicious move in acceding to our request, thereby paving the way for an initial debate this coming Wednesday without prejudice to the necessity of returning to an issue as serious and crucial as the CAP. If reform is needed, the measures must be real and must take account of the interests of the farmers of France and elsewhere.

Mr Rogers (S). — Mr President, I was just wondering if the translation was correct or whether I misunderstood you. Did you say that there was going to be a debate for one hour on reforms to the common agricultural policy? I am not quite sure what Mr Pranchère is about... well, I know what his motives are, obviously. He talks about the farmers, but I think a lot of consumers in Europe would be very interested indeed. What is this debate and what is it about? I could keep going forever. You could ask questions about the CAP for one hour without even coming to any answers...

President. — Mr Rogers, can I explain? Mr Pranchère asked for a statement by the President of the Commission on the reform of the CAP as proposed now by the Commission. It is usual procedure in Parliament that after such a statement we can

have one hour of debate if there is not a resolution prepared. I think that in this context that is the most sensible way of proceeding.

May I ask one to speak for and one to speak against.

... No, Mr Rogers, you made your point clear.

Mr Rogers (S). — How do you know what is in my mind? I have not even asked a question.

President. — You asked a question, I answered a question.

Mr Rogers (S). — Yes, I know, but if I raise a point of order, Mr President, you cannot preempt what I am going to say.

President. — You asked a question.

Mr Rogers (S). — Well, I have a right to ask on a point of order.

President. — Your point of order was a question.

Mr Rogers (S). — Well, of course it is a question of procedure as to whether I heard you correctly. What I would like to know now as a Member, Mr President — if you could inform me — is what happens after the hour's debate? Is it just simply an hour's debate and then it is finished?

President. — Mr Rogers, if you read the Rules you will see that we just have an hour of debate and then it is finished. It is a first opportunity for the Parliament to discuss such a matter, but it does not mean that parliamentary procedures at that moment have ended. They will, without any doubt on this subject, go on still for a considerable period of time.

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, I rise to speak against the proposal by Mr Pranchère knowing that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture recognizes the importance of the document which the Commission has issued on the reform of the agricultural policy. In this context he has arranged for an extended meeting of the Committee on Agriculture the week after next and I presume that there will be a report for this House so that the whole matter can be debated in depth and it seems to me to be something of a waste of the Parliament's time on Wednesday to discuss prematurely by way of question and answer a document which is the subject of in-depth discussion with the relevant committees.

(*Parliament rejected Mr Pranchère's request*)

President. — As regards *Thursday*:

Mr Karamanlis, President of the Hellenic Republic, will make a formal address to the Members of the European Parliament at 12 noon on Thursday.

President

Consequently, the topical and urgent debates will take place, with the agreement of the political group chairmen, from 9 a.m. to 12 noon and not from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. as planned. An oral question with debate by Mr Frischmann and Mr Ceravolo on information and consultation of workers in undertakings, is included in a joint debate with oral question with debate No 180 on the same subject.

Included at the end of the Thursday agenda are the reports by Mr Gabert on the financial activities of the ECSC and by Mrs Boserup on the consultative committees.

Finally, rapporteur Mr Vandemeulebroucke has informed me that new developments have occurred in respect of this report on the Arctic and Greenland pilot project following its adoption in committee. To allow the Committee on the Environment to acquaint itself with these new facts, Mr Vandemeulebroucke proposes to withdraw the report from the agenda for the current part-session.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (CDI). — (NL) Mr President, according to information received from the Greenland authorities, the projects forming part of the Arctic pilot project are no longer to be implemented or at least have been suspended. Consequently, there is not a great deal of point in having a debate and a vote on the subject. It would be far better to refer the Arctic pilot project and the report as such back to the committee for an indefinite period, while we wait to see what happens as a result of the initiatives taken by the Canadian Government.

President. — Here we might usefully ask the Commission whether it can confirm or deny this information so that we may know how best to proceed.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, I only wish I could answer your question. I can only do my best to ensure that Parliament receives an answer today or tomorrow at the latest.

(Parliament indicated its agreement and adopted the draft agenda thus amended)¹

5. Action taken on the opinions of Parliament

President. — The next item is the communication from the Commission on action taken on the opinions and resolutions of the European Parliament².

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) During the last part-session reference was repeatedly made to the procedure to be adopted for this item of the agenda. I therefore think it necessary today to draw the Assembly's attention to what I would call the third *volet* of the procedure on which Parliament and the Commission have agreed. The first *volet* is the monthly communication to Parliament on the activities the Commission has undertaken with respect to the proposals on which it has consulted Parliament, the second is the periodical report the relevant Members of the Commission make to the various parliamentary committees, and the third is the six-monthly review of all the activities on which the Commission has received information.

Our first six-monthly report appeared on 20 July. It has now been made available to the Members of Parliament in all the languages except Greek, technical factors having unfortunately prevented its translation into Greek. I feel Parliament's attention should be drawn to this document. It is not, of course, a document that should be discussed in Parliament as such, but one which might give rise, if satisfactory preparations were made, to a parliamentary debate on a matter in which Parliament has taken the initiative and on which it may feel the Commission has not acted satisfactorily.

As regards the contents, it would, of course, be impracticable for a written document to refer once again to every recommendation Parliament has made in the six months concerned. The Commission has therefore been selective, and a first selection obviously cannot be the final one. The Commission would therefore welcome constructive criticism regarding the form of this document so that it may be made to satisfy as many of Parliament's needs as possible. It should also be pointed out that this document does not, of course, refer to matters on which the Commission has already made its position clear in Parliament.

This is the document in its initial form, which will doubtlessly not be its final form. The Commission is, of course, willing to consider suggestions from Parliament for changes designed to ensure that it serves its purpose.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — (IT) I intend to address myself to the documents supplied to us by the Commission regarding action taken on the proposals from Parliament.

When the Commission, in relation to the directive on the control of trans-frontier transportation of dangerous wastes, declares that it has taken account of the majority of Parliament's amendments, in actual fact it is saying very little because we want to know in detail precisely what amendments have been accepted by the Commission.

¹ Amendments to Friday agenda — Speaking time — Deadline for tabling amendments: see Minutes.

² See Annex II.

Squarcialupi

Consequently I should like to ask the Commissioner exactly which amendments have been accepted by the Commission. As to the prospects for the approval of the directive on the movement of dangerous trans-frontier wastes, it seems that the Council has not met with too many difficulties. However, we should also like to know at this point whether the Commission can tell us something more than what emerges from the cryptic documents of the Council.

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* This is, of course, a problem that we regularly encounter. During the debate on this matter the Commission stated its opinion on a large number of amendments proposed by Parliament, and it is, of course, impracticable for a document that is subsequently submitted to include everything that the Commission has said during a debate. That would be repetition and, in my opinion, out of keeping with this procedure. I therefore believe that in this instance it was made clear during the debate in Parliament what the Commission was willing to accept and what it was not willing to accept. If anything specific had to be added to this view, it would have to appear in this document. I do not believe, Mr President, that this is the case in this instance, and the wording of the document is therefore as submitted to Parliament.

Mr Patterson (ED). — My comment is almost identical to that of Mrs Squarcialupi, but it concerns Item 6 — the report on temporary work. I was very glad indeed to see this featured in Section A which says that the Commission has accepted in whole or part the amendments put. But I would be very glad to hear from the Commissioner which parts have been accepted and which not. In this case the Commissioner during the debate after the vote said that he was unable to say at that point which amendments he accepted. Is the Commission now able to say which parts of the Parliament's report are being accepted and, in particular, has the Commission accepted the common conditions for the authorization of temporary employment businesses — an amendment which received support from all sides of the House?

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* Two months is sometimes not long enough to state precisely what the intention is. In this case the Commission is in the process of formulating its final opinion on the amendments. I cannot therefore refer to every amendment at the moment, but I can say that, as soon as the Commission's formal decision has been taken — I do not know exactly when this item will appear on the agenda, but it will be in the near future — Parliament will be fully informed which of the amendments the Commission finds acceptable.

Mr Moreland (ED). — I would like to ask the Commissioner about an item under emergency aid

granted since the last part-session, which is on page 6 of my version. Could he elaborate a bit more on the 250 000 ECU given to Argentina for displaced persons?

Can the Commission tell us who were the persons displaced and who displaced them and if the aid has gone directly to the Government of Argentina or not?

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* I have a list here which shows that in Argentina's case the sum of 250 000 ECU was made available through a private organization by the name of Ligros. In the case of Nicaragua 150 000 ECU was granted through MSF-Belgique and 100 000 ECU through Oxfam. I cannot, of course, say precisely which persons have received or will be receiving money from these organizations.

Mr Cousté (DEP). — *(FR)* I have listened with great interest to Mr Andriessen's reply to our colleague, Mr Patterson. My intervention is motivated by my belief that a period of two months for the completion of this directive on temporary employment is unrealistically short. You are aware that the House only voted 85 to 67 in favour, with 20 abstentions and that, in my opinion, the adoption of the amendments renders the text completely devoid of practical scope. I have heard from all quarters that the Commission, feeling that the amendments have so reduced the practical scope of the directive, intends to withdraw it and elaborate a new one. It is precisely because a new text would appear to be in the offing, and because the contradiction — underlined by Commissioner Richard — which exists between the means and the goals outlined with a view to harmonizing temporary employment in the 10 Member States must be reconciled, that the most expedient solution would seem to be such a new text. That is why I feel it would be wise, both for the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, and for the House, to be aware of this at the outset.

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* As I have just said, two months is sometimes too short. I agree with the honourable Member that this is the case in this instance. It is not always easy to take account of suggestions like those made by a majority of the Members of Parliament. In this case the Commission is not contemplating the withdrawal of its proposal, but it will be amending it, and as soon as it has adopted the amended version, it will inform Parliament.

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, in July Mr Andriessen advised this House that the Commission would be providing us with up-to-date cost information on the proposal ethyl alcohol regulation. I should like to know when this is actually going to be before us, having regard to the substantial increase in wine production and the reduction in wine consumption.

Hord

Secondly, will he clarify how he is going to provide non-agricultural alcohol producers with the protection they deserve, bearing in mind that the Commission's text sent to the Council did not provide any worthwhile protection for such non-agricultural alcohol producers?

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* Someone has just whispered in my ear that the letter containing the information Parliament has been promised is almost ready and will therefore be forwarded to Parliament very shortly, although I do not know exactly when. I would add that I shall do what I can to ensure that the letter contains all the information the honourable Member has requested.

Mr Eisma (NI). — *(NL)* On the Monday evening of the July part-session I asked the Commissioner if the information relevant to the first and second *volets* — to use his terminology — could not be forwarded earlier. We do not have the Commission's documents until we come in here at 5 p.m. We really ought to have them a few days earlier if we are to exercise proper control over the Commission. I repeat the request I made in July. It also seems to me that the summary way in which the Commission produces this document would justify a quicker procedure.

President. — Mr Eisma, I feel I must come in here. What we have to deal with now is the procedure agreed between Commission and Parliament. The problem as always with this kind of procedure is that, given the translations etc. that have to be done, it takes a little while before the texts reach Members. Leaving aside the special situation we have with the July-September recess, there is normally just one month, sometimes less, between two part-sessions, and it is extremely difficult to combine the two requirements of up-to-date information for Members and last-minute information on the current position. I believe the Commission does its best to achieve this and I have always greatly appreciated its efforts.

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* All I can really do is endorse what you have said. If I remember rightly, I assured the honourable Member during the July part-session that I would again make a careful check to see whether we cannot do things faster than we do them now without overlooking anything. The problem I regularly encounter in Parliament is difficult to solve. Sometimes, I will admit, we could give more information, more detailed information in the time available, but there is some pressure. All I can say is that, when we have a normal period between two of Parliament's part-sessions — the holiday period is, of course, always a month when we have more time, but then our services are far less active — I shall again make a very careful check to see if we can do anything to speed up the process while ensuring that nothing is

overlooked. Whether I can do a very great deal about this situation, I do not know, but I shall certainly make another serious attempt.

Mr Purvis (ED). — I would like to follow up Mr Hord's question to the Commissioner about the ethyl alcohol regulation. I received a letter from Commissioner Andriessen at the end of August saying that, in order to avoid disturbance to the existing market, this subsidized ethyl alcohol would either be exported outside the EEC or carburated. I would ask Mr Andriessen if he could possibly explain how these two methods will be applied without disturbing the world market. Secondly, what exactly does he mean by carburated? Does that mean burning or turning into fuel or what exactly?

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* I can imagine that fascinating subjects under this item of the agenda call for more than just information on what the Commission plans to do or has done, but also raises the question of how the Commission does what it does, whether such action is possible and what implications certain activities undertaken by the Commission have, and I believe Parliament has a right to this information. I wonder if it is not asking too much of one Commissioner to answer all these questions. If Parliament agrees, I should like to propose that I ask the Commissioner who is responsible for this area to provide Parliament's appropriate committee with more precise information on this subject and to explain how he proposes to reconcile one objective with the other. I regret that I am not able to do so at the moment.

President. — Might I then suggest to Mr Purvis that he have further contacts with the Commission so that the matter may be dealt with in the committee responsible?

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr Andriessen actually wrote this letter — that is the interesting point about it — so I thought that maybe he would be able to explain what carburated meant as a means of doing away with the problem of the competition between the two types of alcohol. I would be interested to know how he is to achieve this. He wrote the letter.

President. — It seems that you have to refer to another Commissioner for the details. The Commission is, as you know, a collegiate body.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Mr President, perhaps your observation that the Commission is a collegiate body is a good point at which to start my comments and question on Item 5 in the report on actions taken by the Commission.

My first question must be how any collegiate body can ride roughshod over the clearly expressed will of this Parliament — by a two-to-one majority — to be rid of the antique and unloved proposals contained in

Sherlock

the proposal for a directive on containers for beverages for human consumption. Enfeebled though it was as it emerged from this body, I would like to know the meaning of: 'will incorporate most of the amendments'. I would also like to know why the Commission wilfully proceeds on its course of totally ignoring this Parliament and going not for the recommendation which we sought but still for a directive. It was a two-thirds vote against this collegiate action. A two-thirds vote of no confidence in the Commission is the sort of action we should take if Parliament, as the democratic body elected to put forward the opinions of the people who elected us, continues to find its wishes ignored.

President. — Mr Sherlock, it is beautiful, but it is not a question!

Mr Sherlock (ED). — I am asking if the Commission is going to go on ignoring, Mr President.

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* If I understand him correctly, the honourable Member is not dissatisfied with the way in which the Commission has reached or has replied to the substance of the debate, but fundamentally disagrees with the Commission's view that it need not accept all the recommendations made by Parliament.

There is a basic problem here, of course, and this is not the first time that it has been discussed in this Assembly, and it will certainly not be the last. The question is whether the Commission is bound to accept every opinion Parliament expresses on a proposal it has put forward. On several occasions I have stated in this Chamber on the Commission's behalf that that is not what the Treaty requires in its present form and that, while the Commission is prepared to listen to Parliament whenever possible and in fact does so, there may come a time when the Commission feels it must act on its own responsibility and must make that view absolutely clear in Parliament. That is what has happened in this case. The Commission informed Parliament in very clear terms why it felt that it could agree to a large proportion, a very large proportion of the suggestions made but could not accept some of them.

That, then, is the bone of contention between Parliament and the Commission. The Commission felt it had to act on its own responsibility, and it is for Parliament to express its opinion, but to claim that the Commission totally ignores Parliament, as I think I heard the honourable Member say, seems exaggerated to me when you consider how far the Commission has gone in this case to take account of Parliament's suggestions.

Mr G. Fuchs (S). — *(FR)* My question to the Commission concerns its comments on the Blumenfeld report which, as you will no doubt recall, provided for the setting up of a new Community

instrument to combat unfair commercial practices from third countries.

However, the Commission, while viewing the amendments in a very favourable light — which I welcome — does not, in contrast to its remarks on the other points, set a timetable nor does it indicate the follow-up action it intends to take on this proposal before the Council.

I would, therefore like to know what action is envisaged in this area and when the Commission foresees the completion of its own proposal?

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* The specific question put by the honourable Member that I have to answer at the moment concerns the time when the Commission intends to keep its promise to incorporate the very many ideas contained in Mr Blumenfeld's report and approved by Parliament. This will, of course, be done in accordance with the timetable adopted for this regulation, but I cannot give an exact date and, with the honourable Member's approval, I would therefore prefer to answer his question in writing.

Mrs Tove Nielsen (L). — *(DA)* I have a question to the Commission concerning the report on the directive relating to the annual accounts of banks and other financial institutions. What is the meaning of the cryptic observation that the Commission will be formulating an amended proposal which will take account of proposals already approved? I seem to recall that it was Amendment No 19 in particular that the Commission did not want to accept. This has to do with the provisions governing the valuation of securities. Both the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and the Legal Affairs Committee debated the issue most convincingly, only to be met by a Commission statement that resulted in the amendment being withdrawn. Finally — and this is what impresses me most — an overwhelming majority of Parliament voted for Amendment No 19, which provides for the valuation of securities at the market value at the end of the year. I remember saying, Mr Commissioner, that we would not let the Commission forget what we had decided. Do the cryptic remarks made by the Commission today signify that Parliament's overwhelming opinion in this matter has now been accepted? I hope so, for this would mean that the Commission really does take Parliament seriously.

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — The Vayssade report has been going on for some time and there has I think been a very productive exchange between the Parliament and the Commission on the subject, as a result of which the Commission has — as I think you know — adjusted its position quite significantly. If I could remind the House, we have agreed to Amendments Nos 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 17, 18, 21 and 23 which is a fairly substantial number. We remain of the view that Amendments Nos 1, 20,

Tugendhat

22 and 24 create difficulties and we also feel that there are problems over the amendments concerning valuation of securities which is I know still supported by Mrs Nielsen.

We are now in the process of producing a revised proposal taking into account the views expressed by Parliament and I would only remind the House of two other things. One is the necessity of making sure that our proposal is practical in terms of the industry concerned, namely in this case of course the financial industry, and secondly the necessity of maintaining coherence between what we are doing in this field for banks and financial institutions and what we are doing in the field of company law generally.

6. *Votes*¹

IN THE CHAIR : MR KLEPSCH

*Vice-President*7. *Sale of Christmas butter*

President. — The next item on the agenda is the report (Doc. 1-604/83), drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on compliance with the principles of sound financial management in respect of sales of reduced-price Christmas butter.

Mr Aigner (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report on a new form of Christmas butter sales was adopted unanimously by the Committee on Budgetary Control. Given that it is an extrapolation of Parliament's 1982 recommendation I feel I may look forward to its adoption in the House by a large majority, if not unanimously. The report has unfortunately been dramatically overtaken by the surplus butter production in the interval. Intervention stocks have now reached almost 800 000 tonnes. I believe the facts are known: increased production, reduction of domestic consumption, the drastic curtailment of the world market outlets, and the anticipated stronger competition on world markets by the United States, which is already making itself felt.

These facts illustrate, hopefully, to all those responsible, that the Community can no longer postpone a reduction in butter production. The Council of Ministers of Agriculture is now reaping the fruit of its abject failure over the past years. If it had mustered a timely response to the recommendations we made years ago the appropriate corrective measures would have spared our farmers from such a thrashing. Quite apart from this development we are now faced with the necessity of disposing of these stockpiles of butter and dried milk. An attempt to dispose of 800 000 tonnes of

butter on the world market all at once would result in an immediate price catastrophe. As a result the Commission must make every effort to stimulate domestic butter consumption as well. One such measure in the past has been the resort to the so-called Christmas butter campaign. The questions, therefore, to which we must provide an answer are as follows: 'Was the Christmas butter campaign useful?' 'Was it an optimal procedure' and 'Can it once again be financed under the circumstances prevailing today?' The Commission's Document on the Stuttgart Mandate gave a negative response. It felt that the positive effect remained to be proven and that the costs involved were too high.

I personally believe the Commission to have proceeded from two false premises. Firstly, previous Christmas butter campaigns were successful. This is erroneous. Secondly the costs involved far outstrip those associated with a disposal on the world market. Such an opinion is, as confirmed unanimously by the members of the Committee on Budgetary Control, more than superficial. The Commission would surely not deny that the last Christmas butter campaign got under way far too late and was backed up by insufficient advertising and that Parliament's recommendation for a new model was simply cast aside. Under the previous procedure the subsidy was simply passed on to the consumer without, however, leading to any appreciable increase in consumption. Now, however, the cost of the disposal of an additional tonne under the Christmas butter campaign depends also on the export rebate for the additional quantity disposed of.

Parliament's recommendation has a dual objective. For every kilo of butter sold across the counter at the usual price, the consumer receives a pound of butter free of charge. This means that, irrespective of the quantity disposed of, the subsidy risk is confined to one-third. If, for example, 100 000 additional tonnes were disposed of, not more than 33 % would have been subsidized. Such a formula is applicable irrespective of quantity.

Such a correlation has the effect of relieving world market disposal, and the associated costs thereof, in two ways *vis-à-vis* the free butter. For comparative purposes let us make a simple calculation. Commissioner Tugendhat, in the event of your opposing this Christmas butter campaign you will have to refute this calculation. The gross cost of 100 000 tonnes of butter is approximately 350 million ECU. From this one must deduct the costs of storage for say, only 6 months i.e. approximately 50 million ECU. The export rebates which have been saved amount to some 150 million ECU and to this must be added a saving in the export rebates as a result of the world market stability thus achieved. I would take the modest sum of 10%. As you are aware, Commissioner Tugendhat, the additional U.S. cereal sales to Egypt were sufficient to generate a fall in world market prices of 30%.

¹ See Annex I.

Aigner

I shall take, for purposes of illustration, only 10%. This means that of the 350 million ECU gross costs associated with 100 000 tonnes of butter some 260 million ECU must be deducted. A ratio of 1 to 2 gives a saving of 260 million ECU. When we multiply this by 3 we arrive at 780 million ECU. Even if I were to accept the argument that the housewife would take full advantage of the offer to constitute a stock of butter, thereby purchasing less subsequently, reducing the real incremental consumption to a factor of 1 to 1, the end result of such a Christmas butter operation for the domestic market would be a saving of at least 50-70 million ECU when compared with the export option in the present situation. I have forwarded a copy of this calculation to the Commissioners and I hope that, this time at least, it will be appraised and suitably commented upon.

The responsible Commission officials who assisted at the deliberations of the Committee on Budgetary Control and who addressed our meeting were at a loss to find a single reasonable justification for the Commission's negative attitude last year. Packaging problems were raised, as though it would matter if the butter were packaged in the normal way, or in Christmas paper, with a revenue stamp, as is possible with cigarette packaging. So where are the problems here? We were not provided with an answer.

A further objection was raised to the effect that some of the Member States would be confronted with legal barriers, given that their legislation forbids any linkage between free gifts and the purchase of an article. To which I would retort that the consumer is entirely at liberty to purchase at the usual price. He merely has to forego the free gift. After all, there is no obligation to accept a gift. Furthermore, if need be, Community law would take precedence over national laws, thus invalidating this unsound argument.

In reality there are but two objections; the principal objection raised by the Commission is, I believe, the fact that it has never been done before, that it has not hitherto cropped up. It is of course a strange state of affairs when, in attempting to come up with a novel idea, one is not even allowed flexibility with regard to the timing of the proposed campaign. The second objection which does not seem to be disregarded, by the powers that be, in the Commission — I refer to the disposal of margarine — is perhaps no longer possible on this scale and with the same degree of spontaneity and, more especially, the dealer's windfall profits are no longer possible to the same degree when one's financial room for manoeuvre on disintegrating world market prices has been cut from 800 000 dollars to, say, 400 000 dollars. These two arguments ought to be devoid of relevance as far as the Commission is concerned. Both this House last year and the Committee on Budgetary Control considered them to be unsound. Intervention stocks of butter have now reached 800 000 tonnes. Whether

they are disposed of on the world or domestic market the competition with the margarine industry will still be the same. The 800 000 tonnes of butter now have to compete with substitute products.

To recapitulate, the Christmas butter campaign, in the form proposed by us for the past two years was in our opinion, and on the basis of our calculations for last year by no means more expensive than the disposal by export and would most certainly, in the drastically altered situation which has come about on world markets in the interval, be cheaper.

I therefore appeal to the Commission to take a stand on the matter and to the House to emulate the voting pattern on this report in committee by adopting it unanimously.

Mr Wettig (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control, and rapporteur, has just spoken of 800 000 tonnes of butter in storage. If I may, I should like to correct that figure for, in the interval, such stocks have almost reached one million tonnes, given that the rapporteur forgot to include the butter in private storage. Such quantities indicate that storage possibilities in the Community have now almost attained their limit, that we shall be faced with serious storage bottlenecks in the next few months should we fail to dispose of more butter than has hitherto been the case. There are but two ways of disposing of additional quantities of butter: either on world markets — and the rapporteur has illustrated the current state of world markets, on which it is to all intents and purposes no longer possible to dispose of large quantities — or alternatively one embarks on an emergency campaign in an effort to dispose of the stocks on the domestic Community market.

There is an underlying current in the report which I would like, on behalf of my group, to contradict. Such emergency campaigns must never become institutionalized for we already have a situation in the Community in which every other kilo of butter has to be subsidized out of the Community budget. This is certainly not a healthy state of affairs but rather one which highlights the need for overhauling the common agricultural policy.

An analysis of the interests involved has always come down in favour of the disposal option which spared the budget most! The Community budget will certainly be most alleviated by having recourse to world market disposal. Secondly — and somewhat thinly veiled — the question arose as to the optimal disposal method as far as the national balances of payments were concerned. The only solution in this context is a stronger butter disposal campaign on world markets and less reliance on domestic Community disposal campaigns. The export option, however, gives rise to the reservation that economic resources are also being exported, to the extent that the

Wettig

consumer price in the importing country has been subsidized. This begets the question as to whether one cannot equally do something for the Community consumer.

When one has gifts to distribute, what better recipient than oneself. This is, without doubt, a viable proposition in the context of the Christmas butter campaign. A prerequisite is, needless to say, that the entire campaign is carried out efficiently, free of bureaucratic obstacles, as was the case last year in the Federal Republic. On behalf of my group I shall refrain from approving the individual recommendations of the Committee on Budgetary Control — there will certainly be other opportunities — but I must formally emphasize that this operation must be organized along efficient lines. A vote by us in favour of this report must not be perceived as a change in our criticism of the common agricultural policy. Our approval must be seen as confirmation of the need for the constantly postponed reform of the CAP with a view to ending once and for all the dissipation associated with surplus disposal on world markets and other expensive disposal campaigns.

Mr Edward Kellett-Bowman (ED). — Mr President, I do not think that either this House or the Commission should regard this as an attempt by the Budgetary Control Committee to reform the CAP by another means. That is going to be a long negotiation extending over the months and possibly over the years ahead. This report, on which I would like to congratulate Mr Aigner, is a small initiative on the part of the Budgetary Control Committee. The fact is that the stocks are there, butter in store does perish, and these stocks are continuing to be an embarrassment to the Community.

This report is an attempt to push the Commission into a new initiative in marketing exercise. Limited price-cutting in the past — the Christmas butter idea — just has not really worked: it has not increased consumption. The housewife just buys the extra when the price is low and pops it into the refrigerator, and consumption just has not gone up at all. In fact, there has been a side-effect which has done us harm. We have advertised the fact that there is Christmas butter, but it has not arrived in the shops. It has got stuck somewhere in the channels of distribution, and that has not helped. A very bad piece of publicity for us. But, if the housewife can buy half a kilo and then get a quarter of a kilo, or buy a kilo and get half a kilo, free, that might well stimulate her to make additional use of butter in the running of her household. If she thinks that it is free, I think this might well come about. If consumption rises — and I believe there is a chance that this will happen — it will be a success for the Community.

I hope that the House will support Mr Aigner's initiative, coming from the Budgetary Control Committee, and I hope the Commission is listening and will

adopt the suggestion. It is worthwhile trying something new, and I do not believe it should be said about the Community that they are not prepared to try something new: I think they should look at marketing as practised by the international corporations and try a bit of it themselves. I support the report.

Mr Adamou (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, with their highly developed dairy farming methods, the northern countries of the Community have created huge reserves of milk and butter, which naturally enough they are trying to get rid of. Unfortunately, the importing of dairy products will not serve the interests either of the Greek dairy farming industry, or of Greek consumers. Greek dairy farming is exceptionally weak, lacking in infrastructure, and instead of becoming more developed, it is becoming still weaker year after year. It is quite clear that the Greek market, which is today flooded with powdered milk and cheeses coming from the Community — while Greek cheeses remain unsold — will sustain a crushing blow if it has to face competition from the Community in dairy products.

For this reason we propose that before any dairy products are imported into Greece, the EEC should buy up and dispose of the Greek dairy products, and only when consumer demand is left unsatisfied should the requisite imports take place. So you see, there will always be a need for protectionistic provisions to apply in the case of Greece owing to her underdeveloped economy. As for the Greek consumers, in the long term they will suffer because when the Greek dairy farming industry disappears they will become totally dependent on foreign dairy production, which will no doubt exploit the situation with a will. Thus, our position is quite clear. No imports until Greek reserves have been exhausted.

Mr Delatte (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Aigner report was originally scheduled to be debated on Thursday and I am at a loss to see why he has just requested the House to bring it forward to today's agenda, for the Committee on Agriculture was to have delivered an opinion to the Committee on Budgetary Control. Given that the former meets only tomorrow morning a pronouncement on the matter and a subsequent opinion to the Committee on Budgetary Control has now been precluded. Consequently I would reiterate my astonishment at Mr Aigner's haste. The fact that this problem is not the exclusive domain of the Committee on Budgetary Control provides yet a further reason for astonishment. It has to do with agriculture but also with farmers and dairy producers who are so often indicted for the cost of the CAP — the cost incurred in disposing of dairy produce.

What is the issue here? On behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, Mr Aigner is suggesting an additional subsidization of Christmas butter in an

Delatte

effort to dispose of the surpluses. Whilst the idea would appear to be a good one at first sight, the results are quite disappointing when viewed in the light of past experience and in the context of the Christmas butter sales at the end of 1982. The Aigner report estimates the cost of that operation at 150 million ECU. It reveals that the scheme facilitated the disposal of 30 000 tonnes of additional butter. In the light of questions I submitted to the Commission I feel I shall have to correct this figure for they have informed me that it is very difficult to estimate additional consumption, given the tendency of consumers to stockpile. The Commission feels that the figure of 30 000 tonnes ought to be revised downwards to 25 000 tonnes to arrive at an estimate for surplus butter disposal under the 1982 Christmas butter scheme.

I therefore consider that the result attained is a very poor one and one to which I would draw the attention of our colleagues on the Committee on Budgets, for 150 million ECU to dispose of 25 000 tonnes of surplus butter works out at exactly 6 000 ECU per tonne of surplus butter. However, the intervention price is only 3 500 ECU per tonne. In essence this means that we have paid double the price for the Christmas butter than the value of the butter itself. As such I cannot imagine that we can support the idea of Christmas butter sales. If we want to subsidize the consumer then let us go right ahead, but this time let us explain why and let us ensure that the cost is not, under any circumstances, borne by the EAGGF budget.

Mr Mouchel (DEP). — *(FR)* Mr President, very briefly, I echo the sentiments just expressed by our colleague, Mr Delatte, and I would add that if the Christmas butter scheme is to be considered as agricultural expenditure I would be vigorously opposed to it. In reality the scheme serves no purpose at all as far as disposal of surplus stocks is concerned. If, however, one wishes to give the consumer a present and debit the expenditure to another budgetary heading, then let's go ahead and do it.

I personally believe that we could put the Community's money to better use than by providing presents of this kind. If anyone has an alternative scheme for disposing of surplus stocks they should expound it. I, for one, remain convinced that the Christmas butter scheme is a sheer loss-making present to the consumer, and one which does nothing to relieve the markets.

Mr Paisley (NI). — Mr President, I rise to support wholeheartedly the resolution before the House. We are indebted to Mr Aigner and his committee for preparing this report and resolution and for their successful action in having them debated here tonight.

I speak as a Member representing Northern Ireland, but my arguments will be appropriate to the whole

Community. The elderly need this proposal. Through this measure, a very gloomy Christmas can have something of comfort and help. Out of a population of 1.5 million, Northern Ireland has one of the largest percentages of elderly in the Community — more than 178 000. 71 000 men and 107 000 women. Every country in this Community is plagued by grave unemployment. Those families suffering from that demoralizing blight can indeed have some little relief over the Christmas period. The extra butter made available under these proposals will mean that half as much again of what is purchased will be given free.

In Northern Ireland we have the largest percentage of unemployed in the Community, our average being 21 %, compared with a Community average of 10 %. Furthermore, in Northern Ireland, 100 000 heads of families are in receipt of supplementary benefits because their earnings are below the breadline while 11 000 families earn so little that their wages have to be topped up by family income supplements.

Add to the elderly and unemployed the sick and you have another category of needy to which this free butter will be most beneficial. The whole Community, right across the board, will have this butter available to them. In my opinion they are more entitled to it than certain people outside this Community, for example the people of Russia. If anyone is entitled to benefit from the Community's surpluses, surely it should be the Community's own taxpayers and consumers.

The question of timing is important and I am glad that the resolution underscores this vital point.

The butter must also be appropriately wrapped so that those who receive it know its source.

I trust this House will adopt the resolution.

Mr Marck (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, on behalf of the PPE I should like to express my full support for Mr Aigner's resolution and also my surprise at the Commission's announcement to the Council that it does not intend to have a Christmas butter campaign this year.

The Commission has said that the last butter campaign did not come up to expectations and that all the parties involved, including the dairy industry, were opposed to the idea. And yet the provisional statement on the last campaign, of which the Commission also has a copy, proves the opposite. The reaction of the parties concerned differs from one country to another. But what is striking is that in countries where butter consumption is relatively low, the results are very favourable, in both the short and the long term. And I think that is very important. Although the results achieved in France and Britain are somewhat less satisfactory than might be expected from the reactions of our British and French colleagues, the provisional statement shows a permanent increase in the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, Italy and Ireland. All the countries regret that the campaign was launched so late and that adequate preparations could

Marck

not therefore be made. If it is now decided that there should be a new campaign, it will be successful if account is also taken of distinctions made in the various countries.

I should like to compliment Mr Aigner very sincerely on his perseverance, because this is not the first time that he has come forward with a proposal of this kind. I hope that this one will be successful. It is a novel proposal, and it will appeal to the imagination of the European consumer and taxpayer at a time when large sums are having to be spent to get rid of butter surpluses.

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, may I say first of all that I support this initiative by the Committee on Budgetary Control, for which Mr Aigner is rapporteur. It is perhaps pertinent that this particular initiative emanates from Parliament's Committee on Budgetary Control, the committee which is concerned with value for money so far as the taxpayer is concerned. That committee is quite clearly concerned at the way in which the cost of the agricultural policy has risen to a point where we must say *no more*. I think that we must give full marks to the Committee on Budgetary Control for coming forward with initiatives to tell the Community how to deal with a serious problem.

We must be in the record breaking business this evening. Mr Aigner talks about 800 000 tonnes of surplus butter. Mr Wettig talks in terms of a million tonnes. We already know that there are 1.2 million tonnes of dried milk. Whatever the actual figures are, we know that the biggest ever butter mountain is with us today. Still consumption goes down. Milk production goes up, but the Commission continues to go on procrastinating. I say three cheers to Mr Aigner and his committee for this initiative.

Then we have people like Mr Delatte who will pour cold water on the idea and say that we did not get rid of 30 000 tonnes; it was only 25 000 tonnes. Who is Mr Delatte to lecture us on this initiative when it is the people he represents that are producing all the milk and all the butter? When are Mr Delatte and people like him going to tell us of a solution to this problem, because it is the farmers and the shortcomings of the common agricultural policy that are causing this great problem?

If we are anything in this House, we must act on behalf of the taxpayers of Europe. We want them to get a fair deal, and in that situation I believe that this is a proposal which warrants the wholehearted support of this House. I hope that we shall be talking in the near future, Mr President, of some worthwhile proposals for the reform of the common agricultural policy. If this debate does one thing this evening, it does confirm the seriousness of the surplus situation. Action is vital. Crash action is what we need. I sincerely look forward to the Commissioner's

response to this debate, not only in order to hear that he and the Commission as a whole will support the proposal but also to hear what other suggestions the Commission has in regard to reducing this mammoth and record dairy surplus.

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, as Mr Delatte — to whose speech I shall be referring several times — said at the outset of his remarks, it had originally been intended that this proposal should come before the House on Thursday, and the Commission has been working on that assumption. If it had come before the House on Thursday, then my colleague, Mr Dalsager, would have been here and we should have been able to provide an answer in a good deal more detail than is the case today, when I am responding rather on the spur of the moment — as I think the House will understand. Though what I say will certainly go down the same road as my colleague, it will be backed up with fewer figures.

I listened with great interest to what Mr Aigner said because, as a number of speakers have made clear — particularly Mr Hord in his intervention at the very end — the surplus problem is now extremely serious and it is therefore right that everybody who is concerned with the Community — not just with the financial side of the Community but with the Community as such — should be looking for ways of reducing the surplus and reducing the cost of that surplus to the taxpayer.

What is more, the idea that Mr Aigner and his committee have put forward is, as a number of people have indicated — I think this was a point in Mr Marck's speech — an idea that obviously has a good many attractive political features to it. What could be better for the Community's image certainly than to be able to provide the housewife with a commodity which she has to buy every week, in some cases almost every day, free of charge? It would be a very attractive thing to be able to do.

Politically, therefore, I wish very much that I could go along with what Mr Aigner said. Unfortunately, I cannot. Let me say that bluntly at this stage in my speech. Indeed, I have to point out that there is a certain irony in the fact that the House has rushed this attractive proposal forward, while consideration of the supplementary budget has been postponed until next part-session. There is no secret in the fact that the Commission is operating right up against the limits of the money that is available for the common agricultural policy this year, and if the supplementary budget is not passed during October we shall find ourselves unable to discharge our normal obligations, let alone take on new obligations. I think — if I might say so with great respect — that it would have been more logical to take steps towards providing the money before this proposal was brought forward.

Tugendhat

In terms of the proposal itself, despite Mr Hord's rebukes to Mr Delatte, I thought Mr Delatte hit the nail fairly firmly on the head and, in part of his speech, Mr Wettig did so as well. Mr Delatte drew our attention to the unhappy fact — I am sure that he finds it an unhappy fact as well as I do that in the past these attractive schemes for disposing of butter on the internal market have not proved very effective. The fact of the matter is that, as the economists say, the market for butter is not a very elastic one. There is a limit to the amount of butter that most households are either capable or desirous of consuming, and that if you provide some free or at a reduced price, it tends simply to displace purchases that would otherwise have been made. I fear that the hard home truths that Mr Delatte laid before the House are indeed hard home truths and there is no getting round them. Mr Wettig at one point drew attention to the economics of this and then went on to say that it would be an attractive thing to do. It would be an attractive thing to do but it would also be a very expensive thing to do. I understand Mr Kellett-Bowman's point that one should be imaginative in looking for ways of disposing of a surplus commodity. I have no objection to this advice that we should see how international companies would behave in the same situation. I am sure that one thing international companies would not do would be to embark on a campaign which was preordained at the outset to lose a very substantial sum of money. As I said, I am having to speak with rather less preparation than I would have wished, but according to our preliminary estimates, the average cost of this proposal might well be as much as four times as expensive as disposing of the surplus butter on export markets. This, in the present state of the Community's budget, is clearly a factor which has to weigh very heavily with us.

I see Mr Aigner indicating his disagreement. I do not want to appear to have a closed mind, and I think it would be right for the Commission to consider any evidence that can be laid before us as to how one really could increase the consumption of butter within the budgetary limits which we have. I am reminded of that rather wise phrase of a well-known American economist called Milton Friedman, who said that there is no such thing as a free lunch. My experience is that he is right on that point. I do not agree with him in everything — far from it — but I think he is right when he says there is no such thing as a free lunch and there is usually no such thing as a free political initiative. That is the difficulty which we face with this proposal.

Mr Aigner was absolutely right when he said at the beginning of his remarks that this situation of the enormous surplus should never have been allowed to arise. I entirely share the desire that almost every speaker expressed — and those who did not, I think, meant to — to be able to provide cheaper butter to our own citizens. The problem, as Milton Friedman's

eloquent phrase so vividly demonstrates, is that it is very difficult to have cheaper butter when one has higher prices. That is the nub of the matter. The surplus flows from the price levels that have been set, and if one is to provide cheaper butter with higher prices, one is bound to have to spend a certain amount of money in subsidizing it.

I said at the beginning that I think everybody who is concerned with the conduct of the common agricultural policy, with the conduct of the budget and with the conduct of the Community as such must be concerned about the problem to which Mr Aigner has drawn attention — the subject of this debate. It is right that not only this Parliament but individual committees should bring forward ideas to try and deal with the problem. I shall certainly transmit what has been said to my colleagues. We would welcome an opportunity to study the matter, but for the reasons that I have described, I cannot hold out a great deal of hope that, in its present form, this idea could be accepted.

Mr Aigner (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, the Committee on Budgetary Control is neither the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment nor the Committee on Agriculture. Its only term of reference was that of investigating the most economical way of disposing of 800 000 tonnes of butter with regard to Community finances. The statements made by Mr Delatte and Commissioner Tugendhat remind me of two blind men confirming each other's visual powers! They simply glossed over the figures presented by our committee.

Commissioner Tugendhat, allow me to reiterate those figures. The cost of 100 000 tonnes of free butter is 350 000 ECU with no strings attached. If, however, one eschews the world market option and links 200 000 tonnes of butter at the usual price to the 100 000 tonnes of free butter one can save the export rebates on 200 000 tonnes — and I am not speaking of 300 000 tonnes — while simultaneously saving both storage and deterioration costs. Just try, in the prevailing world market situation, to dispose of 800 000 tonnes of butter on world markets and you will see what will happen to world market prices! This means that with such a calculation, Mr President ... allow me, if you would be so kind, to demonstrate it once more for I find myself having to coach some individuals ...

(The President urged the speaker to conclude)

Allow me, on behalf of my group, to request a roll-call vote. Mr President, you announced at the outset that we would take a vote at the end of this debate.

President. — Here we have a slight problem. The 12 amendments have only just been translated into all

President

the languages. If then there are any objections from the House against an immediate vote, I cannot oppose them. We shall therefore close the debate and the vote will take place on Wednesday after the vote on the institutional resolution.

8. Mountain and hill farming (continuation)

President. — The next item on the agenda is the continuation of the debate on the report (Doc. 1-444/83) by Mr Wettig¹.

Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE). — (*GR*) Mr President, fellow members, I am very pleased that today a plenary sitting of our parliament is being devoted to this subject, i.e. to the Council directive concerning the Community's financial assistance for farmers in mountainous and disadvantaged regions.

Of course, the report is being presented on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, and we certainly have no objections in principle. However, since Mr Wettig, who has drawn up a remarkable report, was unaware of certain facts concerning my country, Greece, let me tell you that very substantial problems exist not just for Greece but for other countries as well, because large sections of the agricultural population have to produce their products, be they agricultural or dairy, under extremely unfavourable conditions, with high production costs and on very small holdings. This creates special problems.

In the light of the fact — which the report itself also mentions — that as a Community we must make an effort to maintain the agricultural populations in these disadvantaged regions, and at the same time to achieve some degree of regional development and a supplementary income for farmers in such mountain and island disadvantaged regions, I ask the Vice-President of the Commission and Commissioner responsible for the budget now present, to see that grants relating to these truly disadvantaged categories of farmers are increased, since they deserve every possible material and moral support.

Mr Kyrkos (COM). — (*GR*) Mr President, we shall vote in favour of Mr Wettig's report even though we do not entirely agree with it. We shall support it because it acknowledges the need for a reorientation of the organizational policy on agriculture, and within this framework it proposes special measures for agriculture in mountainous and difficult regions. At the same time, it recognizes the need for Community intervention in my country, where there are special organizational problems in agriculture, the need for this policy to be coordinated with the regional policy so as to achieve the greatest possible impact on behalf of disadvantaged regions, and it stresses the need for integrated regional development plans that will ensure autonomous regional development.

However, I would like to make one point of disagreement clear. This concerns the reason why directives on the reorganization of agriculture have not proved very fruitful. In our opinion, Mr President, the criteria they imposed were so strict that they made it impossible for many producers to qualify for any plan for the development of their activity. It must be made clear that each of our countries, separately, faces its own specific problems. Directives for the reorganization of agriculture should take account of precisely such individual differences, and be adapted to the needs of each country.

The directive we are considering envisaged support for farmers operating on 3 or more hectares. Mr President, this would bar at least half of Greece's agricultural population from any plan to assist the development of its activities and to encourage it to remain in agricultural regions. That is why the Committee was obliged to reduce the extent of individual smallholdings to two hectares in the case of Greece, but we think this limit is still too high. We propose that there should be no limit at all. We cannot understand why a farmer, who rents land for grazing his cattle and for producing animal feed, should be excluded from any kind of assistance.

Subject to these reservations, and some others I could mention, but for which I just do not have the time, we shall vote in favour of the report.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (*GR*) Mr President, we have many reservations about the proposals in the Wettig report, especially in relation to our own country.

In Greece there are many mountainous and disadvantaged regions, in which agriculture is extremely hard-pressed. Consequently, limiting the compensatory allowances to farmers who cultivate two hectares or more will leave most of them uncovered. We therefore propose that the two-hectare limit should be abolished, and that compensatory allowances should be paid generally to any farmer who wishes to secure a certain income by developing cattle-breeding, particularly goats and sheep. We must stress that cattle-breeding in Greece is so underdeveloped, so lacking in even the most rudimentary infrastructure, that it faces the threat of extinction; a danger that is becoming greater by the day because of the high volume of imports of cheaper dairy products from other Member States of the Community. For this reason, not only should the compensatory allowances be extended to all farmers in the mountainous and less-favoured regions of our country, but the proportion contributed by the Community should be increased from 50% to 75% of the total expenditure. Moreover, subsidies for the production of animal feeds should be extended.

Firstly because, as a result of the drought this year, cattlebreeders were forced to feed their animals with

¹ See debates of 8. 7. 1983.

Adamou

animal feeds even during the summer months. Secondly, because animal feeds have become much more expensive.

Mr President, I should like to take this opportunity to stress the critical situation that Greek farmers are facing today within the Community. This situation is likely to deteriorate as a result of the impending organizational changes to the Community's agricultural policy.

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, there is still a lot of business to get through in the time remaining and therefore I shall be brief. Again, this is something where perhaps my colleague would be more appropriate than myself. But as this is from the budgetary control I am happy to be able to answer on behalf of the Commission and indeed to note that the Committee on Budgetary Control has found a significant improvement in the monitoring of the implementation of Directive 75/268.

I feel that in describing the situation at the launching stage, the report goes a little far when it says, and I quote here: 'The method of calculation being so imprecise that the number of beneficiaries has increased substantially'. This is not confirmed by inspections on the spot carried out by Commission staff in the Member States. When one says, Mr President, that the objectives are defined very vaguely, which is also an opinion that the Commission cannot fully share, one should not, I think, forget that the directive itself specifies the instruments and measures to be applied by the Member States with absolute clarity.

Moreover, with regard to the implementing provisions, no major differences are to be found concerning the purpose of the directive. Naturally the directive leaves the Member States a certain latitude. This was intentional and is necessary in view of the fact that situations vary very considerably, even among less-favoured areas.

The draft resolution also speaks of the directive's different aims. It must, however, be said that it does not come out clearly enough on what exactly the aims are that are involved. The directive has indeed only one aim: that is, it defines the special system of aids. This aim is to ensure the continuation of farming in areas where permanent natural handicaps exist. It is for this reason that specific aids are granted corresponding to the higher costs of production resulting from those permanent natural handicaps.

With this as its goal, the directive helps to maintain a minimum population level and, of course, it helps to conserve the countryside.

Naturally, Mr President, the Commission wants to take every opportunity to amend the directive where this can give better results and to make the measures more effective. In this connection, I would remind the

House of the amendments proposed by the Commission and adopted by the Council in 1980 for an increase in the compensatory allowance and in the refund rates for Ireland and for Italy.

President. — The debate is closed.

*Vote*¹

9. Budget

President. — The next item on the agenda is the submission by the Council of draft supplementary and amending budget No 2 of the European Communities for the financial year 1983 and the draft general budget of the European Communities for financial year 1984.

Mr Pottakis, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers. — (GR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I feel greatly honoured to be presenting the draft general budget of the Community for 1984 — the framework within which the Community will pursue its activities in the coming year — and with it draft supplementary budget No 2 for 1983.

I also feel a special sense of honour to be a part of this movement, the platform for a profoundly democratic institution in which free speech and a plurality of opinions reflect the facts in almost every possible light and result in a synthesis of the contrasts that form the very substance of democracy.

The period in which the budget is being debated is not one of serene and cloudless perspectives.

All over the world there has spread a climate of uncertainty and crisis, which affects every country and has direct consequences for every institution, be it economic, social or political.

In the economic sector the high levels of unemployment and the high inflation persisting in many countries, the recession, interest rates and unforeseeable fluctuations of exchange rates, Third World debt, the decline in international trade and the protectionism that goes with it, set the scene and define the parameters within which the situation evolves and in the face of which peoples and their political leadership are struggling to emerge from the crisis.

Relations between North and South are characterized by the contrast between accumulation of wealth-creating potential in the North and lack of consumer potential in the South, resulting in retarded development and stagnation in the South, with a parallel persistence of recession and unemployment in the North.

East-West relations alternate between periods of cooperation and phases of tension, which quite apart from their causes, do not make it easier to emerge from the recession.

¹ See Annex I.

Pottakis

In the relations between North and North, i.e. between the European Community and the United States and Japan, unsteady exchange rates and high real interest rates on the one hand, and on the other hand the threat faced by Community markets from a multitude of goods backed by aggressive foreign trading politics combined with the simultaneous protection of internal markets, place great obstacles in the way of the Community countries' wish for economic recovery.

In the relations between North and South, the gap between countries that produce oil and those that do not is widening, though it is hardly possible to envy the fate of some of the former. The foreign debt of many countries is growing, their consumer potential is decreasing, the sum total of their exports cannot cover their interest payments, and the instability is consequently intensified more and more.

It is under these conditions that the Community is seeking its own identity and sketching in the features of its own personality.

The road from Stuttgart to Athens will perhaps mark the beginning of a reorientation of the Community in facing the challenges of our times and fulfilling the vision of its creators, but also in the light of the needs generated by present-day realities.

Targets such as the equalization of economic development levels in Member States, and measures such as increased own resources and adaptation of common policies are being debated energetically, and the vision of developing the Common Market into a true Community is seeking a realistic foundation.

With a high sense of responsibility, and mindful of the limitations arising from the gap between wishful thinking and what is in fact possible, Council, having heard the Commission's proposals and the views expressed by Parliament, has drawn up and now places before you the draft general budget for 1984 and draft supplementary budget No 2 for 1983. These drafts are based essentially on the rules in force, on the agreements, and on the need to honour all the obligations assumed by virtue of previous agreements and to adapt the financial provisions to economic developments and to the priorities.

The general budget for 1984 is necessarily linked to present-day financial realities. Allowance is made for coping with possible new decisions by making the necessary adaptations and adjustments, though of course this can only be evaluated after a change in the conditions prevailing today. Present own resources are the only means available for fulfilling the aims defined by all the institutional organs, namely :

— so far as agricultural policy is concerned, exercise of the most effective possible monitoring of expenditure, without in any way threatening the basic existence of the CAP,

— in respect of new policies, finding the necessary economic means for their support,

— and finally, securing a better and fairer financial balance.

As for the revenues making up the budget, available revenues for the 1984 budget are restricted by the upper limit of 1 % of VAT and by the unfortunate fact that we are now very close to this upper limit.

Council reached the conclusion that the most realistic estimates of available resources for 1984 amount to 25 billion 444 million ECU.

On this point, I want to make it clear that the method of estimating available resources adopted by Council is absolutely identical to the estimating methods used by the Member States for their own national budgets, and that the resultant estimate is in any case lower than those used by the Commission.

So far as budget expenditures are concerned, the total arrived at is made up as follows :

1. For the EAGGF there are total payment appropriations amounting to 16.5 billion ECU, from which 16.25 billion ECU are distributed between the corresponding codes, while 250 million ECU have been allocated under Chapter 100, to make up a contingency fund for meeting future unforeseen expenditures.
2. For the Regional Development Fund, being conscious of the need for continued efforts through the medium of this fund towards reducing regional inequalities between the territories and countries in the Community, and within the present-day financial framework, Council has approved payment appropriations of 1.3 billion ECU and commitment appropriations of 2 billion ECU.
3. For the Social Fund, Council has approved total payment appropriations amounting to 1.420 billion ECU, comprising 1.1 billion ECU of new appropriations under the corresponding code number, and 320 millions unused balance from the budget for 1983, which are transferred to 1984. Furthermore, appropriations have been approved for the assumption of commitments on behalf of the Social Fund, amounting to 1.7 billion ECU. In parallel with the appropriations for the Social Fund itself, in anticipation of forthcoming decisions Council has set aside reserves of 50 million ECU under Chapter 100 for reorganizational measures in the iron and steel industry.
4. As for expenditure on personnel and on the Management of the Commission, Council has allowed appropriations of about 800 million ECU. Following the example given by Parliament in its own budget for 1984, this amount was arrived at on the basis of fairly strict criteria. Council rejected the Commission's appeal for approximately 600 new permanent or temporary posts, and discontinued appropriations for various functional expenditures that were not deemed entirely essential.

Pottakis

5. In connection with new policies, in most cases decisions have not yet been finalized concerning these policies as such, and the development of certain debates indicates that though agreement may exist on the aims, there is disagreement on the specific measures proposed by the Commission.

Nevertheless, Council wished to confirm its faith in the idea of developing new common policies, and with this in mind has set aside under Chapter 100 considerable sums for activities stemming from policies on which specific decisions are still outstanding.

Thus, under Chapter 100, 70 million ECU of commitment appropriations are set aside for programmes in the energy sector, and a similar sum for programmes of common expenditure under Chapter 73, 90 million ECU of commitment appropriations for the Esprit programme, 22 million for the development of communications, and 60 million for the programme of infrastructure in the transport sector about which so much has been said in this House. Compared with the sums set aside for these sectors in the past, these new appropriations represent a step forward and open up perspectives for the development of common policies in such sectors during 1984.

As for assistance to the provisioning sector, Council has allocated 300 million ECU of non-commitment expenditure, having also allowed 153 million ECU for provisioning assistance under the commitment expenditure.

6. Regarding the budgetary rebates payable to the United Kingdom and to West Germany for 1984, Council has provided 1.2 billion ECU for net repayments to these two countries. This decision of Council's is based on the implementation of decisions taken at the highest possible level within the Community. In two successive agreements, first at the European Council of Brussels in March and later in Stuttgart, Council agreed that the rebates to the United Kingdom and West Germany should be embodied in the draft budget for 1984. Of course, we all know that the European Parliament has often expressed its opposition to the payment of rebates to certain Member States; but we also know that it has been shown that such rebates are perhaps necessary.

Council considers that in accordance with the acts decreed for the 1983 budget, the totality of the amounts for these financial payments must be allocated under common policies in the sectors of energy, transport and social programmes. Within the framework of the common declaration of 30 June 1982, Council also proposes that part of this sum should be designated a temporary commitment expenditure, since it covers commitments entered into by the Community. Council expects that its proposals on this matter will be the subject of a continuing dialogue with Parliament within the framework of the appropriate procedures.

In this connection, I should like to lay particular stress on the following:

— So far as the Social Fund is concerned, Council has a high regard for its role and its efforts to combat unemployment, the gravity of which we are all very much aware especially when we bear in mind how enormous is the number of unemployed, and the fact that the risk of unemployment is especially high among the young and among women, i.e. among those who form the weakest sector of the labour market. In its efforts to contribute to the fight against unemployment, Council have divided the appropriations among the various age groups so that 75 % of the commitment appropriations will be devoted to measures on behalf of young people under 25, with special emphasis on certain disadvantaged regions. Besides, we hope that the new nomenclature will contribute to simplifying the procedures enabling grants to be made from the fund.

— As for agricultural expenditure, Council considered, as indeed was necessary, that account had to be taken of the agricultural regulations as things stand at the present stage, i.e. while we still do not know what new decisions are forthcoming and what financial consequences will emerge from them. However, should these adjustments be amended on the basis of decisions to be made at the meeting of the European Council in Athens, it will then be necessary to amend the budget for 1984.

Proceeding, now, to supplementary budget No 2 for 1983, two facts have contributed to the need to draw this up.

Firstly, the most recent estimates of the level of certain revenues for 1983, confirmed in a letter on the subject from Commissioner Tugendhat, and secondly the need to make certain absolutely essential payments during 1983.

Among these, there is a special need to supplement appropriations to the Agricultural Fund so that payments may be made to farmers in the closing months of 1983, to secure appropriations for rebates to the United Kingdom, and to defray certain other expenditures on urgent needs.

From the analytic breakdown of budgetary figures at your disposal, you already know the adjustments made to specific revenues, amounting to 744 million ECU.

As for the scale of the expenditures, I would like to draw your attention to the following three points:

1. In the agricultural expenditures, estimates of the level of production combined with the development of prices for agricultural products on world markets led Council to decide to accept the Commission's proposals for increased finance for the Agricultural Fund, and Council has allocated a sum of 1.76 billion

Pottakis

ECU. Had this not been done, it would have been impossible to fulfil binding commitments to pay the farmers arising out of the regulations of the CAP.

The Community would have endangered its credibility, and would also have to face further difficulties later on, at a time when the problems would most likely have piled up.

2. Regarding rebates to the United Kingdom (risk sharing), during Council's deliberations various interpretations were advanced on the method of computing the size of rebates. In the end, Council decided to set the level of the rebate at 370 million ECU. To achieve consistency with the initial decisions, this sum is divided into commitment and non-commitment expenditure in the same ratio as the sums recorded in supplementary budget No 1.

3. Finally, so far as the remaining proposals for new expenditure are concerned, Council decided to make use of the existing reserves of 64.5 million ECU, which would otherwise have been cancelled at the end of the year, as the Commission confirmed. Payments accepted by Council include 10 million ECU for additional urgent aid to Poland, 9.6 million ECU more for the urban reconstruction of Belfast in accordance with Parliament's proposal, 20 million ECU of support for the Italian tobacco-growers hit by earthquakes, and various other urgent expenditures.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the draft budget for 1984 that I have had the honour to present to this House takes account of next year's agricultural expenditure, continues to support anti-unemployment measures decreed by the Regional and Social Fund, covers the Community's obligations towards two Member States, and finally opens the road towards the development of new policies, so frequently demanded by Parliament.

I would like to remind you that Council arrived at this draft budget after intense efforts within the framework of a marathon session which exhausted not only the inventiveness and goodwill of its members, but their

physical stamina as well; the final result is a particularly sensitive, finely-tuned and fragile compromise. We are, of course, aware of Parliament's basic orientation as regards the structure and role of the budget, and have taken this into account and adopted it to the extent permitted by the situation today and the difficult financial conditions.

Granted the high sense of responsibility of all those involved with the budget, their ability to distinguish matters of substance from the inessential and to subordinate wishful thinking to what is actually possible, we would like to think that once this draft budget has been gone through with a fine-tooth comb, assessed and perfected, it will finally be accepted and will define the framework within which the Community will act in 1984.

Indeed, if we bear in mind the extreme rapidity with which conditions change, and the speed at which the facts that mark the history of our times move, it is easy to see that within the lifetime of this budget so much will happen and there will be so many changes that in the past one would have needed much longer than a single year to accommodate them.

Consequently, I believe I am expressing the feelings of us all when I express the hope that what is not feasible today will soon become possible. Reality is not exhausted by what is delivered 'up front'. It contains within it potential; potential is an ingredient of reality and it is the duty of the Community's political leadership, the responsibility of us all, to open the way for potential to emerge and to create conditions which will allow it to become actual.

(Applause)

President. — Thank you, Mr President-in-Office of the Council. I trust that your cooperation with us and this House will be fruitful, especially in relation to the difficult six months that now lie before us in connection with the budget procedure¹.

(The sitting closed at 8.05 p.m.)

¹ Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.

ANNEX I

10. *Votes*

The verbatim report records hereunder the opinion of the rapporteur on the various amendments together with explanations of vote. For details of voting please refer to the Minutes.

SIMONNET REPORT (Doc. 1-434/83 — Financial Regulation of 21 December 1977): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was :

- FOR Amendments Nos 1 to 88, 91 to 94 and 99 ;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 90, 96, 97, 100/rev., to 106, 108 to 110, 112 to 117.

* * *

WETTIG REPORT (Doc. 1-444/83 — Mountain and hill farming): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was :

- FOR Amendments Nos 2, 7B and 8A ;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 3 to 7A, 8B and 10.

Explanation of vote

Mr Bombard (S). — (FR) As my constituency embraces an area characterized by mountain and hill farming and a region which has not been subject to much development, I fully endorse the reticences voiced in this resolution on the subject of the Commission's directive. There must be a close correlation between agricultural structures and regional agricultural policy of which the form and the means must be outlined, taking account of agricultural harmonization, demography and ecology. Given the regional incentives and aid, I approve the request for a modification of Directive 75/268/EEC which has now lapsed. For the reasons indicated I shall vote in favour of the Wettig resolution, in the hope that this will edge the Commission towards a policy which is more dynamic and better adapted to fulfilling the needs of these regions which suffer a dual handicap.

ANNEX II

ACTION TAKEN BY THE COMMISSION ON OPINIONS DELIVERED ON ITS PROPOSALS AT THE JUNE AND JULY PART-SESSIONS OF PARLIAMENT

The purpose of this report is to inform Parliament of the action taken by the Commission on the amendments it recommended at the June and July part-sessions under the consultation procedure and on emergency aid decisions, as agreed with Parliament's Bureau.

A. Commission proposals for which Parliament has tabled amendments which the Commission has accepted in whole or in part (June and July part-sessions)

1. Mrs Van Hemeldonck's report terminating the procedure for consulting Parliament on the Commission proposal to the Council for a directive on the supervision and control of transfrontier shipment of hazardous waste within the European Community (COM(82) 892 final).

On 16 June the Commission transmitted to the Council pursuant to the second paragraph of Article 149 of the Treaty, an amended proposal for a Regulation on the supervision and control of transfrontier shipment of hazardous wastes within the Community, incorporating most of the changes requested by Parliament.

At its 16 June meeting the Council took account of this amended proposal during its policy debate on the subject.

2. Mr Dalsass' second report terminating the procedure for consulting Parliament on :

- I. The Commission's amended proposal to the Council for a Regulation on the common organization of the market in ethyl alcohol of agricultural origin and laying down additional provisions for certain products containing ethyl alcohol (COM(76)274 final);
- II. the relevant amendment submitted by the Commission to the Council pursuant to the second paragraph of Article 149 of the EEC Treaty (COM(79)237 final).

On 25 July 1983 the Commission submitted, pursuant to the second paragraph of Article 149, an amended proposal for a regulation incorporating all the amendments adopted by Parliament (OJ C 214, 10.8.1983).

3. Report by Mr Prout terminating the procedure for consulting Parliament on the Commission's proposal to the Council for a directive relating to the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning consumer credit (COM(79)69 final).

At the beginning of October the Commission will transmit to the Council, pursuant to the second paragraph of Article 149 of the Treaty, an amended proposal for a directive on consumer credit, which will incorporate all the amendments proposed by Parliament at its July part-session.

4. Report by Mr Gautier terminating the procedure for consulting Parliament on the Commission's proposal to the Council for a decision adopting joint research programmes and programmes for coordinating agricultural research (COM(82)853 final).

The Commission is preparing an amended proposal under the second paragraph of Article 149 of the Treaty, which takes account of those of Parliament's amendments which it has accepted.

Resolution

The Commission will look into the feasibility of furthering research projects in the agro-economic sector which could be included in a future proposal for a decision. It also intends to carry out experimental applications of research findings and, if funds are available, to disseminate these findings to a wider public.

The Commission will report to Parliament and the Council regularly on progress made and results obtained in its research programmes.

5. Miss Hooper's third Report terminating the procedure for consulting Parliament on the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a directive on containers of liquids for human consumption (COM(81)187 final).

At the end of September the Commission will, pursuant to the second paragraph of Article 149, transmit to the Council an amended proposal for a directive on containers of liquids for human consumption; this will incorporate most of the amendments proposed by Parliament at its July part-session, but not the amendment aimed at changing the directive into a recommendation.

The Commission has given a lengthy explanation of the reasons why it cannot accede to Parliament's preference for a recommendation.

6. Report by Mr Patterson terminating the procedure for consulting Parliament on the Commission proposal to the Council for a directive concerning temporary work (COM(82)155 final).

In the light of Parliament's opinion and in accordance with Mr Richard's statement of 5 July, the Commission will be transmitting an amended proposal for a directive to the Council in the autumn. This text will also be transmitted to Parliament for information.

7. Report by Mr Hord terminating the procedure for consulting Parliament on the Commission proposal to the Council for a directive introducing Community measures for the control of foot-and-mouth disease (COM(82)505 final).

In September the Commission will transmit to the Council an amended proposal, pursuant to the second paragraph of Article 149 of the Treaty, taking account of those of Parliament's amendments which it has accepted.

Resolution

The Commission, as it stated in the report on the development of foot-and-mouth disease in Europe, annexed to its proposal, confirms its intention of carrying out the requisite studies so that the second stage of harmonization of measures to control and prevent foot-and-mouth disease can be got under way as soon as possible, and, with due observance of the general provisions in the EEC Treaty, the high-quality health conditions attained in a number of Member States can be preserved.

The measures to be taken will have to make allowance for the development of foot-and-mouth disease in Europe, particularly in countries bordering on the Community, with a view to obviating any new onslaught of the disease and its spreading throughout Community territory. The financial implications will be closely examined, together with the resources required to implement the measures.

8. Report by Mrs Vayssade terminating the procedure for consulting Parliament on the Commission proposal to the Council for a directive concerning the annual accounts of banks and other financial institutions (COM(81)84 final).

The Commission will be preparing an amended proposal pursuant to the second paragraph of Article 149, incorporating the amendments which it accepted at the July part-session.

Parliament will be informed in due course.

9. Report by Mr Blumenfeld terminating the procedure for consulting Parliament on the Commission proposal to the Council for a regulation on the strengthening of the common commercial policy with regard in particular to protection against unfair commercial practices (COM(83)87 final).

Parliament approved the Commission's proposal by a very large majority; in general, the Commission considers the proposed amendments acceptable.

The Commission took particular note of Parliament's request for an annual report on measures taken under the new regulation.

The Commission does not consider the time is yet ripe for putting the idea of extending the regulation's scope to commerce and services to the Member States, although it views the two possibilities with great interest and considers that they could well be put into practice.

However, the Commission will keep Parliament's amendments in mind in its discussions with Council bodies concerning the regulation.

B. Commission proposals to which Parliament has proposed amendments which the Commission cannot accept

None.

C. Commission proposals which Parliament has approved or to which it has not requested formal amendments

1. Report by Mr Curry terminating the procedure for consulting Parliament on the Commission proposal to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 804/68 on the common organization of the market in milk and milk products (COM(83)127 final).

In Regulation (EEC) No 2167/83 of 28 July 1983 (OJ L 206, 30. 7. 1983, p. 75) the Commission laid down detailed rules for the supply of milk and certain milk products to school children.

2. Report by Mr Martin terminating the procedure for consulting Parliament on the Commission communication to the Council on a transport infrastructure experimental programme (COM(82)828 final).

On 9 August the Commission presented to the Council a proposal for a regulation on financial support for a multiannual transport infrastructure programme.

The proposal follows on from the communication, and Parliament's Resolution on the question approved such action. The adoption of the proposal regulation by the Council should make it possible to develop Community infrastructures policy along the lines indicated in Parliament's Resolution.

3. Report by Mr Boyes terminating the procedure for consulting Parliament on the final report from the Commission to the Council on the first programme of pilot schemes and studies to combat poverty.

Parliament's Resolution on poverty corresponds to the Commission's intentions as set out in its final report on the first programme and to the statements made by the Member responsible during the debate on the Resolution.

D. Emergency aid granted since the last part-session

I. Non-member countries

1. Financial aid

- 100 000 ECU to Paraguay (floods)
- 250 000 ECU to Nicaragua (displaced persons)
- 250 000 ECU to Argentina (displaced persons)
- 350 000 ECU to Bolivia (drought)
- 100 000 ECU to Mozambique (drought)
- 200 000 ECU to Sri Lanka (victims of disturbances)

2. Food aid

- 250 000 ECU for the purchase of beans by the International Committee of the Red Cross for drought victims in Ethiopia

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 1983

Contents

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1. <i>Budget (continuation)</i></p> <p><i>Mrs Scrivener; Mr R. Jackson; Mr Lange; Mr Tugendbat (Commission); Mr Pottakis (Council)</i></p> | <p><i>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Moreland; Mr Charalambopoulos</i> 80</p> <p>— <i>Question No 5, by Mr Bonde: Majority decisions in questions considered to be of vital importance by one of the Member States:</i></p> |
| <p>2. <i>European Union — Report (Doc. 1-575/83) by Mr Spinelli</i></p> <p><i>Mr Spinelli; Mr De Gucht; Mr J. Moreau; Mr Pfennig; Mr Prag; Mr Seeler; Mr Zecchino; Mr Thorn (Commission); Mr Glinne; Mr Barbi; Mr Prag; Mr Berlinguer; Mr Nord; Mr de la Malène; Mr Bøgh; Mr Pasmazoglou; Mrs Focke; Mr Seitlinger; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Galland, Mrs Castellina; Mr Romualdi; Mr Didò; Mr Croux; Mr C. Jackson; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Cecovini; Mr Capanna; Mrs Spaak; Mr Saby; Mr Johnson; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Haagerup; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Petersen; Mr Adonnino; Mr Eisma; Mr Kirk; Mr Gawronski; Mr Alexiadis; Mr Plaskovitis</i></p> | <p><i>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Bonde; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Adamou; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Seligman; Mr Charalambopoulos</i> 80</p> <p>— <i>Question No 6, by Mr Rogalla: Checks at internal frontiers:</i></p> <p><i>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Rogalla; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Simpson; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mrs Ewing; Mr Charalambopoulos</i> 81</p> <p>— <i>Question No 7, by Mr Papaefstratiou: EEC citizens' right to vote in the Member States in which they are resident:</i></p> |
| <p>3. <i>Question Time (Doc. 1-660/83)</i></p> <p>— <i>Questions to the Council</i></p> <p>— <i>Question No 1, by Mr Marshall and No 2, by Mr Geronimi: Full diplomatic recognition of Israël by Greece:</i></p> <p><i>Mr Charalambopoulos (Council); Mr Geronimi; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Gontikas; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Israël; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Normanton; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Galland; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Alavanos; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Plaskovitis; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Sutra; Mr Gontikas; Lord Harmar Nicholls</i></p> | <p><i>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Alavanos; Mr Charalambopoulos; Sir Brandon Rhys Williams; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Pöttering; Mr Charalambopoulos; Lord O'Hagan</i> 82</p> <p>— <i>Questions to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs:</i></p> <p>— <i>Question No 33, by Mr Bonde: The Commission's role in EPC:</i></p> <p><i>Mr Charalambopoulos (Minister of Foreign Affairs); Mr Bonde; Mr Charalambopoulos; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Charalambopoulos</i> 84</p> <p>— <i>Question No 34, by Mr Bøgh: EPC and the Council of Ministers:</i></p> |
| <p>— <i>Question No 4, by Mr Moreland: Draft Directive of lorry weights and dimensions:</i></p> | <p>77</p> |

<i>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Bøgh; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Bonde; Mr Charalambopoulos</i>	85	— <i>Question No 36, by Mr Ephremidis: Soviet Union proposal for nuclear disarmament throughout Europe:</i>	
— <i>Question No 35, by Mrs Hammerich: Economic aspects of security policy:</i>		<i>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Boyes; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Seligman; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Lalor; Mr Seligman; Mr Charalambopoulos</i>	87
<i>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Charalambopoulos; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Charalambopoulos</i>	86		

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)¹

1. Budget (continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the budget debate ².

Mrs Scrivener (S), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, yesterday we heard a presentation by the President-in-Office of the draft budget forwarded to us by the Council on 28 August 1983. Today I should like to make a few comments and raise a number of questions to which we shall have to find answers over the coming months. These questions are concerned with both the revenue and the expenditure sides of the 1984 budget.

To begin with the revenue side, it has to be noted that, for the first time in the history of the Communities, the Council has departed from the revenue forecasts prepared by the Commission, even though the Commission had followed the habitual procedure, basing its estimates on economic data compiled by its staff. The Council has reduced non-VAT resources by 279 million ECU and made a downward revision of the VAT base resulting in a further cut of 514 million ECU in the resources potentially available to the Community. The combined effect of these two changes is a contraction of 793 million ECU in the overall volume of resources available.

Since this situation is without precedent, I feel that it is important to know the Council's reasons for preferring the estimates supplied by the national administrations to those of the Commission. Are they purely objective, technical reasons, or is it that this new departure represents a deliberate move to reduce the volume of the budget?

¹ Approval of Minutes — Topical and urgent debate (announcement)

² See preceding day's debates.

The aspect of this budget procedure which unquestionably commands most attention is the prospect which everyone has been trying to ignore for a long time, the fact that Community resources are now virtually exhausted, and the budget authority, if it is not going to provoke a situation in which payments will have to be discontinued, is obliged to adopt an even more responsible attitude than in previous years, at all stages of the procedure recognizing the limit imposed on us by the circumstances. At the present stage of the procedure, the sum available, before own resources are exhausted, is 556 million ECU. This is the ceiling figure for everyone, not only the Council but also the Parliament, which will have to abide by it when voting on the budget.

I am therefore appealing to the sense of responsibility of Honourable Members in the various groups and committees in Parliament.

I now turn to expenditure.

The main point that I note here is that the appropriations to the Guarantee Section of the EAGGF have been set at 16.5 billion ECU, which was in fact the figure shown by the Commission in its preliminary draft.

Under present conditions, this is an estimate for items of expenditure which are by definition unavoidable. It is nevertheless undeniable that retention of this figure has had the effect of reproducing the present imbalances in the budget. The money to cover other needs, by which I mean the rebates to the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, has had to be found by making reductions in other titles, with much of the brunt borne by the appropriations for the other structural policies classed as non-compulsory expenditure.

The Council has reduced the payment appropriations in the Commission's preliminary draft by a total of 1.9 billion ECU, and the commitment appropriations by 3.3 billion ECU. This attitude is incompatible with the concern to re-establish a proper balance which was central to the Commission's proposal and moreover — this point should be stressed — consistent with the wishes of the European Parliament and, more

Scrivener

specifically, with the guidelines that this Parliament voted to approve last March. At the same time, the Council has added a combined total of 1.2 billion ECU for the rebates to the United Kingdom and Germany. The amounts concerned are shown in the budget under immediately operational headings. Is this to be taken as the Council's way of showing its intention of ensuring that these measures have the status of Community measures, or should we not be wondering whether the choice of heading does not prejudge the outcome of the negotiations initiated following the decisions taken at the Stuttgart European Council? Does not the fact that only this single aspect of the programme drawn up in Stuttgart has been adopted cast doubt on the 'global' approach to the budget dossier called for by the Heads of State or Government?

A final point, Mr President: as many of us will be surprised to learn, the draft budget for 1984 presented by the Council is smaller, in terms of payment credits, than the 1983 budget — when draft amending and supplementary budget No 2 is included, naturally. We are, of course, all aware of the constraints under which the budget authority is having to work. Nevertheless, the significance of this reduction is clear: the Community is quite simply taking a step back. But does this also mean, Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the will to carry on the construction of Europe has been lost? This question will have to be answered one day. It is at times like this, Ladies and Gentlemen, that one realizes how accurately the budget reflects the course of developments in our Community. Thank you for your attention.

(Applause)

Mr R. Jackson (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, although the President-in-Office has not done us the courtesy of attending this debate this morning, I should, like, nevertheless, to welcome him as President of the Budget Council. I hope that that message can be conveyed to him. I hope that he enjoys the intricacies of the budgetary dialogue between the Council and Parliament. (It is, of course, a dialogue and it does help if, occasionally, one is present to listen to what is said by the other side). Certainly, the Council will find that we on the European Parliament side have returned refreshed from our summer break, and I hope that the men sitting on the benches opposite will not be disconcerted if they find that our motto is Noel Coward's saying that 'Work is much more fun than fun'.

Mr President, this draft supplementary budget, which the President-in-Office presented to us last night, marks, I believe, a historic moment in the history of the Community. This is for two reasons. First, taking into account changes both in the expenditure and on the revenue side, it takes the Community to within 82.7 million ECU of the ceiling of own resources for this year; and so a moment which was long expected

and which has been long delayed has at last arrived. The second reason why this draft supplementary budget is a historic occasion is that it marks the breakdown of five years of effort by the Community to restrain the growth of agricultural expenditure. After five years of 'prudent prices'; after five years of 'tough prices'; five years of guarantee thresholds and special levies; five years of trying to keep the rate of growth of agricultural spending below the rate of growth of rate of own resources: after all this we are confronted by a supplementary budget request which increases the expenditure on guarantees by more than 30% over the forecast. So, this draft supplementary budget is a sort of tombstone over what I think of as the 'Gundelach era' in agricultural policy. I am tempted to add when I think of the reason why that era is laid in its grave, that inscribed on the tombstone is the saying: *si monumentum requiris, circumspice*.

The Committee on Budgets has not yet had an opportunity to consider this draft supplementary budget, but, as rapporteur, I think I will be on safe ground if I make the following points. First, we view with some suspicion the Council's claim to have listened to Parliament's delegation when we came to see it in July. I see no sign of this in the draft budget now before us, any more than I see any sign of the President-in-Office sitting in front of us. Secondly, as yesterday's decision of the Bureau made clear, Parliament will not be rushed in its consideration of this draft supplementary budget. We cannot simply rubber stamp a budget which brings the Community to within a heart's beat of bankruptcy. Third, Parliament will look with special care at the huge requests for agricultural appropriations. We all know that, since the Commission submitted the preliminary draft supplementary budget in June, there have been important changes in world markets, especially for cereals, and we will want to evaluate the consequences of this for the draft supplementary budget.

Welcome Mr Pottakis! Because the Community is so close to the limits of own resources, we in the Parliament will be looking hard for savings. My own view is that we should aim to find managerial savings of the order of some 20% in the draft supplementary budget as it now stands. Perhaps it might be suggested that we in Parliament should take as our target a saving of 438 million ECU which is the amount added to the 1983 budget by the Council's additions to guarantee spending only 6 months ago. Maybe that figure will have a certain symbolic value.

Finally, in considering the points we would wish to make at this stage because of the confusion which surrounds the amount of the supplementary measures proposed for Britain and for the Federal Republic of Germany under the risk-sharing formula for 1982, I think that Parliament will want to have a full explanation of the apparently arbitrary basis of the figures which the Council has put into the draft supplementary budget under this heading.

R. Jackson

There is still a great deal of work to be done on this draft supplementary budget. We will have to think hard about how to handle it. In particular, one of the options to which the Committee on Budgets will clearly have to give careful thought is whether we should recommend that Parliament should seek to follow the line taken by our delegation at the meeting with the Council in July when we proposed to pass only a proportion of the agricultural appropriations in supplementary budget No 2, holding over the rest of the agricultural requests and the other elements for another supplementary budget later this year. This option will clearly have to be considered; although I must observe that the Commission introduced in July a letter of amendment, making revenue changes, and that this was adopted by the Council. Inevitably this must open the question whether a third supplementary budget for 1983 will be possible. I hope that the Commission will clarify this matter because it is rather important to our discussions in the Committee on Budgets this afternoon.

At all events, I wish to assure the new President-in-Office that over the busy months ahead he will find this Parliament and his parliamentary interlocutors always willing to listen and always willing to compromise in the Community interest — but always vigilant for the interests of the people we represent in this Parliament.

(Applause)

Mr Lange (S), chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — *(DE)* Mr President, Mr President-in-Office, Mr Vice-President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to add to the remarks made by Mrs Scrivener and Mr Jackson. The Council must take cognizance of the fact that we will most certainly check the revenue and expenditure sides — I stress, revenue and expenditure. We must ask both the Commission and the Council to show us the material on which their calculations are based so that we can see how they have come to such different results.

I get the impression, incidentally, that both draft budgets represent a conscious or unconscious attempt to mislead us, i.e. the Commission and Council are deluding themselves as regards the Community's future economic and financial development. This matter will have to be reviewed very carefully, and I would like to add that we made it clear at our meeting with the Council — which in the light of the results can neither be termed a consultation nor a joint deliberation — that we, that is, Parliament, are anxious to know how the Commission and Council are resolving the task assigned to them by the Stuttgart summit. Parliament's response to the supplementary budget and the 1984 budget will depend on this. 6 December, the date scheduled for the European Council meeting in Athens, is too late for a final decision.

The European Council, which can hardly be said to be familiar with the procedure involved, has selected a date to suit its own convenience and is thereby rendering the adoption of the 1984 budget very difficult. It ought to be clear, Mr President-in-Office — and please take especial note of this — by the middle of November what action the Council proposes to take in various areas and how it intends to turn its decisions into orders or directives, i.e. into legislation, as fast as possible.

You know that we have not just begun to draw attention to the growing financial difficulties; we have been doing so for years, but the Council would not believe us. The Commission only half-believed us, and now we have reached a situation which neither party really knows how to cope with. The Council must be told to pluck up courage so that we can actually fulfil the Community's tasks as far as our financial position allows. In other words, we cannot permit any taboos in this connection as regards the necessity for legislation. These will be the premises on which we will debate the two draft budgets. It is too early to predict the outcome, but it will depend largely on how much of the material on which the two institutions, the Council as part of the budgetary authority and the Commission as the responsible executive body, based their decisions is placed at our disposal. What they have presented us with so far is totally inadequate.

The purpose of my comments, Mr President-in-Office, is to make it quite clear what direction matters ought to be taking. I can only re-emphasize what Mr Jackson and Mrs Scrivener have said: the draft budgets contain no indication that the Council listened to Parliament's delegation on 20 July. I wanted to state this amicably and clearly, and I hope the Council and the Commission will take due note of it.

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, Parliament yesterday requested me, through the chair, not to make a speech in this debate because of the pressure of time and the fact that the subject will be dealt with in detail subsequently. You also have the important question of the Act of European Union to get onto.

However, Mr Jackson asked a specific question to which he tells me he would like to have a specific reply before the end of this short debate. I felt therefore that I should comply with his wishes. The question was whether or not the Commission has the intention of submitting a third amending supplementary budget for 1983 later this year. As Mr Jackson pointed out, the Commission's initial intention in July, as I said, was to submit a third amending supplementary budget for 1983 in order to introduce certain own resource adjustments that frequently occur, as you would know from your own experience. During

Tugendhat

the Council's work in July, however, when we were discussing the whole problem of own resources, the Commission, in fact, introduced at that time the necessary own-resource adjustments — those adjustments which would otherwise have constituted the basis for a third amending supplementary budget for 1983. It is not our intention therefore to introduce one on this occasion.

This is obviously a matter which the Committee on Budgets will wish to go into in further detail this afternoon, and Mr Lange made clear a moment or two ago his intention to go into the resources side as well as the expenditure side with great care. But since I was asked a direct question by the rapporteur. I reply directly that it is not the Commission's intention to introduce a third amending supplementary budget this year.

Mr Pottakis, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers. — (GR) Mr President, in presenting the budget yesterday I had the opportunity to explain the basic thinking behind the appropriations for 1984. I was also able to draw attention to the special reasons which led the Council to submit the amending and supplementary budget for 1983.

Here I wish to repeat that the Council considered it urgently necessary that the agricultural advance payments question be sorted out by, if I remember rightly, 20 October.

This is an urgent necessity and we see no other way of dealing with it. I had the opportunity to emphasize that if this matter is not settled by the supplementary budget, many more problems will arise than might not be solved were we to pursue any other course or way out.

I also explained that the adjustment of the refunds to Great Britain and Germany and various payments to cover emergency needs made up a second reason for working out the amending budget. I must also stress that we have had to deviate from our original intentions as regards the receipts and expenditure heading, namely by reducing receipts and increasing expenditure. It was on the basis of this assumption that we had to solve the problem of accommodating the agricultural payments, the British refund and the emergency aid payments. These are the reasons why we considered it necessary for all these matters to be sorted out now in a second supplementary budget and why we should not embark on drawing up a third supplementary budget or on discussion about if and when to do this and about what it should contain.

Concerning alterations which might become necessary after the European Council meeting in Athens, I think it would be advisable for us to allow this matter to be judged in the light of the future circumstances which will by then have taken shape.

President. — The debate is closed.

2. European Union

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-575/83) by Mr Spinelli, on behalf of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, on the substance of the preliminary draft Treaty establishing the European Union.

Mr Spinelli (COM), coordinating rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, in order to carry out the task assigned to it by Parliament in July last year, the Committee on Institutional Affairs appointed six rapporteurs to draw up the six sections making up this motion for a resolution, and me to coordinate their contributions and bring them together in a single text. I shall accordingly be confining myself to a presentation of the motion for a resolution in broad outline and an exposition of its political implications, while my fellow rapporteurs will be speaking to their respective sections.

The essential features of this motion for a resolution can be summarized as follows. First, it is not a work of improvisation. It is not so much to my six colleagues and myself as to the committee as a whole that the draftsmanship and coordination should properly be attributed. Under the intelligent, determined chairmanship of Mr Mauro Ferri, it has spent an entire year reading and rereading every paragraph of every section, quite often reworking them completely, so as to reflect the broadest possible consensus in each case. Before proceeding to the final vote, it invited proposals for amendments from the political groups and, finding that these were largely compatible with the existing text, it incorporated them more or less in their entirety into the final text that it eventually adopted, by a majority of 29 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

Secondly, this motion for a resolution is on a theme which is not new to Parliament. In drafting it, the Committee on Institutional Affairs has adhered faithfully to the guidelines which Parliament voted by a very large majority to approve in July 1982. The text therefore merely gives concrete form to a political/institutional vision already embraced by this House.

Thirdly, contrary to what has been rashly suggested, this motion for a resolution is not a leap in the dark. On the contrary, the intention has been to base it on what has been achieved to date in the institutional and political aspects of the construction of Europe, in other words on the *acquis communautaire* proper and the commitments entered into in respect of political cooperation and the European Monetary System. We are confronted by serious new political and economic problems calling for common action or cooperation among European nations, but neither the competence nor the powers vested in the existing European institutions are adequate for the purpose of dealing with them effectively.

Spinelli

The motion for a resolution proposes a redefinition of the institutions' respective areas of competence and powers with the aim of rekindling confidence in the construction of Europe among the peoples of the Community, confidence which is being eroded by the current state of institutional and political disarray in the Community. Ladies and Gentlemen, I shall not insult you by enumerating these problems or the shortcomings of our institutions, with which you are all too familiar.

They are a perennial topic within this Chamber and beyond. Without trespassing on the ground to be covered in my colleagues' reports, I draw your attention to the fact that the competence vested in the Union has been geared to the problems with which it will have to cope, but the motion for a resolution proposes that its competence be exercised in conformity with the principle of subsidiarity and insists that there must be a high degree of agreement whenever a transfer of competence to the Union is envisaged for the purposes of intergovernmental cooperative action and whenever common action by the Union is conducted for the first time in one of the fields specified in the Treaty.

Having thus affirmed that unification of our peoples around common policies cannot be achieved other than gradually and with their democratic consent, the motion for a resolution nevertheless then addresses the problem of reform of the existing institutions so that each is able to function effectively in the framework provided by the Union and none is able to steal a march on the others and obstruct all action, which has been the situation in the past and remains so today.

The institution in which the citizen is represented, namely the Parliament, the institutions in which Member States' governments are represented, namely the Council of the Union and the European Council, and the institution responsible for applying the laws and enforcing the Treaty, namely the Commission, have been redefined in the light of the positive and negative lessons by repeating that this motion for a resolution is neither a leap in the dark nor an abstract construct. It is the reasonable, measured response to the real problems that arise in connection with the competence and powers of the European institutions. Any suggestion of reducing the scope of this competence and these powers would be comprehensible only to those who are against the European Union, but not to those who are committed to it.

I come now to a fourth feature of the motion for a resolution: it is not an expression of the thinking and ideology of a particular political group. The drafting process has been a collective effort, with Conservatives and Communists, Liberals and Socialists, Christian Democrats and anti-clerics, people from the left and the right, federalists and moderate Europeans taking a

hand. That it has been possible to work together to produce a coherent, constructive text demonstrates the marked degree to which the European idea now transcends the traditional ideologies of our parties. The other side of the coin, admittedly, is that no-one finds the text exactly as he would have written it. Nevertheless, what each of us should be looking for is not the ideal wording according to our own lights, but that which is likely to meet with the widest approval, since European unity cannot be partisan in its inspiration. It has to be the expression of a very broadly-based consensus cutting across national frontiers and political alignments.

I would ask you to bear this aspect in mind when voting on the amendments. Some of these amendments add important concepts which not only enhance the significance of the part of the text to which they refer but also help to make the motion for a resolution more widely acceptable. Our committee will be proposing adoption of such amendments.

Others, however, in seeking to be too specific, reopen a debate on a reasonable but complex balance achieved by the Committee after long and arduous discussions. Even where I or any one of you may be personally in favour of the wording of such amendments, I shall be asking you, on the committee's behalf, to reject them, because their adoption would undermine the consensus. For instance, it really is not reasonable to put down amendments concerned with a formulation of the legislative procedure the essentials of which have already been accepted and incorporated into the text, a formulation which is basically very similar to the procedure called for in the existing text. One can only conclude that the author of these amendments has simply failed to appreciate that the motion for a resolution has been drafted in this way in order to take account of requirements stated by other political groups.

Finally, the committee has had to set its face against amendments which are manifestly contrary to the overall philosophy not only of the motion for a resolution but also of Parliament itself. For instance, it is inconceivable that this Parliament, which has been protesting for a quarter of a century against the need for unanimous voting in the Council, in other words against the right of veto accorded to a single government, should now accept an amendment attributing this right for an indefinite period to any Member State whenever the need arises to give the Union's common action greater depth in a field which is within its competence. I would urge those who have put forward such amendments to be mindful of the frustration of years that we are trying to bring to an end and, rather than ask us to prolong it indefinitely, to devote themselves to bringing home to their governments and parties what is really meant by building the European Union.

Spinelli

When the time comes to vote, I shall be stating the committee's position on each of these amendments, but I should like at this stage to urge all those who have tabled amendments to ask themselves, once the debate is over, whether it would not be preferable to withdraw as many as possible of them, bearing in mind the complexity of the discussions in committee which brought the text to its present form.

I now come to the fifth feature of this motion for a resolution. We are forever reading in the newspapers or in statements by ministers and other politicians that the best solution to our economic, external policy and security problems would be the European solution, that to fail to go through with the effort of European unification would amount to exposing our peoples to disastrous effects on their economies and their independence, but that the necessary European political will is unfortunately lacking. Proof of this is found in the pitiable meetings of the Council, not least the most recent, which was supposed to have been a first step towards implementation of the solemn commitments entered into at Stuttgart, while the Genscher/Colombo report could be described as a great deal of effort for precious little return. Further evidence is found in the temptations to succumb to protectionist introversion which are seen on all sides.

It would admittedly be very ingenuous to expect a European political will to spring from the action of national ministers with an interest in making their national political will prevail, to expect these ministers to entrust their civil servants, whose function is to give concrete expression to the national will, with the task of drawing up plans for European initiatives, or to expect these procedures to provide the springboard for the development of a European political will.

National governments and ministers are put in office by free national elections, and their displays of misgivings in regard to the idea of Europe are accounted for in terms of the misgivings that their electors themselves feel. Once again, how ingenuous and, in many cases, how insincere.

National elections, and indeed the whole of national political life, conditions the electorate's reaction by concentrating exclusively on national problems and offering exclusively national solutions.

Even if the distrust shown towards the idea of European development was not a consequence of the conditioning of national political life and even if it really did reflect the opinion of our countries' citizens, these citizens have nevertheless freely elected this Parliament and it should therefore adopt the same attitudes and express the same misgivings as their ministers. Consequently, any attempt made by the Parliament to progress beyond the Communities in their present state would suffer the same fate as the Genscher/Colombo initiative. In that case, it would have to

be acknowledged that the will for unification of Europe does not exist.

The facts of the situation are otherwise, however: the progress of the debates and voting in Parliament, between July 1981 and July 1982, and more recently the discussions and voting in the Committee on Institutional Affairs have demonstrated beyond doubt — and there will be further confirmation if, as I confidently expect, tomorrow's vote is strongly in favour of this motion for a resolution — that the European political will exists and that it is in this Chamber that it finds expression.

Admittedly, it still remains for us to show consistency and determination in our actions, but we shall have an opportunity to discuss this in a few months.

For the time being, though, let us concentrate on the demonstration that we have given — and are going to give today and tomorrow — of the existence of a political will to build a united Europe which is more effective, more democratic, and more confident in itself.

Of course, you will be told, and will have been told time and again over the years, that you really count for very little, but I say to you that if you acquiesce in this scornful denigration of the European elections and your own status, if you settle for seeking only those things which tally with your governments' current wishes, then in that case, Ladies and Gentlemen, you really will be politically weak and insignificant and you will be dominated by those who make national policy, since those who show themselves to be weak are always imposed upon. But if you are conscious of the dignity vested in you as members of the European Parliament and aware of the political responsibility that you carry as the representatives of Europe's citizens, you will find the courage for the effort needed to make your parties, your national parliaments, your governments heed this shared European will as expressed by you.

Tell yourselves that, however much they may conceal the fact, they all have uneasy consciences and are therefore very unsettled in their attitudes to Europe, since on the one hand they know what will happen to our peoples if the European venture fails and yet, on the other hand, they are stifling efforts to promote it.

The sixth feature of this motion for a resolution is its timeliness. Scepticism about the future of Europe is spreading dangerously and the Council, which has hitherto been the sole repository of real power in Europe, is doing nothing to allay it, in fact it is doing quite the opposite. The political and economic outlook for our countries looks bleak and will become even bleaker if the prospect of the gradual unification of Europe recedes. In the prevailing confusion of the situation, our action is the one beacon discernible on the European horizon, the only source of hope. The importance of this debate and the vote to follow

Spinelli

cannot be overstated, because, once this motion for a resolution has been carried, the next stage will be the preparation of a preliminary draft treaty to be drawn up in proper form by the Committee on Institutional Affairs with the assistance of eminent jurists, which will then be submitted for your approval in January or, at the latest, February 1984. That will be the signal for commencement of the political battle to secure approval by our national governments and parliaments. We can worry about that during the intervening months. At this stage, let us begin by lighting the beacon.

In view of these six features of the motion for a resolution, Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask you, on behalf of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, not only to approve it but to do so by a handsome majority.

With your leave, there are two further points that I should like to mention briefly before concluding. The first is merely a point of information that I should like to pass on to you on behalf of the Committee on Institutional Affairs. You will note that the motion for a resolution contains no reference to the final and transitional provisions, to revision of the Treaty, to the question of the seat, or to the action to be taken by Parliament once the draft of the Treaty has been settled.

These are not oversights. The Committee on Institutional Affairs will be tackling these problems over the months ahead and will bring forward proposals when presenting the draft Treaty.

The second point is in the nature of a political observation which I offer to all groups, but especially to those in which adoption of our draft met with most difficulties and differences of opinion. I address myself in particular to members of the Socialist Group and the European Democratic Group, both of which have made important contributions to the drafting of this text, notably in the persons of the rapporteurs. I am aware that there are members of these groups, and of others also, who are quite opposed to any further development of the Community and would even like to see a reversion to the level of intergovernmental cooperation. I respect their views and do not propose to try to win them over now. I merely express the hope that they will one day realize that they are wrong, as have many of their colleagues over the past few years or decades.

A word now for those who are in favour of progress towards unification, but would perhaps prefer to see greater emphasis on such and such an objective or would like to see one institution or another performing a different role. I appeal to these Honourable Members to remember that we are not engaged here in a purely academic exercise, but in the process of carrying out political action. The fact that the Socialists and Conservatives, two essential constituents of democratic political life in Europe, have made

major contributions to this action is of the greatest importance.

Their contribution is important because even though socialism and conservatism may not be alone in providing fertile soil for development of the European venture, they certainly are among the political philosophies which do provide fertile soil. Ladies and Gentlemen, the essential requirements for which you argued during the long preparation of this text have been taken into account. Some of your requirements could not be incorporated, and you know that this is not because you were defeated by your adversaries, but because your allies in the battle for the construction of Europe — your allies, I repeat — were unable to reconcile them with their requirements. I therefore invite you to come to terms with the full importance of the commitments that you are about to assume, I urge you not to stand aside in a mood of mistrustful churlishness, refusing to take part in the battle for the European Union which this Parliament must wage with determination if it is not going to sink into oblivion. Let Pascal's wager be an example to you, since if this venture — the most important of the first elected Parliament — should founder, you will have lost nothing for having supported it, but if battle is joined, it would be very sad if one day you had to say: 'We were there when it started, and we were expected. There was an important part for us to play, but we stayed away for no very good reason.'

I would invite those of you who have not yet made up your minds to reflect, before making your decision, that this message comes to you not only from the rapporteur of the Committee on Institutional Affairs but from every supporter of European unity in this House and throughout the Community.

(Applause)

Mr De Gucht (L), rapporteur. — *(NL)* Mr President, if there is one field in which the Community has been successful, it is certainly legislation. The uniformity of the interpretation and application of Community law which the European Court of Justice has managed to ensure, and the judgments which it has passed in many areas have made a great contribution to the permanence of the Community's foundations, often despite national egoism. The Court is thus the only institution in which nationalism has not taken hold and which, as a result, has been able to increase its power substantially. The Court has filled the vacuum, its prestige is consequently unimpaired, its authority unquestioned. The Union which Parliament has undertaken to outline must therefore be based above all on law in the broad sense of the word. The Union must find its democratic legitimation in law, the protection of the fundamental rights and freedoms, the uniformity of the interpretation of policy by giving the law of the Union priority, and the unifor-

De Gucht

mity of decision-making by merging the political and judicial elements. For each of these areas the present situation is a useful starting point, and it is noticeable that, where the Community has abandoned this concept of uniformity, it has got into difficulty. The law of the Union must thus lay the foundations for the construction of a strong and efficient Europe. The Union derives its democratic basis — the first principle — from the fact that its institutions are elected, directly or indirectly. In a democratic and constitutional State, of course, the directly elected institution is of primary importance. In other words, Parliament has a primordial role to play. The Member States and the Council underestimate this primordial role to be played by Parliament, which in their insolence they once allowed to be elected directly, a fact that they have since regretted.

The present Community is thus losing much of its democratic legitimacy. If the Union is eventually to do its duty in this respect, Parliament must have a right to a say in all the Union's areas of activity. Only then will there be understanding and respect for indirect election, for the indirect democracy that governs the formation of the Council. An indirectly elected body which prevents a directly elected body from exercising its natural powers does not deserve to be called 'democratically legitimate'. While the Community derives its democratic legitimacy from the nation States, the Union derives its democratic legitimacy from the European citizen.

The fundamental rights and freedoms of the citizen must therefore occupy a fundamental place in the Treaty, and their enforceability with regard both to fellow citizens and to the national governments or the Union's institutions must be ensured by means to which everyone has access. The European Court of Justice has done pioneering work in the field of fundamental rights and, on the basis of the Stauder judgment, has developed a form of jurisprudence that seeks to afford maximum protection, which is not, of course, complete because of the limited access the individual citizen has to the Court. The express jurisdiction of the Court and the general right of access for the individual citizen after he has exhausted national legal remedies must be specified in the Treaty. The prestige the Union enjoys with the individual citizen will stand or fall with fundamental rights and freedoms. A list of these rights must be included in the Treaty and form part of the Union's contribution. There should, of course, be scope for the further development of these rights through the administration of justice, and the difference in the weight carried by civil and political rights on the one hand and social, economic and cultural rights on the other must be borne in mind.

The uniformity of law that binds the Union together also means that Union law must take precedence over the Member States' legislation. This is not a question of political supremacy: it is vital for cohesion. Nor

can there be any doubt about this precedence. In its judgment in the case of *Costa v ENEL* the Court clearly states what is involved here. The precedence of Community law is thus part of the *acquis communautaire*, and there can be no meddling with it. As a result of this judgment, which has the backing of the Treaties, national courts are empowered to declare inapplicable any national legislation that conflicts with Community law on the grounds that the latter takes precedence.

The full importance of this precedence of Community law becomes clear, of course, when it is combined with the wider access to the Court that is one of the aims of the Treaty. In particular, wider access for individuals where their rights have been adversely affected by any Union act concerning them, the express jurisdiction of the Court in respect of the protection of fundamental rights and the right to annul the decision where an application for a preliminary ruling is refused or is misinterpreted and no further appeal is possible round off the legal protection of the individual. The jurisdiction of the Court, as described in the Treaty, is an extension of its present jurisdiction and is aimed at providing the widest possible access, which will eventually be vital to the uniformity of the Union.

One of the causes of the disintegration of the Community is undoubtedly the fact that the status enjoyed by various areas of its activities differs, most of them being areas for which the Treaties make no provision or which they mention only in passing. The Union that Parliament has in mind must be based on the unity of the political and judicial corpus. In other words, any activity undertaken by the Union comes within the jurisdiction of its institutions, although room must, of course, be left for different procedures. Thus European Political Cooperation and the EMS must come within the framework of the Union, and this will automatically be the case for all the Union's future activities. The action it takes will be in the form of cooperation or of common action, with priority clearly being given to common action and cooperation prohibited where it will encroach on areas which are reserved for common action or in which common action is already being taken. Cooperation will be a marginal phenomenon, and that is a good thing.

The rules governing the whole of this judicial system will be laid down in laws, which it will, of course, be for the legislature to adopt. The present system of directives which subsequently have to be incorporated into national legislation will be dropped. This will be a logical extension of the present jurisdiction of the Court, which already recognizes the direct efficacy of directives. This is not to say that Union legislation will not leave room for further elaboration at national level. In fact, this will usually be the case. But what Union legislation decrees will ipso facto become directly enforceable Community and national law.

De Gucht

The Union will also put an end to the confusion of executive and legislative power in the hands of the Council as we now know it, which is one cause of the paralysis that now characterizes the institutions. This will bring the Council's self-righteous attitude under control. In so important an area for the further development of European integration as law, a great deal can thus be done by building on the *acquis communautaire*. There is no clear line separating the view taken of the law by the Treaty of Rome and that taken by the Union Treaty: there will simply be a logical evolution, official confirmation of what is already common practice in many cases.

The role the Court has played in this is of historical importance, having prevented the collapse of the brittle structure which the European Community today forms. It is the awareness of this brittleness, the awareness that the Community does not have a satisfactory answer to today's challenges, the growing infrequency with which answers are found, that has in fact moved Parliament to take the initiative by drafting this Union Treaty. Putting across its view of the European adventure was one of the tasks a directly elected Parliament could naturally be expected to perform. A Parliament which criticizes but does not come forward with a general view of the problems is not playing its democratic role to the full. The vote that will conclude this debate tomorrow will therefore be of historical importance. It will after all reveal whether this Parliament is capable of arriving at a general and cohesive concept despite nationalities and political views.

To conclude, Mr President, without exceeding the time allocated to my group, I should like to say the following. Firstly, the last four years must have left every Member of the European Parliament regardless of his political group and his nationality and provided that he is not opposed to the Community in principle, with considerable feelings of frustration about the effect Parliament has at present. Every Member of this Parliament must be feeling frustrated about the Council's inactivity. Every Member of Parliament must be feeling frustrated at how little this Community can do for the citizens of its Member States. But every Member must also realize that there are not a hundred ways of finding a solution. The appeal for political will that I have heard here hundreds of times, sometimes couched in the most lyrical terms, will fall on deaf ears everywhere unless this political will is reflected, unless it is committed and guided, unless it is required to exist because of the structure and particularly the institutions of this form of cooperation.

Secondly, the question of the priority of policy and, more specifically, of the institutions only appears to be a problem. The Socialists, for example, are wrong to ask what Europe is doing about the crisis, what

Europe is doing for the 12 million unemployed, as long as Europe does not have the institutions to give an answer. Those who are now thinking primarily of tinkering with the institutions to make them democratic and resolute are accused of legal quibbling, of not appreciating Europe's real problems — unemployment and its economic and political future — of deliberately sticking their hands in the sand. The Union we have in mind is not Socialist or Liberal. It will have democratic institutions which, depending on who is in the majority, will map out a Liberal or Socialist course. The Union itself cannot have an ideological bias. The Socialists disagree: they want the Union to have an ideological bias. They have obviously not forgotten Mitterand's slogan: *'L'Europe c'est le socialisme ou ne sera pas'*. They are wrong and, what is more, they are being anti-democratic. Any ideological group that intends to grab the Union for itself will be doing democracy and the future of this part of the world a disservice.

Tomorrow's vote will therefore reveal the real intentions of the various political groups. Do they want Europe or not? For there are two kinds of Europe. Do they believe in democracy, and so in majority government, or not? And finally, do they want Europe to have a future or not? Its future is assured only if the Union grows in strength.

(Applause)

Mr J. Moreau (S), rapporteur. — *(FR)* Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Committee on Institutional Affairs entrusted me with the task of drafting the economic section of the motion for a resolution which has come before the House for debate today.

It goes without saying that this section of the resolution is an integral part of the overall text adopted by the Committee. Your rapporteur, for his part, would have preferred the approach to have been more empirical since this would perhaps have meant that it was more closely attuned to the realities of the present day situation in the Community and the possibilities for progress, or at least the possibilities for the future as he sees them.

However, I would ask you at this stage of the debate to look beyond the formal aspect and concentrate on the content and scope of the proposals that have been laid before you. The construction of a European Community able to affirm its own identity and *ipso facto* its autonomy in regard to decision-making is a political objective. Our approach calls for more than simply establishing such things as a customs union or a policy on competition. It is more ambitious than that, the aim being the gradual drawing-together of economic, social and cultural strands to form an entity which will be unique in its character and in its operational modalities.

Moreau

Drawing on the experience of these past 25 years, we have endeavoured, when defining spheres of competence and tasks and formulating procedures to be followed, to give the Community the instruments and means with which to pursue bold economic, industrial and monetary policies. However, granted that the procedures and institutions must be suited to current conditions (types of problem faced, specific national situations, state of public opinion in the various Member States), we are all aware that what is crucial to any progress by the Community is the combination of force of necessity and determination on the part of governments and political and social elements to work together, although their interests are at variance and despite the difficulties arising out of differences which could not have failed to develop between countries whose cultures have evolved over centuries.

We begin by reaffirming the need for the earliest possible attainment of one of the fundamental objectives of the Community; the establishment and proper functioning of a European internal market, without which there can be no true common policy, as I am sure all of us here are convinced. However, conviction is not enough, since we also need to equip ourselves with the means with which to establish this common market, without which, as I have just said, there can be no true common policy. This is the inescapable imperative facing us. If we procrastinate, if we seek to protect vested interests, we shall undermine the strength of the whole and detract from the overall effectiveness of common action decided upon by the Council or the Commission.

Establishment of the internal market, with free movement for goods, services and persons, is a benefit not only for the peoples of Europe but also for those of the rest of the world and at the same time — this is something which I personally feel the Parliament should stress — a symbol of the fact that such freedoms as the unimpeded movement of the individual throughout the Community creates a *de facto* unity without suppressing the individuality of the various Member States. Nor can there be a Community without a policy on competition. What we are looking for in this field is a broadening of the range of activity available to the institutions, as a development of this policy to take account of an evolving situation. Without subscribing to an unrealistic and sometimes perhaps utopian view of European company law, we draw attention to the imperative need for a legal environment which is favourable to the development of cooperative ventures, and to the formation of 'European undertakings' in particular. As recent examples of abortive ventures demonstrate, the lack of an appropriate legal framework is clearly an obstacle to the development of industrial cooperation in particular.

On the subject of conjunctural policy, we simply clarify the powers available to the Community under the treaties and the various Council decisions and

make overdue provision for effective economic convergence which has now become so necessary.

This is an extremely difficult field, and our formulation takes account both of progress to date and of current realities. However, one should not be misled by the cautious wording. The Community has competence, in parallel with the Member States, to take effective action in the field of conjunctural policy. Events in recent years have shown that, without a conjunctural policy, the Community is incapable, in the same way as the various countries that it comprises, of coping with crisis and the problems that it brings.

Exactly in line with the views expressed in the past by the Parliament, our text reiterates that the European Monetary System is to be integrated into the institutional and decision-making framework of the Union. The embryonic European Monetary System is unquestionably one of the achievements of the most recent period. Action needed to consolidate it, to create a European currency in the full meaning of the term and to achieve monetary union is definitely part of the competence and role of the Union. I do not think that it is necessary to expatiate on this point in this Chamber, since Parliament has discussed it on many occasions in the past and will be returning to it in a forthcoming part-session. The most innovatory aspects of our motion for a resolution are to be found in its treatment of the nature of sectoral policies and the instruments to be designed and used in order to carry them out. What is meant by sectoral policy and the extent of the Community's competence in this sphere were the subject of detailed discussion in the Committee on Institutional Affairs. Given the differences in their economic backgrounds and prevailing conceptions, the various political groups do not, as we know, always use the same words to describe the same things, some being wary of anything which smacks of interventionism, which they consider ineffective. After many discussions we finally agreed upon a wording which, in my view, has the spark of innovation and allows the Community scope for action. I do not think there is any need for more than a mention of the sectors that the Committee examined: agriculture, fisheries, transport, telecommunications, research and development, industry, energy. I would merely stress that, mindful of the principle of subsidiarity and having regard to the nature of our current industrial problems, the Committee was particularly concerned to formulate strategies for these various sectors which would be capable of achieving the results envisaged at the most economic cost. We believe that our text, particularly the parts dealing with research, industry and energy, should provide a basis for development of a European policy capable of meeting the challenge facing us and achieving our goals.

One further topic — other forms of cooperation — was the subject of many discussions, some of them heated. Your rapporteur would have wished to go further than the text that you have before you. In its

Moreau

present form, it recognizes the realities of the situation and leaves open the possibility that some European ventures would be mounted by only some Member States or perhaps even certain enterprises. The complexity of the problems — and that of modern industrial activity — calls for great flexibility making for speed of action. The specialized agencies concept is seen as a potential way of dealing with some of these problems.

In conclusion, this text, which is the outcome of often heated discussions, many of them, well-informed discussions and constructive compromises, attempts to give a realistic picture of the range of the Community's competence in the economic sphere. In my view, it marks a step forward by our Parliament both in the definition of Community action in this sphere and in the responsibility incumbent upon the Community to make Europe a political, cultural and economic entity capable not only of restoring confidence among the nations of the Member States, where it is greatly needed today, but also of fitting itself to perform a role of benefit to all countries in the world, thereby realizing one of the essential objectives of our Community: harmonious development of all the nations making up humankind.

(Applause)

Mr Pfennig (PPE), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, none of us expects a European constitution to solve all the European Community's problems overnight, and nor was that the object of the Institutional Committee's work. The Committee tackled the job of drafting a constitution for the European Union because there are two concrete reasons, apart from general political and moral considerations, for promoting the Community's development by revising the Treaties: Firstly, the Treaties of Rome signed in 1957 are not primarily concerned with the issues that are so vital to us today — combating unemployment, securing energy supplies, protecting the environment, defence policy, to name a few.

Secondly, the Treaties of Rome comprehend the European Parliament as nothing more than an ornamental appendage to an all-powerful Council of Ministers made up of ministers from Member States. Apart from the fact that the fathers of the Treaties of Rome could not foresee the Council of Ministers' present decision-making incapacity, this state of affairs is simply so undemocratic that it requires changing. Both of these points are in need of reform and that in itself is sufficient reason to call for a new constitution.

I prepared the section of the report on the Union's policy for society. The Union has three major tasks in this area, also from the point of view of subsidiarity. The first of these relates to the way in which people treat one another, i. e. social, health, consumer and

regional policies. The second relates to the way people treat their environment, i. e. environmental policy. The third relates to Europeans' attitude to their culture, i. e. policies on education, information, culture and research.

A constitution can only indicate the ideas and values on which the Union's tasks are based, and which tasks these values give rise to. A constitution cannot specifically prescribe how each of these tasks is to be resolved; that is a matter for day-to-day politics. We should always bear this in mind in our work.

The ideals on which our society in the Community, in the future European Union and in the Member States is based are described in the introduction to my section. I would just like to outline the main features of our deliberations in committee. To my mind there is no doubt that European society and society in the Member States is based on a vision of the State as a parliamentary democracy guaranteeing liberties and rights which evolved during the Age of Enlightenment. This is Europe's and the United States' common heritage.

This ideal was and still is founded on the conviction that every individual possesses certain inviolable and inalienable rights. These values are at the heart of the common basic conviction shared by the citizens of the European Union. Any differences of emphasis and presentation in the political parties' programmes are a manifestation of pluralism, democratic legitimation, the institutional division of powers and the recognition of the majority principle.

In the European Union and the Community these traditional values have been joined by a new concept, that of union. The association of Member States in the Community and Union guarantees peace between them and is based on the renunciation of force. At the same time it offers all European countries the opportunity to accede if they accept the Union's values.

Closely linked with this is the conviction that a European Union is the best vehicle for jointly implementing these ideals. This derives from the idea that individual freedom, awareness of performance and responsibility can develop best in a European Union, although at the same time Union-wide responses will have to be found to the new economic and social challenges arising in Member States. In my view the European Union has a chance of gaining the respect of its citizens by opening up new avenues of social peace and social justice throughout its territory. In order to guarantee each Union citizen every opportunity to freely develop his or her personality, a social consensus has to be maintained and it is the Union's task to do so by implementing an appropriate social policy.

There are four points connected with my section of the report which I would like to particularly emphasize. The Union must pursue a social policy of its own

Pfennig

in addition to economic and monetary policies. I have listed a large number of the Union's tasks in the social field, ranging from efforts to combat unemployment to vocational training for young people and a European law on the constitution of enterprises. But I must warn you, ladies and gentlemen, not to entertain any illusions; like its economic, monetary and ultimately its defence policy, the Union's social policy cannot be dissociated from that of the Member States. The Union can and should contribute to its citizens' social welfare but it too is bound by the principle that it cannot distribute more than is jointly earned and the present generation must not live at the expense of future ones.

Much the same goes for Union policies to create full employment which are welcomed by us all. We should never forget that the Union's measures have a fourfold aim, being designed to maintain steady, sound economic growth, stable prices, balance of payments equilibrium, and a high level of employment, all within the framework of a market economy.

In the field of education the Union must at last promote the Union-wide validity of examination certificates, diplomas and other qualifications. The Treaties of Rome make provision for diplomas to be recognized on a selective basis only, and we have a duty to the young people of Europe to extend this provision.

Union environmental policy prevents and redresses damage which is of the same nature throughout the Union, or occurs in more than one Member State, or originates or terminates in the Union. From the point of view of subsidiarity the Union is fulfilling its task with respect to environmental protection, but this policy is also necessary. May I remind you that if provisions of this kind were already in existence the issue of the dying trees would not merely be postponed from one Council of Ministers to the next and treated as a problem allegedly affecting only Germany.

I have mentioned these last two examples particularly in order to illustrate the practical impact of our work to my colleagues, and hope that this will lead even the sceptics among them to approve of the work of the Committee on Institutional Affairs.

(Applause)

Mr Prag (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, 'an economic giant and a political dwarf'. This used to be said about the Federal Republic of Germany before a German government decided that it need no longer be true. Now it is said about the European Community, simply because our governments do not have the same determination and political will to change things as the German government did at that time.

Let us look first at the economic giant. The European Community is not only the world's biggest trading group, it is also the world's second greatest industrial power and one of the world's leading producers of most farm products. Including intra-trade the Commu-

nity accounts for well over 30 % of total world trade. For a large number of countries it is the world's most important single outlet for their products. For every man, woman and child in the Community countries the Community imported roughly 2 1/2 times as much as the United States. Last year the Community gave over 12 billion dollars worth of official aid to the Third World compared with just over 8 billion dollars from the United States. The economic wealth, industrial and commercial experience of the Community countries provide them with a mass of potentially powerful foreign policy instruments — development aid, trade concessions, loans, investment funds, export credits, know-how, both technological and commercial, and marketing skills. The total potential impact of these economic instruments cannot be matched by any country or group of countries in the world. The Community is indeed an economic giant.

However, because it has failed to harness this great economic power to the political means of using it, it remains a political dwarf. Let me give Members some idea of how little of their resources the Member States devote to a common foreign policy. The Community's total budget for all items amounts to about 0.8% of its total gross product and under 2% of total public spending. Even when you add in the European Development Fund, which, as we all know in this Parliament, is not budgetized, well under one-tenth of total Community disbursements has gone to foreign policy purposes. That is less than 0.2% — less than one-five hundredth if my arithmetic is good which it usually is not — of the Member States' total spending. Set against total spending on the Common Agricultural Policy, or even set against anything else, that is derisory. Indeed, in foreign policy the Community's economic instruments are tiny and ill-balanced. They are inadequate to permit an active foreign policy. Yet, in a world dominated by the two superpowers, the individual Member States — with one possible exception, and that is not my own country — are not strong enough to pursue such a policy effectively themselves.

Having put the situation into perspective, I freely acknowledged what has been achieved. The Community has brought into force a Common Customs Tariff and a common commercial policy, including a network of trade and cooperation agreements extending over the whole world.

It has begun to develop a new economic diplomacy despite its shortage of economic instruments for doing so. Through the Lomé Convention's other Community development aid and food aid as well as its generalized preferences in trade, it has been able to play an important role in world development policies. Though even here inadequate funding from time to time has had most unfortunate consequences as when the imaginative Stabex export stabilization fund ran out of money half way through last year.

Prag

Even in the field of external trade and external economic policy where the Community has full power to act, Member States on occasion follow divergent policies in conflict with one another.

The looser intergovernmental system of political cooperation has extended the role of the Ten into the political and diplomatic aspects of international relations, beyond the Community's fields of commercial policy, development policy and, more recently, fisheries policy.

But European political cooperation is built on the Community framework, though it remains legally separate from it. The regular meetings of the ten Foreign Ministers frequently coincide in time and place with meetings of the Community's Council of Ministers — after all, they are the same Ministers and they do not even, except symbolically, wear different hats. The ambassadors in third countries who supply a continuous and often coordinated flow of information to the ten foreign ministries are the same ambassadors whether they are dealing with external trade — a Community responsibility — or the Madrid Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which comes under the other hat of European political cooperation. As we all know, Mr President, it is the same foreign minister who reports to this Parliament on European political cooperation and on Community affairs; the same foreign minister who answers questions to the Council and questions to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation. And as we all know, indeed — at least those of us who attend Question Time — whatever the hat, it is the same chap.

Well, I have been poking gentle fun at this curious distinction between the Community and European political cooperation frameworks. But it has a very serious side.

First, there is the question of the effectiveness of European political cooperation. It has no common instruments to carry out agreed policies; no common secretariat to provide continuity and prepare dossiers. Even coordination is limited because of the fact that political cooperation is operated by national foreign ministers and national officials who find it very difficult to cast off their national capacity.

Mr President, I believe, and that is reflected in my section of the report of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, that the separation between Community responsibility in foreign affairs and European political cooperation is a nonsense both administratively and in practice. And that is indeed why our main proposal is to end this artificial and indeed increasingly nonsensical distinction between Community policy and EPC by bringing the latter into the Union framework, though without changing the fundamental process of

decision-taking in the fields currently in the sphere of political cooperation. That would remove a piece of illogicality which has grown up with the Community but which is a very serious restriction on the effectiveness of the Community.

Our second main proposal recognises and strengthens the Union's exclusive competence in fields allotted to it by the existing Treaties, essentially those concerned with foreign trade.

Thirdly we would bring all development policy into a common policy framework over a transition period of ten years. Development policy is the main instrument of foreign policy over a very wide field, and here is a field where the Community has made an excellent start and where the Community's role could be effectively developed to make it a major instrument of Union policy.

Fourthly — and this is an important point — we leave the transfer of a matter to the field of common action in international relations subject to a unanimous decision by the European Council. Nothing would be put into the field of common action in international relations if the European Council did not want that to happen unanimously.

There is also a permanent vital-interest clause for international relations and there is confirmation of the Union's power to act even where one or more Member States abstained from participating in such action, as happened in the Falklands crisis.

There is power of Treaty ratification for the Parliament which this Parliament has so often demanded.

In the field of security, there was a sharp battle about whether the Union was to have competence for matters of security plain and simple or just for political and economic aspects of security. We reached a compromise, Mr President, but the important thing is that if we adopt this text we will end the ridiculous battles that we have had about whether we can debate security questions or whether we cannot and we would leave the possibility open of the transfer to Union competence by unanimous vote of the European Council of any field of security policy, whether of defence policy, disarmament or arms procurement or any other.

There is no empire building for the Union, Mr President, in this section of the report — just a determination to allow the Union to do what it can do more effectively in full accordance with the principle of subsidiarity. But we believe that these proposals would greatly increase the Union's weight in the world, its clout in external relations and that it would go a very long way towards building that wider and deeper Community, speaking with the single voice that the Community's founding fathers spoke of.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR : MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

Mr Seeler (S), *rapporteur*. — (DE) Ladies and gentlemen, if one takes the trouble to investigate which topics were debated most in this House in recent years, one discovers that budgetary and financial issues have cropped up most frequently. Adequate finances are quite simply the *conditio sine qua non* for successful policies, and that applies equally and especially to the European Community. I am not saying that sufficient money necessarily guarantees good policies, but the reverse is true: without money good policies are often impossible.

My report is concerned with the Community's financial constitution. The proposals to amend existing provisions derive on the one hand from experience, while trying on the other hand to create a basis for further successful collaboration in Europe and to furnish some concrete suggestions. This includes particularly a clear description of the interdependence of the Community's tasks and finances. The principle of subsidiarity governing the Community's tasks must be matched by a similar principle relating to financing. Just as the Community's tasks must be clearly defined, so must its financing powers. After all, the Community must have sufficient funds to cover its expenditure, so that e.g. common social and regional policies, not forgetting structural economic — and equally important — agricultural policy, deserve the name.

I would like to comment briefly on the principal proposals for amendments and improvements in my report. One of the Community's major resources up to now has been a proportion of value-added tax, which could amount to 1% depending on budgetary expenditure. This gave rise to disputes each year about the rates of increase for the next budget. But more importantly, every resolution of the budgetary authority affects national budgets if this proportion of VAT has to be increased to meet expenditure. I am proposing that a fixed proportion of VAT be set aside for Community revenue and that 1% is taken as the VAT assessment basis, instead of *up to* 1%, as at present. This would mean that when the Community and the budgetary authority were drafting the budget they would know how much revenue would be available to balance expenditure and would be able to make their decisions accordingly. If the Community's tasks were extended or any resolutions were adopted resulting in higher expenditure, e.g. in the case of agricultural prices, the revenue side would then have to be adjusted too.

My second proposal is that the Community should be responsible for collecting and adjusting its revenue, i.e. a joint decision by the Council and Parliament should replace the time-consuming and costly procedure of treaty amendments which have to be ratified

by Member States' national parliaments. The Member States' interests would not be at risk because their representatives in the Council would have to agree to such decisions. The revenue side also includes the Community's being empowered to raise loans.

A third proposal in my report is that the Community be authorized to finance investment expenditure by loans, the scope of these loans being laid down in the budget by a resolution of the budgetary authority. This would end the present unsatisfactory state of affairs in which the executive can in effect dispose as it pleases over borrowed funds without any parliamentary control. I would like to emphasize that the report clearly states, however, that only investment expenditure may be funded by loans. The only exception would be short-term loans raised to bridge a temporary gap caused by a decline in revenue due to unforeseen economic circumstances.

I am also proposing that the Community's powers to harmonize Member States' taxation laws be increased. An important feature of the evolving economic community is that private individuals, undertakings and economic activities should be subject to roughly equal taxation. The present variances among Member States are one reason, for instance, why we cannot do away with customs at our internal frontiers. Without similar rates of taxation equal competitive opportunities cannot be guaranteed within the Community. I am therefore proposing that the Community be given responsibility for determining the legislative framework for major taxes. The Member States will of course continue to collect the taxes, i.e. the revenue, but their levels and legal foundation will be the same, regardless of which country they are levied in. Let me quote an example by way of illustration: motor vehicle tax, that is taxes on cars and lorries, is a basic cost factor. It varies from country to country and forms part of Member States' tax revenue. This would not change, but the Community would be entitled to specify compulsory tax levels and assessment bases for all Member States. This is undoubtedly an onerous task, which would be assigned to the legislature, but the Community's whole development into a political union or federation will be no less protracted and laborious.

Another proposal of mine relates to financial compensation by means of the budget. As the Economic Community develops into a union the economic power of its members and regions must gradually be adjusted in order to avoid any distortions resulting from the unrestricted movement of goods and more especially, people. The regional fund currently included in the budget is merely a first step in this direction.

I will refrain from going into the details of an improved budgetary procedure involving a substantial

Seeler

increase in Parliament's rights and a strengthening of the Commission's position with regard to implementation of the budget.

Since the Commission is the only body that can keep constant track of the budget's development, it should also be empowered to oppose any decisions of the budgetary authority affecting expenditure. This would constitute a warning signal, as it were. In such cases the budgetary authority would have to amend its resolutions by a qualified majority. My report proposes supplementing the annual budget by a multiannual financing plan, to be updated on the basis of the budget each year. In this way the Commission and the budgetary authority could keep track of financial developments. Above all, the effects of financial decisions over a number of years would be clearly recognizable and the financial scope permitted by projected revenue and expenditure trends would become more apparent, facilitating decision-making.

In conclusion I would like to comment on the so-called 'twelfths' procedure, which comes into effect if no budget is available by the beginning of a year. The new budgetary procedure adopted by Parliament yesterday states that the 'twelfths' procedure shall apply for only 3 months in the absence of a budget, without making provision for any further consequences. My report specifies that the 'twelfths' procedure shall be based on the previous year's budget including supplements and adjustments and shall apply for 6 months, and that thereafter only expenditure to fulfil legal obligations would be permitted.

I hope my report will contribute towards rendering the Community more effective and will help to halt the insidious process of self-destruction which is apparent throughout the Community. History will not give us another chance to shape our future largely on our own in a world dominated by super-powers. With all due deference to national individuality we should not overlook this fact when it comes to decision-making.

(Applause)

Mr Zecchino (PPE), rapporteur. — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, when opening the debate on the chapter 'Institutions' of the European Union I have to begin by saying that the subject of the Institutions is one which gives rise to very considerable disagreement even among those who do not hesitate to declare their support for further progress along the path towards European integration. Such disagreement concerns not only the content of any reform but also a matter on which it might be said that a preliminary ruling is needed, in the sense that there are those who question the very desirability and usefulness, at this stage of relations within the Community, of raising the matter of revising the institutional order of the Community, which has been established both on the

basis of the provisions of the Treaties and, and perhaps especially, as a result of adjustments made during almost thirty years of Community existence, through practices, agreements and compromises which have considerably altered the original shape of things. We need only think of voting procedures within the Council, the way in which Coreper has been made official and the setting up of the European Council.

Doubts of this kind, which emerged within the Committee on Institutional Affairs largely as a result of consultations with both sides of industry (management and trade unions have been singularly united in their opposition) continue to be expressed with dangerous frequency by, among others, sources and organizations which quite clearly have the ability to influence public opinion in Europe. We need only cite a recent report drawn up by certain leading European foreign policy institutes: the German, Royal, Italian and Dutch Institutes of International Affairs, which, while considering that the time has come to take stock of the state of the Community, feel that the way forward lies simply in increasing the number of policies in different sectors and implementing the Treaties themselves more accurately, rather than in revising the Institutions and so amending the Treaties.

We must, therefore, here and now and from the outset renew our efforts to overcome these differences between those who, on the one hand, consider that progress towards integration and even the solution to the Community's present problems cannot be achieved without a new institutional order and those who, on the contrary, see this proposed remedy as the product of an abstract, a-historic Enlightenment-style vision, and point to the need for a fresh political will geared to the real problems of society or — to put it correctly — towards policies falling within the ambit of Community competence.

In fact, it seems to us that the latter argument arises from a misleading failure to understand. No one can deny that at the bottom of the Community crisis lies a political problem or, to be more precise, a weakening of the so-called political will, for familiar reasons which it is difficult to summarize here but which can be attributed to that same weakening of motivation and ideals expressed in terms of increasingly putting national self-interest first and resulting from the economic crisis; therefore, we urgently need a political revival of the European idea. However, the real question is the choice of the appropriate means or, if you prefer, the order of priority to be followed for this attempted revival.

If it is true that the notion of a gradual, almost automatic progression towards integration has proved in the course of events to have only limited validity, and if it is equally true that the present institutional system acts as a brake — and it is sufficient to think

Zecchino

for a moment just of the way in which enlargement, which has almost doubled the number of members of our Community, has shown up the lack of efficiency of the institutional system — then the logical corollary seems to be to stress the need to revive the European idea first and foremost by means of institutional reforms.

On the other hand, it should be clear that, whereas no institutional system is capable in itself of guaranteeing that the aims of a given political body are achieved, it is nevertheless true that the existence of an effective institutional system is a necessary precondition for this.

Given the general climate of public opinion which has so far surrounded our Parliament's initiative and which, we have to admit, has revealed suspicion or, even worse, lack of interest we should, in my view, hope that our debate will lead as an initial step to a clear, unequivocal and vital assertion of the compelling need to give priority to a revision of the institutional order by revising the Treaties in order to ensure the revival of Europe.

Basing itself firmly on this much-stated premise, and in accordance with the guidelines laid down by Parliament, the Committee on Institutional Affairs has in the proposals which it has submitted to you today set out the general principles of the new entity which should spring up from the present Communities.

The European Union will also, like the present Communities, be seen as a unique model which cannot easily be classified according to the traditional concepts of the doctrine of international law. It will not be a federation, for the fundamental reason that the Member States will retain their sovereignty, but it will have important federal characteristics such as the complexity and subdivision of the institutional system and the introduction of legal rules which may, in given cases, be of immediate concern to citizens of the Union.

The guiding principle behind the institutional model for the Union is that of the separation of powers, which is still an established part of the legal traditions of the western democracies.

In order to give effect to this principle, executive power must be assigned exclusively to the Commission, which will be extensively revised both as regards its method of constitution and because legislative power and political control over the executive will be exercised jointly by the Parliament and the Council.

It will be clear to everyone that this introduces a completely new element into the organization of the Union. The Council, which is at present the sole holder of legislative and, in practice, of executive power, and which is the target of all the criticisms now levelled against the institutional order of the Community because of the way in which it exercises

or, more properly, fails to exercise its vast powers, will inevitably within the Union come just to share in the 'joint exercise' of legislative power.

On the much-disputed question of the constitution of the Council, the motion for a resolution has reached the realistic solution of retaining the Council's present structure as the representative body of the governments of the Member States and of keeping the system of weighted votes. As a general rule, decisions will require a majority of the weighted votes cast, but provision has been made for a transitional period of ten years during which a national delegation may request that voting be postponed, giving its reasons which will be published, and that the subject be re-examined in order to defend a national interest.

The power to initiate legislation has been largely assigned to the Commission in recognition of its role in putting forward and guiding draft laws, and so a solution has been adopted which is perhaps rather too restrictive with regard to Members of Parliament and the Council delegations themselves.

Each draft law will always be submitted initially to Parliament for examination and then to the Council, with the possibility of reference to a Conciliation Committee in order to settle any disagreements between the two Institutions. To prevent the risk of draft laws becoming submerged and the consequent paralysis of the Union's activities specific deadlines have been laid down within which each individual draft law must be considered, failure to do so being deemed equivalent to the adoption of the draft law.

In this brief 'panoramic tour' mention must finally be made of the European Council. There is no provision for it in the Community Treaties, but its presence is nevertheless felt within the Community as the supreme political decision-making body, and it will, at last, acquire a clear and well-defined role within the structure of the Union. It will consist of the Heads of State or Government and will, on the one hand, be responsible for tasks which, with certain differences, can be compared to those of a Head of State, that is, appointment of the Head of the Executive and communications with the other Institutions, and on the other for specific tasks in the field of cooperation.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, these, very briefly, are the main points of the proposals for the institutional model. They are, inevitably, the result of hard-won compromises. Therefore, the motion for a resolution is rather unclear at times and badly-worded at others. However, these compromises have, in general, enabled us to draft a text which is neither revolutionary nor utopian but is politically balanced and intended to represent a realistic proposal for reaffirming our ability to operate and so give new purpose to our desire to unite in facing the problems of our times.

Zecchino

The proposal which our directly-elected Parliament is aspiring to place before the Member States and the people of Europe, so fully legitimizing its presence on the European political scene, will (in the wishes of the overwhelming majority of members of the Committee on Institutional Affairs) open a serious debate to clarify the positions of all those political forces, governments and national Parliaments and oblige them to make a choice which can no longer be avoided between the decline and the reinforcement of the Community spirit and, it could be said, between a return to backwardlooking nationalism and the practical furtherance of a new phase in the life of our Continent which, if it becomes further united politically, can guarantee a more certain future for its people and might even make a unique contribution towards lessening that dangerous climate of instability which so besets the world.

(*Applause*)

IN THE CHAIR : MR LALOR

Vice-President

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (*FR*) Mr President, this is not the first time that I have had occasion to comment on the Parliament's initiative aimed at the formulation of a proper constitution for the future European Union. Now, however, this initiative has happily reached a decisive moment or stage in its development. Following long discussions during which difficult compromises have had to be reached, we now have an overview of the future draft Treaty's content and can see the outline of the complete configuration of the European Union as you envisage it. That in itself is a tremendous political achievement. The credit for this is, of course, shared by many people, and I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate all the rapporteurs, but I think you will agree that special acknowledgement is due to my friend and former colleague Altiero Spinelli, for whom this first rate motion for a resolution represents the culmination of three years' dogged effort.

Ladies and gentlemen, in a disunited or insufficiently united Europe which is seeking a new role in a world that has seen profound changes since the Second World War and is still changing by the day, we have increasing need of men who are able to couple a European breadth of vision with determination, and, as for the latter quality, a terrier-like determination such as has been displayed by Altiero Spinelli.

If it adopts as its own the work of its Committee on Institutional Affairs, the European Parliament will have demonstrated that, although elected by the peoples of ten different States and made up of Members representing widely varying political views, it is nevertheless able to articulate a detailed common

position on the future of Europe; it will have succeeded in a relatively short time where the representatives of our governments have sadly failed to achieve any progress for some several years. This will be a lesson in dynamism and, I would add, in true political realism.

Of course, it still remains for this political text to be put into the proper legal form of a treaty by our Committee on Institutional Affairs, assisted by a team of highly skilled lawyers. This, let us have no illusions, will be a difficult task of harmonization, explanation and clarification. It would be a mistake to think that this task will be a purely practical one, or even virtually automatic, since it is bound to entail the exercise of judgement on various points. Nevertheless, the structure that your Parliament is building is now clear in my mind's eye. After your July 1982 resolution, there was just the scaffolding; now, the whole framework — and more — is complete and clearly visible. Consequently, although it can be expected to have things to say about one or other provision in the draft treaty once it has been completed, the Commission is already able at this stage to make an overall assessment of the content of the future European Union's constitution as envisaged by the Parliament.

This assessment confirms the preliminary position that we adopted in our letter to Mr Ferri, chairman of your Committee on Institutional Affairs. Let me tell you without further ado that the Commission's overall assessment is very favourable and that we congratulate you on the initiative you have taken.

With your permission, I should now like to state our reasons for this favourable assessment, while at the same time entering a few reservations, a few qualifications, in regard to certain very specific aspects of the motion for a resolution.

First of all, the Commission, as stated in its letter to Mr Ferri, is pleased to note that the approach that you have adopted is one of adhering to the Community patrimony and maintaining continuity in the process of building Europe. It is essential to my mind that there should be no backsliding and that progress should be achieved on the basis of the existing foundation. I also have to say that I am pleased to see that your motion for a resolution lays an obligation on the Union to uphold fundamental rights, although, since it has not been possible to enumerate them specifically, it mentions them only by reference to the Member States' common principles and to a number of existing international instruments. A treaty establishing the European Union would of course be inconceivable without an express affirmation of the obligation to uphold fundamental rights, and it is particularly important that this could be a binding obligation. It is most appropriate that the definition of the Union's foundations should give prominence to the principles of the rights of the individual, from which we draw our inspiration.

Thorn

I am perhaps a little less clear as to the necessity, desirability and feasibility at this stage of creating obligations for Member States. I say this in the light of the different approaches adopted by the various Member States to the international instruments referred to in your motion for a resolution — but we shall have the opportunity, I am sure, to discuss this at a later stage.

The Commission also notes with satisfaction that the positions taken up in the motion for a resolution on many fundamental points tally with those which the Commission itself has adopted.

This I can make clear merely by mentioning some of the principles and ideas contained in the report on the European Union that the Commission presented as long ago as 1975: the principle of subsidiarity, the various types of competence (exclusive, concurrent, potential), joint exercise of legislative power by the Parliament and the Council, the power of initiative and executive role of the Commission.

Another principle that I should like to mention, Mr President, is that according to which any serious and persistent infringement of the law of the Union must be sanctionable, a principle which the Commission expressly endorsed when commenting on Parliament's resolution of 8 February concerning Member States' responsibility for application of Community law.

I should now like to concentrate on two or three institutional aspects, beginning with the need for a clear and unequivocal distinction to be made between the lawgiver and the government of the Union.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, of all the problems besetting the Community in its present form, the fact that the Council assumes both legislative and executive responsibilities is certainly not the least. The Council is becoming increasingly bogged down in executive tasks, and this is having an increasingly severe adverse effect on both the legislative process and the efficiency of the government function. It is absolutely essential for the Union to be given a strong executive — or stronger than the present executive — whose role is clearly distinguished from that of the legislature and protected from all interference by the legislature. In this connection, the Commission would not wish to miss the opportunity to stress the constructiveness and special significance of the amendment to the motion for a resolution that has been made since the draft that the Commission had to hand when setting out its initial reactions in its letter to Mr Ferri. In accordance with the wish expressed by the Commission, your motion for a resolution now excludes even the theoretical possibility of interference by legislature in the province of the executive. Overlapping of this type is most undesirable. There has to be clarity in reactions between the institutions. It is necessary to eliminate the ambiguity of roles which is currently causing us so many problems in inter-institutional relations; this is

particularly important in the Community, where we have no precedents, no frame of reference, so that we always have to innovate. This is therefore a positive step, for which your committee is to be congratulated.

The second institutional matter which I should like to discuss is, of course, the right of initiative in the legislative procedure. As we all know, the existing system in the Community concentrates legislative power in the hands of the Council, tempering this concentration of power by according a hitherto exclusive right to the Commission enabling it to limit the Council's power and set the pattern of its action. Under this system, the Parliament's role has hitherto been an essentially consultative role, and both you and we have complained of this, with good reason. The system now envisaged in your motion for a resolution differs in that it very appropriately calls for a sharing of legislative power between the Council and the Parliament. It is only logical, I grant, that with such a system there is no longer the same need for the Commission's right of initiative as the means of tempering the Council's omnipotence. I therefore appreciate the reasons why this right of initiative should no longer be exclusive and no longer serve to limit the legislature's power. Under these conditions, you are no doubt right that the Parliament should not in future be denied the right to present drafts, or to express the same idea in positive terms, that it should be given a share in this right of initiative. It is also understandable — at a pinch, I would say — that a certain right of initiative should even be attributed to the Council, but subject to certain limitations which we shall perhaps need to discuss on another occasion.

I personally have certain reservations on this point, and the Commission has certain doubts, in view of its responsibility for protecting the common interest. As you are, I know, fully aware, the Commission must continue to be the engine providing motive power to the Community and must not be reduced to executing legislative acts stemming from a variety of sources and motivations. Beware, ladies and gentlemen, the danger of excessive renationalization of the right of initiative, which the founding fathers saw as the exclusive preserve of the Community, not the Member States. And they did so for good reason: the European Community institution, or a Community institution, has to be the engine of the Community, because otherwise too many engines in the future could mean no engine at all. Moreover, the Commission's central role does not entail any limitation of the decision-making powers available to the Parliament and the Council, which ultimately determines the fate of the Commission's initiatives. On the other hand, it does indicate that the Commission's power of initiative should — as you have acknowledged — take precedence, possibly over the Parliament's but certainly over the Council's. The Commission is therefore gratified to note the change from earlier drafts of the motion for a resolution, so that it

Thorn

now allocates the right of initiative to the Commission in the first place, while the Council and even the Parliament cannot exercise this right unless the Commission has refused to present a proposal following a request from either of those institutions. There is also the stipulation that priority must be given in all circumstances to examination of amendments put forward by the Commission, but I think that this is one of the points to which we shall have to return for detailed consideration before the final drafting of the treaty.

I should now like to say a few words, Mr President, on the subject of the vital interest concept. I note that the motion for a resolution proposes that there should be a transitional period during which a Member State would be allowed to invoke a vital interest during the course of the legislative procedure in order to have a decision postponed.

Moreover, it allows the same possibility, but on a permanent basis, in the field of diplomatic and political relations.

Under the Community's current constitution, the Commission has constantly had cause for complaint, as you know, against the attitude of certain Member States which feel that they can take it upon themselves to obstruct decisions of Community interest by invoking an alleged vital national interest, which is often simply used as a pretext, in my view.

This attitude is not only contrary to the Treaties, but in addition it is unjustified, often unreasonable, and destructive. It is unjustified not least because under the Community's present decision-making procedure, the Commission's role, its composition, its behaviour in practice, the precautions that it takes before submitting its proposals are so many guarantees that due account has been taken of national interests and should in principle ensure that action proposed is acceptable to all Member States.

It follows that the possibility of a Member State being outvoted on an issue which is genuinely of vital national interest to it is in practice no more than an academic hypothesis. On the other hand, the attitude which certain Member States feel they can justify on the strength of this academic hypothesis is having very concrete and extremely damaging effects. It consists in claiming or pretending that certain interests are of vital importance when they are not, or when they are the interests of minority groups, pressure groups. The result is that national interests are given precedence over the Community interest, the European interest. The efficiency of the decision-making machinery is undermined and what should be the highest common factor is often brought down to far too low a level.

The conditions under which your motion for a resolution allows a Member State to invoke a vital interest are admittedly — and happily — very different from those characterizing the bad practice of today. According to your motion for a resolution, at least if I understand it correctly, not only must the vital interest be recognized as such by the Commission, but the fact that such a vital interest has been invoked will not be allowed to block the adoption of a decision indefinitely. Moreover, it has to be remembered that the sphere of diplomatic and political relations is of course one in which the Community does not at present have any competence, regrettable though this may be. Nevertheless, ladies and gentlemen, recognizing the right to invoke a vital national interest is really making a concession to the current bad practice, a practice which, I readily admit, is regrettably persistent and has even spread, since we have recently noted that even those States which have hitherto expressly repudiated it are hinting that they too might resort to it. The fact remains, though, that it is incompatible with the Treaties. Formal recognition of it, even in this limited, circumscribed way, could prove to be a retrograde step as compared with the existing legal situation; hence the Commission's duty to put you on your guard against this, and I am confident that you, like us, will be vigilant in this respect, in the interest of all the Member States, in other words of the Community as a whole.

I cannot conclude this address without discussing the capacity for decision-making in Europe today. A treaty establishing a united Europe cannot be produced out of a hat, as you yourselves have said. Institutional reforms take a great deal of time. Pending success in this venture along the lines that you would like to see, the Community has to continue functioning. For some time it has been in an impasse in which the decision-making system has been brought to a virtually total standstill.

The painful experience of exercising the 'mandate' is a striking example. The failure to reach a decision on total allowable catches and quotas in the fisheries sector, to quote just that one instance, and the strictly temporary decision on the quota system for steel are scarcely encouraging and must give pause. Further development of the Community and even continuation of its existing activities will be possible only if our Community can regain its ability to take decisions, which means that there must be a return to a decision-making procedure which is genuinely *communautaire*, in which due weight is once again attached to the Community interest and to efficiency. The first requirement to this end is more systematic use of majority voting, in accordance with the provisions of the Treaties.

I can say to you with absolute conviction that the majority voting procedure will not lead to polarization of the Community; on the contrary, it will make it

Thorn

possible to reach compromise solutions more easily and speedily. Anyone who does not appreciate this knows nothing of how the Community works.

(Applause)

The second requirement, Mr President, is much more extensive recourse to delegation of administrative and executive tasks to the Commission. It is not for the benefit of my institution that I say this, but because this is a more logical way of handling routine work than seeking a unanimous decision from ten governments.

I am in no doubt that systematic reliance on the unanimity rule — often to an absurd extent — is a major obstacle to the smooth functioning of the Community. I have said this before, the Commission has said it, and it is unnecessary for me to go over the same ground again. I simply give you my assurance that the Commission will not lose any opportunity of reminding the Council and the Member States of their responsibilities.

The efficiency of the decision-making process could be improved to a marked degree if more administrative and executive powers were delegated to the Commission, but these problems are taking on a new dimension with the approach of the next enlargement of the Community. Enlargement in itself will bring many new difficulties. It will necessarily cause a loss of homogeneity in the Community, and divergences of interest will rise accordingly, with an exponential increase in the number of blockages. Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we drew attention to all this five years ago, when presenting the 'fresco'.

Not only has the Commission always maintained that it is essential to observe the voting procedures laid down in the Treaties, which means majority voting when this is what is called for in the Treaties, it also considers that, in a Community of twelve Member States, decision-making by qualified majority should be introduced in certain fields instead of the unanimity at present stipulated in the Treaties.

This idea, advanced in 1978, has been developed in the Commission's communication on the institutional implications of enlargement addressed to the Council and forwarded to your Assembly.

In this communication the Commission also proposes amendment of the Treaties so as to ensure that administrative and executive tasks are as a general rule performed by the Commission. With twelve Member States, the danger of the whole decision-making system being brought to a complete standstill will of course be even more imminent than it is now. The Commission is convinced, Mr President, that these proposals represent an essential contribution to improvement of the decision-making process in the Community and hopes that it will quickly receive the backing of this House, which I take this opportunity to canvass.

Although I have concentrated essentially on the institutional aspects in my comments on your motion for a resolution, it goes without saying that the new institutional framework to be defined in the Treaty establishing the Union will be no more than a means, albeit an essential one, towards an end: implementation and development of policies. Some principles governing these policies are already embodied in your draft. However, it is clear that the Union will have to take fundamental decisions on the content of these policies. The Union Treaty will be the starting-point for renewed effort; hence the need to be ever mindful of the importance of continuity in the basic guidelines laid down in the Treaties, which is essential to the maintenance of economic operators' confidence in the stability of the necessary legal framework. This is why I have stressed the principle of continuity. It follows that a few of the provisions called for in the economic section will require some further treatment in order to avoid inconsistency with the basic consensus prevailing in the Community. This applies in particular to the role to be played by the monetary authorities and the social partners, and to the approaches to be adopted in the industrial sphere.

There is to be express provision in the Treaty establishing the Union for various policies which are not covered by the existing Treaties, and it would perhaps be useful to give them official sanction as of now by amending the existing Treaties, since this could relieve the never-ending difficulties that we have with the Council over implementation of these policies. I am thinking in particular of the fields of research and development, industrial innovation, energy, the environment, and regional policy. The Commission is currently examining the possibility of updating the Treaties along these lines.

In conclusion, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, you will assuredly agree with me when I say that the next nine months, leading up to the European elections, are going to be crucial. Crucial for the success of the ideas which inspired your draft treaty. Once it has been adopted, favourable and less favourable reaction is to be expected at all levels. We shall get a first indication of how far the Member States are prepared to go along the course to European integration from the decisions taken in Athens on the future financing of the Community and new policies. When it comes to your elections, the voters will have their opportunity, through their choice of candidates, to express their aspirations for Europe and make known the policies which they wish to see adopted. Let us hope that the Union will meet their aspirations and give them fresh grounds for hope.

The time has come for all of us, on your side and ours, to redouble our efforts in order to secure the best possible result.

Thorn

Those Mr President, were the observations that I wished to contribute at the beginning of this very important institutional debate. I have consciously confined myself to a limited number of essential points in the motion for a resolution. At the end of the debate, my colleague Mr Andriessen will undoubtedly wish to address the House, taking up points made in the important contributions that we shall be hearing during the intervening period. Thank you.

(Applause)

Mr Glinne (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, this debate is taking place in a disturbing environment. First, the international situation has become extremely sensitive. With the increase in tension between the super-powers, Europe must display greater firmness in order to protect its own interests and to contribute to peace and disarmament, a task which is becoming increasingly arduous. Secondly, we are going through a period of great difficulty in the internal life of the Community, whose institutions seem incapable of solving a wide range of problems, economic and social problems in particular. This inability to take decisions is taking on increasingly serious dimensions. Those responsible for this situation — and the Council must bear the main responsibility — do not seem to be sufficiently worried about the danger that the Community will disintegrate. It was in order to set today's debate and tomorrow's vote in such a political context that we in the Socialist Group proposed a new preamble. I am pleased that the Committee on Institutional Affairs has decided to accept this amendment and very much hope that the House too will accept it.

Mr President, as the Euro-barometer in particular suggests, the general public is naturally becoming increasingly disenchanted with the Community, since the great hopes raised and promises made have not been followed by concrete action. The Community has not responded in any significant way to the economic crisis, nor has it even set up an appropriate framework for dealing with it. Unemployment, inequality between regions, and environmental problems are all getting worse. In the 1984 European elections, the voters' enthusiasm will not be fired by yet another round of fine idealistic speeches, more or less indistinguishable from one another in their concentration on abstract notions and detachment from practical realities. The Socialists will be taking the opportunity afforded by the campaign to launch an attack, based primarily on the failure to deal with unemployment, on the economic policies advanced and supported by the centrist majority in this House, and a reciprocal attack will no doubt be made against the left, which is only to be expected.

In the meantime, the European Parliament must continue to be the forum where the great political movements express their respective views. These will

often be contradictory, but this can be tolerated as long as they are expressed in a European spirit. Confrontation of this type does not necessarily weaken our institution. At the same time, we have a duty to join in voicing our shared disappointment with the Council, and sometimes even with the Commission also. It is unacceptable that we should be punished next year by the electorate for the mistakes and shortcomings of the other institutions.

As Chairman of the Socialist Group, I have always held the view that any institutional reform must command the support of a large majority in this House. If we were divided on this, we would be in no position to press our claims as a Parliament. Even though we are far from a consensus on economic and social problems, we have to find a reasonable consensus on these institutional problems. The debates on our own Rules of Procedure and the uniform procedure for the European elections should, I imagine, have brought this lesson home to us.

Mr President, the Socialist Group has made a considerable contribution to the work of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, quite apart from the signatures of most of its members on Mr Spinelli's motion for a resolution. Our colleague Mr Mauro Ferri has chaired the Committee's meetings with infinite patience. Two of the reports were prepared by my friends Hans-Joachim Seeler and Jacques Moreau. The amendments that we have tabled do not in any way represent a withdrawal from our previous position. Socialists have always had their own conception of Europe and this conception is clearly not embodied in the existing Treaties. It is therefore quite natural that we should have wished and continue to wish to express our ideas clearly through the medium of amendments.

This is what we have done in committee and in plenary ever since the Committee on Institutional Affairs began its work.

Mr President, today's debate happens to coincide with the beginning of the second European election campaign.

As I have already said, we must take active steps to avert the danger of a mass abstention by the electorate, a refusal to vote for the Parliament of a Community which is not working. We in the Socialist Group are perhaps more familiar with this problem than others, since we represent the workers, the unemployed, the most disadvantaged members of society. In short, we speak in this Chamber for fellow Europeans who are disappointed and sceptical, those who have reason to feel that they have been let down by a Community in which poverty and inequality are on the increase and many young people face a future of permanent employment.

Even though we therefore fully understand all the reasons why our peoples may find this institutional

Glinne

debate very uninspiring, we are nevertheless prepared to play our part in it and to continue to do so on a reasonable basis.

We are very well aware that it is pointless to make promises of action without setting up the necessary means for such action, institutional and financial means. It is for the same reason that many of our friends in the trade-union movement, for instance, have supported this move, including Georges De Bunne, President of the European Trade Union Confederation, when he paid a visit to the Committee on Institutional Affairs. The Confederation of Community Socialist Parties has also responded positively. When in Madrid recently, I was struck by the interest and support expressed along similar lines by the Socialist group in the Cortes.

I would remind you in this connection that those who have tried to dissuade the Parliament from proposing a new treaty are not only ministers and national civil servants, but include such men as Mr Pandolfi, addressing the Committee on Institutional Affairs in his capacity as President of UNICE. Why should this be? Because he, like Mr Carli, knows that Europe's private entrepreneurs are well suited by the liberal philosophy of the Treaty of Rome.

I believe that the report by Mr Jacques Moreau, with its realism and imagination, represents a much more appropriate approach to the economic circumstances of the late twentieth century.

I should like to conclude with a few words on the procedure to be followed between now and June 1984. The text refers rather vaguely to the content of the preliminary draft Treaty. My group has proposed an amendment intended to clarify this aspect. My information is that the decision of the Committee of Institutional Affairs to discuss this draft with the national parliaments and political groups, which had been accepted by the enlarged Bureau, has had to be postponed for lack of time.

It is absolutely essential that detailed discussions of this type take place as soon as possible, so that Parliament and the various groups have an opportunity to draw conclusions from them. The Parliament's final draft for the establishment of the European Union must not be consigned to oblivion on library shelves or republished in another collection of texts which will be exhumed twenty or thirty years hence. Not only must there be a reasonable consensus on our draft in this house, it must also be widely supported and understood beyond.

It is our opinion that, while achievement of this consensus is not an impossible task, it will take time, in other words that there will not be enough time in the months preceding the 1984 elections, particularly since the election atmosphere will not be particularly conducive to achievement of such a consensus. And yet we cannot afford to take the risk of failure. I hope

that the Committee on Institutional Affairs will give thorough consideration to this aspect; we must not waste all the effort put in over the past two years, we must meet our obligations and ensure that the next legislature takes over and continues the work that has been started.

In voting for Mr Spinelli's motion for a resolution, assuming a sufficiently positive response to our amendments from the other groups, we shall be conscious that this is a beginning, an important phase in a large-scale and protracted battle, a battle justified by the need to strengthen the institutions and at last begin the development of the European Union.

(Applause)

Mr Barbi (EPP) — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I want to say straight away that the EPP Group will vote for the proposal of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, and will do so unanimously after a long and careful examination.

During our discussions we have overcome our doubts and difficulties, and we are now in a position to give our whole-hearted support, not only because our ideals and political programme are clearly geared towards a united Europe, but also because of our experiences during these four years in the European Parliament, which have given us first-hand knowledge of the inability of the Community institutions to meet the economic, social and political needs of our countries.

Everything in this day and age requires basic agreement and joint political action in Europe, but the Community institutions as set up by the Treaty of Rome and, in particular, as made to function in recent years make this extremely difficult, slow and lengthy and often quite impossible.

And yet, as I was saying, everything requires us to work together more closely and effectively within the Community: from the compelling human needs of our millions of unemployed to the urgent need for security in order to safeguard the independence and freedom of our countries.

We cannot revive our economy and create new jobs without consolidating and expanding our great European common market.

We cannot beat off the American and Japanese challenge in the field of technology without a joint research effort in the applied sciences and a common policy for reorganizing industry.

We cannot make up for our serious lack of sources of energy without a Community policy for research, production and distribution in the field of energy.

We cannot conserve a natural environment without a common ecological policy.

Nor can we support and maintain the evolution of the developing countries of the Third World without a

Barbi

development and cooperation policy which has been agreed with them and is administered by the Community.

But it is even less likely that we shall be able to defend our freedom and security in a practical and realistic manner without a common foreign and defence policy.

The historical events of this century — with its two disastrous world wars and decolonization — the technological revolution, which has made the world smaller and brought us closer together, and the population explosion in the Third World have led to the emergence of two economic and military superpowers (the USA and the USSR) and other huge nations of the size of a continent or subcontinent (China, India, Brazil and Indonesia).

If Europe wants to measure up to and compete with powers like these it must do so at the Community, and so continental level.

Anyone who believes that this can still be done at the level of our old, individual nation States has lost touch with reality and is bogged down in a futile rearguard action destined to certain defeat while making ready to be reduced to the role of a satellite.

Anyone who refuses to give up even a particle of the national sovereignty inherited from the past in order to further a common, free European Union will have 'limited sovereignty' imposed on them sooner or later by one superpower or the other.

Those of us who are aware of all this are working to guide our countries towards the greatest possible degree of political unity which is compatible with the respect for and enhancement of the great and varied cultural, linguistic, religious and civil characteristics which we have inherited.

This is why we continue to criticize the failure to act and the contradictory and inconclusive nature of the Council of Ministers, which often seems to be reduced to the level of a mere intergovernmental conference instead of functioning as the Community's legislative and decision-making body.

This is why we considered that the measures proposed by Mr Genscher and Mr Colombo were inadequate, even though worthy and well-intentioned.

This is why we support whole-heartedly this proposal to reform the Treaty of Rome drawn up by our Committee of Institutional Affairs.

Let us be quite clear: we do not consider it entirely ideal from our point of view.

I may say that last week in Monaco, where we made our preparations for this sitting which is so important for the European Parliament, some of us considered that this proposal was not close enough to our unitary and federalist aims.

And it is true. But in spite of this we shall vote for the proposal because we think that it represents an impor-

tant and valid step in the right direction. It is, above all, a realistic step, that is, it will obtain a safe majority in this Assembly and then the necessary consent of the political and social forces, the public at large and our electors, to whom we must look and whose vote we shall be asking for in a few months' time.

This proposal does not do away with the sovereignty of our States, it does not set up a federation, as we should like, it does not create the United States of Europe; but it does lay the institutional basis for that European Union which our political leaders said they wanted to bring about ten years ago; it provides for a better, more democratic balance between the Council, the Parliament and the Commission; it makes it possible to formulate and make a democratic choice of Community policies and creates the conditions under which they can be implemented rapidly and effectively.

In short, it offers the people of Europe the chance to choose a modern instrument which will respond to the urgent need for united, free, democratic but effective action to serve their economic and political needs.

The EPP hopes that the Parliament will adopt it by a large majority and that the people of Europe will back it with their votes.

(Applause)

Mr Prag (ED). — Mr President, I would not normally have divided my contribution to this debate into two parts, but I felt that my role as rapporteur was very different from that of spokesman for my group.

May I begin by saying that my group dearly wishes to be able to vote for this report. It is not a wild Eurofanatical document. As Mr Barbi has just said, there is no question of setting up a federation or even a confederation. May I say also that the attitude of my group in committee has always been cooperative and constructive, and I am grateful for Mr Spinelli's remarks to that effect. We have always, wherever possible, been ready to help and willing to compromise. We have not stood on ceremony. We wanted a text and we wanted one that we, as a group, could approve of. Large sections of this text have a substantial part of their parentage in members of my group, and I believe that those sections are practical, sensible and European.

My group also believes it to be of fundamental importance that this document should gain acceptance in all Community countries, and if I refer particularly to Britain and Denmark, that is not unnatural, since the members of my group are all from Britain and Denmark. You are aware of the particular difficulties in Denmark, with its minority Conservative-Liberal coalition government and the dominant role played by the market committee of the Folketing in decisions about the European Community. In the United

Prag

Kingdom, I believe there cannot possibly be any change in present attitudes towards rules and customs concerning the veto and the need for unanimity in Council decisions until two things happen ; the first is that the pattern of Community financing and spending should change so as to reflect the real priorities of the present era, and the second — and it is part of this major reform — is that a lid must be put on the open-ended subsidization of however much agricultural output our farmers care to produce. That is why we have put in major amendments to paragraphs 20 and 124 on the decision-making process. I shall come back to those amendments later.

I believe the United Kingdom's attitude could change fundamentally once the Community has moved away from the present positions in which the budgetary balance — the financing system and the pattern of spending — is not improving, but merely being rectified from year to year in an apparently endless series of unseemly squabbles. The United Kingdom could not acquiesce in new arrangements which for example, allowed the Council to enforce by majority vote short-sighted and unfair policies to which Britain was opposed. Once this major hurdle of a sensible balance in financing and spending has been cleared, we could then surely look at practical improvements in the Community's, or the Union's decision-making process.

I repeat that my group would dearly like to be able to vote for this document. All our instincts are in favour of strengthening the Community. We want to bring about European Union, an objective to which all the Member States have subscribed. We know how much remains to be done in so many fields. We know that the enlargement of the Community from 10 to 12 Members is bound to make the decision-making process more cumbersome. We approve of the commitment of this text to a flexible and gradual approach. We want the Member States to be able — and I quote from the preamble to the document — 'to respond jointly to the technological, financial, monetary and other challenges with which they are confronted'. We want a strong Union able to defend its interests in the world effectively — and I quote again — 'to promote, by its international action, security, peace, disarmament and freedom of movement for peoples and ideas'. We approve wholeheartedly of the commitment of this report to rapid completion of the common market, where so much still remains to be done, especially in transport and in services — services such as insurance and banking — before even the work of creating a single market, the work of the EEC Treaty itself, is completed. On industry in general, energy, telecommunications, research and development and the need for cooperative ventures among companies of our Member States, the report comes very close to what my group believes in and wants to achieve. It sets out the aims of a policy for society in some detail, and there are few of these with which my group, like the other groups, could disagree.

On the Union's international relations — the subject of my own report the Committee on Institutional Affairs has adopted a modest but practical set of proposals which would go a long way to harnessing the massive economic power of the Ten to their political objectives in the world. My group welcomes, in particular, the inclusion of security among the matters for which the Union would have competence and hopes that if this document is approved, it will mean an end to the long quibbles about whether we can discuss matters related to defence — including the subject of disarmament — in this Parliament. The budgetary section would remove the nonsense of the present distinction between compulsory and non-compulsory spending and would surely bring desirable improvements.

Mr President, I believe that the amendments from my group aim at improving the text and making it better able to achieve what the Committee on Institutional Affairs desires. All along, as I have said in committee, we have been constructive, cooperative and reasonable. I know that in this report, and elsewhere some of my group will find points and proposals that they approve of to a greater or lesser degree, and some that they do not approve of at all. Mr Spinelli has pointed this out. We know, too, that the document is not yet final but will go to a committee of four lawyers who will turn it into a draft treaty. No one can expect to find in this document that everything is exactly to his or her political taste. We are not European robots : our Europe, thank heavens, is one of diversity.

We know, too, that this Community is not working as it should, and that the reason for that lies in the log-jam in the Council of Ministers. No one in any group could fail to be aware that the failure of the Council to vote, except on budgetary matters, causes our Community to limp and falter internally and in its policies *vis-à-vis* the rest of the world. The Council must be made to work better, and voting in Council should be the normal practice and not the exception. But my group, Mr President, is not prepared to abandon entirely, after a transitional period of ten years, the right of a Member State itself to consider its vital interests affected by a matter ; and that is why, on two major paragraphs of the text, my group has objections which in importance go far beyond any other objections it may have, or its members may have. As I have said, those paragraphs are paragraphs 20 and 124, and we have amendments to change those paragraphs.

We cannot accept, first, that common action by the Union should be extended to new fields simply by a majority. This could remove new fields of competence from some Member States against their will. Let us be clear : in practice, no Member State will accept this. We have therefore put in Amendment No 12, in my name, and that amendment would require an unanimous vote by the Council to initiate common action in a new field.

Prag

Secondly, we cannot as a group accept that the vital interest clause should be limited to a transitional period of ten years or that a vital interest should require recognition by the Commission to be valid. Amendments Nos 109 and 110, in the name of Lady Elles, would remove these restrictions.

I have to say formally that my group regards these amendments as key changes on which its final vote will hinge. That is a grave statement, because my group badly wants to be able to vote for this report along with, we imagine, most of its colleagues in the Parliament. We trust that by accepting these crucial amendments our colleagues will give us that chance. We hope they will enable us, in the final vote, to express our European feelings in the way that we should like to, because we too believe that this great enterprise of Community Europe, and this move to European union, is one of the great historic developments of our time.

(Applause)

Mr Berlinguer (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it has become commonplace to say that the European Community has been in a state of deadlock for quite some time. The old policies and techniques are taking it towards paralysis.

After the failure of the negotiations to reform the Community, which opened with great pomp and rhetoric on 30 May 1980, the new negotiations, which began with the Stuttgart European Council, do not point to a better outcome. Once again the aim at the outset was to deal jointly with all aspects of Community reform. In fact, they began almost exclusively to discuss cuts in agricultural spending: these cuts, by pure coincidence, were to be made indiscriminately, and so would most affect those types of farming which benefit least from the CAP, especially Mediterranean farming. The absolutely necessary reform of the agricultural policy cannot consist of cuts in the budget: on the contrary, we must increase the resources allocated to agriculture and use them in a fair and rational way. Nor can this reform be treated separately from the revival of the other policies.

But this is not the path which the Council and the Commission are following. Some Member States are now basing their actions on a purely 'financial' view of their membership of the EEC and in effect limit themselves to asking repeatedly for 'rebates'.

Apart from these matters what really is deeply worrying is the trend of the Community towards a progressive decline as an economic and commercial power by comparison with recent decades. This decline can now be proved by statistics (it is enough to look at the recent analysis of competitiveness by the Executive Committee) and which is shown both by its inability to maintain and increase its share of the world market and in internal development, where

investment has shrunk and there has been a tremendous increase in unemployment, including by comparison with the other great capitalist economies.

The most alarming thing is that this decline is most marked, by comparison first and foremost with the United States and Japan, in the field of the most advanced technologies, which are vital for the very near future, like those concerned with information, communications, automation and biotechnology. It should be stressed that we are falling behind not so much because of investment in these areas (if, for example, we add together the amount spent by individual countries on research, we see that the Community spends more or less the same percentage of the GDP on it as Japan) as because of the fragmentation of Community measures regarding energy policy, industrial policy and research.

This situation reflects adversely on each of the Member States of the Community, even on those which are considered the strongest. And this leads us to think that none of the Member States can, in isolation, solve the problems and meet the challenges of the 1980s. Contrary to the opinion of some people, these problems can certainly not be solved by the spontaneous workings of market forces: if anything (and very many examples of this could be cited), these tend nowadays to make European industries seek alliances with industries in Japan and the United States rather than seek agreements between themselves. These trends are very dangerous, because within a few years there is the risk that Western Europe will be relegated to a role of economic inferiority by comparison with the other most developed areas.

Faced with this very sad picture and this very worrying outlook, we might ask ourselves if our present discussion is timely, and if the aim of a general reform of the Community institutions with a view to drafting a treaty to set up the European Union might not become a sort of flight into the future away from present-day reality.

This is not our opinion: we agree with what Mr Spinelli has said, and we thank him for his prolonged and serious commitment to Community reform. We think that the main cause of the crisis at present affecting the Community and its Member States is the result of a prevalent short-term view, which has led and continues to lead governments to place the defence of narrow, immediate interests before the wider long-term interests of their countries and of Western Europe as a whole. This leads to courses of action which do not rise above low-level compromises.

We thus have the confirmation that the old ruling classes, the economic and political groups which have so far dominated the Community, are not capable of directing a process which will give Europe new impetus, unity and, therefore, the ability to act inde-

Berlinguer

pendently which it needs to be able to meet the great challenges of the 1980s and to maintain its progressive and peaceful role in the world.

We think that, if this aim is to be achieved, it is now vitally necessary for it to be adopted by the working classes in all that they say.

We understand the doubts felt by certain sections of the left wing in the face of the present social and political state of the Community, but in our view these doubts must give way in the light of all the facts which demonstrate that greater cooperation and integration are in line with the most vital interests of Europe and, especially, with those of the working class, the brainworkers, women and young people.

It is at Community level that we must make a genuine economic, political and cultural effort to meet the challenges and changes of our times. At this level we also find what is certainly new ground but is also a wider sphere and one more favourable to the unity of the working classes and their fight to transform the present state of things which is basically dominated by the interests of big monopoly groups.

In our opinion we should, therefore, take a fresh look, different from the past, at the traditional terms of opposition: supranationalism — defence of national interests. Differently from what might have been expected when the Community was set up, in some areas it is now the provision of common supranational policies which might best safeguard the interests of individual people and countries.

If we follow this path we shall, therefore, take a far-sighted view of the real interests of our countries. And at the same time we shall respond as we should to the request from many countries in all continents that Europe should play an active part in the struggle for world peace, in the furtherance of a balanced and controlled process of disarmament and in the construction of a new and fairer international economic order.

Every time we have contact with representatives of other countries we note how great these expectations are, especially in those Third World countries which see Europe as the force which can help them towards independent development, free from the pressures, blackmail and impositions of the two largest powers; and they, too, need a Europe which will encourage them to cooperate instead of competing to win spheres of influence and to rival each other to disarm instead of continuing the arms race. This is what the European Community should choose, refusing, to rearm like the others which would inevitably mean atomic rearmament.

These are the reasons which led us to consider that it is appropriate and right that our Parliament should today be tackling the vital problem of the powers of the Community institutions and that other, closely-related problem of the new form to give to integration.

The proposals contained in the resolution submitted to us by the Committee on Institutional Affairs, which have been drawn up after long and open discussion, are a good starting-point for a long-term process like that of reforming the Treaties. Let no-one think that this reform will come about immediately after the European Parliament has voted, not only because the ratification procedures are lengthy, but especially because of the numerous political obstacles which will be placed in its path. However, this initiative of the European Parliament has the merit of placing the problems clearly before the governments, the national Parliaments and the political and social forces and aims, justifiably in our view, to take these matters outside the realm of discussions between specialists.

Realism does not always coincide with a perception of the opportunities which are immediately available. Moreover, the European Parliament's initiative does not preclude other possible measures of a more limited nature, some of which like, for example, the initiative of the French Government, are already under discussion, especially the idea of 'progress in stages' towards greater future cooperation and integration.

We support every initiative which points towards this, in the hope that it will produce practical results. There may be different approaches, but the important thing is to reach the conclusion that the Community urgently needs to take a new direction, as the present situation cannot be allowed to continue for long and nor can we be content with mere adjustments.

(Applause)

Mr Nord (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, the activities of the Committee on Institutional Affairs have now reached the stage of passing from the general to the more specific. As a result, certain differences of opinion which at an earlier stage it was possible to hide behind very general and balanced premises are now becoming more evident. But the Committee on Institutional Affairs has succeeded in submitting to Parliament what we regard as a reasonable document, which was adopted by a very large majority of the committee's members. We owe this success to the chairman, Mr Ferri, and the coordinating rapporteur, Mr Spinelli, and they must certainly be thanked for their efforts.

From the outset, Mr President, my group has adopted a positive attitude towards the initiative that first led to the setting up of the Committee on Institutional Affairs and then to the mandate to submit today's report to Parliament. Our attitude is still positive. Now that we have reached a more critical stage, it is important for it to be clearly stated once again what our motivations were and remain. It is a Liberal habit, and a good one at that, to approach ambitious political initiatives with a healthy dose of hard-headedness and scepticism. Despite this, we are very well aware

Nord

that politics become weak and sterile unless they are conducted with a sense of vision that looks beyond everyday events and places them in an historical perspective. It was such vision, Mr President, that led to the establishment of our European Community, and it is the gradual fading of this vision that is threatening to reverse the initial success of the Community.

Some appear to believe that the wisest course would be to revert to what they regard as the security of the absolutely sovereign, centralized and bureaucratized nation State shrouded in magnificent complacency. This system, which is again being recommended in some quarters, has this century resulted in two European civil wars and the death of tens of millions of people. If we again opt for this system, the seal will finally be set on the economic and political decline of this part of the world and of our various countries. Is that considered enough by those in this House as elsewhere who have no more than a friendly but compassionate smile for the report we are now discussing? Politics is, of course, the art of the attainable, but it would not be an art in the true sense of the word if it was not required to make it possible to attain what is absolutely essential for our countries and for our peoples. And that this is possible is proved by the very history of our Community. Who would have dared to think in 1945 that we would have a supranational European Coal and Steel Community in 1951?

Various members of my group, Mr President, will be speaking in this debate on specific aspects of the resolution now before us. I shall confine myself to four comments of a more general nature. I believe we must link this report to the initiative taken by Parliament's Bureau in calling for a report on the economic state of the Community and measures the Community might take to overcome stagnation and mass unemployment, the Albert and Ball report. They are in fact two sides of the same coin. We must not, of course, simply revel in the thought of fine institutional structures which do not comply with present-day reality. Nor must we present our peoples with fine plans for European policies in all kinds of areas when we know that, with the present institutional structure, they will not be implemented.

The path to the failure of our Community is paved with splendid plans launched at summit conferences and then not implemented. For their implementation a smoothly functioning decision-making mechanism is essential, and that is precisely what we lack at the moment. We therefore look forward with particular interest to the proposals which the Committee on Institutional Affairs will be putting forward in the future regarding the procedure which must be adopted to prevent this project from suffering the same fate as many of its predecessors.

My second comment, Mr President, concerns the idea of subsidiarity which runs through the report like a

thread and in which we are firm believers. We do not want a Europe, or indeed countries, in which everyone and everything is treated uniformly. We Liberals believe that there is only one right course, and that is to make clear distinctions between the various decision-making levels and to ensure that decisions are always taken at the level that is closest to the citizen. It is not our goal to subordinate the nation States to a centralized European authority. What we want is to preserve and encourage local, regional and national differences by creating European decision-making levels to which only those decisions will be transferred which concern us all. We are also very satisfied with the clear choice made in the resolution of institutional balance rather than the preponderance of one institution. Europe is as incapable of tolerating the hegemony of one country as it is the omnipotence of one institution. There must not be one dominant institution — the Commission, the Council or Parliament: they must all participate in the political decision-making process by a system of checks and balances. We feel that the resolution is very appropriately worded in this respect.

If we compare the report now before us with earlier documents, we are struck by the continuity in this area. For years the finger has constantly been pointed at the same weak points and proposals of similar purport have constantly been made for improving the situation. This continuity is evident not only from Parliament's own documents but also from the proposals regarding institutional questions put forward by the Commission some time ago. It is also clear from the many dissertations and recommendations that academics and researchers have compiled on the subject. The resolution might be described as a synthesis of what has emerged over the years in very wide circles in our countries. The time has now come to act accordingly.

Lastly, I must confess that I find some parts of the motion for a resolution — particularly the sections on the economy and policy for society — too detailed. They delve too deeply into the content of policies to be pursued in the future, which is out of keeping with a document that primarily concerns institutional development. We would have preferred it otherwise. The policy to be adopted cannot be stipulated in a treaty. That is the task of the appropriate institutions, taking majority decisions. We have refrained from tabling lengthy amendments in an attempt to make this text read as we think it should. Instead, some of us have tabled just one amendment, which seeks to tone down the detailed content of the sections of the resolution I have just mentioned, so that we do not tie ourselves down too much where future action is concerned. We hope that Parliament will approve this amendment.

That, then, Mr President, is the basic position of my group on the motion for a resolution. We hope that the debate will be a good one, because that is what the

Nord

subject deserves. We hope and we are confident — and that confidence has already been repaid by Mr Thorn's statement, for which I should like to thank him — that the Commission will state its position clearly, not only today but on future occasions too, because the smooth functioning of the decision-making process in our Community must, of course, be a matter of constant concern for the Commission in particular. We also hope that this debate and the debates that will follow will have an impact on the public, so that when our citizens are again called to vote in the European elections in the near future, they can make their choice in full knowledge of the facts.

(Applause)

Mr de la Malène (DEP). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like, very quickly, to explain where my group stands in today's debate.

I should like to say that, on the face of it, we have no objections of principle to the Ten agreeing on a new Treaty that will take us further.

I should also like to say that we are in favour of the principle implicit in the expression 'European Union' that Georges Pompidou, the President of the Republic, supported at the period when I had the honour to be his minister.

And I should further like to say that, going beyond any new treaty, beyond European Union, we have to admit that the institutions are not functioning satisfactorily at the moment. During the 1984 campaign, we shall do our best to make proposals that could perhaps take the form of a new treaty, which means that, at the outset, we have no objections of principle.

But coming to the procedure used and the text which the rapporteur and his team are proposing to us, we have to be honest enough to recognize that these proposals are full of drawbacks. They seem to us to be Utopian, ill-advised and — I say this advisedly dangerous for the construction of Europe.

I said Utopian. What we recently went through with the plan by two important ministers for foreign affairs — the Genscher-Colombo plan, that is — is still fresh in our minds. It was a reasonable and I should go so far as to say modest ambition to which we subscribed. But we are indeed sorry to have to say that, although this plan did not get a completely negative reception, the final result was a long way from what was originally intended. Honourable Members, what a gulf there is between the original ambition of the Genscher-Colombo plan and the ambition of the vast project before us today. It will be said, of course, that hope of success is no prerequisite for action and of course we share this intellectual point of view. But look at this text — and I do not wish to be harsh on those who were so willing as to produce it — and it is obvious that, from many angles, it is very difficult for public opinion in our countries to understand, to the

point where, wrongly perhaps, it could well also be a disappointment to those who are against rapid progress. We are told that it is up to us in the European Parliament to make proposals, because no-one can do that for us. That is true and we believe it. But we can see just what sort of a gap there is — as we indeed saw at the time of the Genscher-Colombo plan — between what we want and what the governments want and, going beyond the governments, between us and the desires and possibilities and attitudes of the national parliaments. It has to be realized that these are legitimate governments, even if, like me, we are fighting them.

Yet they are legitimate because they have the confidence of their parliaments and, for the time being, these parliaments are also legitimate. So we cannot gloss over the reality of the political forces of our countries with fine words.

Not only did I call this project Utopian. I also said we thought it was ill-advised. Without wishing to do so, perhaps, the authors of this project are likely to lead us into what have been called theological arguments, which we all felt were things of the past but which no doubt had some meaning when political forces were not what they are today — which is why these arguments are outmoded. But there is a risk of reviving them today. Going beyond institutional quarrels, in fact, all political and economic observers are tireless in pointing out that we Europeans spend too much time arguing about the institutions and about the budget and about own resources and that these arguments we go in for, in all good faith no doubt, divert attention away from the real problem, which is achieving the great internal market and the industrial policy that will prevent Europe from being left in the sidelines on the eve of the third industrial revolution. We fight over a few million ECU when we discuss the budget or own resources, but we fail to count what is lost because we have not set up a proper internal market. And that is worth far more than the few million ECU that we think we ought not spend or we think ought to be channelled into one or other of our policies. What I fear is that this project we are about to launch will unintentionally revive the quarrels that lead Europe to forget where its real priorities lie.

I said the proposals were dangerous and I use this word advisedly, because the authors of the project, I am convinced, are meaning to try to make this Europe of ours progress. However, they themselves have taken stock of Europe's abortive attempts at advancement. And we would not like to see this project join all Europe's past failures in the minds of the Europeans — as alas we fear it will. This is why we go so far as to say, with a certain amount of reservation, that we think that, instead of serving the construction of Europe, this project brings in another element of despair that Europe can certainly do without.

de la Malène

We would not have been against our Committee looking at the problems — and how important they are! — of improving the Community's present decision-making machinery. There thanks to the weight of this Parliament, we could perhaps have tried to make improvement and progress with this decision-making machinery at the level of the institutions. And we could also have focused Parliament's attention on the budget procedure that I mentioned just now and that has been calling out for improvement since the Council — and I regret having to say this — has stopped having any policies and has become a sort of vetoing body. There again, with the decision-making procedure and the budget procedure, there was something practical we could do, something which would have been in line with the desires of the governments and the parliaments and of public opinion as well. But no. It had to be more than that. I understand and I respect it — even if I am unable to follow suit.

In conclusion, I should like to insist on one particular point. In view of the no doubt excellent intentions that motivated this report, in view of the somewhat deliberately vague and sometimes difficultly comprehensible and always rather theoretical nature of the proposals and in view of the weight that a Parliament like ours is bound to have, we could have appreciated the intention and overlooked the structure and rally to what we believe to be the majority of this House. We did not, however, wish to do this. Why? Because we set too much store by European construction to entertain two truths in this matter. We do not wish to join the ranks of those who vote and then forget what they have done. We do not wish to join the ranks of those who vote and fail to believe in the effect of their vote. We do not wish to join the ranks of those who vote today and support the governments that do the opposite tomorrow. And we do not wish to join the ranks of those who vote because Europe makes them look democratic. We need none of this.

We believe in what we are doing. We think our votes are important. We aim to be coherent and we wish to work as efficiently as possible for this Europe we have to build together if we are not, once again, to be marginalized.

It is because we seriously and regretfully consider this text to be Utopian, ill-advised and perhaps even dangerous that we are saying so clearly. However, as we do not wish to go against the majority of the House, which seems to see things differently, we have decided not to table any amendments and not to take part in the voting.

(Applause from the European Progressive Democrats)

Mr Bøgh (CDI). — *(DA)* Mr President, General Clausewitz of Germany once said in a famous statement that war is the continuation of politics by other means. When we cannot get any further with talks, negotiations and votes we resort to the use of force as an argument.

In the Spinelli report the advocates of union have resorted to the continuation of politics by other means, which Clausewitz called war and which in any case have nothing to do with democratic rules of conduct. What is before us is a motion for a resolution calling for the scrapping of the Treaty of Rome, which is the basis on which the Member States became part of the Community, and its replacement by a treaty of union. It is proposed that the Community, which the countries joined under an agreement on economic cooperation, is now to be turned into a unitary state with its foreign policy, armaments policy, defence policy and cultural policy — with all of these constituting changes which could not be brought about by legal means. A plan of action has been put before us for the gradual removal of authority from the national parliaments by the delegation of one area of competence after another to this Parliament, which feels that it has been humiliated and now wants revenge. And it is already now arrogating to itself the legislative power which the proposal would confer on it, with all the honour and greatness which Parliament seeks. The plan is to set aside the Council of Ministers, the only body which can legally represent the Member States and the only institution competent to decide on amendments to the Treaty of Rome and on changes in the nature and field of action of the Communities. It is stated that we have lost confidence in the Council and that we have decided 'not to rely on officials from national ministries but to set in motion a political process with a broad backing from political parties of all Member States.'

The plan for the new Union-State which Parliament intends to adopt in the spring will be directly adopted, without the involvement of the Council of Ministers, and ratified by the national parliaments. In other words the plans for the Union are to be fulfilled without regard to the existing legal instances, with all their misgivings, their tempering of Union aspirations, their respect for the right of veto and their attachment to the national constitutions. And the missing legal basis is filled in so neatly by a reference to the will of the electorate, which the European Parliament represents. That's all very well, but the voters have never been asked for their opinion on European Union! It is crass arrogance now to attribute to them views which they have not expressed.

This crassness is compounded when two legal experts, including the vice-chancellor of the prestigious University of Strasbourg, put their names to reasoning of this kind in the issue of *Crocodile* which was devoted to the legal basis for this process. But the crassest thing of all is the contempt for those Member States which do not wish to be incorporated into a Union-State. It is splendidly democratic to say: 'no Member State of the Communities which refuses to join the union can be obliged to do so'.

Bøgh

But when the the knife is pointed, the threat follows. It is hardly any more democratic when the report goes on to state: 'nor may it, through its refusal, prevent others from setting up the Union'. What cavalier treatment of international legal agreements! When a State, in pursuance of the Treaty, has integrated its economy into that of the Community, it can suddenly be relegated to the third or fourth division, if that State, for example Denmark, for constitutional reasons cannot and for democratic reasons will not join.

But the Spinelli treaty makes some grand gestures. I quote: 'The Communities, political cooperation and the EMS will automatically cease to exist. (... The Member States) would authorize the institutions of the Union to negotiate with those countries which did not join a solution to all the problems deriving from their previous membership of the Communities.'

It is clear to me that those who drafted this document were not very interested in the problem of Denmark, which in this way is reduced to a third-rank protectorate of a large superpower. I hope there are no Danes in this chamber who will vote for such a proposal. At all events one thing must be clearly understood: the next elections for the European Parliament in Denmark will be a vote for or against the European Community.

Mr Pasmazoglou (NI). — *(GR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it would be a grave and impermissible dereliction if we — the directly elected representatives of our peoples in the European Parliament — were not to indicate the way for the European Community and our countries to get out of the present rut of immobility which contrasts with what the European Community achieved in the first fifteen years after it was founded.

I want to commend the contribution of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, of all its rapporteurs and members, but particularly and emphatically the clear-sightedness and persistence of Mr Altiero Spinelli. The European Parliament has a duty to launch a timely and firm initiative so that new political impetus can be given to strengthening the institutions of the Community and to putting European political union on a sound footing, thereby establishing the European Union.

The resolution proposed by the Committee on Institutional Affairs must be endorsed by a large majority so as to give appropriate emphasis and prominence to the wish of the elected representatives of the European peoples for the decisive step to be taken towards a unified, robust and effective approach to the great problems of our times. Approval of the resolution by an impressive majority will also serve to reinforce trust in our will to overcome the economic crisis and achieve growth and progress in Europe and the world.

I will make three brief comments concerning this great issue. The first is that it is impossible for the

economic and social problems of all the European peoples to find a solution outside the framework of European economic and political unity. The European Community stands in need of fundamental reforms, chiefly as regards the increase of its resources and the enhancement of its capacity to initiate and implement essential decisions swiftly and consequentially, though in a manner which is democratic. These truths apply just as much to the economically powerful countries and regions of Europe as to those which are weaker and still developing.

My second comment is that no European country or government can effectively exercise an autonomous foreign policy outside the context of a common European foreign policy which must necessarily be coordinated with a European perception of the world and a joint policy of our security. The strengthening of European political cooperation is a crucial precondition for making our cooperation with the United States of America strong and fruitful and our relations with the rest of Europe and the world as a whole constructive.

My third comment is that it is imperative that a durable and strengthened democratic procedure be established for electing a European political leadership with the participation of all our peoples. This is necessary in order for us all jointly to acquire the international political influence which is essential and for us to give authenticity and credibility to our separate political and cultural identity. Countries or political forces which refuse to take part in such a development will, in objective terms, I fear, be doing their national sovereignty a disservice because their peoples or countries will be left without essential backing, without the influence required to cope with the inevitable and inexorable debilitation wrought by the powerful pressures and dangers inherent in the conflicting and incompatible currents of our time.

The draft preliminary treaty which is being proposed contains many positive solutions and above all combines the developmental process with decisive steps on defining procedures and areas where joint action needs to be taken by the European Union. I propose no amendments because at this stage the direction itself and the decision take precedence. However, it would be necessary and logical for the arrangements on decision-making which are being proposed to be combined with the affirmation that the European Union we must build will hold to a policy of active solidarity as regards the protection of the fundamental rights of each member country accordingly as these rights and their ramifications are laid down in international law.

I would like to say few words to our friends of the European Democratic Group. The two main issues which have just been specifically raised by Mr Prag,

Pesmazoglou

namely, a new financial system for the Community's own resources and the reform of the common agricultural policy, have been decided in principle and the relevant resolutions should be shaped in the coming months. I would add that the rules on decision-making are those which have been effectively provided in the Treaty of Rome. A negative resolution or abstention by the Group of European Democrats at this preliminary stage will weaken our major effort to advance in this decisively important matter.

I would also point out that I listened with great interest to Mr de la Malène's statement and comments. I profoundly hope that the worries, reservations and hesitations of the Group of the European Progressive Democrats will be overcome. Indeed the massive support of our French colleagues is vital for the initial phase of this great undertaking.

I conclude, Mr President, by saying that the endorsement of the preliminary draft by the European Parliament by a large majority will be an important contribution towards opening the way to the final decisions and acts through which the European Union will be consolidated. Hesitancy or abstention, timidity or evasion, reservation and delay, will be damaging. A firm and positive outcome is vital for the security and the economic, political and cultural survival and progress of all our peoples.

(Applause)

Mrs Focke (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, if, during a period of crisis for Europe and the world, nine months before the next direct elections to the European Parliament, the European Parliament presents proposals for the Community's development extending beyond the Treaties, it is important for voters to be able to relate these proposals to their own concrete problems, needs and expectations. In other words, such proposals must counteract any undesirable developments and must act as genuine stimuli in order to bring about greater harmony of interests among Europeans and to protect these interests by means of common democratic institutions.

These words are taken from Jean Monnet, the founder of the European Community. Jean Monnet was concerned with a process, the continuous change in relationships between the nations and peoples of Europe. He said: 'I have never doubted that this process will one day lead us to the United States of Europe, but I am not trying to picture the political framework today because the terms being argued about are too inexact. What we as the Community's representatives are preparing has no recognizable precedent. The Community is firmly anchored in institutions that need strengthening, although it should not be forgotten that the true political authority on which European democracies will one day be based has yet to be embodied in a constitution and implemented.'

I am speaking on behalf of the German Social-Democrats in the European Parliament and the majority of the Socialist Group in quoting Jean Monnet. Let us emphasize the process, the movement, the negotiations, let us make the direction clearer — not just in today's debate, but in all our speeches and decisions, in agricultural resolutions and budgetary decisions, in environment directives and employment programmes, in regional policy, in combating worldwide hunger and last, but not least, in trying to secure peace in the world. Let us remain true to the Community, which is unique and has neither precedents nor models. Don't let us jeopardize its growth and the strengthening of its institutions by disregarding the Community's present situation and setting a deadline for its development based on historical structures instead of allowing this unique association of nations to develop naturally.

When we tell people about our work here and they see the gulf between what we are trying to achieve and the governments' inflexibility they ask: 'what have *you* to say?' Our experience and this question, with which they are simultaneously querying the effect of their votes, both point to the same thing; it is time the European Parliament was given more rights. By strengthening the Community's institutions now we are strengthening democracy in the Community, giving Parliament powers of co-decision-making not just where the budgets are concerned but on every decision.

I have chosen the term 'powers of co-decision-making' deliberately. Strengthening Parliament should not mean depriving the Council of its powers or turning it into a sort of second chamber, as recommended by the Spinelli report. The laborious process of achieving closer and closer union among nations calls for the governments' collaboration in an institution that tries to shape common policies out of their different interests.

Our European Community budgetary law has pointed the way for this type of cooperation between Parliament and the Council; we are in complete agreement with the section of the Spinelli report on Community finances contributed by our colleague Jochen Seeler, which even extends this budgetary law. Our proposals, which differ considerably from the Spinelli report, urge a similar type of cooperation between the Council and Parliament. This would involve the Council being set a deadline to reach a decision, as with the budget.

Our second proposal is thus that the Council's inability to reach decisions be replaced by pressure to make decisions. It also implies that the Commission's status would be upgraded; if the Commission and a qualified majority in Parliament largely agree on some point, the Council will find it even harder to reject proposals. This also means that the dispute about unanimous versus majority Council rulings would be

Focke

ended by a new form of resolution and not that the Commission would decide what constitutes national interest, as envisaged by the Spinelli report. It would be unreasonable to burden the Commission with a function so alien to its character.

What we are recommending instead is that the Council's powers of overruling proposals on which the Commission and Parliament basically agree are limited to cases when there is a negative qualified majority, as with the budget. In other words, we are more interested in constructive cooperation between the Community's institutions than in the division of powers and built-in conflicts.

This ought, incidentally, to apply not only to cooperation between the Community's institutions but still more to cooperation between the Community and Member States. We therefore cannot accept the misleading term 'competitive legislation' which is given several different definitions in the Spinelli report. The Community is based on cooperation and its institutions must be geared to cooperation. This is the third conclusion we have drawn from our experience to date.

The fourth is a very important one for us because it relates to the participation of the individuals concerned. We would like the Treaties to embody this right of participation as a binding principle. The Commission's proposal for a directive on assessing the effects of major investment projects on the environment makes provision for this. Parliament's proposal for reforming regional policy also make provision for it. It is one of our essential tasks, we believe, to counteract the trend towards overcentralization in the Community, private individuals' alienation from the Community and the subjection of European diversity to an inhumane levelling process. The Spinelli report does nothing like justice to this goal.

Binding rights of co-decision-making for Parliament, pressure on the Council to make decisions, more cooperation between the Community's institutions and rights of participation for the public — these are our four main reform proposals. They reflect a cohesive concept which we regard as more European than the Spinelli report. The latter contains too many analogies with nation States and fails to concentrate on what is needed now, i.e. more democracy and more-cooperation. In its ambition to rename everything this document creates utter confusion and teems with inherent contradictions which would make the job of any lawyer trying to turn it into a draft treaty quite impossible

Draft, Amendment No 131 by the German Social-Democrats is a coherent expression of their views on reform. The Socialist Group has concentrated on the essentials. I call on you to approve of the whole proposal or the Socialist Group's set of individual propo-

sals. People are expecting us to come up with proposals capable of changing the situation in line with their needs. The Spinelli report as it stands does not meet this requirement. Help to prevent Parliament's institutional initiative from becoming just another draft constitution to be shelved, and make it into a challenge that arouses a response from both the Community's citizens and national parliaments.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Seitlinger (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, honourable Members, the draft Treaty we have to discuss today reflects the need to strengthen the institutional machinery of the European Community — something no-one would deny to be well-founded and urgent if we do not wish to relegate the European ideal to the realm of stillborn ideas. We are not of those, who, like Mr de la Malène, give up their hopes for fear of not realizing their ideal. We are of those who will persevere because, as far as we are concerned, the European ideal is not stillborn. More than ever before, the objective analysis of the economic, social and international situation and the profound feeling of public opinion (as the surveys, in particular, bring out) militate in favour of greater common action to take up the challenge. It should be clear that the text we are discussing today is not the fruit of a marginal initiative by one or other of our members who happens to be particularly well-versed in institutional matters. We are not a university or a faculty of constitutional law. We are a democratic body that represents and expresses the concerns of the hundreds of millions of electors who voted us in.

The result of 18 months' work by the Institutional Affairs Committee therefore expresses the aspirations of the citizens of Europe as far as it can. It sets out most of their social, economic and cultural requirements — and their security requirements — in a full legal text. And who would be more legitimately or better placed to make the proposal to achieve European Union by a gradual, pragmatic process than the elected European Parliament? Our Parliament is going to the hustings for the second time next year and it would have been inconceivable for it not to have been in a position to put a vast project giving the guidelines for better organization of European relations before the public.

I should like to return to the feeling of rightness that I get from the text of the Institutional Affairs Committee. Two of the main points made in this document are worthy of emphasis. The first is to do with the subsidiarity principle outlined in the part on the legal structure of the Union. This, I think, is an essential principle and one which, moreover, brings up to date and makes explicit one of the convictions that inspired the founding fathers of Europe back in the 1950s.

Seitlinger

This concept of subsidiarity in fact covers one of the most elementary of commonsense ideas that could only shock the most closed of minds today — the one contained in paragraph 15 of the motion for a resolution, and I quote: 'Within the spheres of activity thus assigned to it, the Union shall undertake only those tasks which can be executed more effectively in common or in corporation than by the Member States separately, or those whose execution requires a contribution from the Union because their dimension or their effects extend beyond national frontiers'. There can be no better illustration of the fairness of this distribution of tasks between the Member States and the European Union, with a view to more effective results, than the very specific examples which Messrs Albert and Ball gave in the report published last July at this Parliament's request. This report enabled us to take stock of the disturbing extent to which the countries of Europe have fallen behind their partners and competitors in America and Japan in the race for technology and to adapt their industry. If we have all but missed this rendezvous with the future, at the risk of becoming marginalized nations that can only stand in the wings of those advanced industries that create employment, it is because Europe has lacked the sort of authority that can point to common interests and get them organized. This is why the proposals the Institutional Affairs Committee has made have the great merit of posing the question of the power of decision along lines that I consider to be both daring and reasonable.

The second aspect of this text I should like to emphasize is that recent and tragic events have proved to be obvious justification. By proposing that, after a unanimous European Council has invited it to do so, the Union can have specific responsibility for security and the arms supply policy and defence more generally, the draft Treaty is at last dealing clearly with one of the subjects that has long been taboo in European discussions and which, very fortunately, we are all now forced to take notice of. The destruction of the South Korean Boeing and the death of 269 innocent civilians should have provoked an immediate, firm and homogeneous reaction from democratic Europe. In face of the violent arrogance and the spirit of superiority and militarist domination of a nation which no longer hesitates to use force to make an impression on the pusillanimous who prefer to be red rather than dead, there was only one dignified and effective attitude to adopt and that was vehement protest accompanied by the relevant joint sanctions. Once again the criminal acts of the USSR are dividing the Western world and revealing the weakness and the shortcomings of the Europeans' spirit of defence. The European Union, with its common diplomacy and acting with the speed and assurance its powers would give, would never have allowed such a manifestation of powerlessness to occur. We need common diplomacy and this security must be established without delay. History is speeding up, it is threatening, and the size of the pacifist movements reflects a feeling of fear and a tempta-

tion to give up that I, for one, would see as a lack of confidence in the ability of the nation-States we now have to ensure the safety of us all.

I shall conclude, honourable Members, on this note. If my group is supporting this text, if the project before us, albeit imperfect, reflects our essential concern, it is because these concerns are intended to be as near as possible to public opinion. What we have to do now is convince the media, the leaders of public opinion and each and every one of the voters that our debate today and the prospects it opens are aimed at a better defence of their interests, of their standard of living and of their jobs. But above all, they are aimed at enabling a European Community of freedom to emerge and take shape, a Europe that can defend, with all the strength of union, those supreme values of liberty and responsibility which are in danger of crumbling and disappearing under the heel of totalitarianism.

So what the Institutional Affairs Committee has done is essential, in our eyes, and it by no means excludes any other drive to advance inter-institutional relations within the framework of the Treaties being made as soon as possible. A drive along these lines is in fact being made parallel to this in the Political Affairs Committee and the various reports the European Parliament has adopted on the subject are now being put before the Council and the Commission. Because we need more Europe and more effectiveness and more cohesion in what we do together, we have to do our utmost to ensure that the economic and institutional integration of Europe progresses. This debate and the vote that follows it are a turning point in the European Parliament's work towards these aims.

(Applause)

(The sitting was suspended at 1.05 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR : MR VANDEWIELE

*Vice-President*¹

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED) — Mr President, we all know that the famous European, St Augustine, prayed earnestly to be delivered from temptation — but not yet. Those who want a draft treaty before the end of this Parliament may feel that the hesitations of the European Democratic Group are like the hesitations of Augustine. But Augustine did finally become a saint, and no doubt we shall one day persuade the British and Danish peoples that it is necessary to strengthen the institutions of the Community to enable those institutions to bear burdens which our nations States quite clearly cannot bear.

¹ Membership of Parliament : See Minutes.

Catherwood

Mr Kirk will speak later for the Danish Members. I, for my part, would like to say that this does come at an exceptionally difficult time for the British. Until three months ago, there was the possibility that Britain would actually leave the Community. The main contribution of the British Conservatives was to win that victory three months ago so decisively that following the referendum of 1975 and the election of 1979 there is now absolutely no doubt about British membership of the Community. Labour said there was no need for a referendum because the electorate would decide, and the electorate has decided. But to go from the final and decisive debate on the prolonged argument about membership straight into a debate on European union within three months is just too fast.

We in this group here know perfectly well that the present constitution of the European Community does not work. We know that the abuse of the veto has made rubbish of the decision-making process of the Community, that it has left us with what has been described recently as a non-Europe, in which even the common market, that foundation of Europe, is being strangled by the 10 000 silken strands of non-tariff barriers which have prevented the reformers from keeping the market free, and we are aware of the changes that are desperately needed to enable the Community to adapt to a very swiftly changing world. Without a reform of the institutions, therefore, the Community will not only not go forwards, but it will continue to go backwards. We know as we look across the Atlantic and consider the absurd imbalance between Europe's immense industrial and commercial strength and its weakness in face of the dollar, which accounts for 80 % of all reserve currencies, of American interest rates based on that dollar, and of American political power, which they wield increasingly in their own interests, that we in Europe need far, far greater unity in financial and in political action than the present constitution can give us. We know all that. We understand all that. We know that there is a need to amend the constitution. Above all, we know the anxiety of the countries which formed the Community 25 years ago to take the Community forward another stage, to build Europe, which has to advance if it is not to fall back and collapse. We in this group share all those hopes.

Pragmatists though we are, we know that there is a place for gesture too; but a gesture which is repudiated is worse than no gesture at all, because it would set back an enterprise which we all want to go forward. We in Britain simply cannot go from the old argument about membership of a Community to a proposed treaty for a draft union within three months without some help from you.

Now we know that all the proposals that are made here are not so fundamental as they look. We know that the union is not a federation or even a confederation. We know that already a great many helpful

concessions have been made to our point of view, and we are grateful for that. But it is the considered view of friends and colleagues who wish you well and wish all those well who have this enterprise in hand that we need two more critical concessions to pass this staging-post with you as we would wish. The British Parliament and, I am pretty certain, the Danish Folketing too, would want to be asked for their assent before agreeing that policies on which they had legislated for 500 years and more were to be handed over to the exclusive competence of the Union as proposed in paragraph 20. They would also want to decide for themselves and not leave the Commission, with the greatest respect to the Commission, to decide what was their vital national interest under paragraph 124, and they would not want at this stage to put a firm terminal date on their right to exercise delaying powers.

Those are the two points on which we absolutely have to have your help before we can pass this staging-post with you. I do most earnestly appeal therefore to colleagues in the other groups not to write these things off as the insularity of an island race, but consider them as helpful suggestions put forward by colleagues who want to pass this staging-post with you and do not want you to leave them behind at this point. We are with you in spirit, but there is no point in our going through with this particular proposal without having your help on those two points.

We have not finally decided as a group how to vote, but those two amendments are absolutely critical to our decision. Building Europe means building the Europe that we have got, including the two northern countries whose separate identities go back a thousand years — pragmatic countries who came to the Community as all our economies were heading into trouble and who have had to take on faith the economic benefits which are so obvious to the peoples of the founding Six. If we want to make a gesture to the Council before this first elected Parliament runs its term, then it is better to make a gesture all together, including Denmark and including Britain. But to do that we need to help each other to adapt Europe's objectives to our own political realities. If you cannot do that today, the Union will not do it tomorrow.

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — (GR) Mr President, we have listened to the rapporteurs and the other speakers indulging in flights of fancy and making statements about positive developments which will take place in the Community if this Parliament adopts unanimously or even by a substantial majority the resolution under debate. We presume that all of this is simply part of an election campaign which is getting under way for the approaching European parliamentary elections. It reminds us, nonetheless, of what happened when the Communities were being founded and the Treaties ratified.

Ephremidis

At that time it was proclaimed that economic crises would no longer occur in the European Community; that all the countries in the Community would develop in unison and that the less developed would steadily catch up with the more developed and that the Community would acquire an autonomous identity and exert its own special influence on international developments thereby ensuring peace in Europe and in the world at large. Alas for the founders and for those who still believe in their visions, the reality is tragic. Today, 25 years after the implementation of the Treaties, we have reached tragic impasse so great that leading figures are declaring officially that the Community is on the verge of bankruptcy. We have more than 12 million people unemployed and several million European workers living on the breadline or actually going hungry. We have contradictions, trade wars inside the Community and between the Community and other centres of imperialism. We have a Community policy which, contrary to its declared aim of promoting the development of under-developed countries has today, after 25 years of colonial style exploitation and penetration under the guise of cooperation, left them staggering under the weight of under-development and crushing indebtedness. Moreover, as a result of this policy hunger has spread to much of the Community. Lastly, 25 years after the entry into force of the Treaties, Europe itself is today living with the spectre of war and even a nuclear holocaust.

Mr President, does the fault lie entirely with the Treaties and the institutions? In our view the fault lies elsewhere. It lies in the policy chosen at that time which necessitated the corresponding institutions for its implementation. This choice was dictated by the interests of the multinational monopolies and State monopoly capitalism and constant subservience to the Atlantic cold war policy. This is what has led to the present bankruptcy which, Mr President, will not be remedied by amending the Treaties unless we first clearly and categorically opt for an alternative policy designed to serve the interests of working people, of the peoples of Europe and of peace.

The coordinating rapporteur explained the philosophy behind the modifications being recommended and told us that the widest consensus exists within the Committee on Institutional Affairs and of his hope that there will be widespread agreement in the House as well and that the proposed amendments will be adopted. He also told us that it is primarily a matter of compromise. Mr President, I have no intention of acting as counsellor to the coordinating rapporteur. I wish only to remind him that he has served in the progressive movement for many years and knows that behind ideologies which are not divinely ordained and political positions there is a reality which reflects specific class and social interests which no amount of

proclamations, treaties and modifications but only by a clear political choice can transcend. In whose interests are these institutions being created, and which policy do they serve? So let him not shed crocodile tears when he begs for our votes and those of other colleagues in this House.

Mr President, I want to make some comments on the proposed draft. With regard to the legal structure and institutional bodies the proposed resolution institutionalizes grave legal inequity in the relations between the Member States.

In a general sense this inequity mirrors the existing differences between them, particularly those of an economic nature. This legal inequity is reflected in the composition of the legislative body, the European Parliament, and of the executive, the Commission, and likewise in the way in which the votes of the representatives of the Member States are weighed in the Council. Along with the abolition of the principle of unanimity and the upgraded, and almost exclusive, legislative role of the Parliament and the Commission this is an indication of the emptiness and hypocrisy of the statements about the harmonious development of the peoples, countries and regions of the Community. And here I want to stress that, as far as we are aware, no international organization of States or confederation or federation of States contains so many glaring inequities.

Secondly, the proposed draft envisages the gradual realization of European unification without, however, stating what kind of unification is envisaged. This is the real issue and not, as stated in the preamble to the resolution, concern about ensuring the consent of the citizens and the Member States. On the contrary, the draft treaty is aimed, in reality, at reducing the competence of the national governments to a minimum and limiting it to unimportant sectors, so as to prevent those who, despite the foolish talk of the European federalists, believe firmly in the principle of national sovereignty, from rightly opposing it. Moreover, this is evidenced, apart from in the other provisions of the draft, by the institutionalization of the so-called subsidiarity principle which allows for the constant extension of the exclusive competence of the European Union by decision of the supranational institutional bodies without the competent national bodies having any say in the matter, thus disregarding the peoples' wishes. This method was chosen, Mr President, precisely, because the planned European Union is intended to serve the unfettered financial, political and military interests of the monopolies, and not the interests of the people and the workers.

We are against the draft, Mr President, for all these reasons, not only as members of the Communist Party of Greece, but because we come from a country which has its own specific characteristics. It has special areas of concern, and its experience of three years in the

Ephremidis

Common Market has shown that membership will not serve the real interests of the Greek people unless the political orientation of this so-called European Union is set out in advance.

Mr Galland (L). — (*FR*) Mr President, honourable Members, there are obviously a number of ways of looking at the Spinelli report. We, for our part, are in the category of Europeans and we have deliberately chosen to look at it in an optimistic and constructive manner. For, undeniably, the work of our Committee on Institutional Affairs has come at the right time. It has provided away out of the impasse, an answer to the contradictions and the dithering. It has, in short, come up with an answer to the permanent and now structural crisis in this Europe of ours. But a constructive look is not necessarily a laxist look. The development of European Union, the essential reforms, the strengthening of the institutions and the statutory definition of new Community policies are all positive things and they warrant our support.

But we also have reservations and we should not like the House to overlook them or forget them.

First of all, it must be clear that, as far as the French Liberals are concerned it is not the Commission's job to recognize or therefore to define what the vital interest of any given Member State is. Here we have the most extreme reservations as to certain articles which, like Article 124, give the Commission such powers.

And then — and this is what amendment No 111 tabled by myself and Mr Geurtsen is all about — we think the Institutional Affairs Committee has gone too far. It has gone beyond the principles by which it ought to have abided and tackled specific applications — as is quite obvious from Articles 45 to 53. The Institutional Affairs Committee, as we see it, has anticipated as regards the later work of the Treaty and in doing so it has adopted one or two standpoints that do not all suit us. The vote on amendment No 111, which is not a contradiction, as the general *rapporteur* seems to think, with Article 1, could remove these objections. Article 1 provides that a preliminary draft Treaty establishing European Union should be based on the following principles and guidelines. In the reservations we set out in amendment No 111, we consider simply that precautions should be taken and that we have gone beyond the principles stage.

My conclusion, Mr President, will be a twofold one. But it will be simple.

We understand the reservations of our colleague, Mr de la Malène, but, even if certain points in the Spinelli report do seem Utopian, as indeed they do, we cannot agree that the debate is either ill-advised or dangerous. There are such things as divine surprises and he, with the new position his group has taken up on European

defence and security, is the symbol of the unexpected and very fortunate developments that the Community may have in store for us.

And we shall also pay considerable attention to the contents of any work presented to us now and in the future. We in France are experiencing something that brings us incompetence, poverty, error and even sectarianism day after day. A rose-coloured view of the treaty setting up European Union — and a view that we can already detect in the Spinelli report at this first stage — would be unacceptable for us. It must be clear that we believe in Europe and that we want to relaunch Europe but that we shall fight, with determination, against the idea that Europe will be socialist or nothing at all.

As we see it — and no-one should be surprised at this — we are fighting for a liberal Europe, a Europe that we want to be in the interest and for the happiness of 300 million Europeans.

Mrs Castellina (CDI). — (*IT*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am frankly very hesitant in coming to a decision on this resolution but not, let it be clear, for the reasons which have led other political groups in Europe, including some on the left, to oppose it. I am absolutely convinced of the need to work towards unity in Europe as, in my view, this unity is necessary if each of the countries of Europe is to have the strength to shake off that state of dependence which has so far characterized the policy of the individual Member States and of the Ten as a whole. Convinced as I am of the need for a Europe which is autonomous with regard to the two blocs, non-aligned and, above all, independent of that superpower, the United States, which has, until now, allowed us only conditional political, military and economic freedom, convinced as I am, therefore, of this need I can only approve of the guiding spirit behind this resolution. I do not, therefore, hesitate because I oppose the idea of the union but because of the means by which it is proposed to initiate this process, which seem to me to be such as to weaken this project instead of furthering it. We all know that a European union will never come into being, or, rather, will never be a democratic entity, until the basic structures of the union have been set up; and by basic structures I mean, first and foremost, a policy of economic convergence based on solidarity between the weak and strong areas of the Community so aiming at equalization in order to rectify the long-term imbalances which certainly exist within each country but which are clearly more marked between one country and another. There can be no common economic policy within the Community or with the rest of the world and no development of the European Monetary System unless we can bring about this convergence based on mutual support and the rectification of imbalances.

Castellina

All this, however, means that we must abandon narrow national concerns and corporative systems which are, in turn, the product of those internal corporative systems which have greatest contractual force. You know as well as I do that the whole of Community policy has been determined by national concerns, which have always prevailed over the idea of an autonomous Europe. Now, the idea of beginning to build Europe from the roof instead of from the foundations seems quite clearly perverse.

I quite understand the objections raised by the supporters of the Spinelli resolution to this statement, even while they agree with it. They say that even an act which is largely symbolic, like Parliament's adoption of this resolution which sets out guidelines for amending the Treaty, can stimulate the will and the drive towards a united Europe; they claim that it is the first real step towards a policy of economic and social convergence. I understand their objection, and I would agree with it as long as others see as I do that even the adoption of symbolic positions can have an influence and set in motion processes which would otherwise be much slower. But what prevents me from going along with their claims is the realization that this symbolic gesture contains a glaring contradiction: and this springs from the fact that very many of those groups which will vote for this resolution today and who will, therefore, set their seal and identity on the symbol which this resolution sets out to exalt, are precisely those groups which have always in practice within the Community opposed that convergence and solidarity which should form the basis of the Union. Even symbols can be valuable when they are unsullied; when they are so debased and muddled they become mere trickery. I think that we are all very well aware that if Europe has not done all that it could to achieve unity this is not because of the limitations of the Treaty but because of the lack of will-power. And that those same forces which have prevented this unity should today declare their support for the Spinelli resolution is astounding. I may perhaps vote for the Spinelli resolution, but with great mental reservations and without any enthusiasm.

Mr Romualdi (NA). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I hope we all realize that the opportunity we have today is our best if not our last chance to show ourselves and the world that in spite of the lack of success and the many disappointments of these difficult years the European Community — and this Parliament in particular — should not only continue their work but also have the basic motivation and the practical possibility of helping Europe and its Member States to defend their basic interests and, even more importantly, to have once again a central and determining role in world politics.

We are talking about 'ways and means' and the overriding need to progress from the old Economic

Community, whose size and structures are now too small to be able to cope with the events we face, to a genuine European Union. That is, to an entity which is no longer just economic but also cultural, legal, social and moral and so basically and genuinely political.

This would be a new entity which really would be common and which it is our duty to aim towards in order to restore to Europe, its countries and its people the capacity to be at the forefront, importance in world affairs, a sense of their own greatness and, as a result, an awareness of their duties and responsibilities.

I do not know if the document we are discussing, which has been drawn up by the Committee on Institutional Affairs and in particular by some enthusiastic and deserving colleagues who deserve our warmest thanks, entirely meets these needs. If it is necessary, we shall amend it during our discussion, but we must in the end draft a text which expresses the wishes of the greatest possible majority. That is, the document must be authoritative enough to command the support of our national Parliaments and our governments, who are once more called upon clearly and openly to understand that this is the path which we must follow together in order to resolve all our difficulties: the path of great hopes and of the defence of the basic interests of those who elected us four years ago and who will be called upon to elect the new Parliament in a few months time. We are talking about the interests, the desires and the destinies of three hundred million people — as has already been said today — of people who would otherwise be condemned for ever to a subordinate, second class role in politics, whose technological, economic and social development would necessarily be impaired and who would feel that their desire for freedom, justice, security, peace and civil progress for themselves and their children had been betrayed. But let us hope that this does not come about.

Mr Didò (S). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the decisions which we are called upon to take today and tomorrow make this a particularly serious occasion for the future of our Parliament and the prospects facing the European Community.

The Community is paralyzed. Europe appears increasingly remote to our people and in particular to young people and workers, incapable of taking initiatives and decisions not just when facing the internal problems which beset the Member States but also at international level with regard to the very grave problems of peace in various parts of the world, the headlong course of rearmament, hunger and underdevelopment.

We are facing a basic dilemma which we must try to help to resolve if we want to arrest a kind of decline in the role of Europe and tackle the discrepancy

Didò

between increasing calls on Europe both within and without and a parallel increase in its inability to act.

The assessment which we might make of the Community since its inception is not at all negative: without the Community Europe would not still be today the single oasis of peace which exists in the world and our countries would not have reached their present level of development. But it is with regard to the new challenges springing from the world economic and political crisis that the 'acquis communautaire' is no longer sufficient to guarantee our future. Indeed, we run the clear risk of losing what we have gained if we do not succeed in renewing the process of integration and reinforcing and augmenting the internal coherence of the Community.

There is no doubt that the continuing failures of the most recent European Councils, including the one at Stuttgart, is due to the fact that the present, urgent problems of the Community are being faced without any real prospect of creating the political and economic European Union.

Unless this fundamental aim is kept firmly in mind, during the intergovernmental negotiations which is what the meetings of the various councils have now been reduced to, only marginal and unimportant adjustments will be made whereas the reform of the CAP, the question of own resources, the new Community policies and even enlargement require far more than this.

When it is just a matter of propaganda there are many who say that the most important questions facing the individual countries of Europe can only be resolved at Community level: but they almost always stop at the point of noting or announcing this fact and do not proceed to take the necessary action.

There are still too many doubts and fears surrounding the idea that Europe might upset the internal or international balance or weaken national identities and roles.

These feelings and positions are irrational, and efforts have been made to overcome them at summit meetings and by drawing up proposals on the part of experts and diplomats. The latest of these attempts, all of which have failed, was the so-called Genscher-Colombo Act.

The Community archives are full of pieces of paper like this, all of which have proved completely useless.

The proposal for a preliminary draft Treaty establishing the political and economic European Union which has been drawn up by the Committee on Institutional Affairs has the outstanding merit of being a political proposal.

It must above all be seen as a realistic proposal which takes account of the difficulties and complexities which exist and which might arise during the process of Community integration.

The principles underlying the building of the Union are those of subsidiarity, flexibility and the gradual nature of integration itself.

It is, therefore, proposed to establish a means for taking decisions and for operating the Union which will, in substance, concern those economic and social policies and those foreign-policy measures which can no longer be administered at national level or to operate at national level both in the interest of individual countries and in that of the European Community as a whole. I have in mind particularly the problems of employment, competitiveness with regard to the USA and Japan, research and energy. I am thinking of the need for Europe to be the point of reference for the developing countries and to be capable of participation effectively in the negotiations between East and West.

This is a project which provides a positive and calming response to those fears and worries which as I mentioned earlier individual States might have about the Union.

This draft Treaty for the Union should, therefore, be seen as a political initiative which obliges the national Parliaments, and therefore the political and social forces of our different countries, to come to a clear decision on the practical outlook for the European Community.

This will be no easy matter as the forthcoming elections for the new European Parliament will, in some countries, take place within a difficult political climate which might relegate discussion of questions concerning Europe to a secondary level. This would be extremely harmful. Therefore, even if we make some adjustments, we must adopt the proposal of the Committee on Institutional Affairs by a large majority.

I think it is a good sign both that the European Trade Union Conference has already declared its support for such a project and that the Socialist President of the Council of Ministers of my country has said in his policy speech that 'Europe remains at the heart of our international relations and Italy's commitment to European integration must be expressed through firm and courageous action including at institutional level'.

Mr Croux (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is ten years since the European Council announced that we would have European Union in 1980. It is now 1983, ten years later, and we know that European Union has not been achieved. With sorrow and dread we now face the great question: will European Union be achieved, or will Europe become balkanized? That is the main issue, and that is why the vast majority of the members of my group will be giving their approval to the report and resolution of the Committee on Institutional Affairs. After all, a high price is being paid by the peoples of Europe, by all the countries, in all the countries, and the tragic

Croux

thing is that our national governments, gathered in the Council, do not realize this, even though it is quite clear from the analyses that are made. We recently received the major report drawn up by Mr Albert and Mr Ball at Parliament's request, and this shows just how much non-Europe, the absence of the Union and of integration, is costing the peoples of Europe. Because it is obvious that the policies of the national governments are no longer able to cope with today's enormous problems. It is obvious that the decisions taken at national level are in danger of clashing, and indeed do clash, with decisions taken in other countries. This results in confusion and a lack of progress and prevents economic recovery, and that is what Parliament wants to remedy with its struggle for European Union. Not the institutions for their own sake, for the sake of the beauty of abstract figures, but the institutions as instruments with which to give this Union economic, social and political substance, effectively and resolutely and under democratic control, the control exercised by the European Parliament. When we see that we have not succeeded, for example, in organizing a capital market in Europe, in organizing the savings system to enable investments to be financed in a satisfactory way, when we see that Europe has not achieved real monetary stability, that we have not even been able to create the internal market that has been proclaimed for so long, or to introduce an energy policy despite the first and second oil shocks, or to set up an international, a European forum for research and development, or to protect the environment in a way that satisfies actual needs, particularly where transfrontier pollution is concerned, or to give European assurances of peace and security, then it is quite clear where the problem lies and we must appeal to our electors, the citizens of Europe, to join us on the road to European Union.

We can no longer expect the national governments to bring this about. We must therefore tackle the problem with the citizens of Europe, from the basis of democracy, through the national parliaments. We must also urge the national governments to improve the quality and efficiency of their policies, by doing together what they can no longer do individually. This is not to say, Mr President, that the European Union intends to do everything. On the contrary. The subsidiarity principle must apply, and it is obvious that all the countries — I would remind you, for example, of some of the opinion polls that have been carried out in the United Kingdom — must do more to explain what this is. The European Union, the European Community is not a substitute for nation States: it is designed to unite them so that they can do together what they can no longer do individually, as has been said so often in the past. That is the historical context of past events.

As regards the work Parliament has to do today and tomorrow, we of the Committee on Institutional Affairs must draw up a legal text. I must emphasize

that this is not a task for the lawyers. We consult them. But it must be the committee, the political authority, that drafts this text.

Secondly, my group has some important contributions to make in this respect. I am referring to two points, the question of rights, fundamental rights, civil rights, social right, economic rights. This still has to be worked out in detail, and my group will be taking the initiative here. We must also revert to other institutional aspects. The time will come for this later, first in the committee, then in Parliament.

Thirdly, in the more distant future, Mr President, we intend to turn to the citizens of Europe, to the national parliaments and also the governments to remind them of their responsibility. To be quite specific, this means the run-up to the elections, as has often been said. We must ensure that these elections become a test for the national governments, that we really achieve a European dimension, while observing, among other things, the subsidiarity principle. In other words, we need not be for or against national governments, but we must say quite simply that there is something more, something else besides what national policy can bring you citizens of all these European countries. It is our task, and we want to perform it with you in a democratic manner. We ask you to place your confidence in us at these elections so that we can do this great work, with a great deal of patience, which does not mean meekness. We have patience where history is concerned. Europe must be created by progress down many roads in the longer term, but the short term must not be forgotten. That is the task we face, and we believe, Mr President, that the ideas contained in the report of the Committee on Institutional Affairs and in the resolution can play a major part in this process, that we must use all our strength, together with the Commission and even with the Council. Because the solemn declaration of Stuttgart has made it very clear that there are major differences of opinion among the various governments in the Council. As a Christian Democrat, I am particularly happy to say that our ministers are taking a profound interest in these problems. We must all join together in continuing the fight that is being fought today in so striking a manner on the basis of the report of the Committee on Institutional Affairs. That is the major issue. We hope that the media, the public and Europe's political leaders will realize this as we have done and that tomorrow will be an important day in the history of European development.

Mr C. Jackson (ED). — Mr President, as we all know, the recent history of institutional initiatives designed to carry the European Community towards a better future has been — there is no other word for it — dismal. Long is the list of earlier reports which now lie gathering dust, and even the Genscher-Colombo report was emasculated before it reached fruition.

C. Jackson

But now we have Parliament's major venture towards European Union. The Spinelli report — and like other colleagues I want to congratulate Altiero Spinelli on his vision in launching this — comes at a very difficult time in the Community. We face crises in agriculture and in the budget, and all this against a dark economic background of increasing unemployment. It is well known that States find it easier to agree with each other when times are good. On that basis our initiative comes at an inauspicious time, and I have no doubt that many will, with little thought, condemn it, like the others, to oblivion. But here lies a paradox: the very economic and political problems which are now so large, which make change so difficult, may make it apparent to our citizens, deeply concerned for the future, that it is necessary for our States to join hands more effectively to gain the great benefits which are now denied them.

I recall one of the most dramatic moves towards Union which came in 1940. I think it was an initiative of Jean Monnet, but the practical reality was that then the British Government proposed a direct union with France. Well, times are now not as dark as that, thanks to the Community. But we do face common perils, and the industry of the European Community is in a worse state than that of the USA or Japan. So the question is: can our proposals help the Community to do more for its citizens; to bring employment to the jobless; to create wealth to improve people's lives; to improve our security and to do more for the rest of the world? I think it is beyond doubt that effective common action can do these things and that our proposals here can help. And the recent report by Mr Albert and Professor Ball on European economic recovery makes this clear.

So we have our report. What is it? It is a compromise. It is patchy. I doubt whether any one agrees with all of it. And I personally disagree with several parts. But with all its defects it represents a very great deal of thought and effort and it is a worthy start.

May I, however, commend to the House an amendment in my name. In my language 'preliminary draft' — which is what we call this — does not sound very well thought through. I think we could better entitle it 'a consultative draft Treaty' because the fact is we do want to consult others about it. We have to. We know full well that any new treaty demands the agreement of the parliaments of the ten Member States. So it is up to us next to consult those parliaments; to be influenced by their wisdom and counsel, but I hope also to influence them so that in due course of time an enriched and widely-accepted draft treaty will emerge.

In this I am convinced that time is on our side. We should not rush but press forward firmly, picking our way carefully through all the obstacles of which there are many, though none greater than the problem of majority-voting and vital national interest. Today we

have heard stressed the enormous economic muscle of the European Community. We have heard that stressed together with our failure to get that enormous muscle to pull together as it should. Our Community is the biggest economic giant in the world; but it is a political dwarf and it does not yet serve its people as it should.

Well what holds us back? A major factor, as the President-in-Office of the Commission stressed this morning, is the practice of unanimous voting in the Council. I personally believe that it is imperative that we make progress towards a definition of a national interest which is so 'vital' that it justifies insistence on unanimity. The current definition is too loose. I would like to see us establish a difficult and deliberate process, perhaps involving the Court of Justice in hearing evidence, which would dissuade Member States from pleading 'vital interest' too easily. Now such a notion does not exactly find its place in the report, though we see mention of the Commission as arbiter.

Although I shall support the report because it is a consultative and preliminary document, I have to say its wording regarding national interest is at present not acceptable. Vital national interests do exist and will continue to exist. The challenge to us is to whittle away the fake vital interests which hold up the Commission and the Community at every stage, but not to deny the reality that vital national interests do from time to time exist.

Finally, I touch on what seems to me a step of enormous importance. I was very glad that early on in our committee's deliberations our rapporteur accepted my own proposal to include as one of the cornerstones of a new treaty the idea that the European Community should concern itself only with those matters which are more effectively performed in common than by Member States individually or which require Community action. I regret that this fundamental idea grounded in common sense, should be lumbered with the name 'the principle of subsidiarity'. But there it is. Whatever name it is a touchstone against which all must be judged, and I am delighted that this House has already agreed it.

Looked at in one way it commits us to a minimalist approach, but it also gives us the challenge and the opportunity of defining and justifying those matters which are more effectively and more cheaply done in common. And if progress is so justified, why should one or other Member State on its own stand in the way of the progress which Europe needs and for which our people, our jobless, our industries, our businesses wait? That is the question which lies at the heart of this report and our effort. That, if I may say so, not the detailed wording, is the reason why this report — a consultative draft as it is — should be accorded a large majority by this House so as to speed our efforts towards European union on their way.

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — *(FR)* I think you would have to be totally blind or completely stubborn not to agree that the Community has entered a critical stage where not only has it lost credibility in the eyes of an increasing section of public opinion but that — and this needs emphasizing — its future as an entity has become a topical subject of discussion.

There is no doubt that there is a crisis. It is obvious. But where opinions diverge — and these are the opinions of the man in the street and the national governments and this House — is on the analysis of the causes of this crisis and, more than that, on the remedies that are likely to right the wrongs we all know to be so serious.

Our debate, inevitably, is taking place with the European elections of next June in view. I have been given to understand that this was the date that had been fixed. And some speakers have been careful to think about the reaction of the voters to a Community that is far from having provided a response to the hopes they place in it. Europe of the Ten is characterized by dramatic unemployment. There are more than 13 million jobless in the Community, particularly women and young people. And the unemployment is mounting — except in France, where the policy begun in the spring of 1981 managed to call a halt. Europe is characterized by waning growth, by an absence of reaction to the monetary and commercial offensive of the USA in particular — and I am thinking here of the common agricultural policy, of a run-down iron and steel industry, of our failure to exploit the potential of the EMS, of the absence of any agreement in the social field or in those practical measures that should be brought in to solve the problems of the developing countries. I am thinking of our common absence of response, our absence of common response I mean, to the expectations of the people in the field of peace and disarmament. Are we lacking in the Community instruments that would enable us to pick up all these challenges? We do not believe we are. What is missing, above all, is a common political will. Obviously the Community cannot avoid the contradictory currents that cross our respective countries and the somewhat aseptic language of Europe which marks some things that are said, will never iron out these contradictions. The Council's inability to take decisions on certain subjects, something we have complained about on many occasions in this House, has much less to do with the Luxembourg compromise that we are forever hearing about than with different political choices — which does not mean that there is no room for common initiatives that have the necessary respect for decisions taken democratically by the peoples of each of our countries. This is true of, for example, employment, industrial development, workers' rights, energy, transport and finance.

If there is no political will, if there is no common vision of the future of fraught international relations

between those who want a united but independent — really independent — Europe and those who only conceive of it as an extension of the USA, will an institutional leap forward enable the Community to regain the enthusiasm that some people seem to think is gone forever? I do not have enough time to go into the details of the project which represents, let us say, a considerable amount of work. But if I look at the desire that has been expressed to boost the powers of this House, one question comes to mind and it is this. With greater powers, would the conservative majority of this House have acted differently on, say, the Vredeling directive in Brussels a couple of months ago? More exactly, would it have had a different standpoint as regards the albeit reasonable proposal of our colleague Mr Pranchère yesterday or the day before yesterday about getting the Commission to make a statement on the common agricultural policy? Would it have had a positive attitude to the 35-hour week or an approach to apartheid in South Africa that was more in line with the idea we have of human rights? One danger with this new draft Treaty is that it might also contribute to raising ghosts that have long since been laid, things such as the European Defence Community or the discussions on a federal or resolutely supranational Europe. It might generate more subjects of friction or anxiety than it contributes to creating a Community of views that takes account of national realities. I should go so far as to say that, at the extreme, the idea contains the seeds of dislocation of the present Community. The more than reserved welcome that it received in the capitals of the Community seems to suggest that this — indeed interesting — work on the Community institutions is already destined to join the other short-lived projects in the archives.

The French Communists and Allies, for their part, feel that Europe can assert its personality, its being and its presence within the framework of the Treaties, even if it is agreed that some changes are called for. It is all a question of will. It would be wrong, I think, to forget that the law is only ever a legal formulation of an objective situation. The French civil code did not precede the Revolution. It followed it. We cannot really see where, in the Community, lie the changes in outlook that should be behind the new construction we are proposed.

I thought I had understood that we were proposing, with this text, to modify some of the positions of France and even of its President. I am by no means sure that this undertaking, which by the way, reveals a somewhat unusual conception of respect for the national specificities of my country, will be crowned with success. It will in any case be one more reason for the French Communists and Allies — over and above the fact that we do not believe in the saving graces of this text — not to vote it.

Mr Cecovini (L). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are about to do something which will reinforce the hopes and confidence of all those who want a united Europe, that is, of all those who from the outset have pursued the great objective of giving Europe a role and an internal order which will allow it to realize its enormous potential at the level which is due to it, which is that of the great continental blocks which govern the world.

We must, of course, agree that the proposed guidelines for the Treaty still represent the initial outcome of compromises and mutual concessions; however, these compromises and concessions in no way deviate from the original ideals but are the normal and natural results of a democratic debate which has been held in the most appropriate forum, initially that of the Committee on Institutional Affairs and then in this Parliament which, as a result of being elected by all the people of Europe, is not only their legitimate representative but, to put it quite clearly, is the only truly European political institution and not, therefore, a projection of the Member States. Because of this it is fully entitled to its function as a Constituent Assembly, which it has proudly claimed from the beginning and exercises in a competent and worthy manner.

If we act in this way, ladies and gentlemen, we shall be able to hold our heads high when facing our electorate, as we shall have carried out the mandate given to us in a proper and unique fashion and acquired, for those who wish it, the right to put ourselves forward again for election, to continue along the path towards unification and, at the same time, to ensure improvements in the living conditions of the people we represent.

We obviously, also, give our approval and support to the initiatives proposed by others, whether these are diplomatic moves or the proof of good intentions on the part of governments; but we want them all to be in line with the impetus which this Parliament, conscious of the sovereignty it has always had, has provided.

While not wishing to go into the proposal in detail, how can I avoid stressing that it is profoundly innovative? Has it not found the correct remedy when defining the powers of the legislative authority? Does it not incorporate the European Council, which already acts as a major Community organ to the point of being called the summit but which is still merely the necessary product of circumstances, within the institutional framework? Should we not note the intention to give the proposed Union control over certain aspects of security — a matter which was taboo until very recently — which must also be seen as a sign of the desire to play a decisive part in the maintenance of world peace?

The proposal, both clear and original, to provide for dual and parallel possibility of action either by

common action or by cooperation between the Member States will allow equality and balance in dealing with the needs of the Union and Parliament's role as the spokesman of the people and with the Member States which, through the European Council, will retain sovereignty in the agreed areas and will help to establish a federalist policy free from antagonism, conflicts of interest and nationalistic reservations but without imposing those restrictions on the powers of the Nation States which many would still find unacceptable.

While we, as good Europeans, express our gratitude to Mr Altiero Spinelli who today, with just cause, joins the ranks of the luminaries of Europe we hope that all the doubts which might have beset some of us during the preparatory stages will have been overcome. Let there be no backsliding and no yearning for that veto which does not even exist in the Treaty of Rome! We have before us the first great and inestimable opportunity to establish the future of Europe. Let us begin this process with our vote; let us ensure that in its second term Parliament will find ready and waiting that launching pad for the European Union which we have sought, prepared and given to the people of Europe.

Mr Capanna (CDI). — *(IT)* Mr President, we have before us a piece of institutional engineering which is based on an idealistic, Neo-Hegelian-style vision.

The needs, the expectations and the interests of the people of Europe are missing from this draft Treaty for the European Union.

This draft does not attempt in any way to change the real nature of the European Community as we know it.

It contains nothing new. The present state of our Continent is preserved, with the addition of some institutional wizardry as in paragraphs 105 to 116, or even there is no change at all, as in paragraph 125. The only new thing which is clearly established is that the people of Europe will be subject to further heavy taxes — see paragraph 95.

All of this is inserted in a general framework which sees the Ten, this European Community as a whole, dominated by its self-styled North American ally. At present, the amount of United States money invested in Europe is more than double that of EEC investment in the USA. And let us not mention the ascendancy of the dollar and the hardships this causes for our economies.

There is no mention of our subjection or of a bit of real independence for Europe, of a Community which by safeguarding its interests in the face of the two Superpowers might, through the Union, become an active force for peace instead of risking nuclear warfare as Mr Prag proposes in paragraph 75.

Capanna

It pursues imperialist interests using the methods of neocolonialism, as in paragraph 78.

So our wizards have done all they can to set Europe off on the wrong road.

I shall not follow them. I shall vote against the proposal.

Mrs Spaak (NI). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. I should like to start by paying tribute to Mr Spinelli for his loyalty to European Union and also for the political will he has constantly displayed in promoting this ideal.

The campaign for the next European elections has already begun and only a short time is left for us to influence and persuade public opinion — and it is hesitant now and anxious because of something that is far more serious than a simple economic recession and it can only inadequately gauge the absolute necessity of taking European action to achieve the cohesion and coordination of national policies. The great merit of the Spinelli report is that it gives us an institutional project which opens new paths to the future. The great majority of this House, I am convinced or I hope it will at all events, will come out in favour of extending its own powers and its own authority. Ours is the only European institution to have been elected democratically and this authority must translate the will of the majority of the people of Europe. And it must do it better than it has done hitherto.

The Treaties of Rome too are the result of a compromise. For 25 years, they have enabled the Community to live — and to survive and resist, certainly, an unforeseeable and exceptionally serious crisis. The past 10 years have been difficult ones more because of deficient European political will on the part of the national governments and the poor way the Treaties have been used rather than any inadequacies in the Treaties themselves.

But, and I repeat, the European Parliament, with the strength of four years' experience and on the eve of a fresh ballot, has to be on the offensive and has to show itself to be innovatory. Voting for the amendments will no doubt bring about changes in the texts that has been proposed.

There are, I think, two essential principles to respect. Institutional balance between Parliament, the Commission and the Council and maximum simplicity and efficiency of the procedures. The legal drafting of the decisions that are taken seems to be of vital importance therefore.

One last thought is the concern we should be manifesting at the indifference of the people as far as European construction is concerned. Europe has to be able to speak direct to the citizens when schemes are being financed with European funds. This has to be advertised. Today, the Member States turn European action to their own benefit. I am convinced that, if the

regional institutions had direct access to the establishment of priorities and programmes, the Europeans would be aware of the authority that now seems distant at best and non-existent at worst. Making Europe more perceptible also means working for better understanding between our peoples and ensuring that democracy reigns in the part of the world in which we live.

For the men and women who will be voting in the next European elections, this will be an argument of great importance and one which calls for quality — that is to say the way we fix our priorities — for clarity — that is to say the precision of our options — and credibility — that is to say the will we display in implementing our decisions.

A text which sets out to fulfil our ambitions must meet all these imperatives.

Mr Saby (S). — *(FR)* I should like to remind you that the socialists have always been here, from the very start of the Community, and that they have always campaigned to get the European peoples' community to progress, to lay the ghost of war and to develop greater cohesion between the peoples and their governments. But we are forced to admit that, although the Treaty of Rome, as it stands, has considerable potential, this potential is not always realized at the right time. I am talking about the social policy here, of course. There is nothing in the treaties to rule out a more vigorous or more dynamic social policy, particularly in a period of crisis. But we note that, although the Treaty allows for implementation of such a policy, the means and the political will required for this have, to a degree, been lacking.

And there is another point. The Community's response to the energy crisis that has struck our civilization and has struck Europe has not been adequate to cope with the problem, although this was contained in the Treaty of Rome and is certainly not counter to it. So although we were among the founders of this Europe of ours and although we have always strived to see that this understanding of the peoples develops, we have certain reservations, if I can put it like that, as to the efficacy of this preliminary draft treaty on Union that we wanted and still want to be something great. Although we recognize that there is a need for reflection and a need for a political proposal along these lines, we think that this debate on the report ought to have been accompanied by a debate on a proper relaunching of Europe. There will be Athens, of course. The Council of Ministers, faced with many an impasse, with the impossibility of handling the crisis and with the contrast between word and deed, in both political and budgetary terms, is proposing the Athens meeting.

But what have we in this House done? We have had a debate — and I should like, in passing to congratulate the people who produced this resolution, our

Saby

colleagues Spinelli and Ferri and all the others involved — but if you want to know what we think about it, the political will as expressed in this document does not really hang together. Yet the Socialist Group has produced a text inviting reflection. Oh it certainly wasn't something you could take or leave. It was intended to show the governments of the Member States that Parliament is coherent, that it intends solving the problems and that it proposes precise, practical ways of doing so.

But we are still waiting for this debate. And it is not the mandate of 30 May that did anything about filling the gap. And this is the context in which the Spinelli report was written. Certainly — and I repeat — this report contains no unacceptable contradictions as far as the basic subject matter is concerned. What I mean to say is that, in the long or the medium term, we actually have to gear ourselves towards a particular debate. But we are also calling for fine institutions to be created and to have the sort of legal machinery that will enable us to do away with contradictions and progress faster if, at the same time, we find there is no longer any genuine political desire to face the facts of our Community. Two other countries are waiting at the Community's doors. There are serious problems still to be solved — the common agricultural policy, the harmonization of laws on production and consumption and budget problems too. This is what we are concerned about. And we do not have to tell you that this remarkable work should not remain something theoretical and that it should gradually take practical shape through political means and political will. This is where our reservations arise. Of course we will be following the debate that has just started and is to be pursued very closely. And we shall also look at the results of the voting on the text itself and on the amendments that have been tabled. What we want — and I repeat — is to make progress with every aspect of Europe, with its political reality, its means and its institutions. Which is why we shall be following the voting on this report very closely and I hope that we shall be able to go along with the final vote.

Nevertheless, by way of conclusion, I shall repeat that this debate, a very important one in our eyes, seems to be out of step with what is the reality of today, tomorrow and thereafter.

Yes to the Spinelli report, provided this political debate leads to something concrete and that the means that we are waiting for are forthcoming — we repeat this every year when the debate on the budget is held — and that this desire is expressed by the MPs in this House and also by the governments.

And here, I would remind you of the French government's recent proposals on such things as using the ECU more which has become a necessity both financially and as far as the international monetary situa-

tion is concerned. When some countries refuse this, we wonder what the point of creating institutions is if we haven't overcome the elementary blockages which are paralyzing the Community today.

That, Mr President, honourable Members, was what we wanted to say. Yes to the Spinelli report if it does not emerge from the debate and the vote completely changed. We think that the most important debate, bearing in mind the present situation, is not being held in this House. This we very much regret and it dampens our enthusiasm for the Spinelli report somewhat.

Mr Johnson (ED). — Mr President, I want to add my voice to the long list of people who have congratulated Mr Spinelli and Mr Ferri, the rapporteurs on this particular project. I heard my colleague, Christopher Jackson, say a few moments ago that this was a difficult moment for such a vision as is presented here. My view is that it is precisely because times are difficult that it is right to be doing what we are doing. If Europe is in a 'fine' state today, it is because in fact the Treaty of Rome is not adequate for the tasks and the charges which we have today.

If you take the substance — industrial policy, environmental policy, research policy — none of these things are fully thought out in the existing Treaty. Some of them are barely touched on. They need to be thought through. They need to be presented. What we have here on the policy area is a real attempt to build on the substance far more than was done in the original Treaty.

Let us talk about issues which have really preoccupied countries like my own over the last few years — budget reform, the predominant role of agriculture. All of these can be traced back to the inadequacies of the original Treaty. Again, speaking from a wholly British point of view, had we been able to participate in the first drafting of the Rome Treaty in 1957, you can be quite sure that the kind of tensions which have arisen over the last few years between Britain and other new Member States and the remainder of the Community would not have arisen.

Now we have got a new chance actually to get it right, a chance to catch that bus which we missed at Messina. For Heaven's sake, let us look at the broad vision. It has been very disappointing for me, listening to this debate over the last couple of hours, to see people pick out one paragraph or another and forget that we are talking now about a broad vision, the vision of rewriting or redrafting a Treaty 25 years after it was first drawn up allowing the Member States that are now part of the Community to participate in a process in which they could not participate at the beginning. I cannot see — I just cannot see — the force of the objections that the British won't wear it or the Danes won't wear it. Precisely what they need now is to participate in the process of rewriting the Treaty.

Johnson

I pick up a newspaper just to give you an example of the kind of nitpicking that has gone on. It is *The Times*, and I see a headline to the effect that Greece yesterday stopped the EEC from issuing a strong statement condemning the Soviet Union for destroying the South Korean airliner. I do not want to talk about the substance. The nine other countries argued in vain for a strong condemnation but failed to overcome Greek obstinacy. What could be a more classic example of the need for a Community which actually can take decisions by a majority vote? Here we had a situation where we really wanted to say something, make a strong condemnation of a particular incident, and we find that one Member State decides to exercise its veto. My country insists that if we have vital national interests, we must have the power of the veto. That is not even written into the existing Treaty. So I do think that we have to be careful before we start insisting that this is the price of our support for the Spinelli resolution. I think we must be very careful before we start using this kind of language, because I do not believe that it is right to bargain in this way. It would be a backward step.

One issue on which Mr Thorn, the President of the Commission, rightly expressed some reservations was the issue of the Commission's right of initiative. However, to give due credit to Mr Ferri and Mr Spinelli and the work of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, a great deal of effort has now gone into trying to define the Commission's right of initiative in order to try to make sure that it is safeguarded while at the same time safeguarding the rights of parliamentarians to say something about issues which concern them. On this particular issue we have to be very careful that when the legal texts come to be drafted, we get the wording right. I would just throw out one small suggestion, because we have to make procedural decisions. That is that somehow we manage to associate — in a non-compulsory capacity obviously — with the lawyers who will sit down and do the drafting, with people from the legal services of both Commission and Council so that in some way we get the benefit of their advice also as these very thorny questions are tackled.

It is a moment of enormous importance for us. Now I have also heard people ask in this debate what will happen if national parliamentarians don't agree with us.

What are we going to do? We vote it here, and then they don't agree. Mr de la Malène was immensely powerful and rhetorical when he said that the vote of his group had to be a vote which counted. They did not believe in voting here and then voting the other way back at home in their national parliaments. That is precisely the point. We now have to use all our influence, all our power, not just to follow national parliaments but to lead them, to actually point out to

them that this is what we have to do and that this is what the people have to do. By the way, we go forward into the election in June 1984 on this platform, so no national parliamentarian ought to be able to say, once the electorate has been presented with this particular platform, that the people are not for it. We must go forward with this proposal as it will be voted today and as it will be refined in February. We must speak on it next year. The people must know that that is what is being proposed and national parliamentarians must know that that is what the people knew. Finally, therefore, when it comes to national parliaments for ratification, they will have no excuse not to do so. We must ignore the doubters, ignore the waverers — and I speak without fear or favour here — and we must give this project a fair wind.

IN THE CHAIR : MRS DE MARCH

Vice-President

Mr Kyrkos (COM). — (*GR*) Madam President, Parliament, which expresses the trends of public opinion in our countries, is the body most genuinely competent to undertake the historic initiative aimed at achieving full European integration. And we would like to congratulate our colleague, Mr Spinelli, as well as the Committee on Institutional Affairs which has worked painstakingly to lay before us its ideas and the convergence of viewpoints encapsulated in the resolution on the Union.

I think also that all of us will agree that no country can cope with the crisis or with the challenge of our times in isolation. European integration is not only an answer to the problems posed by the need for new impetus to be given to economic growth and technological progress and to the defeat of unemployment. It does not simply carry with it a new dynamic which can surpass what the conservative forces have to offer. It is also a defence for all of us against the existing real danger of the European Community and each country separately being reduced to a state of subjection — with all the consequences — by the hyper-developed countries of the capitalist world and ending up as a satellite in the destructive game of East-West tension. For this reason we insist on the principle of autonomy in Community policy and on the need for unanimity on the major foreign policy issues, as well as on the principle of each country retaining an independent policy on its own defence. These truths are gaining ground among the working people of Europe and shape out the prospect of a move, with their active participation, towards a Europe of the workers — and we shall carry on working towards this end with persistence and a sense of inspiration.

However, if, along the multi-nation path to integration, real difficulties — such as the relative inflexibility of the preliminary draft treaty on certain points

Kyrkos

— are under-estimated, this will, in our opinion, create new obstacles and mistrust instead of helping to shape the necessary popular consensus.

For example, can anyone ignore the fears of small countries like Greece, which is one of the least developed members of the Community, that their interests might be trampled on if, in clearly defined areas, they relinquish reasonable use of the principle of unanimity or the threat of having recourse to it to bring about compromise?

Is it easy to convince farmers in the Mediterranean countries that the restructuring of the CAP which is under discussion will improve their position if, as the resolution proposes exclusive competence is vested in the Union?

Can working people and small and medium-sized entrepreneurs in the less developed countries easily accept that the Commission, which will have legal power of supervision over national measures, will actively pursue a conjunctural economic policy?

And, in spite of the proclamations about peace, is it possible to ignore the fact that up until now a certain mode of practice has led to the inconsistency of Europe following the foreign policy dictates of the USA, of the country, that is, which is waging an economic and trade war of the most unrelenting sort against the Community's interests?

These are real difficulties, and of course there are others. However, if Europe is to make headway as a factor conducive stability, peace and prosperity we have a duty to remove these difficulties by persistence and imagination.

In order to make the views of the internal Communist Party of Greece clear, and in order to help shape the draft in such a way as to make it most widely acceptable to the peoples and workers of Europe, we have put down a series of amendments which I ask the House to approve. Two of these coincide with amendments put down by British Conservative colleagues and deal with crucial questions of respect for national sovereignty. This coincidence should lead us to the conclusion that we need to achieve the widest possible consensus of opinion, not on an ideological basis but in the quest for political solutions. Because of the nuclear threat and the incredible horizon opened up by technological development a new consciousness is taking shape in Europe, a realization that communists, socialists and conservatives have to get along together, that we have an obligation to find answers which will promote peace and the utmost extension of democracy and at the same time provide solutions to the problems of detente, economic recovery and combating unemployment, and that we have to give new hope to the young generations and the world. It is incumbent on us, therefore, to give new impetus to the building of the Community along the lines laid down by Mr Spinelli in his speech and based on the

wishes of our peoples whose trust we must win, however, by offering clear solutions to their problems.

We believe profoundly that the fate of the motion for a resolution will be decided in the overall negotiations in Athens or in those which will follow later. In our opinion not only have the old institutions failed, but the old policy as well, and new institutions must be adopted on the basis of a new policy. In the meantime however, we must open up discussion about the future of Europe in the national parliaments, in the social organizations, amongst our peoples and amongst the workers of our continent.

Mr Haagerup (L). — *(DA)* Madam President, the proposal we are discussing today reflects a view which is shared by the overwhelming majority of the Members of Parliament. Its starting point is that the present institutions of the European Community do not function adequately and that, in particular, the decision making process is too often blocked. This text is a compromise. It does not respond in all respects to what my group might have wished and, on a number of points, it goes further than my two Danish colleagues in this group and myself regard as appropriate and desirable. We think it right to have objectives in the direction of cooperation which is much more binding and comprehensive than the cooperation we have today. But we are not convinced that such a wide-ranging text covering so many fields is the most appropriate means of achieving this aim, and we also do not think that all sections — including the economic section — accord with liberal thinking.

Even so we do not for one moment question the right of Parliament and the majority to put forward such a proposal. We welcome it, because it is a clear indication of our dissatisfaction and our demand that European cooperation be made more effective and more comprehensive.

Madam President, the question we should be asking is not whether cooperation will be too comprehensive or too effective; that is not the real issue, although some of my compatriots for various reasons seem to think so. On the contrary it is the danger that cooperation will grind to a standstill and gradually disintegrate. We Danish liberals therefore sympathize with the basic premise and the main drift of this text, although we cannot endorse every individual proposal.

'Union' is a popular word in many parts of Europe. It is more controversial in other places, including my country. I should like to point out here that the word 'union' is not in itself as important as the idea to which it refers. The proposal before us is to create a 'United States of Europe' at one stroke, if it is approved in all our Member States. We have a long way to go, a very long way, and at times the trend has been more in the direction of strengthening the Nation-States at the expense of the Community. We

Haagerup

should like to reverse that trend, and we find many things in this text which may assist in achieving that aim.

We do not think that the proposal will for the time being — if ever — be implemented in all its aspects, and we have misgivings regarding a procedure which will give rise to a serious risk of a break-up of the Community. We do not therefore think that this text is the last word on the subject. It is in our view an invitation to a dialogue and a debate with the national parliaments and with others, which in time — perhaps and hopefully — will lead to a broader measure of agreement on a text in all our Member States than is likely at present or in the immediate future. We do not want our parliaments when the time comes simply to be presented with a text on these lines, for information, just to say yea or nay. We want to invite them to put forward views, comments and proposals for amendments and, if the proposal should shock somebody who otherwise has a positive attitude towards the Community, perhaps that is not such a bad thing, for that shock reaction may stimulate the dialogue we are seeking.

Madam President, it is on this basis — that by putting forward this proposal we are giving a signal — that I can vote for the text. I do so with a view to drawing more like-minded people into the debate on the present and future of Europe and hence out of the passivity and union-phobia which have for too long been the dominant influence on the discussion — especially in my country.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (CDI). — (NL) Madam President, I should like to begin by expressing my great respect for Mr Spinelli's vitality and conviction. He himself would undoubtedly have gone further than the report he has presented today. I must therefore apologize for the mixed feelings with which I regard this report on the European Union. On the one hand, there are the positive new achievements, the prospect of an extended catalogue of powers, on the other, the positive headwork, with a new European constitution in mind, and above all a clearer distinction between legislative and executive power in the structures.

This document cannot, however, be more than a transitional report. It certainly cannot be called a final report on the Union. The Committee on Institutional Affairs has adopted a compromise position. Almost all the dates relating to the transitional period before a real Union is installed have been removed. Mr Spinelli then says that the course chosen can be summed up in the words: *'Tout est dans le cadre, dans les limites des Traités'*. I wonder whether it would not have been better to look more to the future or even to set the sights rather higher, because this report does not have a ghost of a chance in the Council. The Council might regard this resolution as the furthest the Euro-

pean Parliament will go, and in the long run that could be very much to Parliament's disadvantage.

Steps have also been taken backwards in such areas as worker participation, the ten-year transitional period for the right of veto, the lack of clarity about Parliament and, above all, federalism. Federalism does not simply mean reducing the power of the State by delegating it to a higher authority: it also means delegating power to lower authorities.

To conclude, Madam President, I wish to say that this report will not do the federalist cause any good. Regionalism and internationalism must, after all, be combined.

Mr Petersen (S). — (DA) Madam President, the Spinelli plan is the first serious attempt to work out a replacement for the Treaty of Rome. It is all the more necessary as the Treaty of Rome was formulated before the new challenges made their appearance — challenges of an ecological, economic, technological and political nature. The Spinelli plan tries to meet these challenges, but it lacks one guiding concept: a concept for new economic growth, on the lines of the concept which guided the thinking of Keynes, for example. Its implementation will therefore not bring the qualitative leap in thinking which is necessary to get us out of the crisis.

The Spinelli plan is also the first attempt to draw up a constitution, a real constitution for a European Union. Here there is a guiding concept, that of the federal union, as we know it from the United States of America. But no detailed analysis of the reasons why this principle does not function adequately — in democratic, social or quality of life terms — in the United States is appended to the Spinelli report. And there are no considerations as to whether this principle as a whole will meet the needs of the Community countries, neither are any alternative models of development for European cooperation put forward or discussed. This is the limitation of the Spinelli plan, and it will be its undoing. At one and the same time it is expansive and detailed without the art of self-limitation in its political ambitions, yet commensurately limited in its political psychology. It will thus be one more union comet which, like an apparition with no substance, shoots across the European firmament.

We Danish social-democrats are in favour of European cooperation, whether it be within an EEC or an EPC framework. We would like to see cooperation developed, but think that the fault lies in the will, not in the institutions. The will in the individual countries. Our constitutional model is based on the confederal principle, the Europe of sovereign States, cooperation between countries on an equal footing, based on the right of veto, in other words the Treaty of Rome plus the Luxembourg Compromise. It was under those preconditions that Denmark voted to join the

Petersen

European Community in 1972. Thus it will not only be impossible for the Social Democratic Party in Denmark to back the Spinelli plan; in my opinion, it will also be impossible for five sixths of the Danish electorate to give their support to it.

I would in addition single out five main reasons why the Danish Social-Democratic Party is against the Spinelli plan.

Firstly, the Spinelli plan is unrealistic. There will not only be opposition in Denmark; it will not only be Denmark which will oppose it in the Council of Ministers. I also think that the other countries on outer rim of Europe, apart from Denmark in the north, Britain and Ireland in the west and France and Greece in the south, when it comes to a decision in the Council of Ministers, will also be against it. We saw what happened to the Genscher-Colombo plan. It was adopted in a very much watered-down form and then only with various reservations on the part of a number of the countries on the edge of the Community. The Spinelli plan just does not deal with the centre-periphery dichotomy between the union-oriented centre, represented in particular by Germany and Italy, and the much more pragmatically disposed periphery. The Spinelli plan is thus not attuned to political realities. It is and will remain a political pipedream.

Secondly, the Spinelli plan is damaging. I am not only thinking of Denmark, where the People's Movement against the EEC will acquire fresh ammunition to direct even against sensible European cooperation. In all countries the plan will divert attention from the main issue: the crisis and unemployment. There are no real arguments in the Spinelli plan to indicate that a formal union structure could overcome the crisis. On the contrary, a Spinelli union would rather consolidate the present obsolescent pattern of growth and prevent the necessary qualitative renewal.

Thirdly, the Spinelli plan is not only unrealistic and damaging, it is also an expression of an obsolete mode of thinking. It does not look to the future. It does not offer thoughts of any kind on what significance the third technological revolution will have for the way in which our States function as political units. Microprocessors will probably encourage what is close at hand, quick, specific and local and hence will further grass-roots democracy and counteract centralism, standardization and gigantism. These are regrettable features which characterize the big political unions, such as the USA and the USSR, and which will also leave their mark on a European Union, if it were to be constructed on the Spinelli model.

Fourthly, the Spinelli plan is also naive, politically naive, for it is quite unthinkable for 10 parliamentary democracies to take a revolutionary step at a national political level, and the Spinelli report would mean a revolution at the national political level. It is against

the nature of democracy to take revolutionary steps, all the more so as our political leaders at home would not be able to guarantee for our populations that the Union would bring about an improvement in living standards and in the quality of life.

Last but not least, the Spinelli report is an expression of arrogance, for it is arrogant of Parliament to confer on itself the powers of a constitutional assembly, that is an assembly with powers to enact a basic law. Neither Parliament nor the Commission have that authority, only the ten countries which have entered into cooperation in the European Community have that power. But remember, colleagues, that pride goes before the fall. We are often told in Parliament that the citizens of Europe, our voters, are disappointed that the Community has not become what they hoped it would. But I ask you, should we increase their expectations still further, as we are doing in the Spinelli plan and, moreover, on an entirely unrealistic basis? I think that this assembly would do itself a disservice by adopting the Spinelli report. I believe that this House, instead of gaining in respect and esteem outside Europe, would become known as the house of illusions. 'It is in self-limitation that the master first shows himself,' said Goethe.

Mr Adonnino (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the PPE Group has always considered that the financial aspects of the Community's activities are of fundamental importance for consolidating and promoting consensus among the European countries in those sectors where consensus is relevant.

This has become evident in the institutional sphere just by looking at the way in which the artificial distinction between compulsory and non-compulsory expenditure has prevented Parliament from having full control over a large slice of the Community's public expenditure; in the political sphere just by looking at the balance needed between State and Community finance and the need to protect the correct instruments for stimulating and controlling development both of the Member States and of the Community; finally in the sphere of operations as financial arguments cannot be used as a pretext for blocking the achievement of agreed objectives.

We think that the financial proposals submitted to us in the preliminary draft Treaty establishing the European Union take account of these matters. Therefore we accept them within, of course, a framework of mutual understanding of the overall problems even if they do not represent the best possible approach.

It should be stressed that in the draft submitted by the Committee on Institutional Affairs the financial aspects are, in my opinion, properly related to very different matters and in particular to those concerning the powers and constitution of the various Institutions and the objectives and powers of the Union.

Adonnino

The clear enunciation of the principle of subsidiarity, which becomes the lynch-pin of the financial system of the Union and of the individual Member States, seems to me fundamental; it follows that the transfer of responsibilities to the Union will require the transfer of the relevant and necessary financial resources and the guarantee that the transfer will take place for objectives and responsibilities which are truly beneficial, one result of which will be that cost-effectiveness must be established before the transfer is made. The system will, therefore, be based on a proper relationship between responsibilities and financial resources and should not lead to the placing of extra burdens on the tax-payer while at the same time ensuring that the Union will be financed from own resources which, moreover, will not have to pass through national budgets and treasuries.

We also welcome the proposal to strengthen the finances of the Union by determining in advance what financial resources shall be made available to it and, differently from the present situation, by the effective transfer of resources to the Union.

Areas of responsibility and the relevant financial resources will be allocated within the framework of a periodic review which will ensure that the proper balance is maintained and will be backed up by the introduction of a system of financial equalization which, as we very well understand, must have an effect on expenditure if others wish, as we do, to safeguard the system of own resources created by the revenue system.

I should also like to mention one point which fulfills the demands made on a number of occasions by the European People's Party among others: this is concerned with the express provision for borrowing which may, in principle, be used to finance productive investment. This increased capacity for collecting capital on international markets and the guarantees which the Union will be able to provide will certainly fulfill the expectations of productive sectors especially at times of economic crisis.

I do not think that I can finish this speech, however short, on the finances of the Union without remarking briefly on the proposal, even if after a suitable transitional period, for a framework law to govern fiscal harmonization.

I agree with the reasons put forward by the rapporteur especially with regard to the opportunity for improving the internal market and for abolishing frontier controls.

If, however, the fiscal practices which we are proposing for the Union also act as an instrument of economic policy we must ensure the retention of a certain degree of flexibility in order to take account of differences in social and economic structures. The system can be further integrated only as and when

practical steps, which we hope will be significant, are taken to narrow the gap in production capacity between the various regions and to align economic policies.

Mr Eisma (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, the future of the Community will be influenced less by institutional changes than by the joint will of the present ten Member States to establish a Community policy. Although the form and substance of the Community influence each other, progress will not be achieved simply by democratizing the institutions. That will not be enough.

While it was engaged in all this work on drafting a Union Treaty, Parliament should also have asked itself whether this Union will ever come into being. Even if Parliament completes its work on a preliminary draft Union Treaty by next spring, we have absolutely no guarantee that the proposals will be implemented. All our efforts will be in vain if the governments, not having the political will, shelve our proposals. Would it not have been better to achieve some of these objectives by using Article 235 of the present Treaty, which provides the formal means for this purpose? It might also be asked whether Parliament should not be devoting all its energy to its present tasks with a view to developing an image which the citizens of Europe cannot overlook and will motivate them to go to the polls in 1984. A critical examination by Parliament of the way it functions and seems to be losing rather than gaining prestige is what is needed, and that will also require a great deal of the energy now being invested in these institutional activities.

It seems Parliament adopted a more pragmatic approach when the subcommittee of the Political Affairs Committee considered institutional problems in 1979. This led in 1981 and 1982 to debates on a number of resolutions concerning improvements in the European Parliament's relations with the Commission and Council and other bodies, all designed to increase Parliament's power.

The Commission's communication to the Council that then followed contained a number of useful proposals for the democratization of the Community's decision-making process as a way of coping with the problems it faces.

Despite the moderately favourable position adopted by the Member States on these proposals in the solemn declaration issued at Stuttgart, we have not yet reacted to these Commission proposals for the improvement and extension of the conciliation procedure and the closer involvement of Parliament in the conclusion of international agreements. Would it not be far more effective to take another look at the proposals we made two years ago and to gear our activities to their adoption?

Eisma

Nevertheless, we shall support the proposals now before us. We realize that, with this institutional debate and its sequel in February of next year, Parliament is emerging as a permanent pressure group that is trying both to give European policy more substance and to gain more power for itself.

The most important question in this debate for a pragmatic party like D'66 is how to ensure that the governments do not brush this Union Treaty aside. The empty solemn declaration on European Union that resulted from the far more ambitious Genscher-Colombo initiative has been a warning to us. It therefore seems illusory to believe that governments will be prepared to accept far more extensive compromises a year later.

If we really want to see this Union Treaty come into effect, we should waste no time in setting an intensive campaign in motion in our national parliaments. Similarly, the national employers' and employees' organizations, interest groups and the like should be badgered, with the eventual object of having all 10 national parliaments agree to the Union Treaty.

A great deal could be said about the contents of this document. Not everything can be said now. We shall be discussing it again when the final proposals are put forward. It is important that greater emphasis should be placed, for example, on social policy, health policy and consumer policy as aspects of the policy for society so that European policy may have a genuine social as well as an economic component. We consider it unrealistic for the preamble to refer to the promotion of full employment as one of the Union's aims. It would be better to acknowledge that there is a shortage of jobs and to make the promotion of the distribution of work the goal.

Maintaining the distinction between compulsory and non-compulsory expenditure is a good thing. We fully agree that the Union should be declared competent for security policy and that this policy should be placed in a more democratic framework. The section on security is remarkably short, betraying the timidity with which it has been introduced. But the section on the institutions is the most interesting. The presence of a permanent representative of each Member State in the Council will make for more balanced and more rounded decision-making.

The idea that the Council should have 63 members should be rejected. We have considerable doubt about the position of the European Council, and we shall revert to this question when the final proposals are submitted.

Parliament should certainly have more say in the composition of the Commission than simply giving its approval. I will close by congratulating the seven rapporteurs and particularly Mr Spinelli on the great effort they have made to compile this document, for all its faults.

This initiative justifies European elections in 1984.

Mr Kirk (ED). — *(DA)* Madam President, I should like to join with other speakers in thanking Mr Spinelli and the other rapporteurs for the report which is before us. I think that the Committee on Institutional Affairs has done a very considerable and competent piece of work. I also think that there is a need for fresh thinking on how to get the Community moving forward again. Unfortunately we have to note that in the past five to six years many areas have suffered severe setbacks. The Council has not been able to take the necessary decisions, and the Commission has developed a role in the Community whereby, instead of being the guardian of the Treaty, it concentrates exclusively on accommodating the national views expressed in the Council. We have seen this in many areas: in the sectors of agriculture, fisheries and the internal market. We have seen that what the original treaties intended as institutions no longer function and that things are moving increasingly in a nationalist direction.

I therefore think that there is a need for this debate, and I think that it is very good that the Committee on Institutional Affairs has been able to achieve such a clear analysis of the situation. Yet I do not think the time is right. The situation is that the Council spent the whole spring discussing the Genscher-Colombo plan, which deals with the same questions. We know that the will is not present at the moment in the governments of the Member States to move forward in the Community and extend the Community. I do not therefore think that this report stands a good chance of being adopted. I would have preferred us to be in a position in quite specific areas to put forward proposals which might solve the problems which exist between the three institutions — the Commission, the Council and the European Parliament. What I feel to be the most serious problem is that there is no real cooperation between the Council and the European Parliament. The Commission has shown considerable willingness to listen to Parliament over the past four years, but that is as far as it goes. Only the will is there. When it comes to translating the debate between the Commission and Parliament into concrete policy, the Commission does not have the moral strength to put the views on which it is in agreement with Parliament across in the Council of Ministers.

The Danish conservatives therefore think that there is a need to strengthen cooperation between the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament. We just do not believe that we shall achieve it through this proposal from Mr Spinelli. We do not think that it can be got through. We think that we should have put forward a more concrete proposal on the matter instead. There are many things in the proposal which are needed. The Treaties should be updated. The Danish conservatives also think that there is a need

Kirk

for a more active environment policy in the Community. It is after all one of the areas in which it would make sense to strengthen the common effort. The same goes for vocational training. And the same goes for the implementation of the original Treaties. Indeed we have to concede that in many areas we have still not secured the implementation of the Treaties. The will for this is still lacking in the governments of the Member States.

The Danish Members do not feel they can vote for this motion for a resolution. I have indicated some of the reasons for this. We do not think it can be got through. We would prefer to back a more pragmatic attitude and tackle the problem where it really arises. We would prefer to see a proposal more geared to modifying the right of veto, which has over the years been a contributory cause of the Council's failure to take decisions, so that we can get Parliament more closely involved in the decision-making process. We could envisage a negative right of veto for the European Parliament so that, instead of individual Member States blocking negotiations in the Council of Ministers, we should have a qualified vote in the Council of Ministers and, if there were no majority in the European Parliament in favour of decisions for which there had been a majority in the Council of Ministers, it would be Parliament which called a halt to the measure. This would mean that the Member States, when their vital interests were at stake, would also need to secure understanding for their position here in the European Assembly and to ensure that a majority backed it.

Finally I should like to point out that there is also a Danish People's Movement against the EEC. This movement is very much opposed to the European Parliament. It speaks out against Parliament having an influence on decisions which are to be taken for the benefit of the Community. Madam President, we on the conservative benches cannot accept this lack of respect for our democratic institution. We want further development of the Community, but we want it to be pursued in such a way that it is of benefit both to the Member States of the Community and to the individual citizen.

Mr Gawronski (L). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I do not think that it is going too far to say that today's debate is probably the most important that our Parliament has held since the time of direct elections.

After trying many times with no success (within the present institutional order) to win agreement on the pressing need for a common response, a European response to the great political and economic problems of our times, after trying in vain to carry out the duties assigned to it (as the direct and legitimate representative of the people of Europe) in the administration of Community affairs our Parliament is, today,

making an official request for institutional reform and for the drafting of a new Treaty as a necessary precondition for resolving the crisis of the Community and for avoiding the further decline of this old continent, which otherwise seems inevitable.

Many observers and a sector of public opinion have sometimes made the mistake of identifying the problem of institutional reform with that of an increase in the powers of the European Parliament, but I think that the motion for a resolution which the Committee on Institutional Affairs has submitted to us refutes this narrow and erroneous view once and for all.

Our Parliament has not restricted itself to asking for increased powers within the present institutional framework but is proposing a different institutional order based on a fairer distribution of powers and an improved role for the Commission. The Spinelli report does not just ask for executive powers for the European Parliament but makes an open request for a European Government, for strong, responsible and united guidance for European policies.

If this splendid and legitimate initiative is to meet with success, the proposals must first gain widespread and conclusive support among the public and the political and social forces and they will be one of the major topics of debate during the election campaign next spring.

Tomorrow's vote will, therefore, be a first acid test and a moment of truth for the deeply-held convictions and autonomy of this Parliament, which will be able to show whether its Europeanism is merely rhetorical or quite genuine.

This undertaking certainly requires the support of every one of those in power who has the future of our Continent at heart, and this is why I want to make an urgent appeal (as the rapporteur, Mr Spinelli, has done) to our colleagues in the British Conservative Party, who are the heirs of Winston Churchill's dream of Europe, to reconsider their position.

The text of paragraph 124 of the motion for a resolution, which deals with the right of veto, is the result of a hard-won compromise which takes account (far more than the Treaty of Rome) of the demands often made by the British Conservatives.

I say to our colleagues in the European Democratic Group that we agree with their attacks on the present illogical and unfair allocation of the Community's financial resources, on the need to reform the common agricultural policy and on the budget, but we think that the only practical way to solve the present problems is to take a leap forward and to create a political Europe so that we can also leave behind the Europe of milk lakes and butter mountains!

So I say to you our Conservative colleagues that you must dare to dare! Do not make your country choose

Gawronski

differently from the majority in this Parliament at the moment in which it is making its most important decision, and do not as a condition for your support ask it to do what you yourselves know it can not do!

To conclude my speech, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to take this opportunity to convey the support and good wishes for this initiative which the Parliament is discussing today of my colleague, Mr Visentini, who has taken part in the work of the Committee on Institutional Affairs from the beginning and who has had to leave us at this very point because he has been called upon to become a member of the Italian Government as Minister for Finance.

I think that it is also right and appropriate for me to add my voice to the congratulations and gratitude already expressed by a number of colleagues and by Mr Thorn for the work and dedication of the coordinating rapporteur Mr Altiero Spinelli who, as we all know, is both the spiritual and real father of the initiative we are debating. The resolution which Altiero Spinelli has presented to us today does not, however, represent the utopian dream of an old federalist but is a practical and realistic measure which could give new life to the process of European integration and so give hope and assurance to millions of people in Europe who at present consider the future with increasing doubt and pessimism.

(Applause from various quarters)

Mr Alexiadis (NI). — *(GR)* Madam President, dear colleagues, at a time when the Community in its present restricted form — restricted from the point of view of participation in it by the countries of Europe and from the point of view of essence also, since it is, in reality, nothing more than a customs union — is facing critical problems it is premature to say the least for us to be speaking about the organization of Europe, or rather of that fragment of it which the Community represents, along federal lines. The idea is attractive without question, but history says otherwise.

Organization along federal lines presupposes a unified political will and a unified political will cannot exist except on the basis of a self-sufficiency in defence capable of ensuring that the Community's interests are protected against any dependency, tutelage or threat.

In support of my view I will cite just two historical examples.

Firstly, the fact that the unification of the German nation along federal lines was achieved through blood and steel after two wars one after the other, the Prusso-Austrian war of 1866 which led to the federalization of the north German States (Norddeutschebund) and the Franco-German war of 1870 which created the German empire out of all the German States except Austria. This case involved a people who had a common national consciousness and common aspirations.

Secondly, a more characteristic example. For the United States of America to become really united a

bloody civil war lasting four years was required, the first all-embracing total war in modern history with six hundred thousand dead and incalculable material destruction. Times have changed, they will say. But regrettably they have not changed as much as we would have wished.

The Community today stands at the primary Nord-deutschebund customs union stage and the erstwhile united Germany has since the war been divided into west and east with insurmountable barriers erected, figuratively and literally, between the two. Differences of interest and not just of viewpoint exist between the members of the present Community, between farmers and industrialists, north and south, richer and poorer States etc. Until such time as these differences are settled, until such time as a united political will becomes established, until the range of participating countries is widened and until the Community is capable of defending itself against the two super powers it is not only premature but also quite literally baseless for us to speak of organizing our present limited range European Community along federal lines.

The Spinelli plan is theoretically sound and noble in what it seeks to achieve, but it does not solve issues. It does, however, provide a basis for reflection and is undoubtedly useful as a guide for the future. Mr Spinelli is an Italian and his compatriots have the saying: 'Chi va piano, va sano e va lontano'. Less haste and more time spent in anticipation would prove more effective for the realization of European unification than the precipitate actions proposed.

And now for an observation which I do not wish to be taken as a Parthian arrow against colleagues who have spoken previously. The keen interest of the members of the European Parliament in the idea of European unification has been stressed exhaustively. The emptiness of the benches before which the Spinelli motion is being debated engenders many doubts as to the existence and extent of this interest.

Mr Plaskovitis (S). — *(GR)* Madam President, the European Community began as a limited partnership in the energy sector, in coal and steel that is. At a second stage it developed into a customs union and evolved a common policy in the agricultural products sector and with regard to the free movement of goods, always between the more developed countries of Western Europe. However, from that point on it has not made any significant headway. The steps it has taken towards the dynamic development and economic integration of, in particular, its outlying regions have been faltering and have not led to any worthwhile results. Those who could have hoped for convergence of the economies and for the establishment of a certain parity of living standards between north and south have been discouraged by the difficulties which have appeared in this decade.

Plaskovitis

And instead of efforts being stepped up at this difficult time to find common cause, for working out realistic development programmes and for eradicating the appalling disparities which exist, instead of there being at long last some acceptance of sacrifice by those who have reaped the greatest benefits from the functioning of the European Community since it was first set up, the reserve method has been opted for, for us to move, that is, towards setting up a legal and theoretical framework for the political unification of the countries of the Community which involves the acceptance of major new commitments without a prior solution having been found for any of the economic or other substantial problems.

The draft treaty establishing the European Union is a precise expression of this mistaken conception of things. We fear that rather than being the product of daring it is the product of evasion. Madam President, we are not debating the immediate and pressing problems of the European people. What we are doing is simply laying before them a scenario for the federal transformation of the European Community which is much more ambitious than the Genscher-Colombo plan for political cooperation and thus much more utopian when, indeed, one bears in mind the results of the Stuttgart conference which took place in June.

However, the accession of countries, such as Greece, to the European Community, and the assumption of legal commitments came about after lengthy negotiations and substantial bartering of interests by the sides concerned. On the basis of what rationale are those legal commitments now to be replaced and, indeed, significantly augmented, in the manner provided for in the Spinelli draft under debate without this being preceded by a corresponding process of negotiation?

And now for the second query which poses itself. What sort of federal unification of Europe, roughly like the American prototype, will this be in which the central authority does not take on full responsibility for the fair distribution of federal resources and means of wealth creation and for the uniform development of all the regions in the federation?

We see no mention or clear and precise elucidation of this in any of the proposed draft's provisions. On the contrary, the draft is couched in the vaguest possible terms and the complex manner of operation of the various agencies of the new European Union makes assessment of the commitments those who join the federation will be asked to take on almost impossible. And the commitments involved are of a magnitude such that the Member States are frequently called on to abandon parts of their national constitutions and to surrender their independence in internal affairs.

Noteworthy in this respect are the provisions which give Union law unfettered precedence over national law with the associated obligation on national judges

to apply Union law even if this differs from the stipulations in their countries' constitutions. The laws of the Union are to be approved by Parliament and the Council of the Union by qualified majority, and if these have to do with common action they preclude the operation of national law, while in other cases, where the Union has concurrent competence, national law may continue to operate so long as the Union has not initiated its own law in the particular field.

In the sphere of foreign policy, diplomatic and political relations, security, arms procurement and international treaty ratification the competences vested in the agencies of the Union involve the member countries in the most profound cessions of sovereign rights.

But for us the two most important and unacceptable points in the draft treaty are, firstly, the abandonment — even in matters vitally affecting a nation's interest — of the principle of unanimity and its replacement by the principle of absolute majority, and, secondly, the exemption from a particular policy or a specific issue of one or more Member States by the Council of the Union in order to achieve agreement even though the exempted State or States disagree.

Madam President, in our opinion these provisions and many others which are skillfully inserted into the texts combine to make the deepest objectives of the draft abundantly clear. Namely to put the official seal on the Europe of two rates of advance in which the powerful and the affluent will rule and make the decisions and the rest will be obliged to agree or stay out of the game with all the damaging economic and political consequences this will involve.

It must be understood that the Luxembourg compromise of 1966 is binding on the Community, and for so long as there is no implementation of a policy for a real coming together, of a policy for eradicating the inequalities in the Community, unanimity on matters which vitally affect national interests cannot be abandoned because it constitutes a last resort, the ultimate means of overturning exceptionally unfavourable decisions which are harmful to the interests of the small countries in the Community.

Ladies and gentlemen, the views we have put forward should lead us — as Greek socialist Members — to vote against the draft treaty. Nevertheless, we prefer to say that we shall abstain, and this for two reasons.

Firstly, because we are not in principle opposed to the idea of a united Europe. However, this Europe must ultimately acquire a voice of its own at some juncture and not be confined to going along with the decisions of the United States on all international problems, and particularly on the problem of peace, detente and disarmament where we socialists are waiting for a new situation to emerge, for new hope. Such a thing cannot come about without a prior brave effort by the member countries to find agreement on solutions for

Plaskovitis

the present acute social and economic inconsistencies and disparities.

Secondly, because the draft contains several provisions which refer to a new look being taken at the Community's social policy and at its policy in the economic sector. This demonstrates that, up to a point, there exists an understanding of the need for substantial revision of the policy pursued hitherto.

Ladies and gentlemen, the proposed draft is untimely and premature. It may, of course, find a place in the history of the European Parliament as evidence of a miscellany of intentions and theoretical conceptions, but it does not have the capacity, however, to give a convincing reply to the burning questions of the peoples of Europe who in a few months time will be called on to elect their new representatives.

IN THE CHAIR : MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

President. — Because of the time we shall interrupt the debate until tomorrow morning.¹

3. *Question Time*

President. — The next item is the first part of Question Time (Doc. 1-660/83).

We begin with questions to the Council.

As the subjects are related, I call simultaneously

Question No 1 by Mr Marshall (H-837/82) :

In view of the Association Agreement between the Community and Israel, does the Council not agree that it is appropriate that Greece should afford Israel full diplomatic recognition ?

and Question No 2 by Mr Geronimi (H-328/83) :

Could not the President of the Council, using the authority he at present enjoys, follow up Greece's official recognition of the State of Israel by a personal statement on the matter ?

Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers. — (GR) The Council gave a reply in connection with these two associated questions in July as well. Following this the positions remain the same and I cannot clarify things further because it is not within the purview of the Council to do so. It is, rather, the sovereign right of the country concerned to grant diplomatic recognition as it sees fit.

Mr Geronimi (DEP). — (FR) My question is very simple. Nonetheless I should like to ask you whether you could use the prestige you now enjoy as President-in-Office of the Council to promote the recognition of the State of Israel by Greece and use your influence to make it official and, in particular, to make a personal statement to us on the matter ?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) My country's position on this matter has not changed. It remains the same and since the establishment of the State of Israel recognition has been, as you know, on a *de facto* and not on a *de jure* basis. All previous Greek governments have held to this form of recognition and my Government continues to apply the same policy.

With regard to my own personal view which you request it is as the Foreign Minister of my country that I implement my Government's decisions and I agree with these decisions.

Mr Tyrrell (ED). — Could the President-in-Office tell us what notice Greece has taken of the Penders report, which nearly unanimously called upon Greece to recognize the State of Israel and to bring her policy into line with those of the other nine Member States, and will he tell us whether Greece finds it objectionable that she alone should have foreign policies, not only in this area, but in other areas too, as we have seen this week, which are so out-of-step with those of the other Member States ?

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) My answer to the honourable Member is very simple. As you are aware political cooperation imposes no obligation as regards the pursuance of a common foreign policy.

(Applause)

The meaning of political cooperation is that on such international issues as it is possible for the partners to reconcile their respective stands there is then a common standpoint. On other issues, where they are unable to align their views, each country exercises its own foreign policy. In this case I would like to point out, and the Member knows this, that at the summit conference in Stuttgart, my country, Greece, attached an important addendum to the text of the declaration on the European Union regarding this matter, and in connection with political cooperation, to the effect that Greece will not be bound in the exercise of its foreign policy by the text of the declaration. Consequently, each country has the sovereign right to exercise its own foreign policy as it thinks fit.

(Applause from the Left)

¹ Topical and urgent debate (announcement) : See Minutes.

Mr Gontikas (PPE). — *(GR)* Greek governments have always argued that this stance towards Israel is a corollary of the country's pro-Arab policy. The question to the President-in-Office is as follows. Can this stance be justified today? And what are the advantages accruing from this pro-Arab policy under the PASOK socialist Government?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — *(GR)* I will not go into the substance of your question because you know full well that the party to which you belong held power in Greece for more than 40 years and that it implemented this policy. And I consider it odd to say the least that you should have asked this question and have called on the present government to change its policy. Its policy is that which is being implemented at this time and which will continue to be implemented for so long as the Greek Government judges it to be the one that serves the country's more general interests.

Mr Israël (DEP). — *(FR)* Mr Minister, the Greek government attended the conference on Palestine in Geneva, unlike the other countries of the European Community.

Do you feel, Mr President, that, in doing this, you committed an act which was incompatible with your job as President? In other words, is it conceivable that, as President of the European Community, you should separate yourself from the nine other countries and attend a conference that others declined to support?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — *(GR)* As I have said there is no binding commitment on individual countries as regards foreign policy. Consequently even if a member country holds the office of the Presidency it is free to exercise its own foreign policy in a sovereign manner. Adhering to the principles of European political cooperation my country took part in the conference on Palestine because it deemed this to be in the more particular general interests of Greece, and you will be aware, Mr Israël, that even before we came into government, my country was pursuing the policy towards the Arab world and particularly on the Palestinian question to which it continues to give cogent application. Here I would like to point out that on 20 September 1982 the Ten recognized not only the need for Israel to be able to exist within secure borders but also the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination with all that this self-determination entails, to wit nothing other than the establishment of a Palestinian State.

Mr Normanton (ED). — Does not this attitude adopted by the Council of Ministers very seriously bring into open forum the question as to whether Greece is honouring the commitments which she signed as a condition of entering the European Community?

(Applause. Cries of 'Hear, hear!')

Would the President-in-Office confirm that Greece did accept all those commitments entered into prior to her joining, and does he appreciate that his replies so far have caused deep concern and anguish to the majority, I believe, of the Members of this House?

(Applause)

Mr Charalambopoulos. — *(GR)* I regret very much indeed that I am not all that agreeable to the Member, but instead of addressing his question to me today as President of the Council of Ministers it would be better if he were to look up the minutes to see the answer Mr Genscher gave on the same issue. His answer was identical with the one I gave in my initial response to the two Members' question.

Mr Galland (L). — *(FR)* Since Greece was able to join the Community because it had returned to a democratic régime and since, as a result, you have benefited from this, as your presence on this bench so clearly symbolizes, don't you think that a minimum of convergence among the Ten should be reflected by the official recognition of all the democratic countries of the world?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — *(GR)* As I said before, and I think I made myself clear, I would request the honourable Members — as I did in July when there was a question on the Stuttgart declaration — to ask the President of Parliament for a copy of this text. What you see there will put things into their proper perspective, and if you do read the text of the declaration carefully I believe that you will not feel the need to put questions of this sort.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* First of all I would like to express surprise at the indirect exhortation by the Greek Member of the European People's Party, Mr Gontikas, for Greece to grant diplomatic recognition to Israel which is at variance, so far as I can gather, with the policy pursued by previous governments and with the policy of the New Democracy Party. This is something which not even the seven-year Greek junta dared to do. It makes us sad to hear such things in the European Parliament. And I would like to ask you if Question Time is for pressurizing and questioning the Greek Government or for putting questions to the Council which is spoken for here today by the Presidency which is coincidentally held by Greece. Also, when is this comedy of pressurizing the government of my country likely to end.

Mr Charalambopoulos. — *(GR)* All the honourable Members who are completing their third year in this House have the necessary experience to know how things stand in these matters. In fact I am here chiefly in my capacity as President of the Council of Ministers. Of course, this does not prevent me from

Charalambopoulos

speaking in my other capacity as the Greek Foreign Minister. It is a fact, however, that the questions are addressed to the Council of Ministers. After they have been processed and consultations have taken place between the Member States answers are drafted and sent to the Members. Now, of course, honourable Members have the right to put supplementaries and, as I said last time, I have no difficulty in immediately answering each one of these questions separately. Because I am in a position to say — and you will forgive me for this — that due to the fact that I myself have served in this House — albeit for a short time — as leader of my country's Socialist Group I am conversant enough with the procedures to be able to reply on both questions of procedure and issues of substance.

(Applause)

Mr Plaskovitis (S). — *(GR)* After what has been said I too would like to put a supplementary and to ask whether it is absolutely certain, as I think it is, that neither the Treaty of Rome nor any other provision or binding process of European Community law imposes any form of obligation on the member countries and the development of their diplomatic relations. And I would also like to question whether the House is aware that this has been acknowledged by the other side as well, by Mr Penders when he presented a report on this whole matter a few months ago. At that time the view was expressed in this Parliament that the Treaties merely express a wish but impose no obligation on my country — or on any other country — as regards the level of diplomatic recognition which other members of the Community would like to see it grant to certain other countries.

Mr Charalambopoulos. — *(GR)* I think that this matter has run its course. To my knowledge the issue at the heart of the question has been raised in both the recent and more distant past. The answers on behalf of the Council were those given by previous presidents of the Council of Ministers and those are the ones I myself have given today and which I gave in July. Therefore I think we should consider the matter closed, and it would be a mistake to believe that because Greece has become a full member of the Community it is obliged on the basis of the Treaties to recognize other countries. As I have said, and I stress it, each country has the inalienable sovereign right to make its own foreign policy decisions. And, of course, the recognition of another country is a foreign policy matter and as such falls outside the scope of the Treaties. It is precisely for this reason that earlier presidents have given the same reply.

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE). — *(DE)* Don't you think, Mr President, that both a president of the Council of Ministers and a distinguished government minister of

a Member State should possess the sovereign right to revise their opinions and to seek a sensible solution, which would be for you to apply the *acquis communautaire* fully and to fall into line with the other Member States instead of being the odd man out all the time?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — *(GR)* It surprises me that the Member, who has long experience of these matters, should ask this question. My reply is simple.

Each country has the inalienable right to decide on its own foreign policy. The Community has no remit in this respect. The matter comes within the context of political cooperation and, as I said at the beginning, political cooperation means alignment where possible of the viewpoints of the different Member States. And, naturally, one can say that it is desirable for this unity of position to exist on many issues. However, this does not infer obligation. Nor does it mean that pressure can be applied against any particular country. This is unacceptable and, speaking now as the Greek Foreign Minister, it is unacceptable to my country which will never bow to orders, pressures and blackmail.

(Applause from the Left)

Mr Sutra (S). — *(FR)* Point of order, Mr President. I have to say that I regret that way the debates are being run. Everyone is aware of Mr Charalambopoulos's courage — there can be no question of my helping anyone in this House — but Question Time being misused and changed into an attack on the policy of one country is something I profoundly regret and I think the President of the session should not have allowed this to happen.

President. — Mr Sutra, that is not a point of order. It is a comment on the Rules, and everyone knows the Rules.

Mr Gontikas (PPE). — *(GR)* With all due respect, Mr President, I wish to register a protest with you for allowing the President-in-Office to speak in this Chamber as a Greek Minister. Here we put questions to him in his capacity as President-in-office of the Council and we expect fitting replies. I protest also because you allowed me to be exposed to an attack by Communist colleagues, and I do not think I have given anyone the right to attack me on a personal basis. I expect the Bureau to see to it that in future the Council's replies deal with the Community and not with one country.

(Applause)

President. — Mr Gontikas, I would point out that everyone is responsible for his own duties. The Council is responsible for its answers and the President is there to ensure that the debates are conducted correctly.

Lord Harmar Nicholls (ED). — Mr President, it is quite right that the President-in-Office is responsible for his own answers, but may I ask you, as the one presiding over the whole of the Assembly, whether you are going to allow the record to show that a President-in-Office has referred to legitimate questions — properly put according to procedures — as ‘pressure and blackmail’ in a way which undermines the effectiveness of our Question Time?

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, the record of the Minutes reproduces faithfully the statements which have been made. As its author is not present, Question No 3 will receive a written answer.¹

Question No 4 by Mr Moreland (H-86/83)

When does the Council envisage adopting the proposals on lorry weights and dimensions?

Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers. — (GR) The matter to which Mr Moreland’s question refers was on the agenda at the meeting of the Council of Transport Ministers on 7 June this year.

At this meeting the Ministers exchanged views about the draft directive. Following this exchange of views the Council agreed to seek a general compromise solution which will enable agreement to be reached on the main outstanding problems.

Mr Moreland (ED). — Can the President-in-Office tell us whether this general solution which he refers to is the same general solution that the previous President-in-Office of the Council appeared to be working on — namely, harmonization at 40 tonnes with derogations for the United Kingdom and Ireland, but requesting the United Kingdom to come up to 38 tonnes on road-trains? Is he optimistic that the next Council will agree to this?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) We cannot prejudge the outcome of the Commission’s deliberations but I promise the honourable Member that I will raise the matter with my colleagues in the Council of Ministers, and I might be in a position to give a reply on behalf of the Council very soon.

President. — Question No 5 by Mr Bonde (H-217/83):

In its pamphlet ‘Samtidsorientering’ (information about contemporary life), the Commission of the European Communities informs Danish schoolchildren that the Community’s Member States have agreed NOT to apply majority decisions in questions which are considered to be of vital importance by only one of the Member States.

Does the Council share this view?

Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers. — (GR) As regards Mr Bonde’s question I offer the following answer-cum-statement. The attention of the honourable gentleman is referred to the Council’s answers to Question No H-795/82 put by Mr Lomas in April 1982 and Question No H-411/82 put by Mr Skovmand in November 1982. In these answers, as everyone knows, it was made clear that the Council takes no position on statements made outside the Council framework.

Mr Bonde (CDI). — (DA) In a pamphlet or some form of educational or propaganda material for Danish schoolchildren — a field in which the EEC Commission is also involving itself now — the schoolchildren are informed: ‘the Member States of the Community have agreed not to apply majority voting in decisions on questions which only one of the countries considers to be of crucial importance.’ Well, that seems to be confirmation by the Commission, but I should like to know whether the President-in-Office of the Council thinks it proper for the EEC Commission during meetings in this chamber to insist that there is no right of veto, while at the same time trying to tell Danish schoolchildren, for example, that we certainly do have the right of veto? Is it reasonable for the Commission to present two contradictory statements?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) I can inform the honourable gentleman that this matter has been examined and that many countries, such as Greece, have made their positions known.

More specifically, as the honourable gentleman will be aware, many discussions took place over a period of roughly two years on shaping the final text of the European declaration which, *inter alia*, makes reference to matters connected with decision-making. It is true, in fact, that some countries have refused to surrender the right of veto and I would like to inform the honourable gentleman that Greece is numbered amongst these. I could also add that an annex dealing with matters such as this was included in the Stuttgart declaration, specifically in the final text. With reference to Greece, an important comment-cum-reservation, which I mentioned earlier on, was annexed to the text to the effect that in the exercise of its foreign policy Greece would not consider itself in any way bound by the final Stuttgart declaration. There is also another point which has to do with decision-making. These two points which are of concern to Greece have been placed at the end of the text and the signatures of the Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers have been attached. For Greece at least — and I will not mention the other three or four countries which have retained a dissenting position on this matter — this means that, with the attachment of the Prime Ministers’ and Foreign Ministers’ signatures to the end of the text, the special note which Greece had wished to

¹ See Annex II of 14. 9. 83.

Charalambopoulos

be recorded, and which has been recorded, in the text of the Stuttgart declaration, is now duly part of it and has been accepted by the signatories.

So, in fact, Sir, some countries do have the right of veto.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) I would like to ask the President-in-Office if the Stuttgart declaration in any way diminishes the independence and the freedom of action of the member countries of the Community.

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) I have no difficulty in answering Mr Adamou. I think that the question of independence and freedom of action is directly tied up with the exercise of foreign policy, and as far as Greece is concerned, at least, the country is in no way bound in the exercise of its foreign policy, as I said before. So there is no binding commitment of any sort.

Mr Seligman (ED). — Does the President-in-Office of the Council not agree that the main progress that has been made in the Community in the last few years has been speaking with one voice on foreign policy, and that if we are going to go back on this we are going to cause steady deterioration in the achievement of the Community?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) After the discussions on what is known to all of you as the Genscher-Colombo plan, which has finally taken shape as the familiar Stuttgart declaration on European unification, discussions which, as I have said, lasted for over two years, I think it is clear that we cannot speak of a common foreign policy. What may be desirable, and to some extent attainable, is for a convergence of view to be presented as a joint position of the Ten on any issue where there is such a convergence. If there is no convergence of view on specific issues which arise there exists no joint outward-looking position, because, as the Members here know very well, European political cooperation is based on the principle of consensus. Consequently, even if only one country differs on a specific aspect of the international problems which fall within the direct compass of foreign policy a joint position does not exist.

President. — Question No 6 by Rogalla (H-227/83):¹

Can the Council state what position has been reached in the deliberations on the Commission's proposal for a resolution on the simplification of checks at internal frontiers and, in so doing, indicate the main subjects of contention, say which national delegations have expressed what reservations and state what procedures

have been or remain to be completed (at negotiating, expert, Coreper, Council level, etc.) and when will the negotiations as a whole be completed?

Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers. — (GR) To this question by Mr Rogalla the Council could in fact reply as follows, and moreover it has given such an answer in writing. On 10 March and 30 May of this year a working party met to deliberate on the Council's proposal for a decision on the simplification of checks on citizens of the Member States at internal frontiers.

Awaiting the opinion of the European Council, which was given on 9 June, the working party confined itself to a preliminary exchange of views about this proposal. Scrutiny of the substance of the proposal will take place at meetings to be held later and thus it is impossible today to predict when things will be completed at Council level.

Concerning the positions already taken by the delegations the Council reminds the honourable Member that the discussions of the Council and of its subordinate bodies are governed by the code of professional secrecy.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) I cannot imagine how a question of such importance to the Community's inhabitants can involve any professional secrecy. May I take the liberty of asking whether the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers is willing and able to tell this House how negotiations are progressing, as soon as they get down to brass tacks? There will naturally be a conflict between the interests of Member States and their experts on the one hand and Community citizens' desire for greater freedom of movement on the other. Can the President-in-Office assure me that the latter will be given priority? I would be glad to know that the President-in-Office will be guiding the negotiations in this direction and would be grateful if he could confirm this.

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) I have no objection to answering the honourable Member's question. My only reservation is that in order to give him a full and specific answer I must have more details. However I would like to make it known to the honourable Member who has put the question, and to the other Members as well, that certain problems exist which complicate the matter. One such problem is that the national frontier authorities believe that the introduction of a single European passport will not of itself guarantee simplification of the procedure and that, secondly, with the increase in crime, it would not be in the interests of trans-frontier security.

I will, in any case, take a note of what the Member wishes to know, and I believe that when I have information about how this whole matter is proceeding I will be able to give a fuller answer.

Mr Simpson (ED). — Last December the summit in Copenhagen committed the governments of the

¹ Former Written Question No 600/83, transformed into a question for Question Time.

Simpson

Community to the speedy removal of checks. We have heard enough tonight of Greek reservations on what might otherwise be common Community policies.

Does Greece share the aim of removing the checks? What particular aims and achievements is the Greek Government as President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers seeking during its present term of office, or is this a matter of professional secrecy?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) It is exactly what you said at the end, namely a matter of professional secrecy. What I can assure the honourable gentleman about, in line with what I said before, is that I will consult with my colleagues in the Council of Ministers with a view to speeding up the procedures and finding commonly acceptable solutions.

Mrs Hammerich (CDI). — (DA) I should like to thank the President-in-Office of the Council for giving such clear answers to the questions. Indeed we do not always have that experience, and it is very gratifying. Thank you! But I should like to ask you on this subject of frontiers whether you have opened negotiations with the nordic countries Norway, Sweden and Finland. The fact is that we have a nordic passport union, and Denmark carries out passport controls on behalf of Norway, Sweden and Finland, for example at the German border. Now we are concerned over the possible damaging consequences for the nordic passport union, should the formalities be eased at the Community's internal frontiers. For the other nordic countries would no doubt tighten up their identity controls, and it would mean we should have to take our passports with us to Norway, Sweden and Finland. We have not done so since 1927 with the exception of a five-year period during the war. I wish to ask whether you have opened negotiations with the nordic countries on this question. You should do so in any case, very quickly.

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) What I can say in reply at this moment is that the matters you have touched on will be examined in consultation with the Ten and, as I said previously, I believe that the procedures will be speeded up because it is a matter which is also of concern to the Ten.

Mr Van Minnen (S). — (NL) Does the Council not consider it deplorable that, five years after the prospect of the abolition of checks at the Community's internal frontiers was held out during the last, the first European elections, the likelihood of this happening is now more remote than ever and that checks on travellers are even becoming stricter? And am I to conclude from what the President-in-Office of the Council has just said that what he described as a professional secret is not in fact based on political objections but on technical objections, in other words, on objections by civil servants?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) My answer to the honourable Member is that the matter is at the same stage as it was at the beginning. Namely that certain difficulties exist which an effort is being made to overcome. This does not mean that nothing will ever get done about the matter. It is a matter of very great importance and of interest, of course, to all the 10 Member States. What I can say today is that I will lay emphasis in the Council of Ministers on the need for the procedures to be speeded up and for the difficulties or objections which exist to be smoothed over so that this affair which, as you have said, has been going on for five years, can be brought to a fitting and proper conclusion.

(Applause)

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — Is the President-in-Office in favour of a European passport or not?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) As I have said, this is something which will be discussed by the Council of Ministers. I cannot tie the other Foreign Ministers to a personal view of my own. The matter will be discussed by the Council of Ministers where an effort will be made to find a common position.

President. — Question No 7 by Mr Papaefstratiou (H-221/83):

In view of the forthcoming elections to the European Parliament in 1984 and having regard to the principle of the freedom of movement for citizens of the Community within the Member States, what action does the Council intend to take to enable citizens to vote who are resident in a Member State different from their state of origin? Is the Council aware that the delay in taking a decision on this matter constitutes an important obstacle to progress as regards the freedom of movement laid down in the Treaties?

Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers. — (GR) The Council has given very careful consideration to Mr Papaefstratiou's question. After examining the problem to which the honourable Member refers the Council approved a statement which was notified to the European Parliament on 7 June. Amongst other things this statement contained the following points. The Council verifies that the national legislation of the Member States makes it possible for the great majority of their citizens who are resident in countries of the Community other than their own country of origin to vote in the forthcoming elections. The Member States are working together to facilitate exercise of the right to vote in the context of building Europe the Council calls on the Member States to make every possible effort to ensure that their citizens have the right to vote in the European parliamentary elections in either their country of origin or their country of residence.

Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE). — (*GR*) I have listened to the interesting answer given by my compatriot the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers, but I confess to not having been enlightened and fear that the same applies for those other Members who are present in the Chamber.

Given that this matter affects hundreds of thousands of Greeks who reside and work productively in countries of the Community, and millions of other citizens of Community countries as well, I would like to ask the Minister whether under the Greek Presidency and before it completes its term at the end of the year, the Council of Ministers intends to take a decision allowing all citizens of Member States to vote in the European parliamentary elections wherever they happen to be in June of 1984.

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (*GR*) I can reply to Mr Papaefstratiou with a tone of some optimism, at least as far as initiatives taken by the Greek Presidency are concerned.

The Greek Presidency has raised this matter in the Council of Ministers. It is a matter of very great importance, as you yourself have stressed, and I raised it about a month ago. The appropriate studies are being carried out so that views as regards the voting rights of all those who are resident outside their own countries can be arrived at in plenty of time before the June 1984 elections. I would be very happy indeed if the initiative of the Greek Presidency were to elicit a positive response by the other partners, so enabling us to announce these decisions both to you and to the peoples of the countries of the Community.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (*GR*) I would like to put a question-cum-proposal to the President of the Council so as to get the matter into a clearer perspective. In the event of expatriates not being able to exercise the right to vote in their countries of residence, by virtue of which their only remaining opportunity to vote would be in their countries of origin, could the Greek Presidency take the initiative on having a substantial appropriation put aside in the 1984 draft budget — in the context, indeed, of the millions of ECU being doled out in the run up to the elections — to help the migrants, chiefly Greeks and Italians in the case in question, with the cost of getting back to their own countries. We should bear in mind that the exercise of this right is imperative because in many countries of the Community we are seeing the growth of anti-immigrant sentiment among the native populations, something which is very dangerous and negative and which really does make it essential for the migrants to exercise their right to vote as well.

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (*GR*) I am not ready to reply to these latter observations by my compatriot Mr Alavanos. What I can assure all Members of is that a month ago, as I said, the Greek Presidency embarked on this initiative embracing all those steps which, if

accepted by the others, will lead to a better and fairer approach to the matter, given that the right to vote is for all the citizens of the Member States one of the most important rights they have. It is a sacred right for them to be able to vote and to elect the representatives whom they judge are fitted to speak on behalf of their countries in the European Parliament, and from the point of view of the Greek Presidency at least, this is something which should be considered as of very great importance. In the light of this the Greek Presidency will follow up its initiative with all the vigour at its command so as to bring it to a positive and fruitful conclusion.

Sir Brandon Rhys Williams (ED). — Would the Council bear in mind, when approaching the question of giving expatriates the vote, that administratively it is far simpler to give them the vote in the Member State in which they are resident than to arrange to let them have the vote back at home in their country of origin? Would he also bear in mind that it is also far preferable for the candidates, who can then reach their voters in their election campaign and it is also helpful in the United Kingdom inasmuch as it would tidy up the anomaly that in Britain, Irish residents are already allowed to vote, even when they do not have joint Irish and British citizenship.

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (*GR*) The issues touched on by the honourable Member are in fact among those which have been discussed repeatedly and on which a variety of views have been expressed. There is, for example, the view that citizens residing in a particular country should vote in the country in which they reside and elect Members of the European Parliament from the country in which they reside. There is another view to the effect that those residing in a country should be able to elect Members of the European Parliament in their own countries. So there are a great many views and that is why the problem is complicated and creates a number of difficulties which the honourable Member himself noted; it is also the reason why the matter is being discussed to arrive at the best possible solution, provided of course, that all 10 countries agree.

Mrs Viehoff (S). — (*NL*) May I ask the President-in-Office once again whether the Council is aware of the absurd situation in which we shall find ourselves if, in a common election campaign, we call upon our citizens to turn out to vote in the European elections while at the same time not even allowing some Community citizens to vote at all. I think that the man in the street will find this hard to understand and the Council should therefore really give much more attention to this point. In my country I certainly cannot explain why I am asking people to go to the polling booths in the European elections if I am obliged at the same time to say to one group of people: 'I'm sorry but you cannot vote'.

Mr Charalambopoulos. (GR) I thank the honourable Member for her observation. It is an extremely important one, and I will treat it as a specific request which we will discuss in the Council with a view to taking final decisions. These situations do exist, as do others which have not been mentioned. There is, too, a whole spectrum of particularities relating to the distances between the various Member States, to the special problems faced by people who have been resident in a Member State for many years, to legal adjustments which have not been completed in Member States, and so on. There are a great many issues, it is true, and the problem is not as simple as it initially seems. What is desirable and has been called for on every side and is also the view of the Council, is that the citizens of each country should be given the opportunity to perform the sacred duty they have, wherever they live, to elect Members to the European Parliament.

Mr Pöttering (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President-in-Office, does the Presidency of the Council agree that its deplorable behaviour in not strongly condemning the shooting down of the South Korean airliner by the Soviet Union at the European political cooperation talks on Monday has helped to create an atmosphere of resignation and pessimism in the Community? This in turn is making Member States unwilling to ... extend the franchise to all European Community citizens ...

(Applause from the right)

President. — Mr Pöttering, I must point out that that question is not admissible under the Rules of Procedure.

Mr Charalambopoulos. — *(GR)* Mr President, allow me to reply because the honourable Member has just directed a cutting remark at the Presidency. I said earlier that the Member States are not obliged, in the context of political cooperation, to adopt one common position, and for the Member to do what he did in making a cutting remark about the Presidency is unacceptable. It is unacceptable.

(Cries of 'hear', 'hear!')

Each Member State has the sovereign right to decide upon and implement its own foreign policy.

Lord O'Hagan (ED). — This is the first point of order I have raised in this Parliament. Could I ask you, under Rule 18, to consider whether we should proceed with questions on political cooperation in view of the President-in-Office's recent statement and the action by the Greek Government which has severely damaged the chances of political cooperation succeeding in the future? Could we now resolve whether the President-in-Office is speaking as a Minister of the Greek Government or is genuinely attempting to represent the views of all the members

of the Council of Ministers acting together in political cooperation, before we proceed to this part of Question Time.

(Applause)

President. — Lord O'Hagan, I would remind you that that was not a point of order.

We shall now take questions to the Foreign Ministers.

I call Question No 33 by Mr Bonde (H-180/83):

Will the Foreign Ministers confirm that the Genscher-Colombo Plan, in its present form as an official declaration, does not in any way extend Commission participation in European political cooperation beyond what was decided in the London declaration of 1981, and, if so, does this mean that:

- the Commission may only take part as an observer
- the Commission may only put forward proposals in areas covered by the provisions of the Treaty of Rome
- the Commission may not, without specific authorization from the Council, incur expenditure for foreign policy or security policy purposes
- the Commission may not take part in meetings where purely EPC matters are to be discussed?

Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — *(GR)* The London declaration of 1981 provides for the Commission to be fully involved in political cooperation within the existing framework of rules and procedures. Given this, the Commission participates actively in all the meetings on European political cooperation. I must make it clear, however, that only the ten Member States participate in the formation of the consensus. The Commission will also participate in other sectors of European political cooperation opened up by the Stuttgart declaration. As regards expenditure you are aware that the Commission implements the Community budget as approved by the Council and the European Parliament.

Mr Bonde (CDI). — *(DA)* My question touches in a way on law and order. There is a legality principle applicable to all Community activity, which is laid down in Article 4 of the Treaty. There must be positive legal authority for everything the Commission undertakes. According to the original Treaties, it has no power to involve itself in foreign policy and the political and economic aspects of security policy. I should therefore like to ask the President-in-Office of the Council for a more precise description of the Commission's role in European political cooperation. Is it the case that the Commission can only present proposals for which there is authority in the Treaties, or has it also acquired the right to present proposals for which there is no authority in the Treaties in areas which clearly fall outside the scope of the Treaties?

Bonde

Can the Commission make payments, for example, in connection with proposals, investigations and the appointment of advisers on foreign and security policy matters? Can payments be made for foreign and security policy purposes, for which there is no authority in the Treaty of Rome? Is it now legal, in the opinion of the President-in-Office of the Council? If the Commission has no powers to involve itself in areas which fall outside the scope of the Treaty of Rome, will the European Political Cooperation President assure me that the Commission is asked to leave the room when meetings become a purely EPC affair, i.e. when they deal with matters which are not of any Community concern and for which there is no authority in the Treaty of Rome?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) The practice up until now is for the Commission to be present, and I can come back to what I replied originally.

It is present in order to get a wider view and a better feel of all the Community's activities. That is the real crux of the matter.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Did the Minister not say, in his original reply, that the Council worked at all levels towards a consensus? I think those were his words. Does the Minister not think that he himself ought to work towards consensus in settling issues in political cooperation, and if so does that not entail the minority respecting the wishes of the majority as much as the majority respecting the wishes of the minority? Have he and his Ministers not signally failed to do that over recent weeks during which they have held the Presidency of the Council? Is it not perhaps time for somebody else to take on the job?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) I think that I was clear in my reply. I repeat it because there has been some misunderstanding, unless the interpretation was incorrect. I said, and I want to be clear on this, that only the 10 Member States participate in the formation of the consensus. You said that the Commission takes part. The Commission will participate in other sectors of European political cooperation opened up by the Stuttgart declaration, but it does not participate in the consensus. Only the 10 Member States participate in the consensus.

President. — Question No 34, by Mr Bøgh (H-182/83):

Will the Foreign Ministers explain what steps will be taken at future meetings of the Council of Ministers, the European Council, Coreper and working parties to ensure that EPC matters

- do not appear on the same agenda as matters coming under the Treaties
- are not discussed together with Treaty matters

- are not prepared together with Treaty matters
- are not financed in whole or in part out of the EC budget?

Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (GR) As you know, the official declaration aims at improving the links between the Community's institutional mechanisms and EPC because experience has shown that certain Community issues cannot be handled satisfactorily without account being taken of aspects connected with political cooperation and vice versa. This does not mean, however, that the Community and EPC are to be merged. The Council will continue to deal with the matters on which it has competence under the Treaties, while the Ten will continue to coordinate their views on matters of foreign policy in the context of EPC.

Finally I can add that meetings which take place in the context of EPC are not financed out of the Community budget but by the country holding the presidency. Wherever possible ministerial meetings in the context of political cooperation will be arranged during sittings of the Council of Ministers and vice versa.

Mr Bøgh (CDI). — (DA) Many of us here in the chamber were very pleased a short while ago during time for questions to the Council to hear the clear answers given to the effect that the Member States enjoy complete freedom in regard to their positions on foreign policy matters. I should therefore like to ask whether the presence of a non-national Commission Member at the negotiating table — first on the occasion of the London Declaration in 1982 and then the Stuttgart Declaration in 1983 — did not detract from the possibility open to us, which is so important for many here in this House, to make statements on foreign policy questions without being bound by one another?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) As I stated earlier the Commission's presence is essential because experience which may have been gained by either the President or the Vice-President of the Commission has a bearing, indirectly at least, on many of the issues discussed at EPC meetings when these issues are connected with matters handled by the Commission. One could not say it is without utility. What is of significance is what I said previously, namely that only the ten Member States participate in the formation of the consensus, and that neither the President nor the Vice-President of the Commission have anything to do with this. It is, if you like, quite simply a briefing exercise, which certainly, as you are aware, has ramifications in other sectors as well.

Mr Bonde (CDI). — (DA) I should like to thank the Political Cooperation President for his assurance that expenditure for European political cooperation will continue to be financed from the budgets of the

Bonde

Member States. I should now like to ask the President whether that means that every item of expenditure for European political cooperation, which is not defrayed from Member State budgets but might be slipped into one of the general Community budgets, would then be illegal. Would it not lack a legal basis, since the European Political Cooperation President is of the opinion that every item of expenditure is the concern of the Member States?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) Checks are very stringent, and it is not possible for what the honourable Member has said to happen, for this expenditure to be subsumed under any other heading, that is. What I said is very clear. The practice which has applied up until now is for expenditure incurred in the context of political cooperation to be borne by the Member State holding the presidency. This is what always happens and I do not think there is any ground or obscurity which can give cause for misunderstanding as regards the expenditure incurred in political cooperation.

President. — Questions No 35 by Mrs Hammerich (H-184/83):

Will the Foreign Ministers give a specific and detailed account of how the concept of 'the political and economic aspects of security policy' differs from other aspects of security and military policy, and will the Foreign Ministers confirm, in particular, that the following matters fall outside the economic and political aspects of security:

- arms production
- the arms trade
- the establishment of an arms agency
- matters dealt with in NATO
- matters which may affect Irish neutrality
- studies of defence problems
- nuclear missile deployment
- civil defence
- coastal surveillance?

Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (GR) Concerning the question by Mrs Hammerich I have this to say.

It is well known that in the context of political cooperation views are exchanged about all the important foreign policy matters. In the past these matters have also included the political and economic aspects of security, such as, for example, the CSCE, arms control and disarmament, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, etc. The paragraph of the Stuttgart declaration to which Mrs Hammerich's question refers does not provide for purely military or defence matters to be discussed within the context of European political cooperation, nor does it impinge on the Community's range of competence. I note, finally, that the position

of Ireland will be borne in mind during the consultations of the Ten on defence.

Mr Hammerich (CDI). — (DA) I still feel that I have not had a precise delimitation of what falls within the economic and the political spheres of security. I should like to get a somewhat more precise clarification of that. Could you not be so kind as to go through the list I put down in my question for the sake of a little more clarity! I do not think we have had a full clarification of the matter. I should also like to ask whether the Commission takes part when the political and/or economic aspects of security are being discussed.

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) I have the following to say in answer to the honourable lady's question which touches on a range of matters.

The detailed aspects to which she referred have not been discussed in the context of European political cooperation. I emphasize, moreover, that the paragraph on the political and economic aspects of security in the Stuttgart declaration does not impinge on the Community's range of competence. This is stated quite clearly in the minutes of the last European Council following an approach by the Commission.

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED). — In support of the President-in-Office's first answer: Mrs Hammerich lists nuclear missile deployment as a matter which falls outside the economic and political aspects of security, but does not the Greek proposal for a six months moratorium on NATO deployment of intermediate-range nuclear weapons discussed at the meeting of Foreign Ministers yesterday in Athens signify that this is a matter falling within the political aspects of security? With regard to the further political aspects subsequent on arms production, arms trade and the establishment of an arms agency — all of obvious economic importance to the Community — does not the fact that the European Community sent a peace-keeping force to the Sinai for the withdrawal of Israeli forces and that coastal surveillance, particularly of fishing in Community waters by non-Community vessels is a Community matter debated in this Parliament illustrate the impact of Community actions on the economic and political aspects of security?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) If I have understood the honourable Member's question properly, because he mentioned the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe and other related matters, what I can say in reply at this moment is that these matters go beyond the bounds of whatever military alliance. They are political matters, more far-reaching, with repercussions for peace, and consequently we cannot treat of them simply in the context of NATO or of the Warsaw Pact or of any other military agreement. The matter is of such immense importance for

Charalambopoulos

humanity that it goes far beyond the bounds of alliances. It involves all the countries and peoples of the world because it has to do with the question of peace. It is related to the escalation of arms and this has a bearing on the current nuclear or conventional warfare capability of certain countries. Such is the importance and the catastrophic weight and force of these matters that they can be discussed anywhere whatsoever from the moment the peoples decide that they want to see peace consolidated, arms reduction, and the achievement of balance and security at the lowest possible level of weaponry.

I should remind you that even two or three years ago annual spending on arms stood at approximately 700 billion dollars. Today, I believe, this sum is considerably greater, and an arms race for purely political purposes could lead to catastrophe and death. For this reason the matter cannot be kept within the narrow reaches of military security. It is clearly a political matter.

President. — Question No 36 by Mr Ephremidis (H-242/83):

Given that, in the event of a nuclear conflict, Europe and its peoples, who have already witnessed and suffered from two world wars, will be the first to be subjected to its catastrophic effects, what is the position of the Foreign Ministers towards the new peace proposal put forward by the Soviet Union for nuclear disarmament throughout Europe so that the peoples of Europe may be delivered once and for all from the nightmare of a nuclear holocaust?

Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (GR) As you know, the purely military aspects of security matters are not discussed in the context of European political cooperation. This is related to what I said before. Consequently, the proposals in question which relate to these matters have not been discussed in this context.

I remind you, nevertheless, that the Ten support all specific, balanced and genuine disarmament measures which enhance the security of Europe and elsewhere, and which lessen the risk of nuclear conflict. They therefore welcome the on-going nuclear arms reduction talks in Geneva and hope that these will have a swift and substantive outcome. For the Ten nuclear disarmament is a matter of top priority.

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — (GR) First of all I thank the President of the Council because, in contrast to the previous, West German, presidency, which refused to reply to our question, he was willing today to do so. However, without wishing to put him in a difficult position, because an attempt has been made this evening to subject him to nigh on an inquisition, I want to move on. He said that nuclear disarmament is outside the ambit of political cooperation, but immediately prior to this he said that these matters are so far-

reaching, of such importance and gravity, that they extend beyond the bounds of alliances, and therefore, beyond the bounds of political cooperation as well. However, these matters can be discussed, and a judgement on them given, in the context of political cooperation, especially now that the Greek Presidency has shown laudable initiative in proposing to the Council of Ministers that it take a position on the proposal for a six months moratorium on the deployment of the American missiles in Europe in order to give time for the talks in Geneva to reach a conclusion beneficial to the peoples of Europe and for peace.

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) What I said in my original answer to Mr Ephremidis applies, and consequently I have nothing more to add. However, I would like, now, because I did not grasp it properly during the discussion, to come back to something said by the honourable Member, Sir James Scott-Hopkins.

If he really did say what I now think he said, and made a personal remark about me, I draw it to your attention, Mr President, and to the attention of the Members of this House, and I insist that it is totally unacceptable. The Member does not have the right to cast aspersions on the Foreign Minister of Greece who is lawfully presiding over the Council. And neither I nor the Greek Government will ask Sir James Scott-Hopkins who should be Foreign Minister and undertake the presidency. So please, Mr President, call Sir James Scott-Hopkins to order.

(Applause)

What he said is unacceptable and this must be recorded in the Minutes. It is the first time I have heard such a thing in all my parliamentary life, which goes back 25 years. It is unacceptable and I request that this be recorded in the Minutes.

Mr Boyes (S). — I understand that you said that you could not talk about nuclear disarmament as President-in-Office. However, could you comment on the fact that people are being tortured by a Fascist junta in Turkey in a trial that is coming to an end and on the fact that people there could be subject to a death penalty for one thing, namely, fighting for peace?

I ask you, as President-in-Office if you and your fellow-ministers will consider applying sanctions, political and economic against that country if any of these people are sentenced to prison — or anything worse than that — for fighting for the thing that everyone in this Chamber should demand, and that is peace.

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (GR) The matter has not been discussed by the Council but, as the dear gentleman knows, member countries of the Community have taken certain initiatives in the Council of Europe, and the matter he has touched on is now also before the Council of Europe. If he would like my own more personal view, not as President of the

Charalambopoulos

Council or as a Foreign Minister, I have to say that I feel a particular sensitivity about this matter. Sensitivity for those who are struggling for freedom, for human rights and human dignity, and from a personal standpoint I am shaken when I learn that things like this are happening today left, right and centre. And, unfortunately, double standards do exist. There is no credibility.

(Applause)

Mr Seligman (ED). — I would like to point out that I am not Sir James Scott-Hopkins, in case the Foreign Minister thought I was. Sir James Scott-Hopkins only asked a question; he did not make any allegations. I welcome the President-in-Office's remarks about the strategic proposal of the Soviets, the so-called peace proposal. I think it is very welcome news that he takes this view. Does he not agree that balanced strategic weapons and a balance of theatre weapons are the best guarantee of peace, as they have been for the last 37 years, and that the Soviet so-called peace proposal in no way provides such a balance?

Mr Charalambopoulos. — *(GR)* What I can say in reply, though it does not fall within the range of today's questions, is this. As the Foreign Minister of my country — at this moment I am speaking in that capacity and not as the President of the Council of Ministers — I think that every endeavour must be made to bring about a balance of forces at the lowest possible level, and this means arms reductions. That is our position and I believe that we not only echo the views of our own people but also express the views and anxiety of other peoples who would like to see the talks aimed at achieving this brought to a conclusion.

On the first matter you raised, concerning Sir James Scott-Hopkins, since he did not say what the interpreters, at least, gave the impression that he did say, I accept the explanation and, of course, I would not only have had to say that personal attacks of such a kind are out of place in this Chamber, but in the case of Sir James Scott-Hopkins, at least, I would also have had to express deepest surprise because I know him to

be a parliamentarian of long standing. I am glad you have made this clarification.

Mr Lalor (DEP). — I don't have any brief for the defence of Sir James Scott-Hopkins, but I must say that I did not hear him say anything wrong. I have to put on record that I am surprised that the President-in-Office of the Council, who had replied to the supplementary question by Sir James, then waited for him to leave the Chamber in order to attack him. I think that is inexcusable.

Mr Seligman (ED). — Sir James Scott-Hopkins is going to be at the meeting which is now going to take place downstairs with the President-in-Office of the Council, so they will have a chance to talk there.

Mr Charalambopoulos. — *(GR)* Mr President, this is the formal sitting. It is the formal sittings which are important. It matters not whether I meet up with Sir James Scott-Hopkins and he clarifies what he said. It is what is said here that counts. If Sir James Scott-Hopkins did say that it is unacceptable, and I cannot understand what you mean in saying that I waited for him to leave. I did not wait for him to leave, nor did I even see him. Quite simply I felt the deepest surprise when my ear picked up something related to what Sir James Scott-Hopkins had said, and I wanted to clarify the matter. Since it was not said, it was not said, but I do not think you can criticize the President of the Council of Ministers by saying, as you did, that I waited for him to leave before I spoke. I am not in the habit of taking the easy way out. All my life I have stood up to trouble face to face, and I will stand up to it face to face in this Chamber as well for so long as I preside over the Council of Ministers.

(Applause)

President. — I consider this incident which, I feel, is based, at least in part, on a misunderstanding, closed. The first part of Question Time is concluded.¹

*(The sitting was closed at 7.10 p.m.)*²

¹ See Annex of 14. 9. 1983.

² *Agenda for next sitting:* See Minutes.

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 1983

Contents

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1. <i>European Union (Doc. 1-575/83) (continuation)</i></p> <p><i>Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Welsh; Mr Hänsch; Mr Pflimlin; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Megahy; Mrs Gaiotti De Biase; Mr Turner; Mr O'Mahony; Mr Kallias; Mr De Pasquale; Mr Verroken; Mr J. Moreau; Mr Lücker; Mr Radoux; Mr Antoniozzi; Mrs Boserup; Mr Giavazzi; Mrs Bonino; Mr Estgen; Mr Alavanos; Mr Ryan; Mr Halligan; Mr Macario; Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Ferri</i></p> | <p><i>assistance leading to an increase in nylon manufacturing capacity in Belgium:</i></p> <p><i>Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Welsh; Mr Andriessen; Mr Moreland; Mr Andriessen</i></p> |
| 90 | 119 |
| <p>2. <i>Topical and urgent debate (objections)</i></p> <p><i>Mr Glinne; Mrs De March; Mr Boyes; Mr Gontikas; Mr Boyes; Mrs Ewing; Mr von der Vring; Mr Klepsch</i></p> | <p>— <i>Question No 56 by Mr Gontikas: Inadmissible and deliberate distortion of facts through the press by the Athens Information Office:</i></p> <p><i>Mr Andriessen; Mr Gontikas; Mr Andriessen</i></p> |
| 116 | 120 |
| <p>3. <i>Question Time (Doc. 1-660/83) (continuation)</i></p> <p>— <i>Questions to the Commission</i></p> <p>— <i>Question No 51 by Mrs Martin: Position of women working in family businesses without pay</i></p> <p><i>Mr Richard (Commission); Mrs von Alemann; Mr Richard; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Richard</i></p> <p>— <i>Question No 52 by Mr Bord: Lack of qualified engineers in the electronics industry</i></p> <p><i>Mr Richard; Mr Bord; Mr Richard</i></p> <p>— <i>Question No 53 by Mr Gauthier: EEC's nuclear programme</i></p> <p><i>Mr Davignon (Commission); Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Davignon</i></p> <p>— <i>Question No 54 by Mr Nyborg: Pilot projects for coastal protection</i></p> <p><i>Mr Richard; Mr Nyborg; Mr Richard; Mr Purvis; Mr Richard; Mrs Ewing; Mr Richard; Mr Enright; Mr Richard</i></p> <p>— <i>Question No 55 by Mr Welsh: National</i></p> | <p><i>Mr Richard; Mr Israël; Mr Richard; Mr Seligman; Mr Richard; Mr Bonde; Mr Richard</i></p> <p>— <i>Question No 61 by Mr Gerokostopoulos: Incomplete reporting to Greek public opinion of the results of the country's membership of the EEC</i></p> <p><i>Mr Andriessen; Mr Gerokostopoulos; Mr Andriessen; Mr Bonde; Mr Andriessen; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Andriessen; Mr Lalor; Mr Adamou; Mr Andriessen; Mr Bangemann; Mr Andriessen; Mr Seligman; Mr Andriessen</i></p> <p>— <i>Question No 62 by Mr Bonde: Majority decisions in questions considered by one of the Member States to be of vital importance</i></p> <p><i>Mr Davignon; Mr Bonde; Mr Davignon; Mr Seligman; Mr Davignon</i></p> <p>— <i>Question No 66 by Mrs Scamaroni: Community fisheries policy</i></p> <p><i>Mr Contogeorgis (Commission); Mrs Scamaroni; Mr Contogeorgis; Mrs Ewing; Mr Contogeorgis; Mr Harris; Mr Contogeorgis</i></p> |
| 117 | 121 |
| 117 | 122 |
| 118 | 124 |
| 118 | 125 |

- *Question No 67 by Mr Clinton: Liberalization of intra-Community trade in minced meat products*
Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Clinton; Mr Dalsager 126
- *Question No 69 by Mr Kazazis: Financial Protocol EEC-Turkey:*
Mr Richard; Mr Kazazis; Mr Richard; Mr Adamou; Mr Richard; Mrs Hoff; Mr Richard 127
- *Question No 71 by Mrs Pblix: Community policy in the coal sector:*
Mr Davignon; Mrs Pblix; Mr Davignon; Mr Marshall; Mr Davignon 128
4. *Votes*
Mr Alavanos; Mr Spinelli; Mr von der Vring; Mr Curry; Mr Aigner; Mr Andriessen 129
- Annexes*
Mr Glinne; Mr Bangemann; Mr Barbi; Sir Henry Plumb; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Forth; Mr Bournias; Mr Nordmann; Mr Luster; Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti; Mrs Veil; Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mr Hord; Mr Prag; Mrs Bonino; Mr Petersen; Mrs Focke; Mr Almirante; Mr Skovmand; Mr Bonde; Mrs Castle; Mr Saby; Mr Johnson; Mr Spinelli; Mr Brondlund Nielsen; Mr Adamou; Mr Beazley; Mr de Ferranti; Miss Forster; Mr Gendebien; Mr Israël; Mr C. Jackson; Mr Kallias; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Lalor; Mr Marshall; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Normanton; Mr O'Donnell; Mr Paisley; Mr Pedini; Mr Pintat; Mr Puletti; Sir Brandon Rhys Williams; Mr Ryan; Mr J. D. Taylor; Mrs Theobald-Paoli; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Moreland; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Eyraud; Mrs Seibel-Emmerling; Mr Provan; Mr Gautier; Lord Douro; Mr Vernimmen; Mr Fellermaier; Mr Tyrrell 131

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)¹

1. *European Union (continuation)*

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the Spinelli report (Doc. 1-575/83)².

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I count myself among those who have only scant reservations about lending their support to the report before the House. In so doing I am personally less interested in the implementation of idealistic recommendations nor, on the other hand, in resigning oneself to a pragmatic approach with a view to paving the way for approval of our European initiative by councils of ministers and parliaments in their so-called 'realism'. In giving my stamp of approval I am motivated, as is a large majority within my group, by the presence in every chapter of the draft report, of a commitment to, and recommendation for, a strengthening of the influence, powers and rights

of the European Parliament, a parliamentarization of the economic, financial and political decision-making procedure of the European Union as desired by us.

I would add a remark on the 'acquis communautaire' (what has been hitherto attained by the Community): in the context of the economic constitution of the draft report we are currently debating does not resolve the question as to how the call for continuity of the Community, until it is ultimately subsumed in a European Union, is to be achieved with regard to the legal technicalities. There are two ways. Either a general reference to existing and subsequent Community law in the general chapter of the European Union constitution, or the most airtight repetition possible of the 'acquis communautaire' built into the constitution itself. On a factual basis section 21 comes closest to attaining this but it does not deal with the important question as to whether Article 235 of the Treaty of Rome continues to be applicable; this Article provides for the introduction of new policies by means of a general clause without the need for amending the Treaty. I feel this question ought to be answered as work on the draft proceeds.

As such I shall devote only a few remarks to the economic chapter. Without doubt it is among the most important of the report. Mr Moreau justifiably gave pride of place to the internal market and competition aspects, that is, their completion and responsibility for European Union. We shall be unable to

¹ Approval of minutes — Documents received — Decisions on urgent procedure: see Minutes of this sitting.

² See Debates of 13 September 1983.

Blumenfeld

make clear to the Community's citizens the nature of our aims in introducing this project and how and where the economic parameters affecting individuals or regions are to be ameliorated, employment is to be guaranteed and additional employment created if we are seen, as has hitherto been the case, to be at odds with one another on economic, social and political ideologies, when we constantly create trade barriers acting along national egoistical protective lines — in short when we spoil the Community internal market instead of dismantling, once and for all, intra-Community frontier controls on individuals and goods.

A large Community internal market is the prerequisite for a durable economic recovery, for shaking off the crisis in Europe with its dire consequences for the employment situation and the job opportunities for the young generation. Internal market also presupposes harmonization of the research norms, controls and structures etc. with a view to maintaining our competitiveness as compared with our principal economic partners in the world. A failure to achieve this would be tantamount to reducing the employment market in Europe on a par with the increase which would take place in the United States and Japan. I am, however, sceptical with regard to the recommendation for sectoral policy depicted by Mr Moreau. Europe needs less, not more, bureaucracy and less State initiatives. Put another way, we need such things only where they are indispensable for the economic or political security of our European Union.

The concentrated problem area of our common agricultural policy continues to hang over us like a storm cloud and yet the economic chapter hardly mentions it. Reference to the effect that the objectives of the CAP, as defined in Article 39 of the Treaty of Rome, shall be incorporated as the objectives of European Union is meaningless. No mention is made of the fact that such objectives, as enshrined at the time, have long been surpassed and have even become sacrosanct with the result that the legitimacy of the payments involved and the associated economic and financial effects upon Community industry and commerce are leading the Community to the brink of bankruptcy.

Reference to external economic policy is completely absent. Both in the economic chapter as in the chapter written by our colleague, Mr Prag, this important problem has been glossed over in a more or less meaningless line. And yet no more than two months ago debates were held in this House on unfair competition in foreign trade, on the effect of the CAP on the Community external economic policy, on GATT issues and on the pros and cons of boycott measures — all first-rate debates — the economic necessity and the considerable significance of external economic problems for the Community were all paraded before us. In this document I cannot find our commitment to the Community identity and negotiating responsibility for all aspects of external economic policy nor, for that matter, an iron clad commitment to the prin-

ciple of the liberal external economic policy of our Community and to the Union we desire, as it is already enshrined in Article 110 of the Treaty of Rome. The amendments tabled by me did not, unfortunately, find majority support in committee.

Today we have the first reading. A lot of work was involved and we have yet to render it more tangible and to await the amendments. The definitive version must be presented to the House and unveiled to the public within six months at the latest.

Mr Welsh (ED). — Mr President, I would not be so presumptuous as to affect to speak for my group, but I would like to make it clear that what I have to say is said entirely for myself.

When looking at the Spinelli report, I think we can agree that most of it is a useful and valuable contribution to the discussion about the development of the Community institutions. There are bits with which we can agree and there are bits about which we may be doubtful, but the overall thrust is creative and valuable.

However, there is one element which is of an entirely different order of magnitude and that is paragraph 124 which in effect — and do not let us hide from this — would involve the transfer of sovereignty from elected national governments to the Community institutions. Now we will all have our ideas about the desirability of that. But do not let us conceal from ourselves that that is what it actually means. And do not also let us fudge the issue by pretending that this is just a discussion document. The rapporteur's clear intention is that this should be a mandate to four legal draftsmen to produce a draft treaty, and this is a principle that will be enshrined as Parliament's will in that draft treaty. So that is what we are going to be voting about when we vote for paragraph 124.

Now I have to confess that intellectually I am attracted by the principle of majority voting. But I also have to recognize that in my judgement at least the vast majority of the British people are not so intellectually attracted. And I have to say that I think in many cases one can see why. Because, after all, majorities are coercive. It is all very well to have majority voting, but if one has a binding rule, such as is proposed here, that means that all the different constituent parts of the Community must abide by that majority. Now we have seen majorities here which, I must confess, have been exercised in the most irresponsible way. And I do not think that the British public are yet ready to be locked into a system which might, for instance by the exercise of the majority, commit them forever to paying an entirely undue proportion of the Community finance costs. Because, after all, that is what the majority in this Parliament has voted for time and time and time again. And until that sort of issue is cleared up I do not think that there is any genuine support in the United Kingdom for this particular major and revolutionary change.

Welsh

Although I do not know what the people of France and the people of Germany think, I would seriously say to my French, German, Italian and other colleagues: are you really so sure that the people you represent here are actually ready for this sort of change?

I listened attentively to what Mr Spinelli had to say when introducing his report. I heard him say that it was important for Parliament to give a lead; that we were the guiding light and that it was up to us to take a stand — it was all impressive and I respect him for it. However, we must also remember, colleagues, that we are here to represent the basic aspirations of our citizens, the people who elect us, and that if we do not do this the gestures we indulge in are meaningless. Now, however much I may be attracted by the idea of majority voting, I am conscious that the people who elect me are not and that I would be being untrue to them if I pretended that they were; and by casting my vote for paragraph 124, that is what I would be doing.

Leadership means guiding people in the way in which they wish to go and giving them a nudge. Making political gestures does not establish political facts. If we are going to be leaders then we have to be responsible to what our people are telling us and I do not think the Spinelli report is responsive to that. And if we do not have widespread public support for this kind of move, we are not being leaders, we are being arrogant and that is not the way that I think the new Europe is going to be built.

Mr Hänsch (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report drawn up by Mr Spinelli and our other colleagues can be divided into two sections. The first of these are the interim reports drafted by our colleagues Moreau, Pfennig, Seeler and Prag setting out the tasks which lie ahead for the Community or the Union. We can subscribe fully to these reports and the description of the tasks and objectives contained therein. Even allowing for the inevitable compromises, and the fact that all is not exactly as one would have wished, the section referred to is, nevertheless, a blueprint for a Community of the future which complies with our desires.

It is my belief that the reports drafted by our colleagues De Gucht and Zecchino regrettably fail to meet the standards we feel obliged to set for a painstaking, balanced and mature parliamentary document. I should like the House to bear in mind, therefore, that our criticism is levelled at these two reports within the overall context of the Spinelli report.

We share the desire of the overwhelming majority of the Members of this House for a massive bolstering of the rights of the European Parliament as compared with the other Community institutions in the future. We want to provide the Community electorate with something to vote for when it goes to the polls. We want to see an improvement in the effectiveness of

the decision-making machinery, in the liaison between Community institutions. We want to disentangle the log jam in the decision-making procedure and to reduce the preponderance of the Council. We echo the sentiments of a majority of this House in calling for a strong, closely-knit Community. Our criticism of the guidelines must not be construed as anti-European, as some would, no doubt, like to believe. We are not concerned with 'if' but with 'how' the Treaty is to be amended and with displaying a modicum of honesty, both among each other and with regard to the Community's citizens. Plain speaking is not detrimental to the Community nor is a refusal to address the questions of tomorrow with the answers of the day before yesterday. I feel that the guidelines referred to will only serve to delude our citizens, that the effects of their implementation remain veiled and that they merely serve to divert attention from current Community problems. Let us be wary of such diversion from the real, current difficulties confronting the European Community.

Community-citizens — our electorate — expect us to surmount these difficulties. They expect joint action to combat the economic crisis and unemployment, joint policies drawn up and implemented by us with a view to maintaining the competitiveness of Community industry with regard to that of the United States and Japan, to guarantee the environment and the essentials of life, and individual Community contribution towards safeguarding and maintaining peace; they are awaiting a solution to the financial and budgetary misery through a reform of both the CAP and the Community financing system. All of this could be achieved within the institutional framework as it stands at present, if the necessary goodwill were forthcoming from governments and the main political forces in our States. But such is not their intention.

If we, as Community institutions, ponder the De Gucht and Zecchino reports we are left with the impression that this Parliament's behaviour is analogous to that of a high jumper who, knowing that he won't clear the two metre bar, tries to conceal it by attempting instead to go for 2.40 metres. Likewise I feel that the guidelines contained in these two reports can only delude the Community's citizens. I know many Members in this House who swear by the future European Union but who, in the halls and corridors outside, behave like realists in saying that the whole affair has no chance of success in any event, not even within their own parties. I foresee that this type of dishonesty — and please take it very seriously — will rebound on us.

We all know very well that, in the most optimistic scenario, the course charted in these documents will be followed by some four or five Member States. Indeed the first draft of these guidelines contained a reference to the effect that the proposed European Union could be formed by four or five Member States.

Hänsch

It is, after all, a critical question to know who can and will join in. Can you imagine that such a question was raised and debated in committee? We are deciding here today on guidelines without even having debated such a critical question. It has not, heretofore, even been raised. It had originally been the intention to take up the issue but it has now vanished because it was someone's contention that it belonged in the transitional voting stage. Those pursuing such a line ought to realize that they are contributing to the division of the present-day European Community. I would even go so far as to say that it can be judicious to recognize that a Community of some five or six Member States is the only viable proposition. It can, as indicated, be judicious but it must still be raised and debated in a Parliament such as this; it must be grappled with rather than letting it disappear and retorting: 'We shall get around to it next Spring during the transitional regulations'.

I would like us to wrestle with such fundamental issues of the European Community and the future of the Union when we talk about guidelines rather than about one or other issue which arises from inter-institutional collaboration.

Contrary to what some might believe, I have nothing against a look into the future. It is, naturally, incumbent on the European Parliament to cast its sights beyond the current thoughts and deeds of governments. We must fix objectives for the future, stake out our position for the future development but, in so doing we must distinguish vision, which is a necessary ingredient, from illusion which can put us on the wrong track.

On the basis of these guidelines we shall probably commission, this afternoon, a new report on the concrete articles of constitution from the Committee on Institutional Affairs. I would ask you all to bear in mind that the task has not yet been completed and that there is still time to trim a little off the document so that it could be adopted next year or two years hence by a large majority. Let us guard against the danger of this important Community subject becoming caught up in the European electoral campaign, or that the beams intended for the construction of the European edifice are consumed in the fire of the electoral campaign! This subject has no place in electoral disputes. It is, rather, a task which ought to preoccupy us for quite some time, for Community citizens have a right to a future-oriented, bold and viable programme having a broad consensus. I urge you all to help so that our efforts are rewarded!

(Applause from the Socialist benches)

Mr Pflimlin (EPP). — *(FR)* Mr President, honourable Members, our debate once again suggests to me a comparison between the state of Europe at the beginning of the movement towards unity and its present state. I cannot but feel a certain nostalgia for the great enthusiasm of the 1950s which, scarcely five years

after the end of the war, led farseeing and courageous statesmen to embark on the construction of a united Europe. Let me quote just one name, that of Robert Schuman: tomorrow, 15 September, will be the twentieth anniversary of his death. Having once been at his side, I well remember what courage he needed to direct French policy along an entirely new road and to propose, instead of the conclusion of a peace treaty, the creation of a Community which Germany could join as a partner of the same standing as the other founding countries. At that time the economic situation in Europe, a Europe ruined by war, was more difficult than today. Moreover, the rancour provoked by the recent tragedy could have become an unsurmountable psychological obstacle. That obstacle was overcome and national egoism gave way to the resolve to build a new Europe.

Today many voices can be heard — some even here — suggesting that the conflicts of interest between Member States of the Community are so great, that the revival of national egoism is so strong, that the resolve to advance a stage further towards European integration will encounter unsurmountable obstacles. Cassandra — whether this Cassandra be called Hänsch or de la Malène — can certainly put forward enough arguments to justify her pessimism. Yet an objective analysis of the situation in which we find ourselves cannot fail to lead most of us to the conclusion that the evils our people are suffering cannot be remedied simply by the efforts of national States acting in isolation or even in opposition to one another.

No doubt Europe cannot offer any miracle cure, but European solidarity which, in spite of our political divergencies, often finds its expression in this Assembly, is the only road to salvation.

Progress can and must be made in the framework of the existing Treaties. But we must also acknowledge — President Thorn noted this bitter truth yesterday — that the existing Community institutions and procedures cannot get it out of the rut it is sinking into and that radical changes are necessary if Europe is once again to make progress.

Honourable Members, I am not going to attack the governments. From long experience I know how difficult it is for them to rise above considerations of purely national interests. Indeed, today only the European Parliament can open up new prospects for the common good of Europe. The report drawn up by the Committee on Institutional Affairs, at the initiative of Mr Spinelli and with the assistance of the six other rapporteurs, is certainly not perfect. But it has the immense merit of clearly reflecting the resolve to build a European Union that is able to devise, define and implement policies which respond to our peoples' needs and of making a European contribution to the construction of a peaceful world order based on justice and freedom.

Pflimlin

Yesterday I heard Mr de la Malène tell us in an eloquent speech that the motion before us has no chance of succeeding. Our colleague belongs to a political group which goes back to a statesman, General de Gaulle, who in 1940 assigned himself objectives which reasonable people of the time thought unattainable.

Today we are not speaking about an aim of war but about an aim of peace. We will certainly have to make great efforts to achieve it — Mr Hänsch is right there — and a great deal of patience. But I refuse to believe that it is unattainable. It is a matter of faith and resolve. In any case it is our duty to propose the grand design of building a united Europe in order to raise new hopes and obtain the support of our people for the great enterprise on which we have embarked.

(Loud applause)

Mr Newton Dunn (ED). — Mr President, I support this motion wholeheartedly. I want to speak on two particular aspects; first the voting procedure — majority voting, of course — and then the question of sovereignty and the transfer of sovereignty.

First of all, majority voting. We all know, everybody in this Chamber knows that the Community is not working at the moment, and I think we all know why. It is because difficult decisions are not being taken. Why are difficult decisions not being taken? It is because each and everyone of the national governments casts a veto — a veto which has no legal basis at all — whenever it wishes to do so, no matter how minor the issue. Now, Mr President, you will know that no organization in history has ever succeeded in taking effective action where things are wrong or in doing anything useful in the world if it has given its individual members a veto. History is littered with a trail of organizations which made big speeches but never actually did anything. This was true of the League of Nations, and even the United Nations Security Council cannot take action because it gives a veto to certain countries. The OECD was originally formed after the war to take action, but a veto was given to each of its members. It therefore has no power and merely collects statistics. The British Commonwealth has no power to take any action. The list is very long and I shall not continue with it.

The Community will fail — and it is failing — if the national governments continue to have the right to exercise the veto.

(Applause)

Now I recognize that, for the time being, genuine national vital interests need to be protected because the nations at the moment in the Community do not trust each other sufficiently to go for full majority voting. I regret that; I recognize the lack of trust that is there. I believe that that trust will develop over the

years and we shall be able to go further. But we cannot allow vetoes on minor matters. The people of Europe expect us to do something. National governments wish the present situation to continue. But we, Mr President, are not delegates or representatives of national governments, we are elected separately by the peoples of Europe to make Europe work. We have got to make Europe work. Only we — as Mr Pflimlin said — can do it.

The second aspect I want to touch on briefly is the question of sovereignty. My friend and colleague, Michael Welsh, who spoke earlier, referred to this as a transfer of sovereignty and he thought that people were not really in favour of this. Yet the transfer of sovereignty is to the benefit of our peoples. We have already done this on a number of occasions. In NATO defence is no longer the independent responsibility of any individual country in Western Europe. We do it together for the benefit of all.

The Court of Human Rights here in Strasbourg constitutes a transfer of sovereignty. Citizens from the United Kingdom appeal to it over the heads of their national government and win. Their benefits and their rights are thereby enhanced. Then take matters of trade *vis-à-vis* other trading blocs — Japan, USA even, our allies. Because we negotiate together, and the Commissioners in Brussels have the right to negotiate with real power on behalf of all of us, we are effective. It is to the benefit of our peoples. It would not be to the benefit of our peoples in any of these cases if each individual government continued to work on its own.

We have the responsibility of persuading our peoples that further transfers of sovereignty will be to their benefit. They will not, of course, be to the benefit of the careers of national politicians in national parliaments, but they will be to the benefit of our peoples. The choice for our peoples is not a loss of sovereignty at all. It is a gain in a share of a greater stronger sovereignty. That is the message we have to get across. Our people expect us to make Europe work and we in this Parliament, because there is nowhere else, must not shirk that responsibility.

(Applause)

Mr Megahy (S). — Mr President, I noted the comments made by Mr Spinelli in his introduction when he sought to categorize various Members of this Parliament in their opposition. He typically made an appeal to those Members who are in favour of the general thrust of these proposals and urged them not to take any action which would prevent them being adopted. However, he also pointed out that in this Chamber there were some people — and I count myself amongst them — who are totally opposed to the general direction of the proposals contained in this report. Mr President, I am one of those persons

Megahy

who will vote against these proposals lock, stock and barrel. I have thought for a long time over whether it was worthwhile putting in amendments. I find myself in such fundamental disagreement with the general tenor of the report that amendments would not be sufficient.

It seems to me that in a sense this report is a monstrous irrelevancy. It is the nearest thing we have in Euro-terms to Nero fiddling while Rome burns. We have 13 million unemployed in the Community, we have crisis in the agricultural sector, we are nearly bankrupt, we are faced with massive problems of international relations. Yet at such a time the only answer of this Parliament is to relaunch a federalist concept of Europe. I know it is argued, and Members here would argue, that you can do the two things at the same time. You can tackle these problems and at the same time put forward these proposals. However, it does seem to me that the discussions in committee — and I have attended several of its meetings — and in this Chamber seem to suggest that in some way the way forward is through institutional reform. Too often, I feel, this is the way in which people seek to advance when they cannot agree on common policies. I do not think that is correct.

I think that, by encouraging that belief, this report distracts us from dealing with the real economic and social problems that face us. The real problem is the absence of political will, the absence of joint political resolve within the Community. That will not be settled by institutional reform. If we look at what has happened to recent proposals, we must be anything but optimistic that these particular proposals will be taken up. Look at what happened to the Genscher/Colombo proposals recently. Look at the public opinion polls that have measured the state of public opinion. Look at the state of the parties in the national Member States. Look at the opinion in the parliaments, and you will find that there is no support for any proposals along these lines.

Again, it is further argued here that this European Parliament represents the real political will of the European people. I think that is stuff and nonsense. The members of the national parliaments and the members of the national governments were elected and chosen by the same people, the same electors, as choose Euro-MPs. They are facing the same problems, but in some ways the idea being propagated is that everybody is out of step except Members of the European Parliament. As we say in my native Scotland, we are all out of step except our Jock!

I think that there must be something about the atmosphere of the European Parliament that produces such illusions. I think they are dangerous, because they encourage the belief that the way forward is the old federalist way. Mr Spinelli said we have got to keep

the flame alive here, keep the flame alive in the lighthouse. My response to that is, put out the lights and move the lighthouse to another channel! Move it to a channel that recognizes the reality of political development over the last 30 years in Europe and does not try to put forward the same point of view as was put forward in the 1950s.

One of the fundamental difficulties that faces this Community is that we have got a set of political objectives being reiterated here which were perhaps all right for the original Six. There was a great deal of convergence between them. There were two political aims when this Common Market started. One was to move towards a federalist Europe, and the other was to seek to incorporate any European nation that wanted to come into this Community. I think there is a tension between those two things. I think they are incompatible. The more we move towards a Community of Twelve, the more divergence rather than convergence we get, the more difficult, if not impossible, it will be to get the institutions working along the lines envisaged in this Spinelli report. It is totally unrealistic to try to superimpose the rhetoric of the 1950s on the problems of the 1980s. The problems of the original Six are not the problems of the Twelve. The response of the Twelve is different. One has only got to look at the differences that you find in the state of public opinion, the scepticism and so on in those countries which have recently joined, to see that is the case.

Mr Spinelli says that his proposals are pragmatic proposals. I would deny this. I think they are a resurrection of an outmoded ideology. It seems to me that the ideas embodied in these proposals are now completely out of their time. They do not accord with the real way in which cooperation between European nations has developed. I think a real pragmatic approach would recognize that the idea of a federal Europe is, to quote the heading in the *Times* the other day, 'an impossible dream'. A pragmatic approach would work with the grain of economic development in Europe and not against it. It would loosen rather than tighten the ties in the Community as a recognition that that is the way we are going anyway because of enlargement. It would restore national initiative in many social and economic matters rather than trying to get greater and greater harmonization. It would give a positive lead to cooperation between member governments on matters that are important as between them. It would concentrate on the real economic and social problems, as well as on the problems of peace and *détente*. These are the problems that concern my electors. These are the questions that are being asked at home, not the question of constructing some new super-Europe. We have a message going out from the European Parliament and being listened to by nobody, no action taking place. The considerable talents of the people on this committee and many other people in this Parliament would be far better directed towards dealing with these problems.

Megahy

In conclusion, Mr President, I and many of my colleagues will vote against this Spinelli report. I hope it is defeated and I hope that after that the Members of this House will get down to the constructive and real task of building social and economic policies which will benefit the whole of the peoples of the EEC.

Mrs Gaiotti De Biase (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, perhaps those members who have considered the present debate to be unrealistic are right. Europe is in a state of stagnation: it has been stagnating for years, and the bottom of the mire has perhaps now been reached. The Member States, especially the larger ones, are apparently rediscovering intergovernmental cooperation, and they are staking everything on that. European solidarity and initiative, however, very often do not go beyond a clamorous display of rhetoric, and I, too, am amongst those expressing a marked degree of pessimism. There are, anyway, no grounds for optimism, in the light of the deep social, economic, political and international crisis that has us at present in its grip, and which compels us to seek adequate answers.

And it is because of this — because this Parliament has received from the other institutions nothing of what was implicit in the elections by direct universal suffrage of this Parliament, because Governments continue to play the game of make-belief and procrastination, that Parliament owes to itself, and to European public opinion, this much at least — an act of dignity, an act of pride, a sign of life and vitality, a proof of farsightedness and political consistency.

Of course, it would have been better not to have wasted the first part of this Parliament's life, from the time of its inauguration up to the Van Aerssen resolution, in postponements and uncertainty. We should then have been able to do a better job than we have done, looking more deeply, and without the worry of passing time, for a common meeting point acceptable to everyone.

At all events, far from being an academic exercise, Parliament's initiative grasps the nettle of the European crisis, and faces up to the key question that we are debating: the essential conditions for the democratic and efficient Government of an integrated economy, the essential conditions of the exercise, by 'Europe', of an international, pacific role in the world.

There are many different schools of thought amongst us as to the way in which this role should be exercised; we have different, and sometimes opposing ideas as to the instruments and means for promoting disarmament, for ensuring international stability, for laying the ghost of war. We have different ideas on responsibility for the re-armament race, and on the conditions necessary to ensure peace.

But can these differences, that animate the popular masses throughout Europe and involve our Foreign

Ministries in a constant effort of adjustment, really be left outside this Chamber? Is it not perhaps those same anti-Europeans that are now bringing to our ears the echoes of a debate from which we cannot hold aloof? What is the point of making them heard within this chamber, unless it is to admit that a common strategy, a common design, a common conception and doctrine of European security must emerge here from a democratic majority, to become then the common commitment of the European Governments?

The statement by Mr Prag, whose commitment ought to be rewarded by a braver show of final solidarity on the part of his group, sets down the essential basis of this common quest. Of course, we should have desired something more; we should have desired, first of all, greater emphasis on the function of the European Union in international organizations and international conferences, and the recognition of this consensus as a classic example of political cooperation. The European image is something that is built up continuously, consistently, especially here. And the practice of political cooperation has continued to consolidate itself — albeit with very frequently disappointing results, on these occasions.

A common strategy, a common philosophy regarding the future of the organization and of international guarantees, is the first objective of any political cooperation, consistent with Community philosophy. We could have wished that some reference had now been made to the need for common structures for analysis, study, and proposal, that are necessary in order to provide solid foundations for political cooperation.

At all events, the question is squarely before us, and this is the road we have to take. We realise moreover that the strengthening of the institutions of the Community is in itself a factor conducive to peace on which other continents, troubled with ideological and tribal rivalries, can reflect.

Mr President, the Group of the European Peoples' Party has already authoritatively expressed in this chamber its support for the resolution, in the European tradition that is, I would say, a fundamental feature of Christian Democratic philosophy.

Our work in recent months has been aimed at the achievement of a large majority and broad agreement within Parliament, for which we have accepted the need for self-criticism.

We have in fact decided not to present many amendments for this last debate, so as to make clear our determination to agree. On the one hand, we have tabled a motion for a resolution in line with what the European Parliament had already adopted in the resolution of July 1982, and which could not now be retracted on this occasion; and on the other, the only thing that cannot be asked of us, without invalidating our work, is the confirmation — contrary to the treaties — of the principle of unanimity.

Gaiotti De Biase

Perhaps we shall not have such a large majority as we should have liked. That is to the detriment of Europe. But on the eve of an electoral campaign, in which the electoral debate will also decide future alliances and the future disposition of Parliamentary forces on the floor of this House, it must also be said that, in our opinion, the European People's Party has nothing to lose by having a smaller majority that shows things as they are, and that says clearly who is and who is not for Europe — for a Europe, that is, that is to evolve on the basis of treaties, and not against them.

The European People's Party has nothing to lose if, from this vote, it is clear to public opinion that we are the centre, the fulcrum, and the backing power of the Community's will.

(Applause from the benches of the Centre)

Mr Turner (ED). — Mr President, first of all I must say that, having heard Mr Megahy's speech, I do not agree with him at all when he says he is totally opposed to the direction of these proposals. I, myself, am in favour of the direction and of the objectives, but I am afraid that after that I have to become rather negative. It is very hard to write successful constitutions — take the Treaty of Rome as an example, where its provisions for the balance of power have totally failed so far — but at least when you are negotiating a treaty you are in control of what you are doing, but to commit yourself to a constitution before the negotiations have started is, I think, very difficult and unwise.

I hope the European Parliament is trying to do something else, because it would be foolish to agree to a detailed system of checks and balances, which very much concern our own future, before the system as a whole has been accepted by those who have got to draw it up. I can only hope that this Parliament really is trying to say that, all things being equal, a system such as this one would be acceptable. But to go and commit oneself to a particular frame of proposals is, I think, quite unacceptable at this present time. Unfortunately the proposals as now drawn up and the preamble to the resolution do commit those who vote for it to the details of the principles set out. For instance, if at a later stage they were re-drafted by the committee and brought back, one could hardly vote against what one had already agreed to in principle.

Now I agree that there are many details of any constitution which are self-sufficient and which one could approve now. I give as examples some of the institutional details in the last part of the proposals concerned with the working of the Council and Parliament and so on. I would also suggest that the proposal that social and environmental matters should be part of EEC issues *per se* and not merely because they have economic undertones could also be agreed upon now. However, the basic issues are all interdependent. They

are extremely weighty, and I do not think that one can accept — by voting for this proposal — a whole package which does in fact comprise a detailed system of checks and balances which affect not only this Parliament and us as MEPs but also our parties and our countries at home.

Therefore, first of all, I do not think that, as the European Parliament, we can commit ourselves, before negotiations have started, on the question of our own future powers.

Secondly, as Members of national parties — which we all are — I do not think we can commit ourselves to a particular system before our parties have even started negotiating.

Thirdly, as we are all concerned with many voters at home who have specific problems — such as farmers and those concerned with the budget and many others whose problems have remained unsolved for years — I do not think we can commit ourselves to a system which might prevent us from looking after those interests in the future. Therefore, I am afraid that I agree with those who are against voting for these proposals because I believe they commit us too tightly to a particular system.

I only want to refer to one other thing and that is the position of the Council. We are all looking for the best way of growing out of the need for the continued use of the veto. I agree with those who say that you cannot do this by writing a constitution. I think the only way of making progress at this stage is to make the activities of the Council more transparent. I agree with those who say that a minister should decide when a veto is to be issued and should do so in a formal kind of way, that he should state that he has done so and give his reasons. I believe that the judge should be the people, particularly in his own country, who can decide whether or not he was right in saying that a vital national interest was at stake. But so long as we do have national views that say that vital national interests are at stake, we have got to have a way of interpreting that into the constitution, which means a veto. Once we come to the time when one can hand over the question of whether a matter is a vital national matter to a judge, or as is proposed in this draft, to the Commission, then, of course, we shall have moved miles beyond where we are at the present time. No nation would accept a judge or a Commission who told them what their vital national interests were. So I think that on that aspect we cannot commit ourselves. It is a pity, but it is the reality of the present state of Europe. I hope that out of this debate will grow a demand that the Council shall be more transparent. If that is what comes out of it, we shall have won a great victory. However, I do not think we are very close to being able to commit ourselves to a new and complicated constitution.

Mr O'Mahony (S). — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as most speakers have said, our debate is taking place at a time of great crises in the European Community, and it is appropriate that the parliament directly representing the peoples of Europe should take on itself the task of attempting to find a way forward.

The crises we face are several and complex. The financial state of the Community, it has been said this year, is dangerously close to bankruptcy. This possibility has been foreseen for some years now, especially by our Committee on Budgets. However, our sister institutions, particularly the Council, have seen fit to ignore the signs and refused to take corrective action. Politically the Community is paralysed. At Summit after Summit the same vital issues are raised but no answers are given. Stuttgart was a serious disappointment to all of us, and our hopes for the Athens discussions are consequently not high. At a time when the European Council should be pursuing policies to stimulate growth and employment, it is submerged in attempts to avoid liquidation. That has been its purpose — virtually its only purpose — throughout 1983, and for the people of Europe that situation is intolerable.

Tragically, at this moment of profound economic difficulty the Community appears devoid of leadership, and the combination of both may prove lethal. We are on the brink of what could be a final military holocaust. Our societies are racked by unemployment. Proposals for a new world economic order so essential to Third World development gather dust, while the Community has nothing of substance to say in these matters.

Let us be clear on where the responsibility lies. The Council has no vision and no policies, and it most certainly does not have the political will at this time to act responsibly towards our common future. I know that economic recession on a scale unprecedented since the 1930s and involving mass unemployment inevitably tends to revive crude national interest and feelings of insecurity and self-interest among politicians. If these tendencies win through, war seems to me to be the inevitable result as it was in the 1930s. Our debate therefore is not just about Parliament seeking a greater authority for itself, justifiable though that is. It is also about our insistence that the Community's institutions must respond creatively and urgently to the real problems which face us politically and economically. If they do not, then the peoples of the Community will turn to protectionism and isolationism with all the consequences these entail.

Let us be clear about the Community. Behind the meetings, the reports, the laws and the institutions, what really exists? In the end one is forced to the conclusion that fundamentally we are a common market in agriculture and a free market for capital. These seem to me to be the core of the Community

we have created. There is virtually no macro-economic cooperation, there are no industrial or infrastructural policies and the regional and social initiatives undertaken have been minimal in their scale and effect.

The Community cannot survive on such a limited basis and it would not deserve to do so. That is why I welcome this debate today and the initiatives undertaken by Mr Spinelli and his colleagues. Let me, however, qualify my welcome in a number of important respects. So far, as I have said, the Community has benefited multinational companies and some sections of the agricultural population. There have, however, been few gains for the labour movement, and this has been a matter of deliberate choice on the part of our institutions. I believe it is necessary for the labour movement to organize internationally in the face of international capital — that is one reason why I am here. It is also, however, why I am reluctant to concentrate more powers in the Community's institutions until we see more clearly the policies they would wish to pursue.

Secondly, the proposal to alter the decision-making structures of the Community, while understandable in global Community terms, does pose a potential threat to the interests of smaller, less-developed Member States which we must safeguard ourselves against. Thirdly, I cannot agree to any proposal which would infringe my country's political and military neutrality. The suggestion for a common security policy, combined with the fact that nine of the ten Member States are linked to NATO, is a matter of deep concern to me in its present form.

Finally, the central idea in the report before us is that institutional reform is an essential prerequisite to new, urgently needed policy initiatives. Unless we are careful, however, it may lead to the wrong initiatives, given the present balance of political forces in Europe. That is why I must, with regret, withhold final judgment on the Spinelli process until the Community's policy priorities are further clarified.

IN THE CHAIR : MR K. NIKOLAOU

Vice-President

Mr Kallias (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, these two part-sessions of the European Parliament, today's and yesterday's, will perhaps come to be regarded as historical events because we are debating and are about to decide on the founding of a political union in Europe. The idea of unification is not new; it need only be noted that in the 650 years between 1306 and 1945 there have been 182 plans for the unification of Europe. Much more positive, however, and incomparably more realistic, has been the European unification movement since the second World War. The pursuit of unification sprang, as a need, from the ruins of a destroyed Europe after that fratricidal war. I shall not

Kallias

refer to the familiar history of today's draft resolution. I shall concern myself directly with its content. The resolution is a new and important step along the uphill path towards unification. It is not, of course, a final achievement but at any rate constitutes a noteworthy development of today's Communities. Thus, it ought to be passed with a large majority.

The resolution comprises many important steps forward: The explicit imposition of a regime of pluralistic democracy, both on the Union and on its Member States, together with a profound respect for human rights. The definition of specific responsibilities of the Union for the imposition of sanctions in the event that the democratic regime is abolished in any Member State. It would have been more correct, in addition to sanctions, to provide for an insistent effort to exert pressure for the restoration of democratic legality in any State. The recognition of decisive legislative competence for the Union in the areas of foreign policy and defence. More generally, the extension of the Union's competences to other important sectors as well. The more democratic foundation of the Union's organs and more effective exercise of their functions. The clear definition of the Union's jurisdiction. The Union's specific target to strive for full employment in particular, but also to create parity of living conditions in all its territories and a high level of social justice. This is a target that transcends the bounds of European solidarity and acquires immense social dimensions. And finally, recognition of the close political and economic interdependence between the Union and the Third World, with support for the latter.

The Union's position in relation to security, and even more so defence, must be characterized as timid, since unfortunately even today these matters still give rise to allergic reactions. However, unless Europe acquires defensive autonomy it will be weak and totally dependent. It will be unable to maintain any real foreign policy of its own, and will not be in a position to exercise its equilibrating and peace-promoting function in the world of today.

European Union will be worthy of the name if it gains defensive autonomy and if, as proposed in the Pfennig and Luster constitution, any act of aggression against a Member State is met as an aggression against the Union as a whole. In my opinion, the disadvantages of the proposed resolution are that it is not provided explicitly that each Member State shall be represented on each organ of the Union. That provision is made only for the appointment of President of the Executive Committee, and not for the rest of its membership as well from the European Council. The appointed president is to have powers approximately the same of those of a parliamentary prime-minister in the selection of his cabinet.

There is no respectable and convenient way that Parliament, and its members individually, can exercise legis-

lative initiative. The Committee is invested with an exaggerated role in the exercise of legislative authority.

Finally, it would be possible to mention other points of reservation or omission, and that some parts of the plan should be less detailed so as to allow greater flexibility. The views I have advanced represent not only my own opinion, but also the position of the New Democracy which, I should stress, has given its unambiguous support to the political union of Europe. The initiative of bringing Greece into the Community was also taken by the New Democracy.

Mr President, Fellow-Members, it is a matter of fortunate timing that tomorrow, one of the heralds of the Union, a true European leader, President of the Republic of Greece Mr Constantine Karamanlis is to put his ideas before the representatives of the peoples of free Europe. We Greeks feel particular satisfaction and pride on this account.

(Applause)

Mr De Pasquale (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, the position of the Italian Communists was expounded here yesterday by our Chief Executive, Mr Berlinguer.

This single fact shows better than any words how great is the importance that our Party attaches to this debate, and how high is our appreciation of the work done by the Committee on Institutional Affairs. I shall therefore only make a few brief observations.

This resolution is the third stage in a difficult but precise and fruitful process of planning and political agreement, in the course of which different, and often divergent, views and concepts have been expressed.

The result is a draft reform of the European institutions that is stimulating yet realistic; innovative, yet possible: and that is strictly and functionally linked to the objectives, the implications, the needs of integration and European unity.

There have been many objections that, in order to implement this draft, a political will is necessary that is at present lacking. That seems obvious, at first sight. But, ladies and gentlemen, what is political will? Is it something that falls like manna from Heaven, neatly packed and ready for use?

No, of course it is not. Political will is something that is created, built up, through political struggle and the realities of inevitable disagreements. Political will matures through the coming-together of objective conditions underlying a given historical process; these conditions are best interpreted by subjective initiative.

Let no-one therefore tell us that this draft reform is useless, since the political will is lacking. Quite the reverse — this draft is indispensable, as a starting point, an instrument, a motive force for the formation of a political will sufficient to carry it forward. It therefore cannot, and will not, finish up in the cupboards

De Pasquale

of our Governments, because it is not just an academic exercise. No! It is a political action undertaken by a Parliament elected by universal suffrage — an action that may face obstruction, difficulties and even defeats, but one which is destined to go forward, both here and outside this chamber, in harmony and indeed symbiotically with Parliament's very existence.

Naturally, we do not think that the next stages in this action should consist solely of preparing the new treaty for submission to the Parliaments and Governments of Member States, and making it the subject of debate in the elections and afterwards. This is just one aspect. The prospect of the reform of the treaties must instead constitute a permanent stimulus and a vital, constant guideline for gradual progress along the road to European integration. The fact that it must be gradual, achieved one part at a time, does not exclude the existence of a comprehensive scheme and overall plan; indeed, it presupposes their existence, because progress cannot be made blindly and without objectives. The Committee on Institutional Affairs has aligned itself with this viewpoint, which is deeply realistic. It has not conceived its draft as representing a break with the present. On the contrary, it has worked on the basis of careful recognition of the experience gained, for better and for worse, during these decades, accepting a whole set of new requirements, that have grown up with the passage of time, and for which no answer has so far been found.

The gradual transition from Community to Union does not erode the original structure of the Community, nor does it impair the sovereignty of States or the role of Governments, or compromise the independence of the three institutions; instead, it strengthens and renews the role of the Community organs, and the stature and efficacy of the common policies.

And is not this, perhaps, ladies and gentlemen, the right direction in which we must go? Is there any other road, apart from that which leads to the breaking up, abandonment and decline of Western Europe?

In conclusion, Mr President, I should like to say that, on this basis, we can reach together, here, a wide measure of agreement and a broad consensus, as happened in the Committee. We Italian Communists wish for this, in the interests of the working classes and the peoples of Europe.

(Applause from the Communist benches)

Mr Verroken (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, whether we are working for the archives or for a better future for Europe will largely depend, in my opinion, on the outcome of the final vote. For four years we have been saying that this Parliament is akin to the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem. For four years we have heard it said that those who are to blame for the marking time, for the indecision and,

frequently, the powerlessness of the Community in many areas should be sought outside this Parliament and preferably in the Council and that overstretched structures, our own restricted powers and the Community's limited resources are also to blame.

To show how things should be, the various groups then appointed spokesmen to the Committee on Institutional Affairs. This committee has been working hard and seriously for months. It has listened to others and sought the best possible options and the widest possible consensus on the way forward. The final result is the proposal now before us. With all the members of the committee present, it was approved by 29 votes to 4 with 2 abstentions. But what a Pyrrhic victory that will have been if the vote here should go the other way! How shall we then get through the third phase, how shall we get the proposals ratified by the national parliaments? I am afraid that this Parliament will be even more powerless if this vote goes the wrong way. There is surely no one here who, on closer consideration, does not question or feel concerned about certain aspects of this text, without necessarily having an obsessive desire to correct it. As a citizen of the Community's only multilingual country I should like to refer in this context to paragraph 3 of the preamble and the way in which the European peoples can protect their historical identity, their dignity and their freedom. There is the problem of the established administrations and also the problem of migration, migrant workers, the recognition of diplomas, the right of establishment, the teaching of languages. How are these problems to be tackled within the frontiers of countries where *'cuius regio illius religio'* was replaced with the State dogma of 'one country, one language' two hundred years ago. And what is to come of the dignity of the representatives and citizens in the Community's own multilingual institutions?

But that is a problem to be faced in the future. I have been asked to say that my group endorses the section on 'policy for society'. For us 'Europe' means 'the people of Europe'. Even the blind can see how these people are in urgent need of genuine transfrontier, supranational, supplementary social, health, consumer, regional and environmental policies how they are also in urgent need of supplementary transfrontier education, research and information policies. Whatever the cost, we want to go beyond the literary phase, beyond mere lip service, and we therefore approve this report as a step forward.

(Applause)

Mr J. Moreau (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, after speaking as rapporteur yesterday, I shall speak today on behalf of the Socialist Group.

I think the majority of Members here today are in favour of improving the functioning of the Community institutions. A number of us regret the Commu-

J. Moreau

nity's inability to take decisions at a time when the problems are becoming more pressing every day and when Europe is finding it more and more difficult to overcome the obstacles to its development and to achieve the objectives it set itself.

We refuse to accept this situation because it is dangerous and because — and I feel this strongly — it harbours the risk of death to European integration. Improving the decision-making process is an urgent task therefore, but it cannot be achieved without a collective effort to define, elaborate and set up strategies and policies in the various economic, monetary, industrial and social fields.

Sometimes it looks to us as though the European Parliament were suffering from schizophrenia. It is in favour of a new Treaty, but it equivocates about the problems most vital to the economic survival of Europe as a whole. We need a revival of Europe, but at every level. This revival has several facets: the institutional facet cannot acquire any real meaning if we neglect the other aspects involved in this progress of our Community. In that respect, I am not entirely satisfied with the work done by our Committee on Institutional Affairs. It has often proceeded as though it were a question of building a beautiful institutional constitutional structure which was logical but unfortunately — and here I know that I risk upsetting some people — rather out of date.

I would like to pay tribute to the spirit of conciliation which was reflected in the final phase of our activities; but is that sufficient to enable us to obtain the massive majority needed to give legitimacy to our proposals? Obviously we will know the answer in a few hours time. No-one doubts the need to clarify the respective powers of the Commission, the Council, the European Council and Parliament; if Parliament were given more specific powers and a more clearly recognised capacity to act that would without doubt make it easier to resolve the various problems and to respond more fully to the expectations of the citizens of our Community. But I think this must be done in close liaison with the national parliament, governments and political forces.

We know we cannot go against their wishes. We may regret that. We may in fact wish that some sort of force existed which compelled the parliaments, governments and political forces to obey — I almost said submit to that collective force which would express itself in Europe. Unfortunately, I do not think that is the case, so we must work with what we have. It is a commonplace to say that Europe is a complex structure. But we must still take this into account in our own activities.

I still think that, in this area, what is most important is to ensure effective action. We have two problems to solve: how to promote the emergence of a consensus and how to establish decision-making procedures which combine respect for the quite normal differ-

ences between us with the necessary speed. In this respect, I would have preferred us not to put forward an overall proposal but to seek solutions to these questions, solutions which would allow for effective action.

Indeed, when I read the resolution in which I, for my part, was as actively involved as I could be within the committee, I must say that I sometimes wonder about its effectiveness, even if it were implemented. For I think we tend today to forget all too often that these institutions are necessary. And they only have a value if a consensus exists either within a country or, in this case, within a Community, to resolve the problems in a certain way.

I for my part am in favour of an authentic European Union, with a strong identity. But I think the European Parliament, which must shape an image for itself and prove its resolve to put forward coherent policies, should try to lay the foundations of a genuine consensus.

I dare to hope that after this debate, and on the basis of Parliament's statements, we will be able, within the Committee on Institutional Affairs, to work on proposals that can gain the widest possible favour in our countries.

The Community must adapt its structures and institutions to what it has become and here I am thinking in particular of the most recent enlargement and of the one due in the near future, and also of the questions we will have to deal with, which I spoke of yesterday.

In my view the debate is only starting and I would not like anyone to misinterpret our positions. We must continue with our work and remember — and I am concluding with this — that institutions and policies form a whole. If they are split up, that may in one case improve the form, in another case the content, but it will not give us the means to attain our objectives. For my part I hope that when the time comes to vote, each Member will realise that if he votes for a certain type of institutions he will also have to make an effort to ensure that Parliament defines the policies required by the situation.

Mr Lüscher (PPE). — *(DE)* I agree with those speakers in the debate, yesterday and today, who stated that the Community finds itself in a crisis. It is a profound crisis and one which has been afflicting us for somewhat longer than is healthy for the present and future state of the Community, a crisis to which we have yet to find an answer. If our debate and our venture to which the Committee on Institutional Affairs — after guiding two reports in a very definite direction through this House — has been subjected, is to have any purpose, then our Parliament, as one of the foremost Community institutions, indeed as the body in which the Community citizens have invested the most hope, must show the way out of the crisis. This we are doing, not only in the economic and social sphere, but also in the decisive political and institutional spheres.

Lücker

In my 31 years experience as a European politician, both in the Council of Europe and here in the Parliament, I have experienced our great triumphs but also our setbacks, the crisis, at times very profound. I have tried to amass experience from these and I believe that Parliament would be doing itself a disservice were it to capitulate in the face of this crisis and resign itself to immobility. Is it our task to capitulate when confronted with difficulties? I feel not and as such I would like to wish both my old friend Altiero Spinelli, the rapporteur, and our worthy chairman, Mr Ferry, every success in their endeavours in the course of which they have revealed, particularly before the Committee on Institutional Affairs, not only a great deal of patience, but also wisdom and courage. They have drawn up a report which I feel remains faithful to the goals of European unity while highlighting in a pragmatic manner the ways and means of overcoming this present crisis.

Although I have not often spoken in this House — this is only my second or third intervention — I have been a keen observer and I note that, since its inception, this House has witnessed the constant criticism levelled against Council's decision-making procedure, and the latter's indictment for the lack of progress on Community development. The fact that not all Member States are capable of solving their problems alone, so the argument goes, highlights the need for recourse to the Community dimension. Member State governments also say such things when making ceremonious declarations but the crisis confronting the Community at present, concerning which complaints were also voiced today, is not of the Community's making as such. It has come about through the paradox of national governments attempting to go it alone in solving their problems, although they know better. That is the false course which we must attempt to rectify.

I shall address myself to two problems. The first is that which has been mentioned in points 9 and 10. It concerns human rights, and fundamental civil liberties as enshrined in the Human Rights Convention in Strasbourg in 1953 and the so-called International Pacts of the United Nations — the Civil and Social Pacts. I listened with great attention to Commission President Thorn's address on the subject yesterday and I must say that his diplomatically couched warning has been echoed, both by myself and my group.

Pursuant to points 9 and 10, which are essentially the same, the social and civil pacts once ratified, will be placed on the same constitutional, or quasi-constitutional, level as human rights and the fundamental civil liberties. We cannot do this. My group is in favour of the new Treaty defining human rights and fundamental liberties, as enshrined in the Strasbourg Convention, so that in addition to being directly applicable in all Community Member States — as is the case at present — they would also be reinforced by

the Community. There is a world of difference in the legal content of these various conventions and pacts. According to the Human Rights Convention, proceedings and jurisdiction may fall within the domain of the Human Rights Commission and the European Court of Human Rights, in Strasbourg whose judgment will thereupon be legally binding on all Community Member States and on all parties to a case. It even empowers the European Court of Human Rights to order the payment and determine the amount of compensation — which is likewise legally binding.

The second problem is that such pacts are sonorous declarations of intent implying a degree of commitment to the implementation of specific policies. That has, however, nothing to do with the legal obligation which the fundamental rights enshrined in the Strasbourg Convention entail and that is why we want to see a separation. In the third phase of our work we have the task of finding a legal solution to this problem.

I should like to add, furthermore, a word on Article 124 which has become so controversial. Our Committee on Institutional Affairs wrestled hard over a long period in an effort to find an acceptable compromise. It has been stated that this article elevates the Commission to the role of Community referee. That is not true. However, some of the proposed amendments would, if adopted, have the effect of enabling the Member States resorting to the veto to assume the role of Community referee in the decision-making process.

In his speech yesterday Commission President Thorn, referring to the wording of Article 124, highlighted the inherent risk to Parliament of drifting away from the basic direction charted in the Treaties.

While agreeing with this I would hasten to add that the formula hit upon by Mr Spinelli, as contained in his report, is in essence a challenge, one might even say a bridge, to enable the Council of Ministers, after an appropriate transitional period, to return to the legal path of the contractual obligations concluded by all of the Member States. I consider it a well-understood task of Parliament to focus attention on this route which, given the requisite political good will, remains eminently passable today.

Should Parliament wish to deviate from this course we would be jointly responsible for the absence of a judicious decision-making procedure within the Community and this begs the question: How can one build a democratic Community if every Member State is given a veto right? That is untenable in a democracy. Such a measure would condemn it to stagnate or slowly disintegrate and would most assuredly preclude progress.

Mr Radoux (S). — (*FR*) Mr President, honourable Members, in 1972 the Heads of State and Government undertook to achieve European Union before the end

Radoux

of this decade, i.e. before 1980. In spite of a laudable effort in 1975 on the part of the Council and the Commission, they failed in this undertaking. The best this directly elected Parliament did in the institutional field was to create its special committee in 1981, to adopt the guidelines in 1982 and to propose a text today from which I will quote, because the words are important: 'Instructs its Committee on Institutional Affairs to draw up and submit for its approval ... a preliminary draft Treaty ... on the basis of the following principles and guidelines'. This is followed by the various headings of the resolution. So this is certainly a political text which precedes the drafting of texts of a legal nature.

In acting as it has done, our Parliament of directly elected Members has filled a gap, has taken over from the Heads of State and Government, In other terms it has assumed its responsibilities. Had it not done so, it could have laid itself open to the serious reproach, during the 1984 electoral campaign, of having failed in its mission, which was to ensure the practical achievement of the European Union provided for in the Treaties of Rome. By the same token, it has served the interests of the 1984 Parliament, to which it will hand on a considerable body of work on a subject which will remain of topical interest. We need only remember the remarkable response to our initiative in university circles, among European militants, in the two sides of industry and even, as has been sufficiently well demonstrated, within several national parliaments, to be able to affirm without fear of being contradicted that the grand ideal of European integration has remained alive for those who hold responsibility in our society. These people will help Parliament to submit acceptable texts so that a decisive step forward can be taken towards the creation of our Union. The renewed sense of the need for Europe stems from the economic crisis and from external dangers, due in particular to the fact that our production is being outclassed and to our relative political weakness in international conferences.

My second remark relates to the merits of the resolution, that is to say its realism. The resolution shows clearly that the institutions are a means and that the policies which our nations consider it increasingly necessary to pursue jointly are certainly the end. These two aspects of progress towards Union are indissolubly linked. The realism of which I have spoken can also be found in the attempt to create a balance between the powers of the Community's political institutions, a balance which is one of the factors of their proper functioning. Europe needs them to function properly; it is a matter of life and death. We regret what happened in Stuttgart and today we are already worried about what will happen in Athens in December. Following the proposals of the presidency of our Assembly relating to the recovery of our economies and of our ability to compete, our measures in the institutional field must now become the signal of a revival of confidence in the resources

of our States and of the Community of which they form part.

Let us leave the falterers and sceptics behind and act boldly again. This is the best attitude to take *vis à vis* our friends in the industrialized world and in the developing world.

Mr President, the question of the 1966 Luxembourg Declaration has been raised so often during this debate in relation to what have since then been called vital interests, that I think it would be useful to read it out again in order to dispel any misunderstandings between us. Here is the text:

'Where in the case of decisions which may be taken by majority vote on a proposal of the Commission, very important interests of one or more partners are at stake, the members of the Council will endeavour, within a reasonable time, to reach solutions which can be adopted by all the members of the Council while respecting their mutual interests and those of the Community, in accordance with Article 2 of the Treaty'.

In relation to the preceding paragraph, the French delegation considers that when very important interests are at stake, the discussion must continue until unanimous agreement is reached. The six delegations note that differences of view persist on what should be done if conciliation does not prove entirely successful. The final paragraph is the most important: 'the six delegations nevertheless consider that this divergence does not prevent the Community's work being resumed in accordance with the normal procedure', end of quote.

For my part, I regret that this question has been raised again today. Provided only that we respect the Treaty of Rome and adhere to the Luxembourg text, there should be no problems between us.

Mr President, honourable Members, the Members of the Committee on Institutional Affairs are aware of the faults of the resolution, but the work we will do after the vote will rectify them. What is most important is not to confine ourselves to criticism but to propose and to construct, in order not to prejudice the struggle to create our Union. That Union is necessary. Indeed, I spoke of a balance between the powers of the institutions, and that concept is just as fundamental for the situation in the world. What I call the need for Europe on the part of the Member States also implies the need for Europe in international relations. If we join more closely together, we will increase the strength engendered by our diversity and our national identities. If we are more organized and show more solidarity, we will be able to provide greater services and will be all the more respected. We know the Community functions badly and that our common policies are clearly inadequate. Let Parliament express its resolve to transcend the difficulties through the initiative it has taken and on which we must once again give our vote. Let it make the utmost effort, not

Radoux

hesitate halfway along the road, so as not to lay itself open to the reproaches which it so often, and rightly, levels at the other institutions..

Mr Antoniazzi (PPE). — *(IT)* Ladies and gentlemen, in its debate today, the European Parliament is interpreting correctly the mandate given to it by the 1979 elections by direct universal suffrage.

When, a long time prior to that date, the European Council decided to give a broad democratic base to the European Community through those elections, its obvious intention was to give political strength, at a time of growing cyclical and structural crisis, to the Community in its further development, in accordance with the spirit and letter of the three fundamental treaties which, in their respective preambles, contain a political summary of the individual European objectives.

The new Parliament immediately took some interesting opportunities of denouncing the situation prior to its election — which was in substance a state of stalemate for Europe — including rejecting the EEC budget, but almost the only result was to show even more clearly the absurdity of a situation that had remained for the most part stationary, with no change in the mutual relationships of the institutions, that were understandable in the '50s, but had become out-of-date with the passage of time, and as such represented a considerable obstacle to progress. A different institutional system was essential, that should set Europe free from the quicksands and uncertainties of what were practically intergovernmental policies and organs, and represent an effective step forward towards institutions and policies that were truly 'communautaire', or at least more so than previously.

Two initiatives were undertaken along these lines, the first involving the political Committee, the second the Committee on Institutional Affairs that was expressly set up for the purpose.

The first allowed the political Committee, with objectives that were undoubtedly important but limited, to examine in detail all aspects regarding the full implementation of the treaties in force. Seven resolutions were approved which helped to create new and better relations between the institutions already in existence, and our European Parliament.

I personally presented one of the seven reports, concerning relations between the European Parliament and the European Council — now almost institutionalized summits of Heads of State and Government — and I can bear witness to the fact that there has been a considerable improvement in inter-institutional relations.

The second initiative — second chronologically, that is, but not in importance, is today's. It originates from the obvious realization that, after 30 years, if we want

to give substance to the new policies referred to by the rapporteurs, a new institutional system is essential, that will mark the changeover from the narrow, conservative intergovernmental policies to broader, more effectively common policies, that are regulated by better institutional relationships.

The decision has thus been reached to draw up a draft Treaty establishing the European Union. The peoples of Europe often look at this Parliament with curiosity, hope or disappointment. The Act that we are discussing today will give those citizens a positive political response to the mandate that was given to us in 1979. Today is in my view the most important day in the life of the European Parliament, and of Europe. But, beware! Important initiatives designed to further European union have been taken in the past in various places as well as here, but they have had very little concrete success. Even the Genscher-Colombo proposals are more the evidence of the will of a few nations than the consecration of an effective evolutionary development.

Occasions such as today's will not be easily repeated. That is why I urge that the document that we are examining today should be approved with a large majority. It must have the political power to speak clearly to Governments, to give consistent courage to parties at all times, to converse with the national Parliaments, and to gain fundamental acceptance in the regions, the provinces, the communes, the public and private realities of our countries, so as to set in motion the further stage of a Europe free from the selfishness of the national Governments and structures.

I shall not go into the details of today's draft. It is of necessity the result of inevitable compromises in a Parliament made up of the parties and members of 10 different States, cultures, situations, social or territorial realities and interests, that are undoubtedly very varied.

I do not entirely agree personally with the result of the preparatory work. But today, that is of little account. There will be time for further improvements and modifications. What counts today is the motive behind this draft, and its political value. If Europe wishes to go forward and attempt to solve so many political, economic and social problems, it must have the courage to free itself.

I firmly believe that the road towards political union is the right one for Europe. We are not alone in claiming this: it is borne out by the history of recent years. When Schuman, Adenauer, De Gasperi put together their great vision of a United Europe, the Christian Democrats were almost alone in believing fully in the prospect; and the six countries which formed the Community in the '50s increased to nine, then to ten, and tomorrow, perhaps, to twelve or more. Those same political parties who had doubts or were opposed in principle — and they include some great people's parties — have today developed converging views on the fundamental proposal that was put

Antoniozzi

forward by the Christian Democrats in the '50s, and was so much discussed or opposed. And this, for us in the European People's Party, is a source of great satisfaction. Peace and the will to go forward together have been strengthened, as we can see.

We shall support this motion, making that positive contribution that is needed today, and that is so much awaited by the citizens of Europe. They have given us that exceptional mandate for a safer, more just future for us and for our children, in which Europe has a central part to play as mediator for the peace and progress of the entire world.

Mrs Boserup (COM). — *(DA)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have reason to be pleased at the fact that we are dealing today with a draft Union Treaty. For 10 years we have been hearing that the present Community was to develop into a Union. There has always been a vehement popular reaction against this in Denmark, which is brushed aside with patronizing and soothing reassurances on the lines of: 'Hush, little children. Union can mean so many things, and this will be a new kind of Union. You'll see, it may not turn out to be so bad.' Another version, which moreover is used by a Danish Member of the Assembly, who is not present however, goes like this: 'Don't take any notice of all this talk of union; it won't come to anything. Our grandchildren or great-grandchildren will be the only ones to see it. And, of course, it is not for us to worry about what sort of lives our grandchildren will lead'. But now we know what form the majority here in this Assembly imagine that such a union will take and how rapidly it will develop. It is good and useful to have it out in the open.

Of course this draft treaty is full of visions, wishful thinking, hopes for the future — call them what you will, there is nothing wrong in them. The Socialistisk Folkeparti (Socialist People's Party), which I represent, also has visions. They are concerned with the democratic road to socialism. We therefore like to work together with labour parties and trade union movements in other countries, but we do not want to participate in this Union project. It says in the chapter on social relations, for example, that the Union will be built on the existing economic system — read 'capitalism'. Is that something to offer the workers, who are haunted and bowed down by the fear of unemployment? We are not all-or-nothing politicians, but neither are we naive. We know that the Treaty of Rome and the streamlining and modernization now proposed in the Spinelli report are an obstacle to socialist reforms, and we will not live in that strait-jacket. That is why we are against Danish membership of the European Community. I am fully in agreement with the spokesman for the Liberal Group, Mr Nord, when he says that this is a good basis for an election campaign. Our few Union supporters at home will not escape this time with airy phrases to explain it away. Now we have something on paper to throw at them, and that we shall do.

Mr Giavazzi (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this is the second stage in the process of drawing up the preliminary draft treaty establishing the European Union. It follows the approval of the mandate given to the Committee on Institutional Affairs to proceed along general lines as laid down. It precedes the legal polishing and refining necessary for the preparation of the final text. Speaking as I do after various other speakers it would be pointless for me to emphasize again the importance of the decision that Parliament is about to take, its undoubted significance within the Community — that is to say, in relations between its own organs — and with the outside world — that is, in its relations with Member States — or its impact, which is specifically political, in regard to the peoples of Europe.

I think it is better instead that I should dwell briefly on one or two points. The first refers to the significance that this decision has for Parliament as such. With this initiative it asserts a solid claim to a wider role, that is more consonant with its functions. By affirming the will to progress towards Union, and by showing the way, the European Parliament places national parliaments and governments squarely before the responsibility of having to decide: since this goes back to principles with which the national States also say they are in agreement, at least in their fundamental lines, the European Parliament puts these States in the position of having either to refuse to acknowledge its function, which is obviously out of the question, or to express their decisions through adhesion, discussion, or motivated disagreement. For these reasons the importance of Parliament's initiative is obvious, unquestionable and significant.

A second consideration concerns the effect that the proposal for a new institutional system may have on the European situation in general, and the Community in particular. Others have spoken of the Community crisis, the standstill where decisions are concerned, and the need for a revival — all questions that have been the subject of numerous interventions by this Parliament. It is pointless to go through them, we know them all. Of course, institutional reform does not in itself resolve these problems, but equally it is clear that without a more correct division of power, without the transfer of deliberative power from the Council of Ministers on its own to Parliament jointly with the Council, and above all without the transfer — however flexible and gradual — to the sole or competing Community office of all those policies that it is better fitted to carry out, all in conformity with the proposals put forward in the report — without all that, I say, the Community cannot escape from its static situation, which everyone deplores, but which is so far unresolved. For this reason the institutional reform put forward today is of fundamental importance — albeit a compromise — to the re-launching of Community policies, which cannot be delayed.

Giavazzi

Finally, the third observation concerns future action, which will be decisive as far as this initiative of Parliament is concerned. Obviously, whilst it already in itself qualifies Parliament, it will be of decisive value only if public opinion, parties, press, movements of one kind or another and men of goodwill are massively involved, so as to create the proper conditions for a successful outcome to the decisive confrontation that will take place in the near future between the European Parliament and the national parliaments and governments. This is the task for the future, when the resolution has been carried. And it is this that we all have to concern ourselves with in the months to come, which are particularly important also because of the publicity our actions will receive from the imminence of the new Parliamentary elections. If we want the process that has been initiated today — which I hope has been initiated adequately and successfully, and which confirms the validity of the initiative of those who supported the first resolution right from the start — to come to fruition in the future that awaits us, we must act together — in strength and in harmony.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR JAQUET

Vice-President

Mrs Bonino (CDI). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are finally discussing the preliminary draft treaty establishing the European Union. It is undoubtedly — as members who have preceded me have already said — a very important day for the European Parliament and for our Community. It is also undoubtedly a positive fact, that casts a gleam of light into the darkness of the negotiations in progress, following the Stuttgart mandate.

Of course, the impetus of the first drafts presented in Parliamentary Committee — an impetus closely resembling that of a Constituent Assembly — has had to be sacrificed to the need to find wider convergences of view, to reach compromises enabling the large powers, the large parties in this Parliament, to be united and to find agreement on this motion.

This does not in any way deprive the initiative of its character as a milestone in the construction of Europe. It may be said, perhaps, that the construction is slow, and that perhaps the milestone was placed somewhat timidly in position; but the criticisms voiced by the opponents of this report do not convince me. For example, this morning I heard it said that 'we must tackle the economic and social problems'! I could not agree more; but if we have not got an institutional Treaty, even these problems will not be tackled. And then when a voice is raised — which can if you like be called 'timid', but which I believe to be extremely important and positive — to get us started along this road, we draw back.

Of course the proposal, in paragraph 124, for further transitional periods for the full application of the majority rule within the Council seems a step backwards to us, instead of a reasonable step forward. But this was surely the price that had to be paid, even by those who are strong believers in European Union and progress towards it; a price that it was moreover reasonable and just, in my opinion, to pay, in order to obtain a wider convergence of views.

This is only a beginning. I think that the rapporteur, Mr Spinelli — to whom goes all our praise for the work that he took on and has had to execute in recent months — is as convinced of this as we are. We now reaffirm the support of the Italian Radicals for this motion, and we hope that all political parties that are sincerely for Europe and for the construction of Europe will make it a fundamental commitment to support this resolution.

(Applause from some benches)

Mr Estgen (EPP). — *(FR)* Mr President, honourable Members, it has been stated and restated in this House, often with conviction, sometimes only with rhetorical eloquence, that we are in the process of writing an important page in the history of the European Communities. And this is true. I think that with this text which we are discussing, Parliament will once again deserve the laudable title which Gaston Thorn, President of the Commission, once conferred on it by saying that we are the 'missionaries of Europe'. At any rate, today we are acting as worthy heirs of the founders of the Community, Schuman, de Gasperi, Adenauer, Spaak and Bech. And we are re-kindling the torch they bore.

So I congratulate the authors of the reports, which are coherent as to substance, and certainly point an important political direction.

To tell the truth, looking at the attendance in this Chamber, it is difficult not to gain the impression that there is little enthusiasm for the new-born child in this delivery room of a new stage of European integration.

There is no doubt that the debate we are holding this week reflects the dissatisfaction with the fact that the intentions affirmed and reaffirmed by the Heads of State and Government have remained a dead letter until today.

Of course our motion still leaves some questions unanswered.

It cannot be expected that the Community should in a single step, and at once, cover the whole road away from cooperation founded on the international Treaties and towards a federation that is autonomous *vis-à-vis* its Member States, based on constitutional law, and which I personally and many Members also regard as the final goal.

Estgen

So although I entirely approve the step we are about to take, I still have some fears and hesitations about the ambiguity of some of the formulas used. For instance, two major groups of people seem to be given too low a profile: on the one hand, young people with their great anxiety about the future, on the other, the senior citizens, the elderly, who also expect the European Community to pay them special attention.

The consultative committee should also include representatives of the organizations of consumer groups.

As for young people, in times of crisis and significant change, vocational training becomes a variable which is no longer directly related to employment, as it was during periods of high economic growth. The training/employment relationship must perhaps be looked at in the sense that inadequate training increases the risk of unemployment. The breakaway from the very structures of the economy of the 1960s has led to a search for formulas to replace them and to increasingly rapid change. Vocational training must therefore serve as a system of support *vis à vis* these changes. And, in this context, I would like to plead very earnestly for a much more important position to be reserved in future to the Berlin Cedefop.

Another aspect which worries me is our lack of determination as regards security. A mere glance at the globe should convince us that we find ourselves in a precarious situation. Unless Europe manages to speak with one voice in foreign policy and security, we will be threatened with doom. This time the peoples of Africa and Latin America are also waiting impatiently for Europe to speak out strongly.

I would also like to stress the importance of Articles 26 and 27, which provide for sanctions to be imposed on any Member State that does not respect democratic principles or that infringes the provisions of the Treaties. Indeed it is inadmissible that there are still some States which scheme to obtain the benefits of the Community for some of their regions or peoples while totally disregarding the obligations this entails. In this context my fear is not allayed by the fact that I am the citizen of a small Member State. I cannot fail to note that in the Community of Ten, basically there are three or four countries which exert all their economic, military or simply demographic power in order frequently to direct Community policy along a path which is often not a good one.

We who speak so often here of minority rights and who also fight to safeguard those rights must not disregard the rights of the small States, of the national minorities, in the institutional framework. If we manage to draft new Treaties, we must ensure that Luxembourg, Ireland and Denmark have a say. We must ensure the participation in the appropriate form of the regional authorities in the building of Europe. This threshold which we want to cross must lead to

progress in the interests of the citizens and not just of the institutions.

So I am pleased that regional policy is given adequate importance in our report. Yet here too I am very worried. In the present situation it is no longer enough to reduce regional disparities, or to make up the backwardness of the least-favoured regions. We must also pursue a specific policy for those regions which are still fairly prosperous but whose basic existence is at risk. I am thinking in particular of the iron and steel regions. We must set up a genuine European industrial policy, which will make a decisive contribution both to preserving the existing industrial fabric in the various Member States and to the development of new activities.

At this time, when the European ideal is threatened by defeatism and by the pragmatic European policy pursued by the Member States, the model for the future which European Union represents should be an encouraging one. The road to achieving European Union may be a long one, but we are convinced that it is viable, that we must follow it, for there is no other possible road.

(Applause)

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, I would like to raise a procedural matter because the debate on the Spinelli report is coming to a close. I think the fact that Council has not been called upon to express its opinion is a serious omission. It is known that in the Genscher-Colombo affair we, as the European Parliament, repeatedly expressed our position, and it is also known that throughout the previous presidency either Mr Genscher or his other German colleagues repeatedly took part in important debates. From this point of view I think that Council ought to be invited to express its position, but also because, Mr President, yesterday there was an unacceptable attack from certain sides of the House on the Greek Presidency, and it could be assumed that failure to call upon Council implies that the Presidency and the Committee on Institutional Affairs are associating themselves with this attack, an implication that I do not accept and that could be given the lie if the Presidency were to invite Council to take part in this most important debate.

President. — Mr Alavanos, I take note of your remarks and I can assure you that the Bureau will convey your wishes to the Council.

Mr Ryan (PPE). — Voting for the Spinelli report, it seems to me, is tantamount to a vote of confidence in Europe. Whatever reservations one may have about some paragraphs — and my Irish Fine Gael colleagues, and I have some reservations as our voting pattern will indicate — the overall significance of the

Ryan

report demands that each Member stands up to be counted as being either for or against European unity. Such unity as we have achieved is in danger of being lost because of stagnation and disagreement. To safeguard the unity achieved and to extend the benefits of unity more effectively into greater areas of economic and social activity, it is vital that Europe achieve the objective of the Spinelli resolution, to wit, a strengthening of democratic control and an unblocking of the decision-making process which is the reason for the stagnation and disappointment surrounding the Community at the present time.

It is thoroughly indefensible to argue that the destinies of over 300 million people should be determined by a bureaucratically led Council of Ministers instead of by a democratically elected Parliament. It is totally hypocritical to claim to be a democrat while asserting that the powers of the European Parliament, which are universally recognized as ineffectual, should not be increased. Personally, I would prefer to retire from political life rather than insult the electorate by asking them to return me to a parliament which I believe should be without power or influence. For all its warts, the European Parliament remains the only democratically elected European institution and, therefore, democracy will not survive in Europe unless the powers of Parliament are strengthened.

Governments would like to portray to national parliaments the view that the European parliamentarians are seeking extra powers at the expense of nation States. This is not the case. What we are primarily concerned to demonstrate to our citizens is that their national parliaments surrendered powers over their lives to undemocratic European institutions which are responsible to nobody. As a result, nearly 400 decisions of this directly and democratically elected European Parliament have not been implemented by the EEC. In fact, no decision has been taken on them at all they have not even in many cases been rejected. This is the very negation of democracy. Why demand loyalty to democracy as a condition for membership of the EEC if the very institutions of the Community are themselves undemocratic?

I know that some smaller Member States — my own included — may be concerned at proposals which would diminish the right of veto in the Council of Ministers and which, by making Parliament an equal partner with the Council in the decision-making process, would allow decisions to be taken by the elected representatives of the people of Europe. But do we have confidence in our colleagues, having worked together with them for many years? Apart from Greece, three other Member States have been 10 years in the Community. At the end of that 10 years are we, as parliamentarians, to say that we do not trust our colleagues' decisions and we would not accept a majority vote? To say that is to declare that we are not democrats. On the balance of decisions taken in this Parliament, Parliament has shown itself to be the

friend of the weak and to take into consideration the problems of the poorer and less-developed regions in the Community. And therefore I say that the overall thrust of the Spinelli report deserves the support of any democrat, and to abstain on this vote would be no more than the action, or rather inaction, of a coward. One must at this stage say whether one is for or against a democratically controlled Europe.

There is one aspect of the proposals which is a matter of particular concern to a country which has a commitment to neutrality like Ireland. Some very wise words on this issue were uttered in January 1973 when Ireland joined the Community. On that occasion I said — and of course I speak with humility — that it would be wrong for other Members to insist that any neutral country should abandon its neutrality, because it was necessary that Europe should be seen as being a peaceful international organization, at peace within its own borders and not constituting a menace or a threat to anybody else. If membership of the Community requires that a country abandon its neutral stance, then there would be justification for countries outside our borders to look with some suspicion upon the European Community. We will thrive by showing ourselves to be committed to peace within our borders, and by respecting the right of a Member State to be neutral we will also show that we will be a threat to nobody else. You cannot be a genuine European and say that you do not wish to see Switzerland, Austria, Sweden and Norway within the Community. Europe needs to have such economically successful and such democratically progressive States as those. It would be wrong, therefore, to qualify membership in any way by requiring a commitment to defence as a condition for membership. And, therefore, while I appreciate that the Spinelli proposal contains no requirement in relation to defence without getting a unanimous decision in the Council of Ministers, I would have preferred that this issue had not been touched upon in a report which otherwise I see as advancing the cause of Europe.

Mr Halligan (S). — Mr President, I believe it to be entirely appropriate that the first directly elected European Parliament should have addressed itself to the momentous matter of a European Union. I would hazard a guess that most member parliaments and governments would never have done so. I therefore think Parliament was correct in taking this initiative, and I warmly congratulate Mr Spinelli on the excellence of his report.

Having said that and speaking now as one who supports European Union, I want to enter two major reservations. The first of these concerns regional disparities. An economic and monetary union such as this report advocates plus the already existing customs union would necessarily create profound regional differences while accentuating the appalling differences which presently exist and which are a disgrace to the supposed solidarity of the Community. The

Halligan

disequilibrium which will be set up between regions by economic and monetary union is not just a thesis from theoretical economics. It is based on what happens. In the case of Ireland we have been part of a perfectly integrated economic, monetary and customs union for a century and a quarter. During that time the Irish economy not only failed to grow economically but went into profound real decline from which it only recovered two decades ago. Yet at the same time the metropolitan economy became the greatest economic power in the world enjoying growth and enormous prosperity.

I wish to make the point that Ireland is not a unique case. On the contrary it is a perfect case study of what happens to a less-developed region within an economic and monetary union which does not have a consciously directed flow of investment to the poorer regions. I know it will be said that the European Union will provide a sufficient compensation mechanism to an enlarged regional policy. But three facts rebut that sanctimonious hope. Firstly, the Spinelli report itself is woefully inadequate on regional policy, both analytically and institutionally. Regional policy, for example, is not even included within the economic section, but within the social section, thereby entirely missing the point of what a regional policy should be doing. Secondly, existing regional policy is a farce. Thirdly, the current Commission proposals on the so-called reform of the CAP contain disastrous implications for some regions such as Ireland and yet have been put forward by the Commission. That is why I entertain the deepest reservations about the economic impact of European Union on the regions — no matter how desirable union might be politically.

My second major reservation is that relating to political cooperation in the area of foreign policy and security, to which Mr Ryan previously referred. Ireland is not a member of NATO and is committed to a policy of neutrality, which could and probably would be placed at risk by the proposals for collective international policy as expressed in the Spinelli report. In that regard the vision of Europe as an intermediary between the superpowers which is set down in the Socialist Group amendment goes some way to allay the fears of Members such as myself. But the substance of those fears nevertheless remain. A Europe attached as a military appendage to the United States is not a Europe which my party — the Irish Labour Party — will support, no matter how united or integrated it may be, no matter how necessary it may be for European Union. It is in the belief that a European Union will carve out a separate European identity and free us effectively from the superpowers that I support the Spinelli report. but only in that belief.

Finally, may I ask Parliament and particularly the rapporteur, Mr Spinelli, to reconsider the proposed procedure for intended ratification of the new Treaty,

should it be drafted. Instead of sending the Treaty directly to the various national parliaments, I would propose that we place it first before our national electorates in a common plebiscite to be held on the same day as the direct elections next June. That is the only way we can guarantee new developments, because the only way we can do that is by seeking the direct involvement of the peoples of Europe in the process of their own integration. Our national parliaments and governments are too preoccupied with their own problems and will inevitably frustrate the process of Union. A plebiscite would on the other hand accelerate the process of unification. It would also validate whatever is agreed here and it would invest the proposed Treaty with a democratic legitimacy which would be incontestable. The peoples of Europe must be directly involved in shaping their own destiny; a plebiscite could do that. It would also do more to make the direct elections on the same day more meaningful and more concrete than anything else I can think of. In conclusion, I will be supporting the Spinelli report for the reasons I have stated, but with the two major reservations I have outlined.

Mr Macario (PPE). — (*IT*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the nub of the question that we are putting to the citizens of Europe and the Parliaments of our countries, with our draft Treaty for institutional reform, is the organic and systematic transfer of power from Member States to the Community, where highly sensitive problems of contemporary life are concerned. This is the means that we are using to combat the degeneration and decline of the Community and its institutions, and to fight resignation in the face of crisis and the many examples of chronic impotence in the Europe of the Member States.

There are — and it is time this was said — Heads of State and Government who do not show their people clearly the limitations and inadequacies of the power of the traditional national State which, with every day that passes, is increasingly becoming a mere imitation of that power which it is both necessary and possible for our citizens to capture and possess with European Union, if by sovereignty we mean the dominion, authentic and consistent to the utmost, of ones own individual and collective destiny.

In the age of the Titans we cannot remain pygmies: it is necessary to grow, if growth is possible, as it is in our case. It is pure demagoguery to think or make other people think that, with the grave limitations that afflict the Community, as it stands, and as it has been reduced to operating, it is possible to resolve the problems that beset us — from the economic crisis to unemployment, inflation, regional and sectoral imbalance, safety and defence problems, and the inadequacy of Europe's international role *vis-à-vis* the superpowers or the underdeveloped and developing countries.

Macario

What I feel — what we all feel — is not impatience: it is a deep awareness and realization of the serious and now culpable lateness with which we are acting in relation to all these problems, to the need to have real control of our future and shape our own history. It is a problem of sovereignty, but a sovereignty that is real and total, and not a fake. It is a problem of the real weight and roles we are to have in defining the interdependence by which our living together internationally is governed; it is a problem of how to make the best use of our resources, uniting opportunity and effort, to produce new growth. Becoming and being European citizens today is something very much more, if the corresponding juridical and political power is created, than being simply Italian, French, British, German etc. citizens. Oh yes, of course! Some lions may still perhaps roar in distant, inhospitable lands, but the serious problems that I have referred to, which hold us in their grip, still remain unchanged.

As a man of the Left, which I think I am, I must also say a word to the Left: unlike ourselves, and the political and popular force that we represent, the European Left is turning up for this European appointment in loose order, with contradictory and ambiguous, if not decidedly hostile positions. And yet those workers, those poor people, those disinherited ones that it professes to represent have far greater need than the other social classes of the economic power, the political power and the certainly by no means cowardly or renunciatory pacific power of Europe.

Once again it is committing the error of favouring the institutions and their reform only if they are in its own image and likeness. Unless they discover late — as happened even recently in France — that they are, in short, neutral and aseptic, and you can adapt quite splendidly almost to them!

I hope the Left will be able to review its own position: the Europe that we want, in fact, is not the Europe of the well-to-do — who moreover, as we have seen, and as Glinne has reminded us, are quite indifferent — it is the peoples' Europe, a popular Europe that is open socially and deeply democratic and pluralistic, a Europe in which the great masses have an effective role to play; above all, a Europe in which they can take their own futures and their own destinies into their own hands, in a lasting and coherent manner. This is, and it remains, our most important political battle.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, for anyone who still believes in the future of the Community this debate will have been like a breath of fresh air. Who would have dared hope that at a time when everyone is talking about a crisis in the Community, an economic and institutional crisis, at a time when everyone can see how hard Europe is trying, often without success, to play its role in the world between the superpowers, so much faith

in the European cause would be shown in the Chamber of the European Parliament in the last two days?

This debate is in itself proof of the vitality of this Parliament and therefore of the vitality of Europe, because this Parliament does more than anyone else to represent the Community and the European peoples which make up the Community. On behalf of the Commission, I must therefore say that I am grateful that Parliament decided to hold this debate, that I have been allowed to attend and that I am able to add a few comments as the debate draws to a close.

It may be true that numerous signs of crisis are to be seen in and around the Community. I agree with Mr Pflimlin that, when the Community was established, there was also a crisis and one that was probably both politically and economically more serious than today's. At that time Europe was able to take a decisive step. I consider it of the utmost importance that the directly elected Parliament should now be challenging Europe again to take another decisive step towards integration.

Mr President, it has been said in this debate that this is a new initiative. Reference has been made to the dangers of this initiative. Reference has been made to the limitations of the text before us. It has been said that more might have been expected. That is, of course, true, but at no time in history has a step of any importance been taken that has not had its dangers. In a genuine democracy, a pluriform democracy such as we have in Europe, a decision has never been taken where viewpoints have not had to be reconciled and reasonable compromises reached. This initiative lies, as it were, between pure pragmatism and a perhaps utopian vision of the future. I believe Mr Nord struck just the right note yesterday when he said that pragmatism and idealism have been linked in an excellent manner in this document.

As the Commission sees it, what we are concerned with today is more the renewal of a constitution, something that all democracies resort to at set intervals. What we have here is a really new initiative, the renewed stimulation of Europe, which the coordinating rapporteur rightly, in my opinion, invited this Parliament to undertake yesterday. And all I can say in appreciation of his work is that I hope this Parliament will accept his invitation by a very large majority.

Mr President, many speakers in this debate have referred to a kind of tension, the tension between the development of policies to promote genuine integration, on the one hand, and the development of the institutional framework and the decision-making that is needed, on the other. Some people have perhaps suggested that these two aspects conflict. Mr President, I am convinced that there is no real conflict. Each aspect is an extension of the other, both should be

Andriessen

developed simultaneously. Today we are chiefly concerned with the institutional framework needed to establish policy. Tomorrow, we shall be concerned, as we were yesterday, with the policy that must be developed with this set of institutional instruments.

It seems to me that, above all, this project and the final text which will be given legal form shortly, after Parliament has taken its decision, create space for the new Union to assume tasks that must be performed if the process of integration is to continue. Let us not forget that many of the activities undertaken by the Community these days, however inadequately in some cases, are not defined in the Treaty of Rome but have nevertheless become part of the *acquis communautaire*. I do not therefore consider it essential for this text to go into great detail on which tasks the Union might assume and which it might not. It is important to make it clear that, to further its integration, the Community must be able to assume tasks and to develop fairly simple procedures for giving expression to these tasks. It is in this spirit that the Commission intends to interpret the sections that deal more specifically with economic and social problems.

The document before is not, as the Commission sees it, a discussion document. It is a statement of Parliament's political position, which has to be developed into the text of a Treaty. The elaboration of this text will undoubtedly involve further work on the substance of the matter. Questions will obviously arise as the legal work is done on the text. I can only hope that the same constructive spirit in which the Committee on Institutional Affairs has worked under the excellent leadership of its chairman, Mr Ferri, will obtain in future work on this document.

A great deal has been said during this debate about two paragraphs of the resolution and, with your permission, I too should like to say a few words at the end of this debate. The first of these paragraphs, paragraph 20, discusses the transfer of powers to the Union from the Member States, the other is paragraph 124.

If I understand paragraph 20 correctly, I would point out that a qualified majority vote is appropriate here, since the area of activity itself will already have been declared by the Treaty an area in which the Union has concurrent competence. Within the framework of this document I find it logical that the Union should actually exercise this power by a qualified majority. I would ask those who have opposed the text to consider this point.

As for paragraph 124, the Commission's position was stated by its President yesterday. It should like to add the following to what has been said about this paragraph. It has been said in this Chamber that we might withdraw our objection to some kind of right of veto if various policies emerge, if a balance is struck among the Member States, and so on. But has it not been this

veto that has prevented this situation from arising in the Community, and is it not therefore necessary to state clearly that a veto has no place in the democratic framework of the Union as it is proposed here? That at least is the Commission's view, and that is what the President said yesterday when he expressed his apprehension at the introduction of the term 'veto' or even 'vital interest' into this text.

Mr President, comparatively little has been said in the Chamber about the section on the budget of the Union. This is probably due to the fact that Parliament already has budgetary powers. I would emphasize nonetheless that, in the Commission's view, this section represents a significant improvement compared with the present situation. And as the Commission believes that Parliament is generally circumspect in the use of its budgetary powers, this increase in powers will undoubtedly benefit democratic standards in the Community. I hope, Mr President, that this statement will also prove justified in the forthcoming discussions.

Some Members ask: 'What is the point of drafting a new Treaty when the full potential of the existing Treaty has yet to be tapped?' In this context, I would point out that Parliament took this initiative after adopting a number of resolutions in which it expressed its views on the way in which the opportunities offered by the existing Treaty are or are not being seized. In my opinion, it is time for the three institutions to draw clearer conclusions in various respects. And I consider it important — not to say essential — not only for an attempt to be made to exploit the present situation to the full but also for thought to be given to innovation. There is a constant need for institutional innovation and institutional reflection in any democracy, and the Community is no exception. I therefore consider it appropriate that, while attempting to make better use of the existing Treaty than is often the case at present, we should launch a new project that may well have a positive effect on decision-making under the existing Treaty. This is not just a positive part in the elaboration and interpretation of the present Treaty. It is from this angle, Mr President, that the Commission's proposals on a number of aspects, to which the President of the Commission referred yesterday, must be considered.

To conclude, Mr President, I feel that the text before us raises a number of demonstrably positive points, to which I should like to refer very briefly. Firstly, and perhaps very prosaically, it induced this Commission to look at what the previous Commission wrote in 1975 about the development of the Community, which led it to confirm both the last Commission's and Parliament's point of view, with certain reservations here and there, of course. Today's debate, Mr President, has clearly revealed — and I consider this important, even for those who are unable to go along

Andriessen

with the ideas set out in this draft — the unanimous concern felt in this Chamber about the future of Europe and the determination to do something about it. What is important is that at this stage and in view of the coming elections the elected representatives of the people are showing that they have a concept of how the European Community must develop in the future. This is not in any way to say that it will be the most important issue in the elections, but it gives this Parliament additional legitimacy when facing the electors of the future, including the young people of Europe.

Mr President, as I said at the beginning, the importance of this debate lies, in my opinion, in its demonstration of faith in Europe, faith in Europe's ability to do something about its citizens' problems, employment, human rights, and so on. It will undoubtedly have an impact, even on the Athens meeting, if only because the will of the elected representatives of the people has been demonstrated here. Reference is very often made in this Chamber to Parliament's right of initiative. Allow me to end by saying that I believe a brilliant example has been given here of the efficient and inspiring use of initiative. I can only hope that a very large majority of Parliament will support this initiative.

Mr Ferri (S), *Chairman of the Committee on Institutional Affairs*. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as Chairman of the Committee on Institutional Affairs it falls to me, in agreement with the coordinating rapporteur, Mr Spinelli, to conclude this debate. In doing so I shall not reply to the detailed and particular observations that have been made during the course of the discussion, but will once again make some general observations, above all of a political character.

May I be allowed first not only to thank those members of all groups who have spoken during this debate, which has been one of the fullest and longest in the history and records of our Parliament, but also to thank those who, even whilst disagreeing as to the details, have renewed or expressed firm and sometimes enthusiastic agreement with the initiative and the work of the Committee on Institutional Affairs. Also — as is one's democratic duty — I should like to thank my opponents, even those who have repeated or expressed for the first time fundamental criticisms.

I should like also to emphasize that this report, which is submitted for your appraisal and for you to vote on, is truly the work of the Committee as a whole. Undoubtedly, and by a great margin, first praise is due to the coordinating rapporteur, Mr Spinelli. This has been acknowledged by everyone, and it may seem superfluous for me to renew once more my thanks to him on behalf of the Committee and, I would say, of all of Parliament, even those members who are not in agreement.

The report is also the result of the enthusiastic, assiduous work of the individual rapporteurs who have been responsible for the different sections of the report. I should like once again to thank Messrs Gucht, Moreau, Pfennig, Prag, Seeler and Zecchino. I should also like to remind members that, where the section on the Union's finances is concerned, which was so ably presented by Mr Seeler, part of the work was done by Mr Junot, up to the time of his resignation from our Parliament. But it is not only the rapporteurs who have done the work: all the Committee members, in a very tiring series of sittings and debates, have made an enthusiastic contribution with conviction, supporting their ideas and their arguments in a confrontation that has led to very laborious voting and wording and re-wording of texts, with the aim of finding the maximum possible political agreement.

Ladies and gentlemen, as you very well know, this is the third debate on the subject of European Union. In July 1981 we adopted the resolution which originated this Committee; in July 1982 we adopted the first Spinelli report on the general guidelines for the preliminary draft treaty establishing the Union. And this is the fulfilment of the mandate that Parliament gave us in regard to the report on the substance of the draft Treaty. We have thus worked with the aim of maintaining constant contact with the Assembly and its political groups, whilst proceeding by successive stages, on the basis of a consensus that has been sought, required and then reached, sometimes, after very considerable effort.

I think we can claim to have faithfully discharged the mandate that was given to us, and it is worth my while recalling once again that this will not be the final debate. If, as I devoutly hope, our report is strengthened today by a favourable vote with a large majority in the Assembly, before the end of this Parliament we shall proceed to the debate and the vote on the proper draft Treaty establishing the European Union, drawn up in its proper form.

The present report gives a sufficiently accurate idea of the guidelines of this Treaty, and of its content.

It may seem superfluous for me to recall once again — after this has been made so fully apparent — that the resolution is a balanced whole, and nothing could be further from the truth than to accuse us of having taken into account, in our work and in the report, solely the institutional aspect of European reform, in the new Treaty.

The draft resolution — as was moreover made clear on the occasion of last year's vote — has been concerned with the new duties of the Union, in order to mark out the various possible policies and fields of action, naturally basing the foundations on the general principles of law on which they must rest, indicating the 'finances' of the Union, the problems of security, external relations and, naturally, outlining an institu-

Ferri

tional system that can guarantee — in so far as this is dependent on institutional systems — if not facilitate, the proper functioning of the Union itself.

I think we have also to recognize that the solutions adopted are extremely well-balanced. There was some criticism, in one of the speeches, of the institutional side, on the grounds that it envisaged a system that it would be difficult or even impossible to translate into precise Treaty regulations. I must dispell also this concern because, on the basis of decisions already taken and approved by the Bureau, the Committee on Institutional Affairs can and will call, in the next stage of its work, on the services of extremely highly qualified jurists from various countries, with the aim precisely of ensuring that the text will be drawn up, in the various languages, in the best way possible.

The preparatory work, which has already been started by these jurists on the basis of the Committee's text, has shown that it is absolutely possible or even easy to convert this resolution — the features of which are somewhat characteristic of the documents produced by our Parliament, which are frequently redundant and repetitive — into a text that will at least not contain parts that contradict each other. As I was saying, this work, which has already begun, has shown that it is not only possible but relatively easy to give this substance, these ideas, these proposals, the legal form of a proper Treaty.

I should like once again to remind you, ladies and gentlemen, that this vote today — extremely important as it is — should strictly speaking be considered — at least from the political standpoint — to be a consequence of the vote expressed last year. Why do I say this? Because I continue to have great difficulty in understanding why it is that members or political groups that last year expressed their support for the document regarding the guidelines can today take a different view of the document regarding the substance, which has faithfully followed the guidelines in all respects.

If this change of opinion stems from other factors — external factors — these can even be explained and understood, but it seems to be absolutely inconceivable for anyone to say: 'My ideas and my convictions, which last year led me to vote in favour of the draft resolution on the guidelines for the new Treaty, remain unchanged: today, however, I do not agree, and I cannot vote in favour of this draft resolution'.

I have said that the solutions that are proposed are well balanced, and recognition of this — allow me just to tell you — has been received from a source beyond suspicion: a source which ought possibly to be a source of concern to those who have gone furthest in support of European Union. President Thorn — and today, once again, Commissioner Andriessen — have expressed — and I thank them for it —

a highly favourable view of our work, a view that had moreover already been expressed at a meeting during a discussion and an exchange of documents in the course of our work.

Now, amongst the many criticisms that we are accustomed to level at the Commission we have never so far accused them of being too audacious, too brave. If anything, we have always reproved them for their excessive caution, their excessive timidity *vis-à-vis* the Governments and the Council. This recognition, by the Commission, that this draft is a balanced work of integrity, conforms to the idealistic force that was its motivation; it is indispensable, and also presents the necessary dose of realism, which, in politics, we can never be without. It seems to us important and, I repeat, absolutely beyond suspicion.

I should like to say once again, ladies and gentlemen, that it is essential for every one of us to feel that our vote here must be an overall political one. In many of the speeches that I have listened to it has been said: 'This report and this resolution are not one hundred percent satisfactory: there are parts that I should have preferred to be different — I should have preferred a different wording.' But all of this, ladies and gentlemen, is normal.

I am speaking to political men and women, many of whom not only have experience of the European Parliament, but have also experience of national Parliaments, of debates and deliberations within political assemblies and the administrations of Communes, Provinces and Regions, as well as within party organizations. Tell me, ladies and gentlemen, how often does it happen, at the end of a democratic debate, a confrontation, a democratic discussion of ideas and opinions, that one's own arguments are accepted one hundred percent? This does not even happen within the same party, where at least there ought to be greater proximity of ideas and opinions. This is the characteristic and, if you will allow me, also the great strength of democracy, the comparison of views and their approximation within the limits of what is possible.

I remember that an Italian politician — if you will allow me this brief reference to an example from my own country, since every one of us takes with him his own store of personal experience and his own culture wherever he goes — the first President of the Republic, in fact, who was elected in Italy in 1948, and had made no secret of the fact that, in the referendum of 1946, he had voted for the monarchy, once said — I quote him more or less as I remember it — 'the most exciting thing — at the end of a democratic debate — is not just having been successful in persuading the others that your own views are right; it is just as exciting to let yourself be persuaded by the others — to be convinced that the others, too, are right'.

Ferri

This is the fundamental rule : otherwise there would be no point in discussion. Otherwise, there would be no point in voting, if, when unanimity could not be achieved, the rule of the majority did not apply. Of course, there is an exception to all of this. When one of us, who fights in a political formation, and is true to certain principles, certain choices, sees in the compromises and solutions that are reached a 'certain something' that is irreconcilable with questions of principle, then he clearly cannot accept these compromises. But in every other case — I repeat — the legitimate genuine compromise that is the result of a debate is the fundamental rule of democracy, and the rule of parliamentary life. Otherwise we should be doing no more here than make propaganda speeches, quite ineffective in the outside world.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is why I insist — today's vote must spring from a fundamental, overall judgement. Perhaps a paragraph here or there does not suit, for some it is too advanced, for others it is not advanced enough. But none of these reservations concerns essential motives. I think that in all conscience, every one of us here can say — no matter to what political group of this Assembly he or she belongs — that there is nothing in this motion for a resolution that prevents its being supported by a Communist member, or by a Liberal or Conservative. You will tell me that it is, then, a confusing document, that says nothing. No, my dear colleagues, it is the substance of a draft Treaty and, if you will forgive the comparison, the substance of a draft constitution, for the Treaty — in an organism of an international or supranational character, is the Constitution.

In our countries, ladies and gentlemen, whether the constitutions that we have are old or new (in the majority of our countries they are new — Germany, Italy and France, whilst Great Britain is an entirely different case, not having a written constitution but a complex of rules deriving from individual acts or customs, and these are its constitution — they are constitutions that outline a framework of competences and the expression of the people's political will, on the one hand, and on the other, organs that, interpreting this will, exercise power in its various aspects — legislative, executive, administrative and judicial. In these constitutions — they are all constitutions adopted by a large majority — cases can be found of persons who have fought, struggled, and presented amendments, but have accepted these common principles, these common foundations.

When I heard a speaker from my group say this morning — no offence, Mr Megahy — at the conclusion of his speech, 'Let us not waste time on these things ; it is time that Parliament finally concerned itself with the things that are its concern — namely, a solution of Europe's economic crisis', I asked myself : how can Parliament resolve Europe's economic crisis

in a Europe, structured as it is today, that has neither the means nor the decision-taking machinery to resolve this crisis? The same is even truer of Parliament, which has no power whatever.

An Irish colleague said this morning something which was very hard but, in my view substantially correct, to the effect that if we do not progress with this draft, we must have the courage to tell our electors that it is not worthwhile voting once again for a new Parliament. To elect an Assembly which, ladies and gentlemen — apart from some budgetary powers that have anyway become largely illusory, because of the inflexibility of Community expenditure — is obliged to give opinions that are held in the same regard — and I am not criticizing the Commission, but above all the Council — as those of the Economic and Social Committee, or perhaps less, and end up in a drawer somewhere, or else to relieve its feelings with an outburst of resolutions, all platonic, all academic, that are only of use, when they are any use at all, to feed the press, and for propaganda purposes — electing such a Parliament, I say, is to humiliate and mortify the legitimacy of that universal suffrage that is the foundation of our democracy.

This, then, is why we are more than ever convinced that it is indeed our duty to bring the life of this Parliament to an end with this act of faith or, if you like, this challenge, this dare, or whatever you want to call it. Let Parliament find again at least that sense of courage and dignity that comes from being elected by direct universal suffrage ! Our mouths are so often full of expressions such as 'we are the representatives of the European peoples, we are the elected European Assembly'. Well then, let us find the courage — without prejudice to the differences in our political opinions and our programmes — to discover this common will to tell the peoples of Europe that, with this draft, Europe proposes to go forward and escape from the crisis.

The Albert Report, which was prepared at the request of our Bureau, on the means of achieving European economic recovery, states that 'the Community institutions are unsuitable for decision-making and sick from indecision'. According to what the Commission continues to tell us, and what we already know, we are neglecting reform because it 'would take years', and it goes on to say : 'The recovery proposed by the report looks to a horizon of five or ten years, that is to say, towards 1990'. In the meantime, however, we can also reform the institutions ; that is to say, we can give this European Union not only new substance, new powers and new political commitments, but also an institutional system that will have two characteristics — it will have an adequate democratic base, in other words an elected Assembly, equipped with that minimum amount of power that characterizes a Parliament, and it will also be capable of functioning.

Ferri

Today we are paralysed, in the grip of total indecision, and we ought here to find a solution to all of those doubts, those reservations that would have us keep the right of veto, in more or less disguised forms. But it is clear that the institutions function with a sense of political responsibility, and we are sure that there will be no 'steamrolling' of decisions. We need instruments that can function; at least, Parliament must have the minimum features of an elected Assembly; that is, effective participation in legislative power and a political control over an executive organ of management or government. That is our name for it: if the word frightens people, let us still call it 'Commission', but let it be a political partner with whom a dialogue can be held — otherwise, Parliament cannot survive.

These then, quite apart from questions of detail, are the fundamental points I wanted to raise, ladies and gentlemen. Reverting to what Mr Spinelli said in the introduction to our debate, I should like to say a word or two to those groups that are in a state of uncertainty or doubt, and to those members who are personally in that situation. There are positions of which we are already aware, taken up by those who have said from the outset: 'We have accepted this Community in its narrow limits, and we have perhaps accepted it against our will. We do not agree to any further step forward; no new competences, and no transfer of powers from Governments to the Community institutions, and still less to Parliament!'

Those who have taken up these positions should have the courage to say: 'We give up everything, and we believe that progress is possible only on the basis of cooperation between Governments, and agreements which, we know only too well, are so illusory'. To those who, however, continue to support the cause of a decisive step forward towards European Union, I would say: you must have courage, you must not dwell too much on detail. You must feel the dignity and independence that every elected person must have!

I should like to say, in all frankness, to the members of certain groups — and I refer to members of the Conservative group which, moreover, through the rapporteur Mr Prag and some members of the Committee, has made such an important and enthusiastic contribution to the work of the Committee — and also to some very dear colleagues and friends in the Socialist group: you must have courage! Every member of Parliament must feel his own independence, his own dignity; he must not be subject to constraints, although they exist; he must never consider himself shackled by positions taken up by his own Government — however friendly, and however much it may be of the same colour and the same political outlook as that which he represents.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have finished! Bringing forward the closure of the debate has allowed me, for

the first time since I have been a member of this Parliament, not to be strictly limited to so many minutes or seconds of speaking time, and I thank the President for not asking me to conclude.

I say to you all — have a little courage! And you do not need very much, after all, to support this document. In 1980, speaking on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs in place of the rapporteur, the late Mr Gonella, and defending the amendments of Parliament to a very timid draft directive that was only of symbolic value — the one on the right of residence — I said to Commissioner Davignon — who said he could not accept Parliament's amendments — 'Have a little courage, members of the Commission!' Unfortunately I have to say that the necessary courage was lacking: and, with all its limitations, this directive has remained locked in the drawers of the Council, and has got no further forward; yet another proof that it is absolutely necessary to change the structures.

I never thought I should have found myself in the position of having to say 'have a little courage' to any of you, ladies and gentlemen. I say it without any conceit, without any pretence of setting myself up — God forbid! — as anyone's teacher, but in a spirit of fraternal friendship. We owe this courage to our function, we owe it to our electors, we owe it to our ideas. If this courage and this consistency are present, we shall finish today carrying the motion with a large majority, and we shall be setting the scene for a worthy conclusion to this legislature, the first to be elected by universal suffrage. We shall be setting the scene for a real step forward, a decisive turning point towards European Union.

(Enthusiastic, prolonged applause from a number of benches)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ESTGEN*Vice-President*

President. — Mr Ferri, I cannot help associating myself with your concluding remarks. This debate is indeed an important one, and the vote this afternoon will also be important. In any case, I thank Mr Spinelli, I thank Mr Ferri for his chairmanship and I thank all the draftsmen of opinions who have contributed so much to this important document. I hope that this afternoon we shall once again give proof of our cohesion and that, on the threshold of this second stage of Europe, we shall portray an image of Parliament that will truly reflect its dignity.

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

(The sitting was adjourned at 12 noon and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR : LADY ELLES

Vice-President

2. *Topical and urgent debate (objections)*

President. — I have received pursuant to Rule 48(2), second subparagraph, the following objections, justified in writing, to the list of subjects for tomorrow's topical and urgent debate :

— from Mr Fellermaier, on behalf of the Socialist Group, a motion to include a debate on Turkey as Item II, the debate on Lebanon to become Item V.

Mr Glinne (S). — *(FR)* Madam President, may I point out that a little while ago, at the meeting of the enlarged Bureau to fix the agenda of Parliament's next part-session, it was unanimously agreed that the question of Turkey would be included among the urgent debate topics for the Thursday morning debate, which makes the request by my colleague and friend Mr Fellermaier, on behalf of my group, null and void.

President. — Mr Fellermaier's objection is therefore withdrawn.

(The President read the remaining objections to the list of subjects for urgent debate)¹

Mrs De March (COM). — *(FR)* A point of order, Madam President.

I am very worried that a large number of decisions by the chairmen of groups relating to the agenda are subsequently reversed. That is the case of the Euromissiles.

The press was told that this matter would be discussed and it was going to make quite an issue of it. Moreover, it is a question which interests millions of young people and women.

As a woman and a Member, I find it shameful that we should not discuss this question which is so vital to humanity as a whole, to peace and to détente.

President. — Mrs De March, that of course, was not a point of order. You were making a political point. Secondly, I would remind you that whatever the powers of the chairmen of the political groups, this House is sovereign and can decide by vote whether the decision of the chairmen holds good or not.

(Applause)

After the vote on the objection relating to missiles

¹ See Minutes.

Mr Boyes (S). — When you explained what way we were voting, I think you said : 'For withdrawing and against retaining'. I would have thought there was no difference between those two phrases.

(Laughter)

President. — There wasn't intended to be any.

(Laughter)

Mr Boyes (S). — In that case, Madam President, that was absolutely misleading, because 'for withdrawing' and 'against retaining' mean exactly the same — leaving them on the agenda !

Surely it is the obligation of the President on this, the most important topic that ever comes up in this Parliament, to give proper guidance to this House on how to vote, and not to joke about it !

Euromissiles are the last thing that people in this Parliament should joke about. I have told my Conservative and Christian-Democrat friends that these missiles won't single out only Socialists to drop on ; they will fall on these people as well when they get installed !

President. — Mr Boyes, I think there was no confusion as to the vote, but if you wish to have it again, you may have it and I will be perfectly clear.

Mr Gontikas (EPP). — Madam President, I am sorry, but I have to take into consideration what is stated in the Rules of this House. I think it very inappropriate to put the matter again to the vote.

President. — It is up to the House whether it wishes to vote again or not.

I am advised that you have had a vote on this subject, and that that is the vote that pertains to the debate. The objection is therefore overruled.

Mr Boyes (S). — Is it not interesting that not one of those urgent topics has anything whatsoever to do directly with the Community ? The Euromissiles were a matter for the Community. These people will talk about anywhere and everywhere except about what is happening right on their own doorstep.

(Applause from the Socialist benches)

President. — The vote on these questions concerning the urgent debate are, as you know, meant to be taken without debate and without comment.

I now propose that we set the following deadline for the tabling of budget amendments.

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — Further to the point of order by Mr Boyes, may I ask whether there is not a constitutional issue involved here ?

This House did delegate the decision on questions concerning the urgent debate to the Bureau, confident, no doubt, that the matter would end up with

Ewing

some fair balance between foreign affairs, if you like, and Community matters. We have ended up, having so delegated the Bureau, with a list of urgent topics relating to foreign affairs. I am not against a balance, but I am against a solution that has no balance whatsoever. Is there not a constitutional issue involved here?

President. — Mrs Ewing, I must inform you that it is not the Bureau that discusses the subject matter, the order or the content of the urgencies which are taken in the topical debate on Thursday morning. It is the chairmen of the groups who meet with the President of Parliament, and it is up to the political groups to table their objections, as many have done today, and to vote on them in this House on the Wednesday afternoon. So there is no question of a constitutional issue.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Madam President, I would like to raise a point with regard to the Rules of Procedure, for I have heard that the Bureau has decided to suspend its decision concerning the composition of the Committee of Inquiry and to authorize the appointment of a new committee only as from next month.

I must formally object to this procedure which effectively amounts to the sabotage of the work carried out by the Committee of Inquiry, a minority right, by a majority of the Bureau.

President. — I am not sure to what committee you are referring. Could you kindly clarify?

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) I am referring to the Committee of Inquiry into the responsibility for the transfer of the Seveso dioxin, which could have been nominated long ago and which was to have begun its deliberations this week. The Bureau has once again prevented this.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — (DE) Madam President, I rise to prevent a misunderstanding. Although the Bureau has decided to increase the number of members eligible to sit on the Committee of Inquiry, there is no impediment to the constitution thereof, for the power of appointment of such additional members is vested in the political groups. The constitution formalities are free to proceed apace.

I would once again urge colleagues to seek clarification from their group chairmen before raising procedural issues which hold up the session.

(Applause)

3. Question Time

President. — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. 1-660/83), questions to the Commission.

Question No 50 by Mr Cousté has been postponed until the next part-session, at the author's request.

Question No 51 by Mrs Martin (H-188/83), taken over by Mrs von Alemann:

Can the Commission inform Parliament of the action it has taken or plans to take in response to the call for:

- recognition of the occupational status of women working in family businesses without pay,
- a directive permitting the financing of replacement services in agriculture to enable women working in agriculture to be free to undergo training and participate in social life

contained in the resolution of 11 February.¹

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — As part of the implementation of its action programme on the promotion of equal opportunities for women, and in particular Action No 5, the Commission is at present completing its preparations for a draft directive designed *inter alia* to improve the occupational status of women in family enterprises.

As regards the financing of replacement services in agriculture, which is already possible under the Guidance Section of the EAGGF, this question is also being re-examined within the general context of structural policies in the field of agriculture. New proposals designed to make the references to replacement services more explicit can be expected shortly.

Mrs von Alemann (L). — Although I am very pleased to hear that the draft directive is under way and also that new proposals can be expected very shortly on the replacement service, may I ask the Commissioner whether 'shortly' means this year or does it mean 1984?

Mr Richard. — I sincerely hope that it will be in the course of this year.

Mrs Tove Nielsen (L). — (DA) A very quick question to the Commission: Is there money available?

Mr Richard. — I can only give the same answer as I did to the last question. I hope so.

President. — Question No 52, by Mr Bord (H-212/83):

Following the communication from the Commission to the Council concerning new technologies and vocational training, could the Commission say whether it intends to take effective action to remedy the lack of highly-qualified electronics engineers in the Community and what measures it considers most appropriate for this purpose?

¹ OJ No C 50, 9. 3. 1981.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — The honourable Member who raised this important question should be aware that the Council has now adopted a resolution concerning vocational training measures relating to the introduction of new information technologies following the meeting of Ministers for Employment and Social Affairs on 2 June.

That resolution was based on the Commission's communication of June 1982. It sets out basic guidelines for the development of a common approach to the introduction of new information technologies in all levels of training, and it defines a number of priority themes for action by Member States and at Community level. Many of these themes, which relate, for instance, to the training requirements of industry and small and medium-sized firms, of unemployed young people, skilled workers and women workers, are concerned precisely with the adaptation of training systems in order to offset present and future shortages of skilled manpower and to offer the best prospects of employment to those most in need. The Commission's action over the next four years will be focused on the development of a network of demonstration projects, financed through the Social Fund, and on a number of supporting activities, including study visits for training instructors, information exchanges and work on the comparability of qualifications.

Mr Bord (DEP). — (FR) I thank the Commissioner for giving me such interesting information on the matter. I shall take this opportunity to ask him whether Europe could not embark on making fifth-generation computers, since this has already been done in the United States and Japan. In France, certain aeronautics firms began studying this project as early as 1979 and no doubt matters would proceed with more speed if the European countries joined together to build these supercomputers.

Mr Richard. — The original question related to training. Insofar as that is concerned, the Community is very conscious of the need to train people in these areas of high technology. The precise powers that the Commission has in order to foster this process are limited, but within the scope of those powers and up to the limits of our resources we would certainly wish to move in the direction that I think the honourable gentleman would wish us to go.

President. — Question No 53, by Mr Gauthier (H-225/83):

In view of the notion being propagated in some official circles — notably in France — that there is a danger of nuclear over-capacity, does the Commission not consider it urgently necessary to remind the Member States of the importance in terms of energy strategy of the Community completing its nuclear programme in accordance with the objectives for 1990 laid down by the

Commission in its proposals to the Council, and also to stress the grave consequences of cutting back nuclear programmes?

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) In the Commission's statement in June on the Community's energy strategy, we pointed to the position which nuclear energy already occupies in supplying energy to the Community and to the need to continue developing this type of energy, given the uncertain nature of other sources of supply. This question is the subject of the discussion in the Council and the debate in the Energy Commission on the best way to ensure the sound use of the European Community's domestic resources, which include this form of energy, and we are making sure that the present situation does not lead to any relaxation of our efforts.

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED). — Would the Commissioner also agree that if we cut back our nuclear programme, we run the risk of a grave loss of potential skills to other spheres and particularly a grave slowing down of our research and development programmes, and hence a lack of progress in the field of safety, which I know is something very dear to the hearts of those Members of the House who are concerned with nuclear power plants? Would he further agree that if we cut back on our nuclear programmes, we mitigate the possibility of eliminating loss-making coal-burning plants and also expensive oil-burning plants where the source of fuel may be at risk?

Mr Davignon. — (FR) The Commission considers that we should continue our development policy. The reasons why we are in favour of this development include all the points referred to by Sir Peter Vanneck.

President. — Question No 54, by Mr Nyborg (H-218/83):

In the summer of 1981, the Commission undertook to implement a coastal protection policy.

How long do the inhabitants of exposed coastal areas still have to wait before concrete pilot projects for coastal protection are started as proof of the Community's sincerity?

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — I can only repeat, on behalf of the Commission, the reply given last month to Question 533/82 by Mr Lalor, namely, that I am looking into the matter. It has been established that, unfortunately, there can be no question of funding pilot projects on coastal protection from the Community budget and that the programme adopted by the Council contains no provision for action to combat coastal erosion. Whether such projects can and should be assisted from the Community budget is a matter to be considered by the appropriate inter-departmental working party. However, as the Commission has also mentioned earlier, it is not

Richard

at present in the position to assign much in the way of staff in this connection, owing to the environment priorities laid down by the Council

May I add that the Commission will shortly be considering a document dealing in particular with the advisability of a Community coastal protection operation, the aims of such an operation and the extra funds the Commission would need in order to mount it. In the light of its discussion on this point, the Commission will decide whether to send the Communication to the Council. It will, in any event, report its conclusions to Parliament at the regular November part-session, I hope.

Mr Nyborg (DEP). — (DA) I understood that we now have four Commissioners who feel they have responsibility for the lack of a coastal protection policy. But I have also been informed that a document has been drafted which is to be presented to the Council and Parliament. We are very pleased to hear it.

I should like to ask the Commission whether it might not be considered irrelevant to draw attention to lack of investment in coastal areas, when possible investors do not have the reassurance that they will not be swimming in the sea the following week.

Mr Richard. — I did not say they would not be available. I said that they are not available at the moment, which is a slightly different thing. As far as responsibility for this within the Commission is concerned, I am replying today on behalf of the President of the Commission and, indeed, on behalf of the rest of the Commission. We will be considering this, I hope, in the fairly near future and we shall then be considering whether it will be advisable that there should be such a policy and, if so, what sort of a policy and how it might be financed. In those circumstances I would have thought that the sensible thing to do would be to wait until the Commission has produced its policy and, indeed, I gave an undertaking that we would report our conclusions to Parliament when we had done so.

Mr Purvis (ED). — Perhaps I could ask the Commissioner, while we are waiting for this programme to be developed, whether the Commission could not make greater use of its environmental research programme to find out what in fact can be done in studying the North Sea and other seas that are affecting our coasts. In fact, if we wait long enough, St Andrew's Castle, St Andrew's Cathedral and the whole of the old golf course will be in the sea.

Mr Richard. — The honourable gentlemen must not be so pessimistic. Two years ago, I think, I answered a question on this subject in which he told me that the golf course was about to disappear. Two years after the putative disappearance of the golf course, I gather it is

still there, that people are playing on it and, indeed, that the castle still stands.

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — May I ask why the Commissioner thinks that this is a matter on which he is entitled to be somewhat facetious, as in many cases, it is a very serious matter, even involving lives. Such is the case in two parts of my area, namely, Findhorn and parts of the Banff coast where people were, perhaps, foolish to have built houses too near this dangerous sea. Nevertheless, we have a state of urgency. Is he aware that the Regional Council is hoping that the Commissioner will lend a sympathetic ear to schemes to try and put these matters right?

Mr Richard. — I am sorry if the honourable lady does not think that I have approached the subject with sufficient gravity. I think it is a very important subject indeed. It just seemed to me that the last question was a somewhat facetious re-run of something that was put to me two years ago.

As far as the Commission's proposals are concerned, I said twice already that we are in the process of producing them. I hope we will do it quickly. When they are produced, then, of course, they will be put to Parliament and I hope we can have a sensible and serious and, indeed, sober discussion about it.

Mr Enright (S). — Is the Commissioner aware of the damage that is being done in the city of Leeds by the River Aire? It is causing widespread difficulty and flooding at the moment. Does the Commissioner not agree that those areas are equally important and that his tender heart should extend to that region?

Mr Richard. — I am bound to point out that, in answering a question on coastal erosion, I really do not think that what happens to a river running through the centre of a city in the middle of England is 100 % relevant.

President. — Question No 55 by Mr Welsh (H-233/83):

Is the Commission aware of the proposed agreement between the Belgian Government and the Belgian company Beaulieu under which the latter will acquire the fibre producer Fabelta and does it consider that this agreement respects the provisions of the Commission Directive of July 1977 renewed on 11 August 1981 which *inter alia* forbids State aids for the purpose of expanding fibre capacity?

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Who am I to resist so inviting a request, all the more so as the Commission believes that the position it has so far adopted in the matter to which the question refers is completely defensible.

Andriessen

The Commission heard that negotiations had taken place between the Belgian Government and the Beaulieu company, which manufactures carpets and nylon yarns for carpets. The plan was that this company should acquire an interest in the new firm, which would take over some of the activities of the Fabelta company, which had gone bankrupt. This operation was to be made possible with financial assistance from the Government.

At the Commission's request, the Belgian authorities provided an explanation of the aid the Government planned to grant and of the new company's programmes for the production of synthetic fibres. The Belgian textile plan, which has been discussed in this Parliament in the past, specifies the conditions under which aid may be granted to the textile and clothing industries in 1983. What is certain is that no form of aid may be granted to synthetic fibres, including, therefore, nylon. It is also certain that, if this new investment had come under the current textile plan, the firm concerned could not in any case have received more than 50 % in aid from the Government. This requirement has not been satisfied either.

Finally, because there is still overcapacity in the synthetic fibre sector, the Commission decided in July on a two-year extension of the ban on government aid designed to increase production capacity in this sector. The product manufactured by the firm in question, nylon yarn, is covered by this ban on government aid. The Commission therefore had no alternative but to open the procedure provided for in Article 93 (2) of the Treaty, and the Belgian Government was informed of the Commission's decision by letter of 8 August 1983. I must also stress that the opening of this procedure does not imply that the Commission will take no further action: it provides an opportunity for a further investigation into whether and to what extent the requirements attached to the granting of aid can, or cannot, be satisfied.

The Belgian Government answered the Commission's letter last week. This answer is being studied at the moment, and I believe Parliament will appreciate that I cannot at this stage give a definite answer to the questions raised by the Belgian Government in its letter.

Mr Welsh (ED). — That is a most useful answer, and I think we should congratulate the Commission on the expeditious way in which it has dealt with this matter.

However, should this aid, which is a very substantial one indeed, be split up among the various other parts of the textile chain, for instance, by being granted partially to the spinning operation and partially to the marketing operation or the carpet weaving operation

of Beaulieu and Fabelta, could the Commissioner confirm that, even under those circumstances, it would still be outside the Commission's agreement with the Belgian Government as regards the Claes Plan?

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) The honourable Member is essentially referring in his question to the arguments which the Belgian Government has forwarded to the Commission and which, as Parliament knows, have been reported in the press. As I have just said, I cannot go into the Belgian Government's answer until I have studied it thoroughly. That would not be doing right by the Belgian Government or the Commission. I hope that Parliament will be satisfied with this answer and permit me to revert to this matter when the Commission has had an opportunity to study the letter and to formulate its reply.

Mr Moreland (ED). — The Commission will know, in the context of national aid from the Belgian Government to industry, that the other problem it has on its hands is the national aid given to the sanitary ware industry, which the Commission ruled against at the beginning of this year. It appears, however, that the Belgian Government is continuing this national aid.

Can I urge the Commission to take a decision as soon as possible on this, given that it is now some eight months since it ruled on this issue, because the volume of dumped sanitary ware, particularly in Holland, Britain, Ireland and, I believe, also France, is now a very serious problem to the industries in those countries?

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) I am grateful to the author of the question for his reference to the expeditious way in which the Commission first reacted to this problem. The Commission will be just as expeditious at the next stage in this matter, and I can therefore assure Parliament that we shall be taking a decision as soon as possible. I should also point out that the opening of a procedure of this kind results in the suspension of a national government's power to grant aid, which means in this case that no aid may be granted until the Commission has taken a final decision and that no aid at all may be granted if the Commission's decision is negative.

President. — Question No 56 by Mr Gontikas (H-237/83):

Does the Commission agree with the statements published by the Athens Information Office (in an article signed by A Hatziantoniou) with regard to the intentions and aims of the New Democracy Government concerning Greece's accession to the EEC and, if not, what measures does it intend to

President

take — or has it taken already — against those responsible for the publication of this insulting article against New Democracy?

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) The text to which the honourable Member refers was not written by an official of the Commission and was published under the author's signature. Obviously, someone who does not belong to the Commission cannot state the Commission's position.

I would also point out that the information the Commission publishes through these channels does not always necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Community's institutions. It may also be designed to contribute to a more general objective, arousing interest among the citizens of the Member States in what is happening in the Community and, more generally, in its construction. This is not to say that care is not taken to avoid misunderstandings in this respect, and the Commission will do what it can in future to preclude such misunderstandings.

Mr Gontikas (EPP). — (GR) I am very grateful to the Commissioner for his answer. Specifically, my question is whether he knows if Mr Hatziantoniou, who put his name to the article published in the Community's journal, received payment for it from the Athens Information Office of the Community, or not? If he did, then of course the Commissioner's reply is out of place.

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) As far as I know, the author was not paid. If he was paid, I believe there would be cause to look at this matter more closely.

President. — As the authors are not present, Questions Nos 57, 58 and 59 will be answered in writing.⁽¹⁾

Question No 60 by Mr Israël (H-161/83):

Could the Commission really not bring itself to study carefully the resolution adopted by Parliament on 18 October 1982 and the explanatory statement attached thereto and, in its great wisdom, to make specific proposals to the Council, since the latter, in the statement made to Parliament by its President on 17 May 1983, seemed to indicate that such proposals from the Commission were essential?

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — The Commission has studied with great interest the resolution and report on the teaching of human rights adopted by Parliament in October 1982 and supports the importance placed on it by that resolution. This importance is, I think, underlined by the fact that various international bodies are active in this field —

most notably the Council of Europe, which has substantial programmes for the promotion of teaching about human rights at primary and secondary level, at university level and in vocational training.

Nevertheless, the Commission does not believe that it would be appropriate for it to propose to the Council changes to school curricula of the sort proposed in the report and resolution referred to above. Curricula in school structures vary widely from country to country, as does the level at which control over curricula is effectively exercised, and it would not be possible to draw up a proposal which could be widely applied in anything other than the most general and vague terms.

However, the Commission will take full account of the suggestions made in the resolution when undertaking activities in other areas such as the education of migrant workers' children, cultural and linguistic minorities, the integration of the handicapped and so on. It will also examine, in consultation with the Education Committee, how the wishes of the honourable Member may best be brought to the attention of Ministers for Education and the relevant educational authorities within the Member States, taking into account, as we have to, the very different structures and traditions within the Member States regarding the internal organization of individual schools and indeed the curricula that are on offer.

Mr Israël (DEP). — (F) Do you not think, Mr Commissioner, that if the Commission were prepared to make specific proposals to the Education Council, we could achieve the result we all want, namely closer coordination between educational activities within the Community?

Could we not, for once, while we are still only 10 countries, try to identify the necessary structures to ensure that human rights teaching at all levels is identical in our schools? In other words, we shall never achieve positive results or any common ethic throughout the European Community unless the Commission assists us in this field and makes the appropriate proposals to the Council.

Mr Richard. — In general terms, of course, the honourable gentleman is quite right. Nobody, I think, would quarrel with the generality of his remarks. The problem is that in this whole educational field, given the wide disparity that there is between the Member States, however much we may say, as indeed we all do, that we are in favour of human rights and indeed that they should be more widely disseminated and respect for them should be more widely taught, it is very difficult indeed to see precisely how specific proposals from the Commission can help. Generalities — yes, we could do; specific proposals would be extraordinarily difficult.

⁽¹⁾ See Annex II.

Richard

There is one further point that perhaps I could make to the honourable gentleman. He will know that the Council of Europe does an immense amount of very good work in this field. I am anxious that there should not be undue duplication of effort between that body and the Community institutions. Since we would both be trying to achieve the same objective, and at least in large part we would be doing it in the same countries, it would seem to me really very important that there should not be undue, excessive and indeed perhaps expensive duplication.

Mr Seligman (ED). — I welcome this chance to compound the problem for the Commissioner because Mr Pisani is not here. But does he agree that it would be desirable not only to educate in human rights in the Community but also in the Lomé countries, particularly Africa where they have a different conception of human rights, particularly in the case of Abyssinia where they already have had prisoners imprisoned nine years without trial? Is it not the case that we should spread our net a bit wider, particularly in the ACP nations?

Mr Richard. — I am the Commissioner responsible insofar as we have a policy for education within the European Community. I am relieved and happy to say that I and the Commission have no responsibility whatsoever for education in Abyssinia or indeed in the ACP countries. We have great difficulty in persuading the ten Member States of the European Community to pursue concerted policies in the education and training field. I am bound to say to the honourable gentleman: if he really wants us to take on that increased burden that he is suggesting to us today, then I really do not think we are in a position to do so.

Mr Bonde (CDI). — (DA) Regardless of the sympathy we must all have in the matter of human rights, especially the right to work, which is not faring so well here in the Community countries, I would like to ask the Commission whether it recognizes that educational questions are not matters for which there is authority in the Treaty of Rome and that it would require special authority, a new treaty, if the Commission were to draw up plans and present proposals to the Council to involve itself in the school curricula of the Member States.

Mr Richard. — I am very conscious of the fact that certain Member States, and one in particular have a difficulty in relation to Community competence in the field of education. Not only am I conscious of it, but that Member State is certainly not backward in expressing its own difficulties. Therefore, we have to advance in this area slowly and we have to bring the other Member States with us.

I was very careful in my answer to say that, in view of the great disparity that there is inside the Community

in educational systems and in curricula, I did not think it would be appropriate for the Commission to take action in this field, I am bound to say that that still remains my view.

President. — Question No 61 by Mr Gerokostopoulos (H-279/83):¹

It was reported in the Greek press that the Greek Radio and Television Corporation (ERT) was ordered by the Government not to report the positive results of Greece's membership of the EEC.

Although a Government spokesman did deny the report in the form in which it appeared, he confirmed it in substance by admitting that at a recent Cabinet meeting Ministers were ordered, when alluding to the results of membership, to avoid creating misleading impressions, not to announce the positive results only but the negative ones as well.

Will the Commission say:

1. If such a decision contributes to implementing and observing the Treaty of Rome;
2. if the procedure decided upon is in conformity with Community directives and regulations, which stipulate that when projects are being carried out with Community funding they should be widely reported to the public in the funded area;
3. if it proposes to take a stand on an action which, apart from anything else, is likely to disorient Greek public opinion on the subject of the country's membership of the EEC?

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Clearly, given the freedom of expression that is one of the fundamental principles of every democracy, all government bodies, and therefore the Commission too, must be extremely cautious when appraising what others, be they private or public bodies, decide to issue by way of information. In this context, the premise the Commission adopts is that objective information on the advantages and disadvantages of membership of the Community may be useful, since the Commission believes that the advantages so outweigh the disadvantages that an objective description of the advantages will always convince the reader that membership of the Community is a good thing. This does not alter the fact that the Commission, of course, considers it important for the public to be informed on specific projects implemented in the Member States with the Commission's help in a way that does justice to the Community's participation. The Commission will therefore try to ensure that the public is not confused about its intentions. The

¹ Former Oral Question without debate (0/39/83), converted into a question for Question Time.

Andriessen

Commission should therefore perhaps consider taking steps if information is not objective, but at the moment it has no reason to doubt the perceptiveness of those at whom the publicity is aimed.

Mr Gerokostopoulos (PPE). — *(GR)* I am afraid I must express my disappointment at the Commissioner's answer. The facts were quite clear. The Greek Government's first act was to prohibit the reporting of any news concerning grants and supports provided by the Community. Under pressure of public opinion and from the opposition, the Government backed down at the last moment and tried to justify its initial decision. Despite this, I think the Community, via the Commission, which is also responsible for upholding the Treaties, has both the right and the duty to intervene and bring to order those who contravene the Common Treaties.

With this opportunity I would like to ask the Commissioner whether he knows if the directive decreed by the Community, according to which works performed with financial support from the Community must be clearly marked on site to indicate this, is being respected?

I had the chance to take a short trip to France, and I was both informed and able to confirm personally that in some places Community work is being carried out, but without any sign of the inscription envisaged in the programmes and the various regulations and directives of the Community. The same thing happens in Greece. Huge sums have been provided for regional support, but nowhere can one find an indication that this support comes from the Community.

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* Two comments, two answers. In my answer I was referring not to the first position adopted by the Greek Government but to the second, which — as the question says — was that not only the positive but also the negative aspects of membership should be announced. I maintain my position on this.

As regards the second point, this is a specific condition attached to the granting of Community financial aid. If the Community makes it a condition that the public must be informed where it provides financial assistance for projects, then that must be done. If it has not been done in this case in Greece, the Community will have to take up the matter with the Greek Government.

Mr Bonde (CDI). — *(DA)* I should like to thank the Commission for the clear statement that all information should cover both the negative and the positive aspects, that things should be presented in a sober manner. I should now like to ask what in certain instances would be the consequence for the Commission's Information Offices if on certain matters they forgot to indicate the negative aspects or, even worse from the Commission's point of view, they forgot to

explain the positive aspects, only highlighting the negative ones? What would happen if they omitted to present both the positive and negative aspects in a specific instance? I should like to use as an example what my Greek colleague mentioned in connection with, for instance, Commission aid for regional development projects or other projects in the Member States. I understand that people should be informed that the Community has shared in the financing of the project in question. It is after all an eminently positive item of information on the Community. It is something positive which is being reported. But will the Information Offices henceforth also be obliged to indicate what it cost the Member State concerned in membership contributions in order to receive its present from the Community? In my country, for every 100 kroner we pay in support to the Community regional development fund we get 50 kroner back, but up to now the Community information office has only provided information on the 50-kroner note handed out to us, not the 100 kroner we had to pay up. Can we now expect that the Commission will in future present both the advantages and disadvantages of each individual operation?

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* What I have just said, of course, concerns everyone's information policy. I invite all the political parties represented in this Parliament to make the advantages and disadvantages of their policies known to the general public. I believe that, if we did this, very many political parties would say that their policies have no or hardly any disadvantages. The Commission is clearly bound to provide objective information on what a country's accession to the Community will entail. And what I said is this: I am not afraid to say what the disadvantages are, because I am convinced that they are easily outweighed by the advantages and because I believe in the perceptiveness of the advanced democratic Western European citizen. This is a challenge the Commission is not afraid to accept.

Mrs Tove Nielsen (L). — *(D)* I must say that I listen with great interest to the questions being put which convey the impression that some form of propaganda is being disseminated in Denmark that is not acceptable to the Communist member, Mr Bonde. Sometimes the truth hurts. But do you not think that, when objective information is supplied by the Information Office in Denmark, a Danish member who has been elected to the European Parliament should also present factual information and not mislead this Assembly into thinking that Denmark pays more than it receives? We also have economic advantages from our membership, quite apart from the rightful part we play in cooperation to safeguard peace in Europe. That is something we want in any event!

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* I think it would be wise for the various institutions in the Community to take

Andriessen

charge of their own information and to take responsibility for it as well. This does not in any way exclude the possibility of close cooperation. This may sometimes be useful as regards the Commission's and Parliament's information activities. I shall not refer to the Council in this context. That, I believe, is a different matter altogether.

I believe it makes sense that the responsibilities we have should also give rise to opportunities for turning to the wider public. In this connection, I think it would be wise for information on parliamentary activities to be provided through parliamentary media. But the Commission is big-hearted enough to offer Parliament a helping hand with its information activities if need be, while respecting, of course, its various responsibilities.

Mr Lalor (DEP). — On a point order, I simply wish to apologize, Madam President, for not being here for my own question. I have been at a Bureau meeting and was watching for Question No 56 so that I could come to the House. I apologize to the Commissioner and hope that he will send me on the reply.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) I would like to express my satisfaction with the Commissioner's answer, i.e. that both the positive and the negative aspects should be presented. Unfortunately in Greece the exact opposite to what my good friend and colleague Mr Gerokostopoulos alleges, is in fact taking place. Never have the offices of information and the mass media mentioned that in the two and a half years since Greece joined the Community the farmers have buried 700 thousands tons of fruit and vegetables, nor that in the first two years the deficit in the balance of trade with the Community increased from 54 billion to 450 billion drachmas, nor that in this period thousands of small-to-medium firms have gone to the wall.

I think that objective reporting is essential if self-deception is to be avoided.

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) The last thing the Commission would want to do is mislead the public, because that can never be in our own democratic interests. Having said that, I can only accept responsibility here for what the Commission's media do. The question the Commission has been asked — and I hope, Madam President, you will not take it amiss if I try to confine the discussion to the question — was whether the Commission should adopt a position on the information with which others provide the Greek public. I said, and I stick by my words, that a Government body must be extremely careful about meddling in how others think the public should be informed. That just happens to be part of the system that applies in a free democracy, the freedom of expression. I am also quite willing to discuss with the honourable Member on another occasion whether membership of the Community is an advantage or disadvantage for Greece. I think I know what the outcome of the

discussion would be, despite the comments the honourable Member has made.

Mr Bangemann (L). — (DE) Madam President, I am, as you know, one of those Members who does not appreciate such accountancy-oriented checklists of the pros and cons of Community membership I have to confess to being perplexed and I would ask the Commission to help me resolve my perplexity. How is one to explain the fact that it is invariably Members from those Member States enjoying the greatest advantages who ask such questions?

(Laughter)

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) Perhaps those Members have been badly informed by their media.

Mr Seligman (ED). — To add to that point, maybe there are more imports coming into Greece at the moment, but there is also an enormous amount of capital coming in from the Community to be invested in improving Greek industry so that they can stand up to competition from other countries, and that must be healthy for Greece in the long run.

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) That is very comforting, but it is not a question. But if we consider the Commission's recent reply to the Greek memorandum, the Commission is obviously particularly concerned that those countries of the Community that are lagging behind should be brought up to the level at which the differences between the Member States are diminishing. I do not think the honourable Member will object if this feeling is also expressed when it comes to discussing advantages and disadvantages.

President. — Question No 62, by Mr Bonde (H-216/83):

In its series 'Samtidsorientering' (information about contemporary life), Topic 13: European Political Cooperation, the Commission writes that the Member States of the Community have agreed NOT to apply majority decisions in questions which are considered to be of vital importance by only one of the Member States.

Does the Commission agree with this view, as put to Danish schoolchildren.

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) The honourable Member is referring to a publication intended for schools, which tries to summarise for schoolchildren how the Community and its institutions work. The honourable Members present here know how difficult it is to explain in simple terms to schoolchildren how the Community works.

One of these publications states in fact that 'the Member States of the EEC have agreed not to apply majority decisions in questions which are considered to be of vital importance by only one of the Member States'. Clearly a publication intended for schools cannot go into the discussion, which has never been

Davignon

concluded, on the meaning of the Luxembourg compromise. The Commission has tried to be objective and to explain how things work. Perhaps one could object to the word 'agreed' and say, more prosaically, that the Member States do not apply the majority procedure if one State considers that a matter is of vital importance. As for saying that this reflects the Commission's point of view, Mr Bonde, anyone who is unaware of the Commission's views on this matter can never have attended Parliament's part-sessions in Strasbourg.

Mr Bonde (CDI). — *(DA)* It seems to me that some time ago we heard that the Commission had quite a different interpretation of the right of veto than that expressed by the Commission's Danish Information Office. On the face of it, I do not dispute that what the Commission's Information Office is telling Danish schoolchildren is fully in accord with reality. I should like to ask the Commission whether action will be taken to ensure that in future school pupils in other Community countries, to the extent that they are provided with similar educational material, should be instructed in the same excellent manner as is done in the material which has been distributed to Danish schoolchildren. Will the wording used in that documentation be reproduced in the Commission's educational material in other languages?

Mr Davignon. — *(FR)* The honourable Member seems to think that the Commission does not agree with what its information service published in Copenhagen. I must say I am surprised that he should have deduced this from my reply. I said nothing of the kind. What I said was that the Commission's information service informed the Danish schoolchildren in simple terms of the Council's practice. That is a statement of fact and not a judgment.

Secondly, after our recent debate on information technologies, I find it very strange that anyone should think the Commission provides information on a selective basis, that is to say that the Commission tells those States which are in favour of majority voting that it supports their view while telling States which are not in favour of majority voting that it agrees with them.

There cannot be two ways of stating the facts. I simply believe that if we want to explain to schoolchildren what actually happens, it would be preferable to say that the Member States 'have acquired the habit of not applying the majority vote procedure' rather than saying that 'they have agreed' not to take majority decisions since, as Mr Bonde knows, in their most recent statement *à propos* of the Genscher/Colombo report, the Member States agreed on the contrary to apply the majority decision procedure even more often. In view of all these contradictions I think the Commission's

text reflects its desire to provide the schoolchildren with objective and precise information. In any case, the Commission is sympathetic to the honourable Member's hope that it will perform equally good work in the other Community countries.

Mr Seligman (ED). — On a point of information concerning the veto, I believe the Commissioner was in the position of being the President of the Commission when the British veto on farm prices was overruled. Can he give any indication as to the grounds on which he recommended that this could be done?

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(FR)* The Commission has given Parliament lengthy explanations with regard to the vote on fixing farm prices for the 1982/83 agricultural year.

On the one hand, its position is clearly as follows — and the President of the Commission has reiterated it on behalf of the Commission: the Commission is the guardian of the Treaty; under certain circumstances the Treaty provides for the right to vote and under these circumstances the Commission requests the Council to vote. In some cases, the Council votes, in others it does not vote. The Commission's thesis remains the same, while the Council's attitude fluctuates wildly for reasons it would take too long to go into during Question Time.

President. — As the authors are not present, Questions Nos 63, 64 and 65 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 66 by Mrs Scaroni (H-231/83):

Would the Commission state what the consequences would be for the exploitation of marine resources of the enlargement of the Community to include Spain, in particular with regard to the Bay of Biscay, which is in danger of being overfished by Spanish fishermen?

Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission. — *(GR)* The situation today regarding Spain's fishing rights in Community waters is regulated by the 1980 framework of agreement and by annual agreements that each year specify in detail the licences issued to Spanish fishing vessels to fish in Community waters.

In the negotiations with Spain regarding that country's accession to the Community, the subject of fishing has not yet been approached. Consequently, I am at present unable to give you further details. I can, however, tell you that the basic principle of these negotiations will be to conserve the Community's fishery resources. This is a fundamental pillar of the common fishing policy, as also the fact that the directives ensuring it must continue to be implemented by all Member States whose fishing fleets operate in the Community's fishery reserves.

¹ See Annex II.

Mrs Scamaroni (DEP). — (FR) Thank you, Mr Commissioner, but let me nevertheless insist on this matter and ask you a question: given the forthcoming entry of Spain into the Community, and given the major fishing activity of Spanish fishermen in Community waters, what measures does the Community intend to propose as a basis for negotiation in order to safeguard the established rights of the Community fishermen?

Mr Contogeorgis. — (GR) I think I have already answered Mrs Scamaroni's question. I said that a basic principle of the negotiations will be the conservation of the Community's fishery resources. This is a fundamental ingredient of the common fishing policy established last January. In addition, the fact that all Member States, both old and new, will have to continue abiding by the basic directives concerning the conservation of fishery resources.

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — Would the Commissioner agree that his words are a blanket assurance and that the fishermen working in the various fleets are looking for particular assurances? May I ask if he agrees that the consequences of the vast Spanish fleet entering the North Sea would be disastrous, as there is no room for them? May I ask him if he has had another look at the ideas of former Commissioner Cheysson that there should be joint action between the Spanish fleet and our Lomé partners to develop the rich resources of West Africa?

Mr Contogeorgis. — (GR) As I have said, this part of the negotiations has not yet commenced, and as you will understand, I cannot give further details at this stage since this would prejudice the Community's negotiating position. I repeat that neither the Commission nor Council intend to allow the destruction of the fishery resources, nor of a fishing policy established in January of this year after so much effort and so many attempts.

Mr Harris (ED). — Is the Commissioner aware that the threat of over-fishing by Spain goes far beyond the Bay of Biscay and that fishermen, for example, in the South-West of England are desperately worried about the possibility of further fishing by Spain in their waters and that, quite frankly, they will not stand for an increase in Spain's catches in the waters off the South-West of England? Will he please face up to this problem and make sure that it is not a bargaining position?

Mr Contogeorgis. — (GR) Among the measures decided in January and making up the common fishing policy, there is a Regulation concerning the monitoring of fishing activities by both Member States and third countries which acquire fishing rights within the Community by virtue of our agreements with them. The implementation of the Regulations is the responsibility of the Member States, which are to

carry out the monitoring with whatever resources they possess, and of the Commission. To enable the Commission to fulfil this responsibility, it has applied for a corresponding increase in credits so as to take on the necessary number of inspectors, and this application is being debated as part of the budget for this year.

We hope that Parliament will support the Commission's application and approve the necessary credits, to enable us to take on the inspectors we need as soon as possible.

President. — Question No 67 by Mr Clinton (H-246/83):

With the development of fast food retail outlets in many Member States and the growing demand for meat-based convenience foods such as uncooked beefburgers, sausages, reformed meats, etc., it is essential that the present obstacles to trade in these products be removed. Can the Commission please say what steps it intends to take in order to remove the obstacles to free trade within the Community in minced meat products?

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) The Commission has already put proposals before the Council on the health aspects of trade between Member States in minced meat, which this question refers to. The Council has decided to continue the discussion of this matter with the intention of reaching a solution as quickly as possible. With regard to the other meat products, the Commission will be presenting proposals to the Council when the preparatory work, which is necessary and is in progress, has been completed — very soon, we hope.

Mr Clinton (PPE). — May I ask Mr Dalsager if he is aware that these proposals were first put forward in October 1978, that there was one meeting of a Council working party in December 1978, and that the whole matter has disappeared without trace since then. Could I ask him why, and if he agrees with the situation where the mainland Member States of Europe — I won't name them by name — are allowed to protect their own trade in mincemeat products against trade from any other country? I am sure he is aware also that Ireland is the largest exporter of cattle and meat in the Community that we need the extra employment involved in processing and providing convenience foods, and that we are denied this opportunity — we need the added value — because the Commission is not advancing or progressing these proposals. Could he explain why?

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) I am well aware that these proposals, to which Mr Clinton refers, date right back to 1978, when Parliament regrettably took a negative view of the Commission's proposals to stabilize and harmonize this trade. Fortunately we have produced a revised version of the proposal, which has now been

Dalsager

given a positive opinion both in Parliament and in the Economic and Social Committee. It has been discussed and is still being discussed in the Council, and the Commission hopes that it will lead to the desired result, to which Mr Clinton has drawn attention. Mr Clinton will be aware that when matters are delayed in the Community, it is not always the Commission which is at fault. It is hardly ever the Commission which is responsible for delays. The decision-making process is at times slow-moving, which is to be deplored in a case such as that with which we are dealing here.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 68 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 69 by Mr Kazazis (H-255/83):

In the 1984 preliminary draft budget, the Commission has entered a figure of 10 million ECU in payment appropriations under chapter 9630, Third Financial Protocol with Turkey, and has also entered a 'p.m.' under chapter 9631, Fourth Financial Protocol with Turkey. However, taking advantage of a transfer facility from chapter 9632, Special aid for Turkey, the Commission has also entered a new appropriation of 20 million ECU.

Would the Commission state whether the inclusion of these appropriations in the 1984 preliminary draft budget is consistent with the statements made by Mr Thorn and Mr Haferkamp to the effect that arrangements under the protocols with Turkey would be frozen until there was a return to democracy in that country, and what evidence does the Commission possess that there will be a return to a *real* system of democracy in Turkey next year?

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — In the 1984 draft budget the Commission has requested the following appropriations for Turkey: Third Financial Protocol — 10 million units of account in payment appropriations; Fourth Financial Protocol — 40 million units of account in commitment appropriations and 5 million units of account in payment appropriations in Chapter 100 of the budget; special action for Turkey — 20 million ECU in commitment appropriations and 10 million ECU in payment appropriations.

The Commission has consistently adopted the position that contractual commitments to Turkey have to be honoured, i.e. the payment appropriations for the Third Financial Protocol and the special action that is necessary to meet disbursements for projects covered by financing agreements. On the other hand, as regards the Fourth Financial Protocol, which the Commission still has to send to the Council for signature and conclusion, appropriations for 1984 had been requested but placed in Chapter 100 of the budget.

This ensures that in the event of a political decision to release the Fourth Financial Protocol, the budgetary means to implement it are readily available. In the meantime those appropriations are effectively frozen.

In the above context the Commission takes the view that its budgetary requests for 1984 as regards Turkey are fully in line with the statements it has made on financial aid to that country. As regards the evolution of the political situation in Turkey, particularly the restoration of a genuine democratic system, the Commission continues to follow events in Turkey with the closest attention. At the appropriate time the institutions of the Community will need to reassess their relations with Turkey in the light of these events. But may I reiterate that the Commission believes that a fully representative democratically elected government in Turkey is an essential requirement for sound relations between that country and the Community.

Mr Kazazis (PPE). — (*GR*) I thank the Commissioner for the explanations he has given us. Nevertheless, I would like to ask the Commission for its opinion about the conditions under which elections are to take place in Turkey on 6 November 1983, granted that nearly every day the press all over Europe reports facts showing that arrests of political personalities are continuing, newspapers are being closed down, and that no political parties may be founded except for three, among which one is led by a Turkish general, and the other two by former members of the military government?

Does the Commission feel that such conditions constitute a democratic framework which will ensure democratic procedures and free elections that fulfil the prerequisites set by the Commission for the continuation of financial aid to Turkey?

Mr Richard. — I think that if one thing is clear, it is that it is premature today to make a judgment upon elections which have not yet taken place. It is perfectly clear that the elections are going to change the situation in Turkey. Once they have been held, the Commission's position on their validity will be established within the framework of close consultation with the other institutions of the Community. May I just say, however, that I think the Commission's position on the imprisonment of both politicians and trade unionists inside Turkey has, on numerous occasions, been made perfectly clear. I do not think I need reiterate it today.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (*GR*) I am surprised at the equivocation of the Commissioner's answer. Does he then believe that under these conditions there can be elections that will lead to democracy in Turkey? Is the Commission aware that in Turkey there are continual arrests, torture, trials and death sentences passed on patriots? Where are the conditions that could generate the sort of democracy the Community could support?

¹ See Annex II.

Mr Richard. — I do not think it is in the least equivocal to say that until the elections have been held it is premature to come to a judgement upon them. If that is equivocation, then I can only say that I plead guilty to it.

Mrs Hoff (S). — (DE) Madam President, the Third Community Financial Protocol with Turkey remains suspended, as a result of a decision taken by this House. I should like to ask Commissioner Andriessen two questions in this context. Firstly, what induced the Commission, in spite of the above-mentioned decision, to pencil in a provision for expenditure in this area in the 1984 budget? Will the funds continue to remain blocked, even in the event of an actual provision of 10 million ECU in the 1984 budget?

Mr Richard. — I am afraid I am not Commissioner Andriessen, but perhaps I can try and answer the questions that were put. As I said in my initial answer, the Commission has consistently adopted the position that contractual commitments to Turkey have to be honoured, and it is from that principle that a number of the actions which I think the honourable lady is asking about have, in fact, flowed.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 70 will be answered in writing.¹ Question No 71, by Mrs Phlix (H-261/83):

On 10 June 1983, the Commission adopted a number of proposals to promote a balanced policy for solid fuels providing, *inter alia*, for a cutback in Community production of some 40 million tonnes a year, representing 15% of current output.

To what extent does the Commission intend, in the event of the closure of mines considered to be non-competitive, to meet the demand for coal by means of additional imports or stepping up Community production and what is the Commission's position on the Community's increasing dependence on coal supplied by non-Member States?

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) The question put by Mrs Phlix contains a misunderstanding. The Commission does not intend to cut back on Community production by some 40 million tonnes a year. In the document of 10 June it in fact indicates that some 40 million tonnes of coal are mined under very uncertain financial conditions, i.e. at a loss, and that is a factor which must be taken into account. At the same time, the Commission document provides for the possible development of the Community's domestic production where this offers the best economic prospects and possibilities.

¹ See Annex II.

As for the more general question of dependence in this field, we must of course realize that today the coal market is highly diversified, that supplies can come from very different sources and that the question of security of supplies does not therefore arise in the same way for coal as for other energy products.

Mrs Phlix (PPE). — (NL) I am surprised that this question should arise from a misunderstanding. If that is the case, we cannot but be pleased. Nevertheless, it is clear that output in the Community at present amounts to 240 million tonnes as compared to the projected 270 million tonnes. My question is this: Why is it that the policy on the coal sector is not achieving the objective that was set? I know that this problem is being discussed at great length in the Committee on Energy and Research, where the document mentioned will also be considered. Perhaps it would be a good thing to await the outcome of this discussion before going into the subject in greater depth. But I would point out to the Commission that the constant changes in the policy options for the coal sector, a very difficult sector, have an adverse effect on productivity. Productivity cannot, after all, be changed overnight. Nor do they stimulate the consumption of coal. Otherwise, I believe it would be wise to await the detailed report now being considered by the Committee on Energy and Research.

Mr Davignon. — (FR) I agree with Mrs Phlix. I think this is a question which will be discussed in great detail by the Energy Commission.

May I simply repeat three points: firstly, when we spoke of 40 million tonnes, we were referring to the capacities mined at the greatest loss in the Community; that is a statement of fact, not the setting of an objective; secondly; coal consumption in the Community was not in line with the forecasts, which is why we had to adjust the objectives; the market plays its part here and, moreover, since we want to increase the share of coal in our energy production, we remain in favour of measures to encourage the use of coal; thirdly, it is clear that the adjustments must be made over a period of several years, to give security to both producers and consumers.

Mr Marshall (ED). — Would the Commissioner not agree that keeping open uneconomic pits merely results in higher costs and the creation of unemployment in the Community's export industries?

Mr Davignon — (FR) The Commission's document is perfectly clear. It points out that the utility of Community coal production is also linked to the capacity to produce this coal economically, for a whole host of reasons. The honourable Member gave some of them but they are not the only ones.

President. — Question Time is now closed.¹

¹ See Annex II.

IN THE CHAIR : MR KLEPSCH

*Vice-President*4. *Votes*¹*Spinelli report (Doc. 1-575/83 — European Union)*

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) I wish to raise a procedural matter, and it is genuinely procedural so please do not cut me short as you so often do.

A serious matter arises, which I also mentioned this morning, in connection with the debate on the Spinelli proposal. Council has not been invited by Parliament to take part in the debate, in the person of its President, the Greek Minister for Foreign Affairs, who is here today. I think this is a very serious omission.

Firstly, because the Spinelli report refers to Council itself and to its perspectives, and we cannot be left unaware of Council's position.

Secondly, because there were lengthy interventions by the Commission, indeed twice, from Mr Thorn and Mr Andriessen.

Thirdly, because in all major debates throughout the previous, West German presidency, we used to invite Mr Genscher and his colleagues and listen to what they had to say at length.

So why has the Greek presidency not been invited to express Council's position? This fact leads us to suspect that the omission is part of an attack by various circles in the Community against the Greek presidency, an attack indeed — and I don't think this is symptomatic — which coincides with the forthcoming visit of the President of the Republic of Greece, Mr Constantine Karamanlis, to Strasbourg. Mr President, from this standpoint I think the presidency is at fault and owes us an explanation.

President. — The Council is always given the floor whenever it asks for it. It has not asked for it. Even in the discussions we had with the Council concerning the agenda, it did not express any wish to give its views here. I take note therefore of the point you have just made, and nobody in the House would have objected if the Council had wanted to make its views known. It did not, however, wish to do so.

Paragraph 1 — Amendment No 143

President. — On paragraph 1 I have Amendment No 143 by Mr von der Vring. The Committee on Institutional Affairs considers this amendment inadmissible. I am broadly in agreement with this opinion, but we must first ask the rapporteur for his views.

Mr Spinelli (COM), coordinating rapporteur. — (IT) The manner in which resolutions are voted on is laid down in the Rules of Procedure of this Parliament and may not be amended within the actual text of a resolution.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, in essence Rule 31 of our Rules of Procedure governs the voting procedure on amendments to the Treaties. I bow to the contention of the Committee on Institutional Affairs precluding recourse to this rule. This does not, however, resolve the question as to how Parliament is to vote on a constituent act — and that is something which lies within its discretion. It must first resolve this issue.

It is universally accepted in all parliaments throughout the world that when a parliament elevates itself to the level of a constituent assembly its voting on constituent acts requires a changed quorum. Irrespective of your rejecting my proposal the Bureau has no right to prevent us from voting on a procedural recommendation where this aspect has not been resolved. We have acquired a right in this instance and the question as to how that right is to be treated must be capable of being put to the vote in this plenary part-session.

President. — Mr von der Vring, I will do as you request. The Chair also naturally takes the view that the House should be allowed to decide this matter, if that is what it wants. All I would like to say to you on that score is that the Rules of Procedure do not provide for this manner of proceeding ...

(Interruption: They do not forbid it either!)

... and that the text of the legislation relating to the institutions does not yet exist.

(Parliament rejected Mr von der Vring's request)

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, may I ask you to put it on record that I protest against this decision. I feel that it has infringed my rights.

*(On a proposal from the Socialist Group the President, having consulted Parliament, suspended the sitting for 45 minutes, from 6.35 p.m. to 7.20 p.m.)**Aigner report (Doc. 1-604/83 Christmas butter)*

Mr Curry (ED), Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. — I have been instructed by my committee to ask that this report be referred back to the appropriate committee, because when the author of this report asked that the agenda should be changed at the beginning of this week, in doing so he pre-empted the opinion which the Committee on Agriculture was due to give and which it had already scheduled on the agenda for its Tuesday meeting. As we were then unable to express our opinion before this House, and as, I think I am right in saying, the majority opinion in the committee was likely to have been contrary to what Mr Aigner would have preferred, I think the only reasonable way to escape from what is a difficult

¹ See Annex I.

Curry

constitutional position, and to regularize it, would be to give a month's respite and to pass this report back to the appropriate committee: it can then come before this parliament in due and proper form.

So, on behalf of my Committee, I move that this report be sent back to the committee from which it came.

Mr Aigner (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, the Committee on Agriculture adopted a position as long ago as last year. It has spent hours going over it. The real intention underlying their request is that of thwarting the motion adopted unanimously by the Committee on Budgetary Control. A further delay would be fatal, and would deprive the Commission of the wherewithal to set the relevant machinery in motion. I therefore ask the House to reject this request.

(Applause)

(Parliament rejected the request for referral back to committee)

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — In his report Mr Aigner suggests that the Community should make available by Christmas this year at least 150 thousand tonnes of butter to a 2 kilo plus 1 kilo free programme. The Commission, of course, recognizes the political attraction of the initiative. Without commenting on the vexed question of the level of efficiency of any such measure in terms of surplus disposal, it would draw the attention of the House to the fact that neither the ordinary budget nor the draft supplementary budget was drawn up with provision for this programme. Were the programme to be implemented in 1983, the cost to this year's budget would be at least 500 m ECU. Consequently, Mr Aigner's suggestion could only be implemented if either credits in addition to those requested in the draft supplementary budget were to be made available or other forms of intervention activity in the agricultural sector were to be suspended in order to release the necessary appropriations.

On these grounds the Commission has to advise strongly against this option.

(The sitting was closed at 8.25 p.m.)

¹ Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.

ANNEX I

Votes

The Report of Proceedings records in an annex the rapporteur's position on the various amendments as well as explanations of vote. For details of the voting the reader is referred to the Minutes of the sitting.

SPINELLI REPORT (DOC. 1-575/83 — EUROPEAN UNION): adopted

The rapporteur was :

- IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1, 2, 6, 8 to 11, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 25 to 27, 29, 42, 46, 57, 59, 66, 73, 76, 89, 92, 101, 103, 105, 106, 112, 115, 116, 119, 122, 124, 125, 127, 134, 136 to 140, 142, 146, 151 (1st part), 152, 167, 177, 179, 180 (1st sentence), 182, 184/rev., 185 and 186 ;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 7, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, 28, 30 to 41, 43 to 45, 47 to 56, 58, 60 to 65, 67 to 72, 74, 75, 77 to 88, 91, 93 to 100, 102, 104, 107 to 110, 113, 114, 118, 120, 123, 129, 131 to 133, 135, 141, 144, 145, 147 to 150, 153 to 166, 168 to 171, 173, 174, 176, 178/rev., 181 and 183.

Explanations of vote

Mr Glinne (S). — (FR) The Socialist Group regards the question of institutional revival and reform as too important for anyone to hold out prospects of dangerous electoral utopias or harbour inflated hopes about it. European integration and progress towards European Union must be a reasoned act of faith, based on mutual respect by the political groups, without any of them trying to monopolize Europe: Europe will belong to everyone, or else it will not exist!

(Applause)

The majority of the Socialist Group wants the work to proceed smoothly at the level of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, before and after the ups and downs of the elections. It is in that spirit that it will vote very definitely by a majority, for the Spinelli report and the resolution ...

(Applause)

while regretting that a large number of its amendments were rejected.

(Applause)

Mr Bangemann (L). — (DE) It is only to be expected that a task on this scale and one which contains such a wealth of detailed recommendations should meet with less than one hundred per cent approval all round. This is self evident. Of greater import is Parliament's capacity, despite differences on individual questions, to muster a convincing majority in favour of the further development of the Community.

(Applause)

We cannot indict the Council for allowing narrow national interests to prevail in the decision-making procedure, while doing precisely the same ourselves. We must be capable of giving a lead.

(Applause)

I am delighted that the Socialist Group has brought itself to adopt this majority decision. By the way, my dear friend Ernest, no Liberal ever said 'L'Europe sera Libérale ou elle ne sera pas'. We always felt that Socialists too had a role to play in Europe ...

(Heckling)

... but I am rejoiced that you have taken the liberty of correcting what another Socialist once said.

In our group there are but two members — two Danes — who will be abstaining, not because they take issue with the contents but rather because they have reservations about the procedure. With this exception, the Liberal and Democratic Group will be voting as a bloc in favour of the motion.

(Applause)

Mr Barbi (PPE). — *(IT)* I should like to express my satisfaction with what Mr Glinne has said, and to repeat that, even though it has not had all its amendments accepted, the Group of the European People's Party will vote unanimously in favour of this resolution, and will do so in the conviction that it constitutes a decisive step forward towards that more complete, more nearly perfect European unity to which we all aspire.

(Applause)

Sir Henry Plumb (ED). — During the debate that took place prior to the voting marathon this afternoon many members of my group made it perfectly clear that they are seriously concerned that the Community is not equipped with the decision-making procedures adequate to the many challenges which it faces. We support as much as anyone else in this House the case for reform, especially in the context of the Community's impending enlargement. The fact that there have been so many reports and so little action is itself a serious reflection on the state of our Community.

I hope that Members will agree that our approach to this exercise in committee has been consistently constructive and realistic. I congratulate the many rapporteurs and the members of the Committee on Institutional Affairs on the work that they have done and on their endeavours to try to reach a common agreement.

I should like to concentrate for one moment on just one aspect of this very long report, namely, majority voting. My group cannot feel that the way in which the Community's institutions have handled the British budget problem in particular, or the recent fisheries dispute, offers any justification at all for the surrender of those national safeguards enshrined in the Luxembourg Compromise. Accordingly, although we cannot give wholehearted support to a report which recommends a return to majority voting, we are not going to vote against it. We feel confident that in making this stand we are fully in line with the majority opinion, particularly in our two countries. Denmark and Britain, thus helping this Parliament to discharge one of its proper functions, that of being representative.

For these reasons my colleagues will be abstaining in the final vote. However, I want to support what Mr Glinne, Mr Barbi and, in particular, Mr Bangemann said and to assure this House that my group will continue to approach the question of institutional reform in a constructive and a practical spirit, since we firmly believe that this, above all, is what the Community really needs.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mrs Hammerich (CDI). — *(DA)* We shall vote against the Spinelli report because it is illegal and ominous. If it is brought to fruition, democracy will be finished as we know it in our country. I am certain that the Folketing will reject this plan, but I deplore the fact that in June the government endorsed another Union plan in Stuttgart. It was wrong of the Common Market Committee of the Folketing to give the green light for it; it was wrong in particular of the Social Democrats, the Kristeligt Folkeparti (Christian People's

Party) and De Radikale (the Radicals). One should never give way on Union. Mr Spinelli writes that the Union plan is to be the basis for the European elections in 1984. Well in that case, the outcome in Denmark is certain. Only 10 % want union, because we abhor regimentation and compulsion and because we have already had enough EEC interference, for example, economic directives on how hard to make our cutbacks. The unemployed know that they have nothing to gain from the Community — far from it. Even the farmers are not faring well. What do we want with Union? More and more people in my country are seeking another way for Denmark, whether the Community becomes a Union, lurches from crisis to crisis or falls apart altogether. We want a nordic way. It will be this settlement of accounts with the Community which will be the focus of the European elections next summer, not Mr Spinelli's Union fantasies.

Mr Forth (ED). — This debate and vote are surely about how to promote and advance the European cause. In seeking to do that, we are faced with two clear choices. One is the very unglamorous and difficult task of getting down to the day-to-day job of monitoring what happens in this Community in terms of the internal market, the budget, the CAP and enlargement and trying to get it to work. That is one way of doing it, and it is our job as a Parliament to seek to do just that.

The other approach is to seek refuge in portentous and wordy documents which express high ideals but contain no guidance whatsoever as to how they are going to be attained and, worse, will tend to separate this Parliament yet further from the people that it seeks to represent. If we try to go in a direction in which we are not supported by national parliaments or by our people, then we are going to endanger the future of the Community and not help it.

It is for these reasons that I am unable to support this report. It seeks to substitute activity for action and is a sure recipe for yet further disillusionment in the Community that we are trying to advance and to help forward. With regret therefore I must say that I will join the rest of my colleagues in abstaining in the vote on this.

Mr Bournias (PPE). — (*GR*) Without maintaining that the preliminary draft Treaty on the foundation of the European Union by Mr Spinelli and his collaborators solves the problems that have long preoccupied us, I say that it has many good points and I shall therefore support it with my vote, confident that in this way I am helping the Community to acquire a political presence commensurate with its unlimited economic potential. Its good points include its moderation, which will enable the Community to overcome the present crisis, to establish a true political cooperation, and to implement the proposals that Parliament has repeatedly voiced, especially its resolution of 12 April 1983.

Mr President, I should like to hope that a large majority in favour of our new draft Treaty will constitute the best possible memorial to the great visionary and co-founder of the EEC, Robert Schuman, who died 20 years ago this year.

Mr Nordman (L). — (*FR*) There is still a wide gap between the pragmatism of the founding fathers of Europe and the juristic, not to say systematic spirit which at times weighs heavily on some aspects of the text proposed to us. But the discussion as a whole, and in particular the greater flexibility introduced by some very important amendments, have allayed most of our concern and make the text much less of a straitjacket and more of a framework and, to quote the words of a philosopher, 'an instrument which promotes motion in order to go farther'. That is why I think we must look at it much more as reflecting a desire for unity and as an act of faith than as the letter of a treaty, and must vote resolutely in favour of it.

Mr Luster (PPE). — (*DE*) The comments which follow are being made on behalf of Mr Pfennig and others within my group as well as myself. We support the motion for a resolution of the Committee on Institutional Affairs. We are, in particular, grateful to Mr Spinelli for his courageous and steadfast initiative on the reform of the European Community.

(*Applause*)

The committee's motion clearly embraces the maximum consensus at the time. We would have welcomed a bolder approach.

(Applause)

We would like to contribute towards a greater degree of textual clarity and homogeneity and we would like to make a tangible contribution towards the promotion of European unification. We want to attain the federal state of European Union.

(Applause)

That is why we intend to lose no time in presenting, upon completion of the voting, a model draft constitution. It is the culmination of several years' work and has been available, in all official Community languages, for some weeks now (Doc. 1-653/83). We have delayed its publication in order to avoid confusion and misunderstanding in the course of the present debate. While the text presented by the Committee on Institutional Affairs endeavoured to come up with transitional solution, our paper has been drawn up with its sights on the end-state to which the European unification efforts will give rise. Framed in 90 articles our paper consists of 10 cardinal points: a catalogue of inviolable basic rights, government answerable to parliament, full financial autonomy and individual competence in defence matters as well as the immediate selection of a territory in which the union institutions would be established, are just some of the points contained in our paper. The paper should act as an additional catalyst in forging European unification.

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti (PPE). — *(IT)* The resolution on which this Parliament is about to vote substantially legitimizes its presence on the European political scene. It represents the start of a serious debate between the political powers, the governments and the national parliaments. They have all to choose between the decline or the progress of the Community spirit. Political unity requires a European Government, a European spirit, a European culture and a common economic policy, and, in consequence, a common currency. Finally, it needs institutions with a greater capacity for taking decisions, starting with the European Parliament itself. By redefining the powers of the Community institutions this Parliament is starting a new process, and is performing a constituent function.

The citizens of Europe are in agreement with us. They wish to live in greater security in this scientific society. They ask for employment and tranquility. They want to live in peace, and they want the European Parliament to be a responsive political instrument, capable of taking decisions. By following this line we shall be carrying on the work of the founders of Europe, de Gasperi, Schuman and Adenauer.

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* Like the other members of the Liberal Group, I shall vote in favour of the motion for a resolution, and I thank Mr. Spinelli for his initiative. I will vote for it for the reasons set out by our chairman and which are basically that it gives us an opportunity to demonstrate our resolve to strengthen the Community and to mobilize public opinion in our countries in order to give a new impetus to Europe.

However, I would also like to express some reservations on my own behalf and on that of the French members of the Liberal Group.

I regret that Amendment No 110 by Lady Elles was not retained, not because I think we should maintain the unanimity rule in the Council — on the contrary I believe that is a very urgent problem which we must resolve as soon as possible given the present state of the Community, and I would go so far as to say that it is perhaps the essential problem.

Yet I think the proposal which is defended in the resolution we will be voting on is perhaps not the most appropriate one and that consideration should have been given to ways which might perhaps have enabled us to get out of this impasse. That is the only point — or rather the most important point — on which we express reservations.

(Applause)

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED). — I regret I cannot support this resolution, because I believe it to be wildly unrealistic to be proposing wide-ranging constitutional changes involving the sacrifice by individual countries of powers to protect their own interests at a time when such major issues as the Community's finances, the open-ended spending on the agricultural policy and the problems of enlargement still have to be faced — none of which problems would be solved by riding roughshod over the interests of any individual nation that is affected.

Moreover, I believe the stance taken up by the leaders of the three political groups who are going to support this resolution is incompatible with the view which they themselves take when Parliament is asked to consider such matters as the annual farm price review.

I do not think that the proposals contained in this report would command the support of the governments of the member nations or of our people. I respect the idealism of the authors of this report, but there is no point in this Parliament trying to give a lead to the people of the Community in which we so distance ourselves from the people who have sent us here that we are out of their sight. They do not know in which direction we are going and they are not able to signal to us that they want us to change direction. I consider this recommendation would be divisive within the Community; it is ill-timed and ill-judged, and I shall join my group in abstaining.

Mr Hord (ED). — I am afraid that I myself will be unable to support the Spinelli report. I believe the proposals to be utopian, futuristic and irrelevant to the current needs of the Community.

I am by profession a chartered surveyor concerned with land and buildings. But I am sure it does not need me to tell this House that to build a house on a bad foundation will mean that that structure will not last long. The same is, I am sure, true of institutions — and true of this European Community. I suggest that we have a bad foundation. We know that the internal market is in disarray; we know that the agricultural policy is fast bankrupting the Community; we know that the system of budget contributions is patently inequitable. I am afraid that the Spinelli report does nothing for these urgent problems and I sincerely believe that if the supporters of the Spinelli report really do wish to build the New Jerusalem, they should cast aside this report and tackle, not shirk, these urgent and vital issues which confront us all. On that basis I regret that I cannot support the proposals and shall abstain.

Mr Prag (ED). — I have worked for European Union for more years than I care to remember. I signed the first Crocodile Club document and I have supported the Spinelli initiative throughout.

Although I do not believe that every paragraph of this draft Treaty of European Union is perfect, I want to make it clear that I am personally strongly in favour of it.

(Applause)

Member governments and some Members of this House cannot go on complaining that the Community works imperfectly and ineffectually and at the same time reject every attempt to find ways of making its decision-taking process effective.

(Applause)

As one of the rapporteurs, I believe it is my duty, and I owe it to this House, to say that I am in favour of this report. As spokesman of my group on the Committee on Institutional Affairs, however, I must be bound by its decision on this final vote. That is the reason why, with deep regret and reluctance, I shall be abstaining, and I wanted this House and Altiero Spinelli to know why it was.

Mrs Bonino (CDI). — *(IT)* The Secretary of my Party is detained in Rome on parliamentary business, but this explanation of vote is also made on his behalf. The members of the Radical Party will also in the future support this resolution, making it a basic part of the

electoral campaign next year. The reasons why we support the motion have already been expressed in this morning's speech, but I would just like to add that I consider that this resolution is of itself sufficient — provided it is effectively supported in these next months, and in the stages that are indicated by the resolution itself — to justify the whole existence of the Parliament that was elected by the peoples of Europe.

This resolution undoubtedly has its limitations ; it is perhaps timid in some parts, but this is due to the need to find compromises , so as to allow a large majority to approve this resolution. Frankly, I do not understand those members who complain that the European Parliament has no power, and cannot exercise its own functions, and so on, and then vote against the first attempt — which is probably too timid — to create this European Union. For this first true and possibly late attempt, we must be grateful to Mr Spinelli, to the Chairman of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, Mr Ferri, and to all those who have worked for and supported this resolution in recent months.

(Applause)

Mr Petersen (S). — *(DA)* The Danish Social Democrats are in favour of European cooperation, but we are against a political union and we are against the abolition of the right of veto. Danish membership of the Community is unthinkable if the right of veto is abolished. We are therefore against the Spinelli report and all 'spinelleries'.

We are also opposed to the Spinelli report because it is utterly unrealistic. It is wishful thinking. It is a collection of political pipedreams. Up in the cold north we do not have many legal difficulties in the union context. But how do things stand with other countries, which talk much of Europe but have had various cases before the Court of Justice and have failed to give effect to its rulings ?

We do not talk so much, we do not like grand speeches, we are more for cooperation on a sound basis. We therefore regard this report as damaging. It diverts attention from the important issues, it diverts attention from the crisis and the serious problems we are faced with in Europe, and it detracts from the reputation of this House. It will be a new Union comet, which shoots across the European firmament. It will be a shooting star which leaves no trace, for all these ideas will be torpedoed by the Council of Ministers — at least as long as Denmark is a member of the Community.

Mrs Focke (S). — *(DE)* The Social Democrats in the European Parliament reaffirm their willingness to contribute to an ever-increasing unification of the peoples of Europe over and above that envisaged in the Treaties and, with this aim in mind, they are putting forward constructive proposals in all areas, including the institutional. We regret that, once again, the motion for a resolution under discussion today fails to focus sufficient attention on what is necessary at present — the democratization of the Community, a balanced interplay of its institutions and cooperation both among the latter and between the Community and Member States. We deplore the failure of the work undertaken hitherto to find a suitable degree of compromise which has, we feel, resulted in an incomplete report and once which, in the aftermath of today's vote, will probably embody an even more contradictory concept.

We welcome the acceptance of some of our constructive proposals and hope that further discussion and elaboration of the text will be possible. We have the conviction that common sense will prevail and will, in conjunction with the adoption of some of our motions, eliminate contradictions. To demonstrate our good will towards Europe we can say at the present stage, if with some reservations, yes !

(Applause)

Mr Almirante (NI). — *(IT)* After the brilliant speech by Mr Romualdi, and after the acceptance of some of our amendments by the Committee and the Chamber, I have nothing to add in explanation of our vote supporting this report — supporting, that is, a serious commitment to the construction of Europe. I just want to explain the significance of our supporting vote, from the quantitative and qualitative standpoints.

There are four of us in this Parliament, but, Mr President, bearing in mind the recent results of the Italian elections, we represent at least two and a half million electors and, according to all the opinion polls, that number is at present tending to increase. From the qualitative point of view, our supporting vote is of special significance, because it comes from a political force that is labelled and considered as nationalist, or even hyper-nationalist. Well now, our nationalism, the nationalism of Italians who think as we do, is the nationalism of Europe: our fatherland, in political, social and cultural terms, is Europe. Certainly not because we, of all people, can forget or neglect our Italian fatherland, but because neither the Italian fatherland nor the fatherlands of other European countries are served by those citizens who shut themselves away in forms of selfishness that in appearance can be justified as national selfishness but which, in reality, are the selfishness of party or of movement. Someone said, in explaining his own vote against the motion, that Europe as a nation is a spent myth. That is not true. There are two spent myths: the myth of more or less splendid isolation, and the myth of the pseudo-ideological, for the most part party-dominated or downright speculative 'internationals'.

That, Mr President, is the partly augural meaning of our vote. On the eve of the new European elections, we are voting for the Europe of the young, the Europe of the future.

Mr Skovmand (CDI). — *(DA)* Many rapporteurs have contributed to the Spinelli report, but they all have one thing in common: an almost abject enthusiasm for anything that is great and mighty. The mere fact of a sufficiently large number of big countries joining together in some venture will lead to something good. It was the same empire-building compulsion which drove the Roman emperors, Charlemagne and Napoleon. It is a clear denial of the very essence of democracy — diversity and plurality. When everything has to be centrally controlled and unified, there is no room for trials and experiments. The proposal is especially serious for a small country such as Denmark, which does not have the brute strength of the big countries to say no to what does not suit them. If the Spinelli report becomes a reality, Denmark's existence as an independent democratic State will be at an end. I therefore intend to vote against it. The only good thing to say about the proposal is that it goes as far as it does. Let us hope that it will make everybody in Denmark see that the European Community is not just about economies, it is about politics, and that Denmark, if it is to survive, must withdraw from the Community, to which it never really belonged and of which it should never have been a member.

Mr Bonde (CDI). — *(DA)* I wish to say something about the vote among the Danish Members. While we are devoting millions of kroner to the discussion of far-reaching plans for Union, unemployment is increasing. The total number of persons out of work in Denmark has increased from 9 922 in June 1973 to 256 712 in June 1983. In the largest of the country's trade unions, Specialarbejderforbundet (Semi-skilled Workers' Union), the number of members out of work has increased from 2 825 to 54 779. That is the reality after 10 years of membership of the Community, which was presented as a guarantee of full employment. I wonder if the majority of the unemployed might not prefer secure jobs to European Union? In Denmark we have had opinion polls on Community membership. Ten per cent of Danes are in favour of Union, and even in the party keenest on the idea, Det konservative Folkeparti (Conservative People's Party), only 22.5 % support European Union. In all the other parties, support is even less strong. Now that Erhard Jakobsen has set off for home, I call upon all members of the Venstre Party's group at least to abstain in the vote, so that we can all go back home and say: not a single Dane voted for Mr Spinelli's report on European Union.

Mrs Castle (S). — The British Labour Group cannot vote for this report, because it is part of a stubborn and continuing attempt to transform the Community from a voluntary association of sovereign States freely coming together to achieve certain clearly defined aims into a fully-fledged political and economic union under a federal government in which all members would lose control over their protection of their own vital national interests. One example stands out: in paragraph 35 of the report, which says that the Commission shall define the economic policy guidelines, objectives and possibly measures of Member States, particularly in the budgetary field. What that means is the imposed harmonization of our taxation policies and therefore of our social service poli-

cies. In Britain it means the extension of value-added tax to fields like food and essentials which the British people would never vote for voluntarily, and in this situation I say abstention is not enough; it merely encourages the Spinelli brigade to come back at it again — wait a little bit, it is surrender! That is a surrender we must vote against.

(Applause)

Mr Saby (S) — *(FR)* We French Socialists have already stated our devotion to this Europe, from its foundation to the present day. We would have liked and would like to vote for this report. Alas, we find that a number of amendments — more than half of them — were rejected by this Assembly and that, instead, new amendments were introduced, which means that this institutional tool will make it possible to do a bit of everything.

I want to say that we too stressed the need to resolve the practical problems of today. I have just heard one of my erstwhile colleagues say that he is happy to see that a new spirit is once again blowing through Europe. I would say that unfortunately the Treaty of Rome was also a spirit and that it did not manage to extinguish the blaze of unemployment or to make us agree on practical everyday policy. That is why we think we need concordance between words and deeds. As far as words are concerned and the generosity characteristic of this Parliament, we are in favour. But the deeds are far from satisfying us. And when I see that the proposals put forward by my country, relating to simple practical procedures — for instance the extension of the ECU — are rejected by those who are voting for this text today, I say that those people are impeding the progress towards Europe and slowing down European unification. In the current circumstances, in view of the real situation, we cannot vote for the report. That is why we will abstain.

Mr Johnson (ED). — I am strongly in favour of this proposal for precisely the reasons why Barbara Castle is opposed to it. A group decision to abstain binds members who might otherwise, like me, vote for it. It also binds those, and perhaps there are more of them on this side of the House, who might otherwise vote no. It is therefore in the interests of obtaining the largest possible majority for the Spinelli resolution that I shall vote with my group.

(Laughter and applause)

Mr Spinelli (COM), *Co-ordinating rapporteur*. — *(FR)* I shall try very briefly to explain, by a parable, the significance of my vote in favour.

You must all know the short story by Hemingway, about an old fisherman who, after catching the biggest fish of his life, tries to get it back to shore. But bit by bit the sharks eat it, so that when the old man returns to shore, all that remains is a skeleton.

Mr. President, with the vote it will take in a few minutes, Parliament will have caught the biggest fish of its life. But it must bring it back into port. So let us be careful, because the sharks will always be there waiting to devour it. Let us try not to return into port with a skeleton.

(Prolonged applause)

Mr Brøndlund Nielsen (L). — *(DA)* On a point of order, Mr President, I wish to protest that you did not deter Mr Bonde from pursuing a Danish domestic political debate, to which the rest of us cannot reply, and naming and personally attacking colleagues who are not present and who cannot answer. You should have intervened.

Mr Adamou (COM), *in writing*. — *(GR)* Listening to Mr Spinelli setting out the proposals of the Committee on Institutional Affairs for European Union, I was reminded of Mr K. Lascaris, the Greek Minister of Labour in the right-wing government. Much earlier than the Institutional Committee, Mr Lascaris 'abolished' the class war, i.e. the unbridged gab between labour and capital, by law.

Of course, the members of the Institutional Committee are more methodical. They are applying their 'political imagination' and artfulness in gilding the heavy chains that bind working people, and in creating the panacea of a 'United Europe' in which the exploiters and those whom they exploit can live side by side, 'in harmony'.

There is very well known saying that 'capital has no homeland'. Its homeland is wherever it is best able to exploit the workers and make excessive profits. The members of the Institutional Committee, with their institutional shibboleths, are trying to create just such a 'super-homeland' for capital. However, the workers are not going to become the serfs of monopolistic capital, as the Committee's resolution would have it. That is why no matter how many resolutions are adopted, they are all doomed to find their way into the dustbin of history. Europe's working people will in the end frustrate these plans of the monopolies.

We, in fulfilment of our duty to Greek working people, will vote decisively against these schemes of the Institutional Committee.

Mr Beazley (ED), in writing. — It is with regret that I have found it necessary to abstain on the resolution on the substance of the preliminary draft Treaty establishing the European Union. There is no doubt in my mind that it is essential for the European Parliament to take the initiative in reforming the institutions of the Community, as it is clear beyond doubt that lack of political will and political solidarity within the Council of Ministers — matched with inadequate institutional machinery — is at the root of the reasons why the European Community is not the political force in the world which its history, its experience and its resources should make it.

The second Community problem lies in the lack of agreement at the level of the European Council and the Council of Ministers of the kind of Europe which they want the institutions to create.

Now this House today has had to vote on a specific resolution consisting of 142 paragraphs to which 186 amendments have been submitted. We are advised by the resolution's title that it has been submitted as the substance of the preliminary draft Treaty establishing the European Union. In my view this should have been a consultative document.

Few Members of this House might wish to disagree with the preamble to the resolution written by Mr Spinelli, but the substance of the resolution is contained in the subsequent 130 paragraphs.

These cover the whole scope of the Union and are specific to its legal structure, its economy, its policy to society, its international relations, its finances and institutions.

None of these proposals have been submitted to the relevant parliamentary committees for their opinion. How can we therefore commit our constituents and our countries to these detailed propositions after such a short discussion in a single parliamentary debate? No second reading is proposed to deal with the 186 amendments and their effect on the resolution, which will be hard to assess before we vote.

I can agree that this Parliament needs to be courageous, but I submit that it should not be foolhardy — particularly in regard to paragraph 124 where the proposition concerning voting rights does not even reflect fully the detailed proposals of the Genscher/Colombo initiative.

Regretfully, therefore, I must abstain in order not to block this important initiative and to demand that its proposals are more fully discussed in this Parliament's competent committees and carefully weighed before Mr Spinelli's expert drafting committee presents to this House in 1984 a proposition which may be full of vision and expectation but which may not have been submitted to the necessary professional investigation and consideration and agreement processes which this Parliament is designed to give to propositions of much less moment than a European Union.

Mr de Ferranti (ED), in writing. — The most critical decisions that the Community must take as soon as possible relate to the internal market.

These decisions will critically affect customs authorities in the Member States, as well as the processes for deciding on what goods will be allowed to circulate freely in the Community and several other vital matters.

A great deal more needs to be done before the majority voting procedures envisaged by the report could be made to work. Meanwhile, the institutions must concentrate on the details of the vital areas where progress is required to make the internal market operate without the burden of costs imposed by the present residual national requirements.

Miss Forster (ED), in writing. — I wish to record that although I abstained in the vote on the Spinelli resolution, I fully support the spirit of the resolution and I regret the slowness with which we are moving towards a truly common approach to our problems. It is obvious that there are many things which are better done at Community level than on a national basis, but to do this we need agreement on financing and on institutional reform. The wording set out in the motion for a resolution is not satisfactory as it stands, and I hope that the draft treaty which is subsequently produced will be more acceptable.

Mr Gendebien (CDI), in writing. — (FR) I voted for the Spinelli motion for a resolution because of the undoubted impetus it will give to European construction.

Nonetheless I regret that the resolution neglects one aspect, namely the organization of a Europe of the regions.

Mr Israël (EPD), in writing. — (FR) This is really an explanation of 'non-vote'. I do in fact agree with the analysis made by the political group to which I belong and which has decided not to take part in the vote for the reasons eloquently set out by Mr de la Malène.

I would like, however, to add a few personal comments in support of our view. The preliminary draft Treaty seems far too detailed to me. It leaves no room for action by the governments of the Ten, far less for action by the various national parliaments. It looks like a 'take it or leave it' text. True, in the rapporteur's view, this document is perfectible. But in reality it goes into such detail that it risks putting off those who will have to consider it subsequently in the European Parliament.

I would have preferred a kind of 'outline treaty' which defined the overall guidelines wanted by the Strasbourg Assembly, while leaving the implementing procedures open.

That is why I shall not take part in the vote. But that certainly does not mean that I disapprove of the European Parliament's initiative or of the intention underlying the Spinelli report. Nor does it in any way prejudice our attitude when the final text is submitted to the Assembly. By then we will have had time to learn the reaction of the governments and major European political groups.

To Mr Spinelli and Mr Ferri, to our Christian-Democratic colleagues, to the Liberals, to all those who are about to vote for the report, I say 'see you soon, perhaps ... to build a realistic Europe'.

Mr C. Jackson (ED), in writing. — I believe that progress on the institutional problems which prevent our European Community acting effectively to help its people is essential. The economic situation demands action, and I support the decision of this Parliament to take an initiative towards European Union.

While it contains much of great value — in particular the principle of subsidiarity — the resolution before the House contains several points against which I voted and which I feel should not be included in a Treaty. The proposed treatment of respect for vital national interest is, to me, unacceptable, though equally I believe increased majority voting in Council is of great importance.

This is, however, only a preliminary to a consultative draft Treaty. It would be wrong to stop the process of consultation with experts and politicians in Member States which will, I hope, lead to an improved and widely acceptable text. I support the preparation of a consultative draft Treaty.

Mr Kallias (PPE), in writing. — (GR) During the debate on the proposed resolution, I expressed my opinion which is also the position of the New Democracy.

Despite my reservations concerning serious omissions in the draft, certain mistaken directives that I mentioned in what I had to say, and the timid stance on the matter of European defence, especially after the rejection of the EPP amendment (Pfennig, Pflimlin, Seitlinger), I shall vote in favour of the proposed resolution because it is a step towards the unification of Europe, but also because I feel optimistic that the draft Treaty to be drawn up on the basis of the resolution will be better integrated, more daring and more realistic, and will avoid the errors and omissions present in today's resolution.

Mr Kyrkos (COM), in writing. — (GR) The internal Communist Party of Greece is a firm supporter of the ideal of European integration. We regret that our basic amendments were not approved. Perhaps there was not enough time to examine them in detail. Our amendments did not weaken the impulse that the resolution gives towards European Union. They did, however, add guarantees and a number of fruitful ideas, and did away with certain inflexibilities in formalities that may become established to the cost of our peoples — and hence to that of the Union itself. We believe that if they had been adopted, they would have facilitated the tiring but necessary effort to reach a consensus of our peoples that will take account of the realities and of special features.

We shall therefore abstain, hoping in this way to prevail upon Parliament and the responsible organs to study our proposals with greater care. Abstention is not a denial of the path towards integration — it is an incentive towards what we think is a correct and more carefully considered path.

Our amendments, rejected here today by the majority — along with others like them — will certainly turn up again tomorrow as reactions of our national Parliaments. We wanted to be helpful, so that obstacles might be avoided. At any rate, our vote encourages Parliament to take a more global view, and to proceed in a way that will safeguard the just rights of people at all levels of society and respond to the concerns and hopes of our peoples.

Mr Lalor (DEP), in writing. — My group has taken no part in the debate or in the vote on this Spinelli report. This also covered the amendments, whether adopted or rejected. Our chairman, Mr de la Malène, in his contribution at the outset explained the group's reasoning in this regard. He expressed the view, on behalf of all of us, that, while we all favour and earnestly desire improvements in decision-making mechanisms, we nonetheless attach too much importance to the building of a strong Europe to simply vote clinically on this resolution.

However, in view of the fact that in the Institutional Committee I personally voted against the report and resolution, my group has cleared me to vote against it here in the plenary sitting. At committee level, I opposed it under Social and Institution headings, and Ireland's non-membership of NATO, and I am still as opposed to the resolution as I was then. I am very fearful of many of its implications. So I am voting against.

Mr Marshall (ED), in writing. — I am against the Spinelli report, which is idealistic rather than realistic. Those who vote for the Spinelli report may feel emotionally happier, but their votes will do nothing to solve the problems of the Community.

The Spinelli report is 'head in the clouds' philosophy. It is quite out of touch with the opinions of national legislatures or ordinary individuals. As such it will never be implemented.

Everyone accepts that the Community has suffered years of stagnation. But the answer to this problem does not lie in a new Treaty; it lies in the use of the powers given by the original Treaty. It needs a conscious decision to create a genuine common market. It needs a fairer budgetary system based on a longer term solution rather than an annual ill-tempered wrangle.

The European Parliament almost by definition is ahead of European public opinion. However, there is a real danger that by moving too far ahead of public opinion we can create a counter-reaction. I fear that the Spinelli report could have that effect. It will, if adopted, be manna to anti-marketeters. I shall, therefore, be voting against it.

Mr Newton Dunn (ED), in writing. — I am strongly in favour of the motion on European Union — but am abstaining out of loyalty to my political group, and because, in the belief that there are more members in my group who are opposed than in favour, my individual abstention eliminates two or even more votes which would otherwise have been cast against the resolution.

Mr Normanton (ED), in writing. — I abstained in the vote on the Spinelli report, not because I disagree with the objectives but because the Community as presently constituted has failed to use the existing institutions and the Treaties. The responsibility for this lies with people and political leaders in particular at the level of Member States. To seek a solution in new institutions, new instruments and new procedures is a delusion which this House should not indulge in or promote.

I draw on the wisdom and vision of Sir Winston Churchill who in 1949 called upon Europe to unite — if our peoples wished to survive. He also declared that Europe would not be created by a blueprint, but by the processes of evolution.

I wish to see the creation of a 'totally integrated Europe'. Without it no single State can hope to survive the growing political and economic forces in the world which are inexorably rising against us. We can achieve this objective with our present Community if we only have the wit and the will to use the institutions we have.

Mr O'Donnell (PPE), in writing. — Subject to the reservations expressed by my colleague Mr Ryan, I intend to vote for the Spinelli Report because I believe that we are now on the way to recognizing the importance of transferring adequate resources to the weaker regions of the Community.

It must be borne in mind that the basic and most fundamental weakness and indeed failure of the Community since its establishment a quarter of a century ago has been the failure to tackle the serious problem of worsening regional disparities. In attempting to formulate new policies and new strategies one must first of all be honest and admit that this Community has had one dramatic result to date, and that is that the rich regions of the Community have become richer while the poor regions have become poorer.

If this Community is to survive and if European Union is to be achieved, then it is imperative that the problem of growing regional disparities be tackled as a matter of extreme urgency.

At the moment this Community has no real meaning for the people who belong to it, as long as we tolerate a situation where the people of some regions continue to enjoy a standard of living up to ten times higher than people in the poorest regions.

The formulation and implementation of a coherent Community regional policy designed to transfer resources from the richer to the poorer regions is a *sine qua non* for the achievement of European Union. The regional impact of all the Community financial instruments must be examined and reappraised and steps must be taken to ensure the optimum utilization of these instruments in tackling the enormous problems of regional disparities.

The recent Commission proposals on the CAP, particularly those relating to the milk sector, would mean, if applied, that the Community would cripple Irish agriculture and would have disastrous consequences for the Irish economy. To attempt to impose global solutions to Community problems without taking into account their regional impact would be a mockery of both the letter and spirit of the Treaty of Rome.

A realistic Community regional policy offers the only hope for the survival and progress of the EEC. We just cannot allow the trend of the past quarter of a century to continue during which the rich regions have become richer and the poor regions poorer.

Mr Paisley (NI), in writing. — Mr Spinelli's report and motion for a resolution on the substance of a Treaty to establish a European Union represents another step along the road to organic European unity — an aspiration and a goal which I and those who elected me to this House utterly reject.

The most important and fundamental characteristic of any nation is its national sovereignty and independence to act in the interests of its own citizens. When my own country, the United Kingdom, joined the EEC in 1973, she lost that essential freedom of action to determine and pass laws for herself and to be master of her own destiny. The resolution before the House today, with its emphasis on a united European foreign policy and its weakening of the powers of veto in cases of vital national interest, would further subordinate the interests of the United Kingdom to the interests of foreign powers. This is something to which I am diametrically opposed.

There is no objection in principle to normal, sensible cooperation between neighbouring countries for their mutual benefit. Thus the emphasis should be on encouraging and promoting cooperation in the context of the Council of Europe and NATO which alone can provide for the security needs of Europe. My objection, based on the experience of Northern Ireland, is to forced and contrived cooperation designed purely with one overriding goal in mind, namely, the erosion of the sovereignty of one nation or part of it and its fusion with another.

I shall, therefore, be voting against this motion for a resolution.

Mr Pedini (PPE) in writing. — (IT) I am not abandoning my own personal conviction that it was the fundamental duty of the European Parliament to insist, in every way that was permitted — starting with the use of budgetary powers and the right to 'censure' the executive Commission — on the faithful application of the Community Treaties, from the effects of which, developed with political will, the European Union would already emerge. However I am voting in support of the Committee on Institutional Affairs because, in the eyes of public opinion, governments and parliaments, my doing so acts as a denunciation, which it is our duty to make, of the institutional political crisis that has for too long had the European Community in its grip, and as a clear stimulus to overcome that crisis in a revival of joint political responsibility.

Mr Pintat (L), in writing — (FR) The election of the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage in 1979 inspired great hopes. Many saw it as a means of progress for Europe. When we present ourselves before our electors, they are bound to ask us what we have done for the progress of Europe.

That is why I am very glad to have participated in the discussions which have led to the drafting of the preliminary draft treaty on European Union. I do not agree with all the articles, but I do think this draft represents a compact whole. Edouard Herriot said of the French revolution: you cannot quibble about it: you can only be for or against. The same applies to this treaty: one can only be for or against. As for me, I shall vote in favour, for I am one of those who have been militant in the European movement for more than thirty years and I see the adoption of this text as a step forward in the right direction, that of European Union.

Mr Puletti (S), in writing. — (IT) I shall vote in favour of the resolution presented by the Committee on Institutional Affairs. Anyone who has formed part of that Committee — as I have — has seen the commitment with which all the political groups have designed the Union, from the legal, political economic and social standpoints. I am convinced that by voting in favour of the motion we can start the process that will give Europe adequate unity and political weight in the international context.

As Under-Secretary of the Italian Social Democratic Party I add my vote for a Europe that will overcome the old obstacles of nationalism.

Sir Brandon Rhys Williams (ED), in writing. — I am abstaining in the vote in deference to sincerely-held views of members of my group that opinion in the Community is not yet ready for the significant advances towards a federal Europe which are suggested in the report. I also feel some doubts as to the practicality of some of the recommendations. I would like to place on record, however, that I support the general intentions of the report without any reservations of principle ; and I accept, in particular, that the necessary progress of the Community depends upon the adoption by the Council of the practice of taking decisions by majority vote.

Mr Ryan (PPE), in writing. — My Irish Fine Gael-Christian Democratic colleagues and I will vote in favour of the motion for a resolution, notwithstanding our reservations on, indeed our opposition to, some items in the proposals.

Ireland being a State committed to a policy of neutrality and of non-participation in any military alliance, we are unable to endorse those sections of the draft treaty which contemplate extending the jurisdiction of the European Community into the areas of defence and military security. There are other points upon which we would be in disagreement, such as on the weak and vague clauses dealing with action and funds to improve living standards in Europe's less developed regions.

At the same time the main thrust of the Spinelli resolution is right. Its goal is a stronger, more united, more democratic, more effective and more efficient Europe. It visualizes a parliament with basic democratic powers of controlling and influencing the executive and of making binding laws. This crucial objective is so important that it would be quite wrong to withhold support from the resolution because of disagreement on some aspects or details.

The recommendations of the Committee on Institutional Affairs are not binding. They do not constitute a legal document. They are no more than guidelines to draftsmen of a preliminary draft treaty which, whenever it sees the light of day, will require years of debate, amendment and decision here, in national governments, in national parliaments and in popular referenda before becoming law. There is ample time to correct any blemishes. We are confident that Europe has the capacity and will to move forward without doing harm to any Member State. In that confidence we will vote for the Spinelli report, irrespective of our concern on some points. We will vote 'yes for Europe'.

Mr J. D. Taylor (ED), in writing. — The detailed report and resolution, known as the Spinelli report, which incorporates the draft text of European Union is the greatest threat by the European Parliament to the sovereignty of the United Kingdom since the first direct elections in June 1979. To pretend otherwise or to present the Spinelli report as if it would have no dramatic and lasting implications for the future of the United Kingdom is to deceive the British people.

Paragraph 124 of the report means the transfer of sovereignty from the United Kingdom to Europe. It means that the British people will no longer have the right or constitutional authority to make many of their own fundamental national decisions.

European cooperation is desirable — European federalism would be disastrous for our nation.

When the sovereignty of the United Kingdom is being threatened by the EEC or any other authority outside our nation, I cannot and will not be neutral. On behalf of the British people who elected me to this Parliament I will vote against the Spinelli report and thus be one of those British MEPs who can be counted upon to uphold the interests of the United Kingdom in the European Community. When the sovereignty of the United Kingdom is being challenged I, on behalf of the people of Ulster, am not an abstentionist.

Mrs Theobald-Paoli (S), in writing. — (FR) Everyone acknowledges the need to adapt the European institutions to the challenges generated by the economic crisis and the third industrial revolution, to guarantee, at the level of a whole continent, a maximum of rights and protection of the individual and to strengthen the cohesion between the ten developed Western European countries, which represent a formidable factor of peace. Yet several points in the proposals submitted to us seem dangerous to me. Our reservations go so far as rejection as regards the proposals relating to :

- rediscussing the Treaties.
- abolishing bilateral aid for the Third World countries (and trade with the developing countries becoming the exclusive competence of the Union).
- the powers the Union would have in the field of security and, in particular, defence.
- the accelerated harmonization of the fiscal systems in the ten Community countries.
- the reduction of the powers of the Council.

One of the concerns of the French Socialist Members is to ensure, by not voting in favour of this text, that the European Parliament does not give an unrealistic picture of the prospects for strengthening Europe — and itself.

The unification of a multilingual Europe, which has long been divided by history, which is not entirely united culturally and is disparate in terms of its economies, is a necessary objective if we want to prevent our continent from being dominated by blocs. But if the procedure advocated in the draft treaty submitted by Mr Spinelli were adopted, unification would accelerate at an uncontrolled rate. By trying to go too fast, we would risk very soon provoking international tensions, which would generate conflict and eventually lead to domination from the outside.

While regretting it, we do find that the inhabitants of the Community as it now stands are not yet sufficiently aware of the reality of Europe.

Last year the French Socialists proposed a revival, a modernization an extension of the Community's policies ; they are aware that they can work more effectively for Europe in this way than by proposing a new institutional legal framework. For that will come quite automatically as a result of the pace of development which the Europeans decide they want.

I think such a procedure would be more realistic and effective. That is why the French Socialists will not vote in favour of the Spinelli report.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (CDI), in writing. — (NL) On the one hand, I welcome the report, because it calls for the sphere of activity of the European federal authority to be extended and strengthened : the role of the present nation States must be restricted if Europe itself is to play a role in today's world, as a peace-keeper, the guardian of human rights, as an instrument for breaking the bipolarity of the two power blocs, as a means of creating a social and economic framework within which prosperity and well-being can be ensured.

On the other hand, it is unacceptable that no room at all should be left for a dialogue, let alone guaranteed representation of the regions. An essential aspect of federal Europe is

cynically rejected. It is inconceivable that the Flemish Government or the Corsican Parliament or, in the near future, the Catalan *generalidad* should not even have the right to negotiate directly with the European federal authority.

The construction of Europe is necessary, but it must not be confined to the technocratic building of ivory towers on the Schuman Square in Brussels. Serious thought must be given to the appropriate place of authority, which must be not only supranational but also regional. This is completely brushed aside in the Spinelli report. I shall therefore abstain.

* * *

AIGNER REPORT (DOC. 1-604/83 — CHRISTMAS BUTTER): adopted

The rapporteur was :

— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 6, 8 and 9 ;

— AGAINST Amendments Nos 4, 5, 10, 11 and 12.

Explanations of vote

Mr Moreland (ED). — My group does, of course, support very strongly some of the sentiments in the Aigner report. In this Parliament we have always been extremely keen to ensure that surplus butter is sold within the Community. Indeed, we welcome Mr Aigner's report in that context. Secondly, I welcome the fact that the Committee on Budgetary Control looks for ways in which we can get rid of the surplus butter and looks for imaginative approaches. Thirdly, if I may give a favourable view here, it is my general personal feeling that the Committee on Budgetary Control has over the years, and particularly under the guidance of Mr Aigner, done an extremely good job of looking at ways in which we can reduce expenditure. I have to tell him that that is really my good news. The bad news is that I have to abstain.

I do feel that the particular scheme that is proposed — and I emphasize the particular scheme rather the ideas behind it — has certain dangers. I would suggest from our experience last year that it is perhaps unfair to say that the reason for its lack of success is not simply due to the fact that the scheme was introduced too late. Obviously, there is a danger that if you buy or are given an extra amount of butter in December, you put it into your freezer and you don't buy butter in February and March. Therefore, the danger of this particular scheme is that it will not really add to the consumption of butter over the period. I must say therefore to the House, that I have some doubt about the particular scheme. We would like to see other alternatives like increased subsidies for the confectionery and bakery industry, perhaps a review of the general subsidy on butter in general.

I will have to abstain on this because, while I agree with the sentiments behind it, I cannot agree to the specific scheme. I must therefore support the Commission in its view on this.

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED). — I will be supporting Mr Aigner because I think that this is politically important and charitably desirable. However, I do worry a bit about the poor, the old age pensioners and single persons who may not want so large a quantity of butter all at one time. It may even be that, unlike most Members of this House, they do not have refrigerators to store it until February.

I do suggest therefore to the Commission that if it implements this scheme, it should take into consideration the possibility of introducing coupons that could go with each unit of butter, so that after two purchases a third could be given free, perhaps three weeks later. I think that it is unrealistic to expect some of these poorer people and unemployed and old age pensioners to take on board, if I may use the political phrase, so much butter at one single time.

Mr Eyraud (S). — (FR) That there are butter surpluses is undeniably true, but can the 'Christmas butter' scheme really contribute to absorbing them, and if so, at what price ?

The way we vote must take the following aspects into account : firstly, the Commission representative has just pointed out the heavy cost of this scheme : secondly, last year this scheme led to a marked fall in sales of brand butter ; thirdly, it led to a fall in purchases of normal-price butter during the promotion period ; fourthly — as has just been said — it was very often households with freezers which bought this butter, in order to stockpile it. The inevitable repercussion of households stocking up in this way is a fall in the level of sales after the scheme.

In view of all these adverse effects, on 28 July the Commission proposed extending the industrial uses of butter, raising the levels of fat in milk for human consumption and adding butter fats to animal feedstuffs. These proposals were to be supplemented by a bolder export policy and by the sales promotion of butter for the least favoured categories of society, those who did not have the means to consume butter every day and, *a fortiori*, to stockpile it.

I think a body of measures of that kind should be far more effective. That is why I will vote against this text.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling (S). — (DE) Despite considerable reservation I shall be voting in favour of this motion. I shall do so because I would naturally prefer to give butter as a Christmas present to Community citizens who are constantly being asked to stump up for a failed agricultural policy which represents a threat to environment and health, than to, perhaps, be forced to relieve him of yet more money to alleviate the butter mountain.

My decision to vote in favour hurts, for two reasons. Firstly, because it does not solve, but merely postpones the problem for a limited period, for the butter surplus remains — if somewhat fresher. The second is a more shameful reason. The gift is available only to those with a suitable butter-purchasing power. The poor, or at least those who are unable to purchase large quantities of butter, will miss the benefit of stocking such quantities and will find themselves at Christmas with empty hands in front of overflowing Community doors. That hurts. I am thinking, for example, of the multitude of needy people living alone and who would also like to have a chance of eating butter for once. For them I could have taken much more pleasure in voting yes.

(Applause)

Mr Provan (ED). — It gives me no happiness to rise and give an explanation of vote to say that I shall be voting against the Aigner proposals. I think all of us in this Chamber would want the European consumer to benefit from the surpluses that we have in the Community, and indeed we are embarrassed by these surpluses. Surely, however, we must look at the cost of these proposals. Parliament, as we have just been informed by the Commission, would be expected to adopt a supplementary budget for 500 m ECUs, but Parliament has just doubled the amount in one of its amendments, so it would be 1 000 m ECUs that we should have to ask for in such a supplementary budget.

I do not think many people in this Parliament realize that the Community as such — that is to say, the Commission — does not own the butter that is in intervention stores. The butter in intervention stores is owned by the Member States, and the Community just pays the interest on that capital. Therefore the Community budget will have to buy that butter in order to give it to the European consumer. Now that is a very costly exercise. I do not believe that it can be justified at this present time, when there are other ways in such we could get rid of the surplus and reduce it over a period of time. Food manufacturers would purchase the butter if it were offered at a more attractive price . . .

President. — Your speaking time is up, Mr Provan.

Mr Gautier (S). — (DE) I intend to vote against Mr Aigner's motion. I feel I owe it to the taxpayers. I do not agree with the calculations made by the Committee on Budgetary Control but find those of the Commission more correct. Consequently I would urge the Commission . . .

(Heckling)

... I am one of those Members who rarely gives an explanation of vote and occasionally does something which could be interpreted as running counter to the agricultural lobby. I would therefore advise the Commission to proceed with the implementation of this scheme only if a majority of Parliament sanctions the necessary expenditure.

Secondly I also believe this to be no more than a concerted diversionary tactic on the part of many Christian Democrats. They wish to divert public attention from the fact that these gigantic butter mountains are the result of their demands for a 14 % price hike.

Lord Douro (ED) — I also am most reluctant ever to go against any recommendation of the Committee on Budgetary Control, which does such good work, but I cannot support this proposal and will vote against it.

We have been told of the enormous cost of this scheme and that the money is not available. Other Members have mentioned that it will be necessary to buy two kilos in order to get a third kilo free, and many people will not be able to do that. It is a basic commercial fact that if one is trying to promote consumption, one normally does so at a period of slack demand. Demand for butter is very high just before Christmas, and that is just the moment not to promote sales further. A good time to encourage, consumption might be in September or October, but not in December.

I also doubt very much whether the necessary packaging and distribution can be completed in time to ensure that this butter is in the shops just before Christmas. And if that does not happen, a lot of hopes raised by the publicity of the scheme will be dashed when the butter is not available.

It is a bad scheme, and I will not support it.

Mr Vernimmen (S). — *NL* I am not a Christian Democrat, Mr Gautier, but I shall be voting for Mr Aigner's report because I do not want to deny Europeans what we send all over the world with the aid of export refunds. And that costs the European taxpayer just as much. There is no doubt about that. That is why Mr Aigner's proposals is a good one, it shows imagination, more than in the past, and I hope that in this way we can get rid of a small part of our butter mountain.

(Applause)

Mr Fellermaier (S) — *DE* Mr President, I find it lacking in political style that a Commissioner should enter the chamber to deliver a Commission declaration at the end of the debate, and, having criticized the House, proceed to pack his bags and leave.

(Applause)

This reveals contempt for the elected representatives of the Community citizens and I would ask you to convey the House's displeasure to the President of the Commission.

(Applause)

Mr President. — I have taken note of your remarks.

Mr Tyrrell (ED) in writing. — The Community housewife pays for her butter twice : once, to the shopkeeper, at a price which is inflated by the levy on imported butter ; and once, to enable butter to be sold at cheap prices to foreign countries who sell it on to their own consumers at a profit.

It is now proposed that she receives a gift. Of course, she is paying for it indirectly, but at least she is paying for a gift to herself rather than someone else.

This is what she wants. This is what she should get. So I intend to vote for the Aigner report providing for free Christmas butter.

*ANNEX II**1. Questions to the Council**Question No 3 by Mr Couste (H-25/83)*

Subject : Economic relations between Europe and Israel

Following publication of the report by the Committee of Inquiry in Israel and now that peace negotiations between Israel and Lebanon seem to be moving ahead, does the Council intend, as it should, to normalize economic relations with Israel in respect both of trade relations and of the financial aid which has been frozen since June 1982?

Answer

I would ask the Honourable Member to refer to the debate held on a similar question put by Mr Normanton at Question Time in July 1983.

* * *

Question No 9 by Mrs Hammerich (H-248/83)

Subject : Nordic Passport Union

Will the Council assure the Danish electorate that the Nordic Passport Union will continue undiminished and unaltered?

Answer

The resolutions adopted by the representatives of the Governments of the Member States of the European Communities meeting within the Council concerning the introduction of a uniform passport have no bearing on the Nordic Passport Union.

* * *

Question No 10 by Mrs Van Hemeldonck (H-253/83)

Subject : Regulation of waste transport within the EEC

At their meeting of 16 June 1983, did the Environment Ministers instruct the Coreper to draft a regulation on this problem; if so, when will the Council adopt this regulation? Has the Council decided to accept the European Parliament's resolution of 8 June 1983 on the transfrontier shipment of hazardous wastes *inter alia* as regards compulsory permits from all the countries concerned?

Answer

1. At its meeting on 16 June 1983 the Council held a thorough exchange of views on the proposal for a Directive on the supervision and control of transfrontier shipment of hazardous waste within the Community. It had before it the Resolution of 8 June 1983 containing Parliament's Opinion on the proposal.

2. Following its discussions, the Council recognized the need to ensure that the competent authorities of Member States concerned were informed in advance of transfrontier movement of hazardous waste so that they might satisfy themselves that appropriate arrangements had seem made, particularly as regards safety.

The Council instructed the Permanent Representatives Committee to endeavour to reach rapid agreement on a legally binding Community instrument with a view to its adoption as soon as possible and at the latest by the end of the year.

* * *

Question No 12 by Mr Van Miert (H-304/83)

Subject: Euro-Arab dialogue

To what extent does the signing of the Second Financial Protocol between the European Community and Israel affect deliberations concerning the resumption of the Euro-Arab dialogue, and what are the prospects as regards the latter?

Answer

At its meeting from 17-19 July in Stuttgart the European Council considered that circumstances were such as to enable the Second EEC-Israel Financial Protocol, signed on 24 June 1983, to come into operation.

The Council feels that this should not affect the Euro-Arab Dialogue. The aim of the Dialogue is, over and above the balanced cooperation which the Community carries on with all its Mediterranean partners, to establish a special relationship between European and the Arab World by developing political, economic and cultural cooperation.

A start was made on the resumption of the Dialogue at the meeting of the ad hoc Euro-Arab Working Party (Troika) on 16 June 1983. The approach emerging from that meeting, while not ruling out the possibility of a Euro-Arab Ministerial meeting at a later stage, was directed towards a meeting of the General Committee, which could be held in the fairly near future and, if possible, before the end of 1983.

As I stated in this House in July, Greece is anxious to develop cooperation with the Arab Countries further, and the Greek Presidency will do its utmost to bring about progress in the Euro-Arab Dialogue and to give it greater substance.

* * *

Question No 14 by Mr Van Aerssen (H-260-83)

Subject: Summit politics

The Belgian Government, in the person of its Minister of Finance, has levelled some sharply-worded criticism at the major industrial countries for their increasing tendency to withdraw into 'exclusive clubs' to discuss world economic problems, and for their plans to set up a 'superclub' of the five major industrial countries, thereby intensifying this trend.

Does the Council share this criticism or does it still take the view that the OECD provides the appropriate institutional framework within which to discuss world economic problems as they relate to the countries concerned?

Answer

The Council does not adopt positions on statements made outside its framework.

* * *

Question No 15 by Mr Woltjer (H-265/83)

Subject: Measures relating to the fixing of farm prices

Can the Council indicate exactly which supplementary measures it decided upon in fixing farm prices for 1981/1982 and 1982/1983 and what action has since been taken on these? Can the Council also indicate what the content is or was of the 'Gentleman's

Agreement' on the cessation of MCAs and what the effect of this 'agreement' was in the price decisions for 1981/1982 and 1982/1983 and the extent to which this agreement was observed?

Answer

When the prices were fixed for the 1981/1982 and 1982/1983 marketing years, the Council adopted or undertook to adopt a series of supplementary measures. These measures were designed in particular to introduce or implement the principle of co-responsibility in the CAP, especially for cereals, processed fruit and vegetables and tobacco. They formed a homogenous part of the general policy the Agricultural Council has been pursuing for years now. In compliance with the basic principles of the common agricultural policy, the Council is in fact endeavouring to limit production surpluses without causing an unwarranted drop in earnings, notably for small and medium-sized agricultural holdings.

The Council thus managed to reduce the rate of increase in EAGGF expenditure in 1981/1982, and in 1982/1983 it even proved possible to remain below the appropriations allocated.

As far as the agri-monetary aspects raised in the honourable Member's Question are concerned, it can be recalled that when the EMS was being put into effect in the CAP, on 5 March 1979, nine Member States concluded a Gentleman's Agreement on the dismantling of the 'new MCAs'. That 'Agreement' provision for abolition of MCAs appearing after the EMS entered into force.

Such abolition was to take place over 2 years when the annual farm price decisions were taken and was not to result in a fall in prices in national currencies nor in an increase such as to cause problems for the economy of the Member State concerned.

With respect to the total number of MCAs existing before the EMS entered into force, nine Member States expressed their determination to reduce them gradually so as to re-establish the unity of common agricultural prices, due account being taken of price policy. This gradual reduction may be speeded up if the Member States in question so wishes.

In all the decisions the Council has taken since then on the fixing of green rates — whose differences determine the level of MCAs — those Member States which subscribed to the Gentleman's Agreement have complied with it. In practice, the Council was able considerably to reduce the level of MCAs newly created after the introduction of the EMS and even partly to reduce the number of MCAs in existence before the EMS was implemented. This was in particular the case when the Council decided on the new green rates when the farm prices for 1981/1982 and 1982/1983 were fixed.

* * *

Question No 17 by Mr Gérard Fuchs (H-269/83)

Subject: Use of NCI 3 for the ACP States

Does the Council not think that some of the appropriations available under NCI 3 should be available for the realization of industrial projects of mutual ACP/EEC interest on the territory of the ACP States?

Answer

Pursuant to the decisions establishing NCI 3, the appropriations available are intended exclusively for the financing of investment projects carried out on the territory of the Community which meet the eligibility criteria established by the Council.

* * *

Question No 18 by Mr Pranchère (H-278/83)

Subject: Agreements on the multiannual supply of agricultural products

Despite frequent prompting by Parliament, the Council has still not given a decision on the Commission proposal of 24 July 1981 concerning 'framework agreements relating to the multiannual supply of agricultural products'. The implementation of such agreements would enable the shortcomings of the EEC's medium and long-term policy on export sales to be corrected.

Pending a final decision by the Council, could the latter not authorize the Commission to negotiate such agreements with the countries pressing for them?

Answer

As stated by the honourable Member, the Commission submitted a communication to the Council in July 1981 on the multiannual supply of agricultural products. It subsequently submitted a recommendation for a Decision in March 1982 on the directives to be followed in negotiations with certain third countries on such framework agreements.

Discussion of the matter in the Council both at political and at technical level highlighted a number of issues which must be settled at Community level before contracts can be concluded with third countries. These issues relate in particular to:

- the effects on Community production of the crops in question of the undertaking which would be given to third countries guaranteeing the supply of products,
- other budgetary and technical effects,
- the absence of harmonization in the Community of export credit mechanisms and practices.

It should, however, be noted that discussions have taken place with the ACP States regarding the possibility of supplying agricultural products available in the Community to them and a joint ACP-EEC Working Party has been instructed to examine the matter. Moreover, at the 8th meeting of the ACP-EEC Council of Ministers (19-20 May 1983) the Community indicated that it was continuing its consideration of the matter.

* * *

Question No 19 by Mr Hutton (H-291/83)

Subject: Contact group between Parliament and Coreper

The President-in-Office gave an assurance to Parliament at Question Time on 5 July that he would seek the agreement of the Council to the establishment of a contact group between the Political Affairs Committee of Parliament and Coreper.

Has the President-in-Office now obtained Council's agreement? If not, why not; and when will he succeed in doing so?

Answer

On 25 April 1983 the Council examined the question of establishing informal contacts between the representatives of the European Parliament and the Permanent Representatives to discuss certain institutional matters.

The Presidency is still pondering this question in the light of the positions adopted by the Member States at the abovementioned Council meeting.

* * *

Question No 20 by Sir James Scott-Hopkins (H-298/83)

Subject: Drug abuse

Would the Council state what action, if any, they will take to combat the rising tide of drug abuse within the Community and if they will initiate action through Interpol or any other suitable agency to reduce the inward illegal flow from third countries of drugs such as Heroin, Cocaine and Raw Opium?

Answer

The Council is aware of the problems posed by drug trafficking and peddling in the Community. However, these problems come under the responsibility of the Member States, which cooperate closely in this area, notably within a group of government representatives set up on the initiative of the late President of the French Republic, Mr Pompidou.

* * *

Question No 21 by Miss Quin (H-299/83)

Subject: The Shipbuilding Industry in the EEC

When did the Council last discuss shipbuilding and what was the context of its discussions?

Answer

The Council discussed the shipbuilding industry in December 1982 when it adopted Directive 82/880 extending until 31 December 1984 the 5th Directive on aid to shipbuilding.

It should be noted in this connection that on 8 March 1983, the Commission forwarded to the Council — and to the European Parliament also — a report on policy guidelines for restructuring the shipbuilding industry; as the Commission pointed out, this report is intended in particular for use in the administration of the Community Directive on aid to shipbuilding.

* * *

Question No 22 by Mrs Le Roux (H-303/83)

Subject: Common fisheries policy

In November 1980 the Commission submitted to the Council a communication on social aspects in the Community sea fishing sector. This communication formed an adjunct to the proposals for a common fisheries policy, and the Assembly of the European Communities delivered its opinion on these proposals in 1981.

Since a common fisheries policy has now been adopted, will the Council now implement the measures concerned with the social aspect of the Community's fisheries policy?

Answer

We would inform the honourable Member that the Council is aware of the Parliament's concern on this subject. This matter, which has been examined by Council bodies in the past, was again raised at the Council meeting on 25 and 26 July 1983 by the French delegation which asked the Commission to examine possible means of action for achieving this objective.

However, the matter is complex and gives rise to significant difficulties. The Council is nevertheless open to further discussion in the light of the elements to be provided by the Commission.

* * *

Question No 23 by Mrs Nielsen (H-309/83)

Subject : Harmonization of postal charges within the Community

What does the Council propose to do to harmonize postal charges within the Community, and does not the Council consider that the present discriminatory treatment has a distorting effect on competition and is incompatible with the plans for an internal market ?

There are significant variations in the rules in force for letters weighing over 20 grammes and postal packets, depending on whether they are being sent to addresses in Denmark or to the other countries in the Community.

Answer

Decisions on the subject raised by the honourable Member are currently a matter for national administrations to the sole responsibility of the relevant bodies. The Council would inform the honourable Member that no proposals have been submitted to it concerning postal rates in the Community.

* * *

Question No 24 by Mr Schinzel (H-317/83)

Subject : Development of the internal market

During Question Time in July 1983, the Greek President-in-Office of the Council departed from the regrettable practice adopted by his predecessors, who would regularly invoke the confidentiality of their discussions in answer to questions on the state of negotiations, in what was a most welcome token of his commitment to the further institutional development of the Community (supplementary answer to Question No H-83/83 by Mr Adam).

Is the President of the Council now able to keep his promise and supply precise details of the attitudes of the various Member States to the development of the internal market, and can he assure us that he will continue to keep the European Parliament informed of other discussions in the Council with the same democratic candour ?

Answer

In reply to Question No H-251/83 put by Mr Pearce, the Council explained why, in accordance with its rules of procedure, it did not intend to make public positions adopted by the Member States in its discussions.

The Council has never refused to describe in general terms the alternatives with which it is presented.

With regard to the more specific case mentioned by the honourable Member, namely the internal market, it must first be emphasized that all the delegations acknowledge the need to ensure and develop free movement within the common market and are prepared to work towards this goal within the Council. Indeed, a further meeting of the Council on the subject of the internal market is planned for the end of October.

* * *

Question No 25 by Mr Bangemann (H-318/83)

Subject: Liberal Party in Greece

Can the President-in-Office explain on what grounds the activities of the Liberal Party in Greece are not mentioned on the state-controlled television and radio stations in contrast to those of other political parties, bearing in mind the commitment of all Member States to the basic principles of pluralist democracy and recalling that the entry of Greece to the Community only became possible after a dictatorship, which practised political censorship of the mass media, was overthrown?

Answer

This type of question does not fall within the purview of the Council.

* * *

Question No 27 by Mr Pearce (H-332/83)

Subject: Meetings of the Council

Does the Council ever intend that any of its meetings shall be held in public, as is permitted under Article 3 of its Rules of Procedure?

Answer

At this stage the Council has not considered it appropriate to hold any meetings in public.

* * *

Question No 28 by Mr Pattison (H-334/83)

Subject: Implications for Irish economy of recent proposals on agriculture

Is the Council aware of the implications for the Irish economy of the recent proposals on agriculture, in view of its significance as Ireland's major industry, and will it ensure that the necessary measures to protect it are adopted and implemented speedily?

Answer

Within the framework of major action to revitalize the Community the Council is examining, on the basis of a Commission communication, the adjustments necessitated by the overall situation of the common agricultural policy in its various aspects, with a view to preparing for the next European Council meeting in Athens in December.

In this context the Council is aware of the special problems posed by the rationalization of the common agricultural policy. The various Member States are concerned by this possible adjustment, and in particular Ireland, where the importance of agriculture in general and milk and beef production in particular is recognized by all.

The Council will not fail to take into account the national or regional implications that any adjustments to the common agricultural policy might involve.

* * *

Question No 29 by Mr Bonaccini (H-335/83)

Subject : Destabilizing effect of the dollar exchange rate

In the last few months the dollar exchange rate has become even more erratic and its effect on all European currencies more unsettling. Does the Council not think that this will very much compromise economic recovery in Europe ? Have the Williamsburg agreements had a positive effect and how did the various States contribute to the effort made ? What negotiations are in progress or under consideration with regard to the problem of real interest rates ?

Answer

As yet, it is not possible to assess all the effects of the dollar's recent rise on the likelihood of economic recovery in the Community. The Council is following closely developments in the international monetary situation and their repercussions on the economic situation in the Member States.

During the last few weeks, the monetary authorities of several countries have made major interventions on the exchange markets, in order to contain the fluctuations of the United States currency to some extent, and coordination between central banks has been very active. The Council is not able to give any information concerning the extent of these interventions.

* * *

Question No 30 by Mr Lomas (H-337/83)

Subject : Racist discrimination in France

Will the Council take action against the French authorities who refused British citizens entry when on a day trip from London to Calais, simply because they were black, in order to ensure that this deplorable act of racism never happens again ?

Answer

As the Council has stated in its replies to similar questions, the problem raised by the honourable Member falls within the sphere of the public policy of the Member States and is not within the competence of the Community, without prejudice to any implications for freedom of movement, in particular for workers.

* * *

Question No 31 by Mr Ephremidis (H-345/83)

Subject : Unacceptable activities of the Commission of the European Communities

According to reports on Greek television (ERT I of 1 August 1983 at 9 p.m.) groups from the Commission based in Athens are to begin a tour of different regions of Greece to inform Greek farmers on matters connected with the EEC's agricultural policy.

Whereas this activity by the Commission falls outside the framework of the Treaties ; whereas the political parties and various organizations are responsible for providing information and criticism of Community policy ; whereas similar tactics by the Commission have been strongly condemned both in the past and recently in the European Parliament by MEPs of the British Labour Party, the Danish Popular Movement against the EEC and the KKE following a question on the matter by the British Labour MEP, Mr Megahy ; what measures does the Council intend to take to bring an immediate end to activities of this kind by the Commission which constitute unacceptable interference in the internal affairs of Member States and in the pre-election campaign for the forthcoming elections of June 1984 to the European Parliament ?

Answer

Article 4 of the Treaty establishing the EEC states that 'each institution shall act within the limits of the powers conferred upon it by this Treaty'. It is not for the Council to comment on the matter raised by the honourable Member.

* * *

Question No 32 by Mr Hänsch (H-353/83)

Subject: European Council in Stuttgart

In the 'Solemn Declaration on the European Union' (paragraph 2.3.6) of the European Council in Stuttgart the governments pledged that the Council would open talks with the European Parliament and the Commission on a new agreement on an improved and extended conciliation procedure.

When does the Council intend to open these talks and will it propose a timetable and a framework for the talks?

Answer

At this moment in time the Council is not in a position to state when it will be possible to open the talks referred to by the honourable Member. The Council must first of all continue examination of the issue, bearing in mind, among other things, the position adopted by one delegation on paragraph 2.3.6 of the Solemn Declaration on European Union.

* * *

*II. Questions to the Foreign Ministers**Question No 38 by Mr Fergusson (H-282/83) **

Subject: Cooperation between the embassies of the Ten in third countries

Does the document agreed by the Foreign Ministers on 8 March, relating to greater cooperation between the embassies of the Ten in third countries, envisage the eventual amalgamation of their missions when and where this is possible?

Answer

No doubt the honourable Member is referring to the document drawn to the attention of the Political Committee on 8 March. In that document the foundation of joint embassies was not envisaged because such a measure would not reflect the present degree of unity between the Member States and cohesion of their foreign policies.

* Former oral question without debate (O-32/83), converted into a question for Question Time.

Question No 40 by Mr Habsburg (H-204/83)

Subject : Persecution of Jews in Nicaragua

Are the Foreign Ministers aware of the persecution of Jews by the Sandinist regime in Nicaragua (see B'nai B'rith report) and are they prepared, in their talks with the Sandinist government, to impress upon them that persecution of the Jews and, more generally, of religious communities and racial and national minorities, makes it impossible for the Community to justify the continuation of aid programmes for Nicaragua in the eyes of the European public ?

Answer

I would like to assure the honourable Member that the Ten are fully aware of the disquieting situation prevailing in some Latin American countries in relation to human rights. They have repeatedly stressed the need to strengthen democratic institutions and respect for human rights in those countries. Besides, the economic and humanitarian aid provided by the Community is intended to improve the living conditions of the people in the area, and to reinforce democracy.

More particularly so far as Nicaragua is concerned, some governmental measures instituted against the Misquito indians have raised questions regarding the policy implemented against certain ethnic minorities. Finally, the information according to which the small Jewish community in Nicaragua is being prevented from freedom of worship, has not been confirmed.

* * *

Question No 41 by Mr Kyrkos (H-205/83)

Subject : Statements by Mr Genscher concerning the Greek Presidency

Are the Foreign Ministers in agreement with the statement made by Mr Genscher on 25. 5. 1983 concerning the Greek Presidency or do they take the view that they should provide some clarification of the remarks made by their President, Mr Genscher, *vis-à-vis* a government which 'fully accepts its responsibilities' and certainly has, as the representative of a country, its own special approach to foreign policy ? What are the precise implications of the suggestion that Greece will need a 'trial period' before finally assuming the Presidency ?

Answer

This question, which is based on certain newspaper reports, has not been discussed within the framework of European Political Union.

* * *

Question No 43 by Mr Herman (H-263/83)

Subject : Wave of political arrests in Haiti

In view of the deeply disturbing wave of arrests of members of the Christian Democrat opposition in Haiti in May of this year, particularly the arrest of one Christian Democrat member, the president of the order of lawyers, Mr Jean-Baptiste Duplex, a member of the League of Human Rights, well known for his defence of political and trade union leaders oppressed by the Haitian authorities — a situation even more disturbing since the person in question is aged over 65 and seriously ill — what initiatives do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation intend to take to assist political prisoners and, in particular, to safeguard the life and health of Mr J. B. Duplex, taking account both of the repeated promises of greater democracy in Haiti and the cooperation between the EEC and Haiti ?

Answer

I wish to inform the honourable Member that the Ambassadors of the Ten in Haiti have made approaches at bipartite level to the local authorities on behalf of political prisoners, and in particular on behalf of the lawyer Mr Duplex and his four fellow-prisoners.

According to information we received recently, the courts have set a term for the release of Mr Duplex and his fellow-prisoners. Besides, as we are informed, both Mr Duplex's attorney and his relatives, when they visited him in prison, ascertained that his health had not suffered.

Finally, I would like to stress that notwithstanding the favourable outcome of this matter, we shall not cease to observe the situation regarding human rights in Haiti, with the greatest care.

* * *

Question No 44 by Mr Van Miert (H-274/83)

Subject: Emigration of Ida Nudel from the USSR

What action have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation taken on the resolution tabled by Mrs Ewing and other members and adopted by Parliament on the refusal by the Soviet authorities to grant an exit visa to Ida Nudel, a Soviet Jew (Doc. 1-810/82). What was the result, if any, of their meeting and what do the ministers intend to do in the near future with regard to this matter?

Answer

The matter raised in the question you put to the European Parliament has already occupied the Member States, some of which have approached the Soviet Government concerning the granting of an exit permit to Mrs Ida Nudel.

Since as you well know, the matter of human rights is one of prime importance to the Ten, their efforts to secure permission for Mrs Ida Nudel to leave the Soviet Union will be continued.

* * *

Question No 46 by Mr Hänsch (H-294/83)

Subject: Detention of the Turkish teacher, Sakir Bilgin

At the beginning of January, Sakir Bilgin, a Turkish teacher who had been working in primary and senior elementary schools in Cologne since 1978, was arrested in Turkey. He is being detained pursuant to the new Article 140 T of the Penal Code despite the fact that he was only exercising his right in Germany, as a member of the Education and Science Trade Union and of the Association of Turkish Teachers, to criticize the social and political situation in Turkey.

Are the Foreign Ministers prepared to make a determined effort to secure the release of Sakir Bilgin and what action do they intend to take?

Answer

First of all, I would like to inform the honourable Member that many efforts have been made to secure the release of Sakir Bilgin. Specifically, Germany has repeatedly approached the Turkish authorities in the attempt to have him released. Unfortunately, the Turkish reaction was that the matter is now in the hands of the Turkish courts, and only a competent Turkish court can determine the fate of Sakir Bilgin.

Finally, I would like to remind you that the Ten have repeatedly stressed the need for the respect of human rights in Turkey.

* * *

Question No 48 by Mr Alavanos (H-343/83)

Subject: USA military exercises in Honduras.

In the light of US military exercises in Honduras, US provocative naval exercises off the coast of Central American countries and Mr Reagan's statements which pose a threat to the national independence and territorial integrity of Nicaragua and other countries in Central America and place an obstacle in the way of a political solution to the problem of Central America, what measures do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation intend to take to prevent another Vietnam with a view to ensuring peace in this troubled region and guaranteeing the right of the peoples of Central America to take their own decision on their future free from foreign interference?

Answer

The situation in Central America is causing grave concern to both the peoples and the governments of the Ten, which have repeatedly emphasized the importance they place on social and economic progress in the countries of that area, on the establishment of democratic governments, on respect for human rights, and on the avoidance of any form of violence.

As for the formation of the all-party Kissinger commission in the USA, this fact, together with other initiatives such as the recent contacts by Mr Stone, a special envoy from President Reagan, could well contribute to the search for a peaceful solution of problems in the area.

The Ten offer every support to the efforts of countries in the Contadora group, a fact that has in any case been declared publicly by the European Council in the official declaration of Stuttgart of 19 January 1983, and will continue to support any initiative for the peaceful solution of the problem.

Finally, I would like to remind you that the European Community grants economic and humanitarian aid to the countries of Central America, within the scope of programmes designed to bring relief to the peoples of those countries and to improve their living conditions.

* * *

*III. Questions to the Commission**Question No 57 by Mr de Ferranti (H-244/83)*

Subject: Abolition of Excise Duties which produce relatively little revenue

What action is the Commission proposing to take to abolish the Duties on matches and lighters in Denmark, Ireland, Italy and the United Kingdom in view of the anomalous position as reported in the first issue of the 'Kangaroo News' in February 1983 and the stated intent to abolish excise duties which produce relatively little revenue (Written Question No 280/83 in June 1982).¹

(¹) OJ C 188, 22. 7. 1982, p. 18.

Answer

The abolition of the so-called minor excise duties is closely bound up with the free movement of goods. Free movement of goods entails harmonization of excise duties, notably in order to eliminate the many divergences in this field which often result from the excise duty structure. The Commission's 1972 programme for harmonizing excise duties was embodied in a draft framework directive.

This was followed by a series of proposals for directive harmonizing excise duties on tobacco, mineral oils, spirits and wine and beer. The draft framework directive envisaged that with the abolition of tax frontiers, Member States should only levy excise duties on these five product groups and that other excise duties, especially the duties which produce insignificant revenue, should be abolished.

The honourable Member will be aware that despite the Commission's efforts the Council has not acted on the long-standing proposals on excise duties on wine, beer, spirits and mineral oil, and only very limited progress has been made in harmonizing excise duty on tobacco. Until the structures of these excise duties have been harmonized it would be premature to take special action on the minor excise duties. Clearly the Commission welcomes the abolition of minor excise duties such as those on matches and lighters, which create problems out of all proportion to the revenue produced, as demonstrated in the 'Kangaroo News' article, and there does seem to be a tendency towards reducing the number of such excise duties in some Member States.

* * *

Question No 58 by Mr Lalor (H-678/82)

Subject: EEC Cash for Ireland

The Irish Foreign Minister was given assurances last September that the Community would consider ways of investing extra EEC cash in Ireland to offset Ireland's contribution to EEC rebates for Britain. What steps have been taken to honour this pledge?

Answer

Preliminary draft supplementary budget No 2 of 1983 includes Commission proposals for actions to enhance Community solidarity in connection with the measures decided last autumn for compensating the United Kingdom for 1982. The Council has accepted this in establishing its draft supplementary budget No 2 of 1983.

This provides for an extra 6 million ECUS of structural aid to improve the position of Irish farmers and fishermen.

* * *

Question No 59 by Mr Balfe (H-156/83/rev.)

Subject: Food Advisory Committee

Is it true that the Food Advisory Committee to DG III continued to discuss the IDACE Code at its meeting on April 18 and 19? Further, is it true, as it appears, that DG III intends to proceed with a voluntary code reserving the Directive for some of the more technical elements of the WHO code?

Answer

During the debate on the report by Mrs Castellina in the plenary sitting of 11 April this year, I stated what consultations the Commission intended to carry out on the question of breast-milk substitutes. I mentioned specifically the Food Advisory Committee, the Consumers' Consultative Committee and the official representatives of the Member States.

The meeting referred to in the question was indeed connected with this matter. The Food Advisory Committee consists of representatives of industry, the consumers, agriculture, trade and employees in the Community. It is regularly consulted by us with regard to the regulation of food matters, and is for us an extremely valuable source of information. It was therefore only to be expected that it should also be consulted on the difficult question of breast-milk substitutes. It will continue its deliberations after the summer recess.

The agenda for the committee meeting of 18 and 19 April 1983 contained two items : (1) discussion of the WHO code, and (2) consideration of the draft submitted by the industrial group concerned (IDACE).

The Commission is examining a packet of measures which, taken together, are designed to achieve the aims of the WHO code. The draft of an industrial agreement is only one of a number of elements.

The Parliament will have an opportunity in the late autumn of examining the whole matter on the basis of a Commission communication with appropriate proposals. The work has proved to be rather more complicated than could be expected in March.

Preliminary information will be given to the Parliament's Committee on Development and Cooperation on 26 May 1983.

* * *

Question No 63 by Mr Van Aerssen (H-207/83)

Subject : Conduct by French nationalized undertakings in breach of the Treaties

The nationalized undertaking Avion Dassault has informed the French dealers supplying it with office equipment that it will refuse to accept any foreign products in future. Similar open warnings, which are in breach of the Community Treaties, have also come from other nationalized undertakings among the French banks and large firms.

What steps is the Commission taking to put an end to these Treaty violations ?

Answer

In the Commission's view, measures taken by nationalized undertakings — whether in the form of pressure, demands or anything else — designed to prevent, wholly or in part, the purchase of imported goods and give preference to domestic products fall within the category of 'quantitative restrictions on imports and all measures having equivalent effect' (see Article 30 of the EEC Treaty), since they ultimately derive from the authority of the State.

Before it can take any steps in the cases mentioned by the honourable Member, the Commission must, however, have more precise information on the form and content of the information issued to suppliers by the firm of Dassault Aviation and by companies in the banking sector.

* * *

*Question No 64 by Mr Wedekind (H-346/83)**

Subject : Probationary driving licences

In view of the increasing number of accidents caused by young people, does the Commission not think it would be a good idea for all new applicants to be issued in the first instance with a licence that is valid for a limited period only ?

Does the Commission plan to take any action to this effect ?

*Former Oral Question without debate (O-43/83), converted into a question for Question Time.

Answer

The first Council Directive 80/1263/EEC, of 4 December 1980, relating to the introduction of a Community driving licence, brought into force on 1 January 1983, does not seek to introduce a fixed-term driving licence for new drivers.

Among the harmonization measures to be adopted at a later stage, some will probably, in fact, concern new drivers. Since the driving-licence talks with Governments experts are only just beginning, no comment can be made about the contents of the proposals which the Commission will be making to the Council.

* * *

Question No 65 by Mrs Hammerich (H-230/83)

Subject: Commission representation at Williamsburg

'Europe' of 30-31 May 1983 states that the Heads of State or Government meeting in Williamsburg 'devoted more time than ever in the past to those aspects of their cooperation which relate to security, and adopted a statement reiterating the West's determination to defend itself, but also to negotiate.'

Did the Commission's representatives take part in these talks? Did the Commission's representatives speak on these subjects and, if so, what did they say?

Answer

The President of the Commission, Mr Thorn, was present at the security deliberations of the Heads of State or Government meeting at Williamsburg; he made no statement. He was very clear on this point in this same Chamber when he informed Parliament of the outcome of Williamsburg on 8 June.

* * *

Question No 68 by Mr Pearce (H-252/83)

Subject: Regional policy in the Member States

Will the Commission carry out a study to see whether Member States equally attempt, through de-centralization of governmental functions and in their policy for the location of government offices, to follow policies consistent with proper economic development of the regions or whether they are encouraging centralization of economic development on the one hand while spending 'Regional funds' to deal with the consequences of this process?

Answer

The Commission does not, at present, envisage carrying out a study on the lines indicated in the question.

* * *

Question No 70 by Mr Kyrkos (H-257/83)

Subject: Rich countries' views on the Regional fund

The rich countries of the Community have expressed the view that the concept of geographical concentration of Regional Fund aid should be abandoned, that certain infrastructure projects should be excluded from Regional Fund financing and that more stringent criteria should be applied for granting aid.

To what extent does the Commission share these views and does it intend to give these proposals its firm backing, which also have the support of all Members of the European Parliament?

Answer

(a) The ERDF regulation provided in respect of 1981¹ that 78.23 % of the quota-section resources (which make up 95 % of the total fund allocation) would go to the least prosperous States.

The Commission, in its proposal for a review of the Fund regulation, now under discussion within the Council, has proposed an increased concentration of aid under the quota section in favour of the less-favoured regions of the least prosperous States, principally by restricting a quota guarantee to those states alone. At the same time, however, it proposed a very sizeable increase in the resources of the non-quota section (up to 20%) intended for specific Community projects.

The Council has not yet reached agreement on these Commission proposals; however, *no Member State* has suggested the abandonment of the concentration of aid geographically.

(b) In the course of its review of the ERDF regulation on 6 February 1979, the Council agreed that a list of the various types of infrastructure eligible for Regional Fund Aid should be drawn up.

In the Council negotiations now in progress, it was found simpler to seek agreement on a so-called 'negative list, i.e. including types of infrastructure which do not qualify for assistance from the Fund. The adoption of such a list should not bar from ERDF assistance any of the infrastructure categories which currently receive aid.

(c) The Commission intends to vigorously advance the main lines of its proposals for the review of the ERDF regulation which will be incorporated into new proposals on the basis of the report presented subsequent to the European Council meeting in Stuttgart.

* * *

Question No 72, by Sir Fred Warner (H-264/83)

Subject: Properties of Community citizens in Greece

To ask the Commission whether certain actions taken by the Greek Authorities to hamper the enjoyment and use of his property by the owner of the Achmetaga Estate at Prokopion in Euboea contains an element of discriminatory action against a Community citizen which would enable the Commission to take up this matter with the Government of Greece in the context of other matters affecting the property of Community citizens which are at present under discussion?

Answer

As far as the Commission has been able to discover, the ancestors of Mr Noel-Baker, a British national, acquired extensive holdings of land in Prokopi on the Greek island of Euboea when it was under Turkish dominion in the 19th century. These holdings currently include 4 300 hectares of forest, some 30 hectares of agricultural and other land, houses and farm buildings.

The 'actions' to which the honourable Gentleman refers are clearly part of a legal dispute between the Greek State and Mr Noel-Baker on the right of title to the 4 300 hectares of forest. As far as the Commission has been able to discover, the basis for this legal dispute is not the law on frontier areas which formed the subject of the resolution tabled by the honourable Gentleman and adopted by Parliament on 19 May 1983 but the current legislation on the right of title to forests.

1. In respect of 1983 there are no quotas; in allocating ERDF appropriations the Commission will look to the quotas in force in 1981.

Under Community law Mr Noel-Baker is engaged in agriculture in Greece and must therefore, under Article 52 of the EEC Treaty, received the same treatment as Greek nationals. Article 52 cannot however be invoked to affirm the right of title to real estate if the national of a different Member State is unable to produce unequivocal evidence in accordance with the legislation in force in the host country. The Treaty does however guarantee that in any legal dispute on the right of title to property essential for carrying on economic activity, nationals and the citizens of other Member States will be subject to the same legislation and procedures.

Investigations to date would suggest that as far as the application of Community law is concerned, the legal proceedings involving Mr Noel-Baker have quite normally followed the same procedure set out in Law No 1341/83 which has been applied to some 150 similar cases relating to Greek nationals.

Under these circumstances and unless any new information comes to light, the Commission does not intend to raise this matter with the Greek Government.

* * *

Question No 73 by Mr Kaloyannis (H-276/83)

Subject: Community measures regarding the European housewife

Having regard to the important part played, and the services provided, by the European housewife in society and in the family, can the Commission tell us what measures have to date been taken or suggested by the Community to ensure that the position of the European housewife is covered in the legal, economic and social context in a similar way to that of the gainfully employed, given that, apart from anything else, the work she performs is unremunerated?

Answer

The Commission is well aware of the importance of the role played by the woman who remains at home to look after her family, although current efforts are necessarily being concentrated on issues affecting women in the labour market. That being said, there are, of course, a number of actions being undertaken, in particular within the scope of the New Community Action Programme on the Promotion of Equal Opportunities for Women, which relate to the specific problems of women with family responsibilities and of women who seek to re-enter the labour market after some years at home looking after a family.

Emphasis has been laid on this latter subject in the Action Programme, to try to ensure that retraining facilities are made available to women wishing to return to paid employment. Such retraining facilities may also be the subject of projects funded by the European Social Fund. The particular aspect of retraining in the field of new technology has also been stressed by the Commission.

Action to enable parents to share their domestic responsibilities is also an aspect of the Community's Action Programme, with particular emphasis on the granting of parental leave and leave for family reasons, in parallel with research on the evolution of public child-care facilities and services. A study is also being undertaken into the protection of women during pregnancy and motherhood.

The Action Programme also provides for specific actions regarding women in self employed occupations, including women in agriculture. This will be of interest to many women at home, who assist their husbands in their professional capacity.

* * *

Question No 74 by Mr Collins (H-266/83)

Subject: Health care in the Member States

At its last meeting in November 1978, the Council of Health Ministers indicated its desire to promote better health care in the Member States. The Council requested the Commission to make suggestions for Community action in various spheres and to give such action priority. It did not, however, institute a procedure for effective monitoring of health services in the Member States.

Can the Commission therefore say to what extent the public is represented in the Health Authorities of the various Member States? If not, will they then take steps to provide such information?

Answer

The Commission does not have the information requested.

As the honourable Parliamentarian points out, at their last meeting in November 1978, health ministers identified a small number of areas, for ongoing work. The organization of health services was not included as this was considered to be a matter for the responsible authorities in Member States. Consequently, the Commission has not addressed the many aspects of this topic which include the composition of administrative bodies and public or consumer representation.

The Commission does not think that it would be appropriate now to mount a formal study of this question. Any results of an informal inquiry will be communicated to the honourable Parliamentarian as soon as they are available.

* * *

Question No 75 by Mr Gérard Fuchs (H-268/83)

Subject: Use of NCI 3 for the ACP States

Does the Commission not think that some of the appropriations available under NCI 3 should be available for the realization of industrial projects of mutual ACP/EEC interest on the territory of ACP States and is it willing, if necessary, to make proposals to the Council for a new regulation to this effect?

Answer

The new Community instrument (NCI 3), which empowers the Commission to contract loans by virtue of the Council decision of 19 April 1983, is intended to promote investments within the Community.

As for investments outside the Community, they may be financed by the European Investment Bank.

As far as the ACP States in particular are concerned, the Community has at its disposal the range of instruments envisaged in the Conventions of Lomé. They include loans both on the European Investment Bank's own resources and on the resources of the European Development Fund. During the period covered by the second Lomé Convention, that is to say, from the beginning of 1981 to February 1985, these loans may amount to a total of about 1 700 m ECU. At the present time the Community is in the process of negotiating with the ACP countries the provisions that will govern their relations after the expiry of the second Lomé Convention. It is within this framework that the possibility of Community loans to these countries will be considered.

* * *

Question No 76 by Mr Cecovini (H-272/83)

Subject: Exclusion of the Appennine region of Emilia Romagna from the Community's integrated development programmes

Is it true that the Appennine region of Emilia Romagna is to be excluded from the Community's integrated development programmes and, if so, will the Commission reconsider its current guidelines in view of the serious consequences this would have for the forestry workers cooperatives, employment levels and the overall socio-economic fabric of this mountain region, where the trend towards exodus has only recently slowed down and where serious economic and social imbalances and hydrogeological problems still persist?

Answer

It is true that Emilia Romagna has not been included in the geographical area covered by the Commission's proposal for an integrated Mediterranean programme. The Commission's proposal of 17 March 1983 (Doc. COM(83/fin.) describes the methods used in determining the geographical extent. The Commission does not intend to reconsider these methods.

This however does not mean that the Apennine region of Emilia Romagna will be excluded from participating in existing or future arrangements.

The integrated Mediterranean programme will not affect the provisions in for example Directive 75/268/EEC on agricultural and other deprived areas or Regulation (EEC) No 1944/81 on the adaptation and modernization of beef, sheep and goat production in Italy.

In the proposal which the Commission is currently drawing up on Community agricultural policy due consideration is given to the special agricultural problems in deprived regions as well as appropriate solutions closely connected with possible non-agricultural development arrangements.

* * *

Question No 77 by Mr Habsburg (H-275/83)

Subject: Distortions in East-West trade

Does the Commission not consider that the numerous indications of politically motivated distortion of competition by Comecon in East-West trade provide it with an opportunity to make proposals on dealing more effectively and more quickly than in the past with the monopolistic practices of the State-trading countries?

Answer

1. The Community in its dealings with the State-trading countries has allowed for the complications involved in doing business with them, and adjusted its various rules accordingly.

Thus,

- there are unilateral quantitative restrictions on imports from them in specially sensitive sectors;
- where the Community has comprehensive trade agreements with such countries (at present, with China and Romania) these contain safeguard clauses allowing it to make the necessary steps in the event of disruption of the market;
- with several Eastern-bloc countries — Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Czechoslovakia — it has sectoral agreements on the specially sensitive areas of textiles and steel products, providing for voluntary restraint instead of unilateral import restrictions.

Another important means of protection is anti-dumping action, conducted *vis-à-vis* State-trading countries having regard to their special economic system, and in particular to the fact their prices are State-fixed or State-controlled.

2. The Commission considers that the Community's trade defence armoury does afford our producers adequate protection and is capable of counteracting adverse effects of the State monopoly system on international trade.

All the same, still better protection would be provided if the Council adopts the proposal (the subject of a recent favourable opinion by Parliament) on defence against unfair practices, which deals with practices not explicitly covered by the present rules.

* * *

Question No 78 by Mr Seligmann (H-277-83)

Subject : Political implications of the net contributions by Member States to the Community Budget

In view of the political implications of the net contributions by Member States to the Community Budget, what is the precise method used to calculate this figure for each Member State ; what categories of expenditure and revenue are incorporated in the calculation and what consideration is given to the net benefit to Member Nations of intra-Community trading ?

Answer

The net balances or net contributions of the Member States are calculated, for each Member State, by determining the difference between each country's share in allocated expenditure and its share in the financing of this expenditure.

Allocated expenditure is defined by reference to the payment credits for the financial year in question.

The allocated expenditure by Member States includes most of the major categories of expenditure in the general budget.

Shares by Member States in the financing of allocated expenditure are calculated on the basis of the management accounts as far as the out-turn is concerned.

Payments concerning customs duties, agricultural levies, as well as sugar and isoglucose levies, plus, where appropriate, VAT and for Greece, financial contributions relating to previous budget years are taken as recorded.

The last part of the question asks what consideration is given to the net benefit to Member States of intra-Community trading. It will be recalled that the Commission has stressed from the beginning and on many occasions, the incomplete nature of considerations based exclusively on net budget figures. Thus in the 'reference paper on budgetary questions' of 1979, the Commission pointed out that, 'the Community in itself comprises a number of policies which cannot readily be quantified in financial terms. The advantages of belonging to a single market, the benefits conferred by the Common Commercial Policy, and the political strength which flows from membership of an organization moving steadily towards greater integration are among the more important elements in this respect'.¹ The problem of accounting for the non budgetary benefits is nonetheless extremely complex in financial terms.

¹ Reference document on the budgetary forecasts (Communication from the Commission to the Council).

Doc. COM(79) 462 final of 7 September 1979, page 2.

* * *

Question No 79 by Mr Cottrell (H-288/83)

Subject: Long distance express and international buses.

Alarm has been caused by a number of serious accidents throughout the Community concerning long distance express and international buses. The view is widespread that existing safety regulations may not be sufficient, particularly with regard to speed of the vehicles and hours spent at the wheel by their drivers. There appears to be evidence of lack of supervision of drivers' hours, inadequate controls at frontiers and lack of enforcement of existing speed limits. Will the Commission state a response to these concerns, bearing in mind that it will not be satisfactory to state that enforcement, as such, is a subject for competent national authorities: the question is, how adequate are the existing regulations and do they require re-enforcement?

* * *

Question No 88 by Mrs Castle (H-307/83)

Subject: Regulations for coach and lorry drivers

What steps has the Commission taken together with member governments to tighten up on the enforcement of the regulations on driving and rest periods for coach and lorry drivers following the recent tragic accidents on the roads of the Community?

Joint Answer

Since the questions of the two honourable Members cover broadly similar grounds, I hope that the following will answer both of them.

I. Drivers' hours

The Community legislation on drivers' hours for goods and passenger transport is Regulations Nos 543/69 and 1463/70. The general view of these Regulations is that they are too rigid and should be more flexible — certainly, there is no general desire to make them stricter.

The only means available to the Commission to obtain a better enforcement of the Regulations are (I) letters appealing to Governments to act, such as the one sent in the wake of the recent coach crashes; (II) a recommendation on ways of improving their implementation as we are intending to propose and (III) infringement procedures under Article 169 of the Treaty as a last resort. However, regardless of what the ultimate provisions of the Regulations prove to be after the present revision operation has finished, it will still and indeed must remain the duty of Member States to enforce them as they have to do as far as the present Regulation is concerned.

II. Controls

On the general question of checking vehicles, the Commission is in favour of decreasing frontier controls and Parliament itself has invited the Commission to make proposals to this effect. Furthermore, checks on road traffic should produce better results when carried out in unlikely places, rather than at frontiers where they would be expected.

III. Speed limits

The road safety hearing on 14/15 June organized by Parliament's Transport Committee clearly showed the complexity of this matter, the preponderant role of human error in accident causation and the need for careful selection of priority actions in this field to achieve reasonable cost benefit ratios.

One problem is speed limits, as the honourable Member Mr Cottrell has mentioned. Efforts to draft Community legislation on the introduction of common speed limits have proved abortive, and in the absence of consensus by experts and Governments on the speeds to be selected, the Commission does not at present intend to put forward a proposal as part of its transport policy programme.

* * *

Question No 81 by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-293/83)

Subject: Transit through countries of the European Community of Swiss radioactive waste

The Swiss Government has decided to proceed with the dumping of 1 202 tonnes of radioactive waste in the Atlantic in 1983 regardless of an international resolution prohibiting any such action, and despite the fact that the European Parliament has called for an end to such dumping.

Since it is certain that the radioactive waste passes through one or more Community countries before being loaded on to the British vessel from which it is discharged, could the Commission state whether the transport of Swiss radioactive waste by road or railway complies with the safety requirements imposed by the Community in this field?

Answer

The first point that should be made by way of answering this important and topical question is that so far there are no specific Community provisions governing the transport of radioactive materials. In particular therefore there are no provisions for any consultation procedure at Community level on transport operations of this kind. Transport of radioactive materials is, in fact, governed by national provisions which are based on the relevant recommendations of the International Atomic Energy Organization (IAEO). This is true both of the Member States of the Community and also of the Swiss Confederation, the country specifically referred to in the question. Transport of this kind, is, however, subject to the Community's basic Regulations on the protection of the health of the population and of workers against the dangers of ionizing radiations.

Whether the level of safety thereby achieved can be further improved is a question that, in the Commission's view, needs thorough investigation. The Commission was glad therefore to comply with the request made by the European Parliament in its resolution on the transport of radioactive materials and has set up a working party to consider the problems arising from transport operations of this kind. This working party will shortly have completed its proceedings, and the results are expected to be submitted to the European Parliament before the end of this year.

* * *

Question No 82 by Sir James Scott-Hopkins (H-295/83)

Subject: The 1978 Davignon plan

Would the Commission state whether the 1978 Davignon plan to reduce synthetic Fibre production has been effective. Will he state what action he intends to take to force those Member countries which have not reduced their production as required in the 78 plan to do so in 1983?

Answer

The concerted operation to reduce synthetic fibre production was decided on in 1978, by the producers themselves.

For its implementation they signed an agreement laying down the capacities that each of them could maintain until the end of 1981.

The agreement was intended to bring about an overall reduction of 300 000 tonnes.

The companies have respected the terms of the agreement and have even gone beyond it, since the overall reduction at the beginning of 1982 was about 450 000 tonnes.

* * *

Question No 85 by Mr Ryan (H-283/83)

Subject: Computer compatibility

Having regard to the public interest which requires the widest possibility of connecting into computer systems processors and other plug compatible elements, how soon will the Commission clearly define and effectively ensure timely provision of adequate interface information by computer manufacturers to their competitors?

Answer

The Commission is aware that the compatibility of interfaces between computer systems and also of computer peripherals is a major problem for both computer manufacturers and users.

The Commission has therefore undertaken an active policy for the standardization of computer technology, with the aim of promoting the development and uniform utilization of international standards in the Community.

The Commission does not intend to take general measures with regard to the information on interfaces that each computer manufacturer should give his competitors to enable them to produce compatible equipment.

If a dominant position were abused and information on interfaces were brought into question, the Commission would deal with each case individually under Article 86 of the Treaty of Rome.

* * *

Question No 89 by Mr von Wogau (H-308/83)

Subject: Exemption from customs duty on fuels imported in private cars travelling within the Community

Is there a Community regulation conferring exemption from customs duty on fuels imported in petrol cans carried by private cars travelling within the Community and, if not, what has so far prevented a Community regulation being adopted?

Does the Commission consider that the different rules applied in Member States — in Great Britain, Ireland and Italy, fuel carried in petrol cans is not exempt from duty at all, while in Belgium only five litres and in Denmark, Germany, France, Luxembourg and the Netherlands ten litres are exempt — are the right way to promote travel within the Community?

Answer

1. As far as duty on the transport of fuel in portable containers in private cars is concerned, a harmonized regime already exists in the Community by virtue of the 4th Council Directive of 19th December 1978¹ modifying the Directive of 28th May 1969², and Council Directive of 28th March 1983³; the latter will enter into effect on 1st July 1984. These Directives provide, in effect, that fuel shall be admitted duty free up to a maximum of 10 litres per vehicle.

¹ (78/1033/EEC).

² (69/169/EEC).

³ (OJ No L 105 of 23. 4. 1983, p. 38).

2. The regime is however subject to national provisions governing the possession and transport of fuel, and Member States retain competence for maintaining their own safety rules with respect both to the amount of fuel and type of container. The Commission does not have any evidence to support the inclusion of any initiatives in this field in its priority action programme.

* * *

Question No 91 by Mr Kellett-Bowman (H-311/83)

Subject: 'Resin Based Emulsion Paper Sizes'

Is the Commission satisfied that free competition, pursuant to Article 85 of the EEC Treaty, exists in the Community for 'resin based emulsion paper sizes'?

Answer

The Commission does not have any data on whether there have been any infringements of the rules of competition laid down in the EEC Treaty in respect of the product mentioned by the honourable Member.

If the honourable Member does have information to this effect, the Commission is ready to investigate it.

* * *

Question No 92 by Mr Eyraud (H-315/83)

Subject: Sale of cereals to the USSR under an agreement between the USSR and the USA signed in October 1975 for a period of five years and extended by two years in 1981

The USSR has undertaken to buy a minimum of 6m tonnes of cereals per year from the USA. This agreement expires on 30 September 1983. According to press agency reports, the negotiations between the American and Soviet delegations aimed at reaching a new agreement have come to nothing.

According to the same sources, the Soviet Union 'would like to diversify its sources of supplies'.

This being the case, has the Commission taken this opportunity to compensate for the markets lost in the Middle East? If so, has it begun, or invited the Member States to begin, negotiations with the Soviet Union in this area, and what stage have they reached; if not, why not?

Answer

Since the honourable Member put the question, the USA and the USSR have in fact concluded a new long-term agreement on the sale of cereals.

Under this agreement which will come into effect on 1 October 1983 and which will apply for the five succeeding years, the USSR will purchase from the USA at least 9m tonnes of almost equal amounts of wheat and maize. Moreover, it is authorized to purchase 3m tonnes of cereals per year in addition to the 9m tonnes without prior consultation with the USA.

It is, moreover, true that the Soviet Union has diversified its sources of supply; during the 1982/83 agricultural year it purchased substantial quantities of wheat from Canada, Argentina, the United States and Australia and has been largest world purchaser of Community wheat. In August the Soviet Union already purchased a significant quantity of wheat from the Community for 1983/84. The Commission is confident that business with the Soviet Union will continue. Moreover, it should be pointed out that in 1982/83, despite the loss of an important market for the Community (Egypt), the Community has met its overall export estimates.

With regard in particular to the possibility of negotiating long-term contracts with the Soviet Union, it should be recalled that negotiation of trade agreements is the prerogative of the Community.

Since, however, the Community on the one hand still does not have diplomatic relations with the USSR and, on the other, that all the Member States do not regard long and medium-term contracts as the most suitable trading arrangement, the Commission feels that it is unable to negotiate agreements of this sort with the USSR or to give the member States the authorization to do so.

* * *

Question No 93 by Mr Provan (H-316/83)

Subject: Butter concessionary schemes

When will the Commission consider extension of the various butter concessionary schemes so that such users as the confectionery industry could gain some benefit, as in the past they have been good customers?

Answer

The Commission's departments are looking into the possibilities for extending measures to dispose of butter. They have reached the conclusion that the extension of aid for butter used in cake-making and in the ice cream sector to other food products, could be an effective measure.

However the Commission will have to wait until a more fundamental review of the common agricultural policy as requested by the European Council in Stuttgart has been concluded and decisions taken by the Council on possible changes to the dairy policy, before proposing the extension of the butter subsidy to new sectors of the food industry.

* * *

Question No 97 by Mr Lagakos (H-319/83)

Subject: Road transport and transit problems

Could the Commission tell me if it intends to submit proposals aimed at solving the problems experienced by transport traffic in transit (quantitative restrictions and monetary charges) and, if so, when it intends to submit these proposals to the Council?

Answer

The Commission would refer the honourable Member to the common answer given to Oral Questions by Mr Papaefstratiou (H-186/83) and Mr Kazazis (H-187/83) on 6 July 1983.

In addition Commissioner Contogeorgis plans to raise the transit tax increase and other issues with Yugoslavian authorities during his forthcoming mission to Belgrade on 26, 27 September 1983.

* * *

Question No 96 by Mr Davern (H-325/83)

Subject EEC survey on the British flour milling industry's price policy in respect of the Irish market

Last February the Commission announced that it was 'currently looking into the possibilities of starting a survey on the British flour milling industry's price policy in respect of the Irish market'.¹ Will the Commission now state what stage this survey has reached and what further action, if any, it proposes to take as a result of its examination?

Answer

As the Commission has already indicated in its reply to oral question H-44/83 from Mr O'Donnell, the Commission's Services have examined the position of the Irish Milling industry in all aspects regarding Community legislation. As no infringement of Community rules by the British flour milling industry has been established and no further elements have come to the Commission's notice, this matter is closed.

Question No 97 by Mr Ansquer (H-326/83)

Subject: Introduction of quantitative restrictions for imports of cut flowers from certain third countries

Given the increasing problems which, as it has itself acknowledged, face the horticultural sector, especially in the Mediterranean regions does the Commission not agree that, if the Community is to enjoy effective protection from imports from certain third countries, quantitative restrictions on imported flowers should be introduced at Community and regional level in the form of annual quotas for certain major suppliers, together with origin control procedures making it compulsory for the most sensitive products to be accompanied by a certificate of origin at the time of importation?

Answer

The Commission has, for some time, been examining the problems arising in the floricultural sector; it is actively pursuing its search for the most appropriate solution to these problems.

The Commission draws the honourable Member's attention to the regulation currently in force (Commission Regulation (EEC) No 3353/75 of 23 December 1975 instituting a Community surveillance of imports of certain live plants and floricultural products originating in various countries² amended finally by Regulation (EEC) No 3398/82³ permitting the control of the origin of cut flower imports, in particular carnations and roses, especially from certain third countries).

¹ H-715/82 Debates of the European Parliament No 1-294/1983 of 9.2.83.

² OJ No L 330 of 24. 12. 1975, p. 29.

³ OJ No L 357 of 18. 12. 1982, p. 12.

Question No 98 by Mr Geronimi (H-327/83)

Subject : Fuel prices

Filling stations belonging to certain chains are still offering motorists considerable discounts on petrol. Sometimes reductions of several centimes per litre can be obtained. In July 1983, the French Government threatened fuel distributors offering unfair discount levels with sanctions, since independent filling stations felt themselves subject to 'unfair competition'. It is somewhat surprising that, on 1 July 1983, the Tribunal de Marseille should have handed down a moderately-worded ruling on the question of illegal agreements between the big oil companies and on the matter of 'protection of the large monopolies by the French Government.'

Is it the Commission's view that the Treaty of Rome does not apply to fuel products ?

Answer

The Commission is studying the problems raised by the price of gasoline in France and the rebates given by certain retailers.

Two French courts have, however, decided to remit questions arising from this situation to the European Court of Justice for preliminary rulings and the Commission intends to intervene.

In these circumstances, I hope the honourable Member will understand that a definitive reply at this stage, would be premature.

* * *

Question No 99 by Mr Lomas (H-336/83)

Subject : Racist discrimination in France

Will the Commission take action against the French authorities who refused British citizens entry when on a day trip from London to Calais, simply because they were black, in order to ensure that this deplorable act of racism never happens again ?

Answer

The Commission has asked the French authorities to provide more information on the incident described by the honourable Member.

The Commission is aware that certain British travel companies do not always ensure that their customers possess the travel documents needed to enter other Member States. This has, for example, often led to difficulties with the Belgian authorities.

If, however, Community law has been broken by the French authorities, the Commission will institute proceedings for violation of the Treaties.

* * *

Question No 100 by Mr Van Miert (H-340/83)

Subject : Lomé III and human rights

What stance will the Commission adopt in the negotiations for the renewal of the Convention of Lomé on the inclusion of the concept of 'respect for human dignity' and in view of account being taken of the preparatory talks on the matter, what results does it consider will be achieved ?

Answer

The Commission feels that the promotion of respect for human dignity is intimately linked with the development of human potential, something that must be regarded both as a fundamental objective and as precondition of development. It may be pointed out that human rights are the subject not only of the United Nations Universal Declaration on Human Rights and a European Convention but also of an African Charter, in which the central idea is the one stated above.

The Community is determined to raise this question during the negotiations.

* * *

Question No 101 by Mr Alavanos (H-342/83)

Subject : Exports of Greek wines to Member States of the EEC

Can the Commission state :

- having regard to the level of exports to the Member States of the EEC of high quality Greek wines with a high alcohol content (the export figure for 1980 crop was 120 000 tonnes, for the 1981 crop 40 000 tonnes and for the 1982 crop zero) :
- whereas it is about to issue a regulation establishing import quotas from third countries which will also apply to Greece,

what measures it intends to take to reverse this situation with regard to exports of Greek wines to the Member States of the EEC ?

Answer

The Commission has indeed noted with regret a certain downward trend in Greek wine exports to the Community since 1979.

Being keenly aware of this fact, it has proposed various measures, notably that of distillation, in order to ameliorate the situation which it trusts will not last very long. Indeed, it has high hopes that Greek wine exports to the Community, but also to third countries, will make a sound recovery and in this connection the data for 1982 are encouraging.

I would however emphasize that the most significant fall in Greek wine exports preceded rather than followed accession, coming as it did in the 1980 calendar year. One of the reasons, therefore, is undoubtedly a sharp increase in prices on the Greek domestic market occasioned by intervention measures taken at that time by the Greek authorities. Those prices, so abruptly raised, had a depressing effect on exports.

* * *

Question No 102 by Mr Ephremidis (H-344/83)

Subject : Imports of apricots into Greece

Although apricots are generally in short supply in the EEC and this year's production in Greece will reach between 120 000 and 130 000 tonnes, for the first time Greek producers have already ploughed in approximately 40 000 tonnes and there is a prospect of this figure reaching 50 000 tonnes while the Commission has at the same time approved import quotas for apricots from Israel, Tunisia and Morocco which are to be applied even in Greece. What measures does the Commission intend to take to protect Greek production and to promote the export of apricots from Greece which is one of the major producers ?

Answer

In respect of the export of fresh apricots to all countries other than Switzerland and Austria the Commission has established an export refund of 12 ECU per 100 kg net which is to be applied as from 23 June 1983.

With regard to the import quotas, these refer to apricot pulp under subheading ex 20.06 B II c) 1 aa) and not to fresh apricots. The first portion of the quota allocated to Greece for 1983 amounts to no more than 11 tonnes altogether for the three countries referred to in the question.

* * *

Question No 103 by Mr Harris (H-347/83)

Subject: Western mackerel stock

What steps are being taken to protect the western mackerel stock in view of the latest warnings of scientist about the continuation of virtually unrestricted fishing and why, in view of these warnings, has the TAC been increased to about one third of the estimated entire stock, and what is happening about the proposal for an extended 'box' from which bulk catchers would be excluded?

Answer

In order to protect the western stock of mackerel the Commission has proposed a TAC of 320 000 t for 1983, of which 288 000 t would be available to the Community. This proposal has yet to be adopted by the Council. This TAC is strictly in accordance with the scientific advice.

Until such time as the proposal for 1983 is adopted, the 375 000 t Community share of the TAC adopted by the Council for 1982 remains in force in 1983, as well as the quotas for Member States.

The uptake of the quotas is being carefully monitored by the Commission under its catch reporting system. The Commission will take the necessary measures to close the fishery of a Member State once its quota has been taken. It is not therefore the case that this stock is subject to continued 'virtually unrestricted fishing'.

The estimated size of the adult stock is of the order of 1.4 million tonnes. If the proposal of the Commission for 1983 is adopted, the total catches from the stock in 1983 will represent 26% of the adult stock, much less than one-third of the entire stock, an estimate of whose size is not available.

* * *

Question No 104 by Mr von Hassel (H-349/83)

Subject: Deterioration of the ecological balance of the Baltic Sea

The deterioration of the ecological situation of the Baltic Sea is as dramatic as that of the North Sea. Since part of the Baltic coast is Community territory, would the Commission state whether it is aware of the dangers of pollution and 'dumping' in the Baltic Sea, how it assesses the situation and, if it shares my concern, what steps it is taking to achieve effective solutions by giving priority to joint action by coastal States, including those which do not belong to the Community?

Answer

The Commission has been keeping abreast of the scientific publications on the pollution of the Baltic Sea and is therefore well informed on this subject.

The virtually landlocked nature of the Baltic Sea its shallow depths and the economic structures in its coastal States make this pollution of particular importance.

Since the Community is not yet a party to the Helsinki Agreement and does not therefore belong to its executive bodies, the Commission is not in possession of any details about the causes of this pollution, the measures taken to combat it and the monitoring operations that will be required.

As far back as 1976 the Commission proposed to the Council that negotiations be entered into on accession to this Agreement. In 1977 the Council instructed the Commission to take part in the proceedings of the Interim Commission as an observer.

On several occasions, mainly on the occasion of the ratification of the Agreement by Denmark on 20 July 1977 and by the German Federal Republic on 3 March 1980, the Commission took steps towards accession.

* * *

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 1983

Contents

1. <i>Approval of minutes</i>	
<i>Mr Habsburg; Mr Glinne; Mr Fergusson; Mr C. Jackson</i>	181
2. <i>Topical and urgent debate</i>	
<i>Destruction of the Korean Airlines Boeing 747 — Motions for resolutions (Doc. 1-672/83) by Lady Elles and others, (Doc. 1-683/83) by Mr de la Malène (Doc. 1-692/83) by Mr Bangemann and others, (Doc. 1-701/83) by Mr Galluzzi and others and (Doc. 1-708/83) by Mr Habsburg and others</i>	
<i>Lady Elles; Mr Israël; Mr Berkhouwer; Mr Harris; Mr Segrè; Mr Habsburg; Mr Glinne; Mr Croux; Mr Fergusson; Mr Denis; Mrs Bonino; Mr Paisley; Mr Plas- kovitis; Lady Elles; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Psmazoglou; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Alexiadis; Mr Almirante; Mr Kallias; Mr Haagerup; Mr Plaskovitis; Mr Alavanos; Mr von der Vring; Lady Elles</i>	181
<i>Lebanon — Motions for resolutions (Doc. 1-682/83) by Mr de la Malène, (Doc. 1-696/83) by Mr d'Ormesson and others and (Doc. 1-704/83) by Mr De Pasquale and others</i>	
<i>Mr Cousté; Mr d'Ormesson; Mrs Cinciari Rodano; Mrs Charzat; Mr Nordmann . . .</i>	191
<i>Chad — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-667/83) by Mrs Veil and others</i>	
<i>Mrs Veil; Mr G. Fuchs; Mr Schall; Mr M. Martin; Mrs Scamaroni</i>	193
<i>Chile — Motions for resolutions (Doc. 1-698/83) by Mr Deschamps and others, (Doc. 1-700/83) by Mr Fanti and Mr Piquet and (Doc. 1-705/83) by Mr Glinne and others</i>	
<i>Mr Barbi; Mrs De March; Mrs Macci- occhi; Mr Van Miert; Mr Penders; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Pedini</i>	196
<i>Death sentence passed on Mr Yermak Lukianov — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-664) by Mr Beyer de Ryke and Mr De Gucht</i>	
<i>Mr Beyer de Ryke; Lord Bethell; Mr Israël; Mrs Ewing</i>	198
<i>Natural disasters — Motions for resolu- tions (Doc. 1-677/83) by Mrs Duport, (Doc. 1-689/83) by Mrs Poirier, (Doc. 1-694/83) by Mr Baudis and (Doc. 1-690/83/rev.) by Mrs De March</i>	
<i>Mrs Poirier; Mrs Duport; Mr Baudis; Mrs De March; Mr Pisani (Commission)</i>	200
3. <i>Formal sitting</i>	202
4. <i>Special committee on economic recovery — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-569/83) by the enlarged Bureau</i>	
<i>Mr Bonaccini; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr von Bismarck; Mr Nord; Mr Enright; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Seligman; Mr Rogalla; Mr Glinne; Mr Harris; Mr Nyborg; Mr J. Moreau; Mr Hord</i>	202
5. <i>Statute of Members of the European Parli- ament — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-566/83) by the enlarged Bureau</i>	
<i>Mr Klepsch; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Price; Mr Leonardi; Mr Bangemann; Mr Nyborg; Mr Bonde; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Nyborg; Mr Bonde</i>	206
6. <i>Calendar for 1984</i>	
<i>Mr Habsburg; Mr Nyborg; Mr Fergusson; Mr Mart; Mr Price; Mr Enright; Mr Irmer; Mr Enright; Mrs Lentz-Cornette; Mr Enright</i>	209

7. <i>Next ACP-EEC Convention — Report (Doc. 1-605/83) By Mr Irmer</i>	<i>Mr Malangré; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Lallor; Mr Prag; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	250
<i>Mr Irmer; Mr Pranchère; Mrs Focke; Mr Muntingh; Mr Cohen; Mr Wawrzik; Mr Pearce; Mrs Focke; Mr C. Jackson; Mr Denis; Mr Sablé; Mr Israël; Mr Skovmand; Mr G. Fuchs; Mrs Rabbethge; Mr Perce; Mr Ferrero; Mr Maher; Mrs Ewing</i>		213
8. <i>Votes</i>		
<i>Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Forth; Mr Geurtsen; Mr Klepsch; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Arndt; Mr Enright; Mrs Van den Heuvel</i>		228
9. <i>Committee on toxic substances</i>		
<i>Mr Glinne</i>		230
10. <i>Next ACP-EEC Convention (Doc. 1-605/83) (continuation)</i>		
<i>Mr Vergeer; Mr Turner; Mr Vergès; Mr Bersani; Mr Alavanos; Mr Pisani (Commission); Mr Pearce; Mr Pisani</i> . . .		230
11. <i>Vredeling directive — Orale questions with debate (Doc. 1-601/83) by Sir Henry Plumb, Mr Patterson, Mr Alber, Mr Brok, Mr Bangemann, Mrs Tove Nielsen and Miss De Valera and (Doc. 1-671/83) by Mr Firschmann and Mr Ceravolo</i>		
<i>Mr Peters; Mr Patterson; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Patterson; Mr Frischmann; Mr Richard (Commission); Mr Peters; Mr Ghergo; Mr Spencer; Mr Bonaccini; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Miss De Valera; Miss Quin; Mr Richard; Miss Quin; Mr Spencer; Mr Brok; Mr Harris; Mr Eisma; Mr Herris; Mr Hord; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Beazley; Miss Quin; Mr Harris</i>		238
12. <i>Pharmacists — Report (Doc. 1-485/83) by Mr Malangré</i>		
	<i>Mr Malangré; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Lallor; Mr Prag; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	250
13. <i>Carriage of goods by road — Report (Doc. 1-465/83) by Mrs von Alemann</i>	<i>Mrs von Alemann; Mr Lalor; Mr Buttafuoco; Mr Eisma; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	254
14. <i>Telephone calls — Report (Doc. 1-502/83) by Mr Marshall</i>	<i>Mr Marshall; Mr Moorhouse; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	257
15. <i>Status of the mobile trades — Report (Doc. 1-462/83) by Mr Deleau</i>	<i>Mr Deleau; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i> . . .	259
16. <i>Beef veal and buffalo meat imports — Report (Doc. 1-451/83) by Mr Seal</i>	<i>Mr Enright; Mr Eyraud; Mr Pisani (Commission)</i>	262
17. <i>Noise emitted by household appliances — Report (Doc. 1-495/83) by Mrs Krouwel-Vlam</i>	<i>Mrs Krouwel-Vlam; Mr Ghergo; Mr Beazley; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Beazlzy; Mr Narjes</i>	263
18. <i>Financial activities of the ECSC — Report (Doc. 1-464/83) by Mr Gabert</i>	<i>Mr Gabert; Mr Pisani (Commission)</i> . . .	267
<i>Annexes</i>		269
<i>I: Mr Pearce; Mr Goerens</i>		
<i>II: Formal sitting:</i>		
<i>Mr Dankert, President of the European Parliament; Mr Karamanlis, President of the Hellenic Republic</i>		271

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 1983

IN THE CHAIR : MR KLEPSCH

Vice-President

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

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Are there any comments ?

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I fail to find a record in yesterday's minutes of what the President said at 3 p.m. She stated that the group chairmen had agreed that in the next part-session two or three hours of the topical and urgent debate should be set aside for a debate on Turkey.

I should like to make it perfectly clear that in my view the group chairmen have no right to do this, that their decision in this matter cannot be binding on Parliament and, what is more, that this action of theirs destroys the true meaning of the concept of urgency, since it is supposed to apply to something of up-to-the-minute topicality. This encroaches upon our rights, and I therefore request a clear statement to the effect that what was said is not binding on us.

(Applause)

President. — Mr Habsburg, I did not personally hear what was said yesterday, but in my view it can at most have been that the group chairmen were contemplating this move, since the manner in which urgency is decided is clearly laid down. At the beginning of a part-session the motions tabled with request for urgent procedure are collected, after which the group chairmen and the president meet and draw up a proposal, which is then put to the House for approval, and of course that is the way it will be done in the next part-session also.

Mr Glinne (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, we are talking about the oral questions on the draft Vredeling directive. At yesterday's meeting of the enlarged Bureau, I had the opportunity to put forward the following objections : very soon the Committee on Social Affairs will have a chance to hear Mr Richard speaking on this very subject. Many members — both of my group and of other groups — belonging to the Committee on Social Affairs are somewhat put out by the fact that we would be having a debate today following the presentation of two oral questions on the Vredeling draft when the Committee on Social Affairs is, in any case, due to deal with the matter soon.

I therefore ask the House the following question : would it not be wiser to postpone the debate in

plenary sitting until the Committee on Social Affairs has heard what the responsible Commissioner has to say ?

President. — Mr Glinne, I heard yesterday what you have just said, but that does not change the fact that Parliament has fixed the agenda for this week and that this item is accordingly on the agenda.

According to the Rules of Procedure, you may, however, request at the beginning of the sitting, when this item is announced, that it be removed from the agenda. That is not now possible.

Mr Fergusson (ED). — Mr President, reverting to Mr Habsburg's question, can we take it then that the announcement made from the Chair yesterday about Turkey has no status whatever in this House until we accept it ?

President. — No, Mr Fergusson, I am not prepared to let anyone else speak on this matter. We are not supposed to be holding a debate on it. It is a question which is clearly covered by our Rules of Procedure and which must be raised in the relevant week. If anyone wishes to speak on it, I cannot allow it !

Mr C Jackson (ED). — Mr President, my point is about the Minutes of yesterday. On the Spineli resolution, I put in a duly signed amendment and was informed that this related only to the English language, not to the other languages, and that therefore the change would be made in the text. It relates in fact to the first line of the resolution. I should be very grateful if the Presidency could investigate what happened to this, because I was given to understand that the change would just be made automatically.

President. — We shall look into it.

(Parliament approved the minutes of proceedings) (1)

2. *Topical and urgent debate*

Destruction of the Korean Airlines Boeing 747

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

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-672/83) by Lady Elles and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group on the shooting down of the Korean passenger aircraft, flight KAL 007 ;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-683/83) by Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of the European Progressive Democrats on the destruction of the Korean Airlines Boeing 747 ;

⁽¹⁾ *Document received — Referral to committee : see Minutes of proceedings.*

President

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-692/83) by Mr Bangemann and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group on the South Korean Aircraft shot down by the Soviet air force ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-707/83) by Mr Galluzzi and others on the shooting down of the South Korean jumbo jet ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-708/83) by Mr Habsburg and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) on the destruction of a Korean aircraft by the Soviet air force.

Lady Elles (ED). — Mr President, my group, the European Democratic Group, and, I hope, all those who have signed and approved the amendment to our resolution condemn totally the cold-blooded, ruthless and unjustifiable shooting down of aircraft KAL 007 by Soviet military planes. We take this opportunity of expressing from this House our sympathy with the bereaved families of all the victims of that incident.

By their action, in violation of international norms of conduct, the Soviet Union has put in jeopardy essential agreements between nations for guaranteeing the safety of civilian commercial flights. The Soviet Union must be made to understand the enormity of this crime and its consequences. We therefore strongly support all those governments which, encouraged by the pilots' associations around the world, have imposed a ban on Aeroflot in their territories for a period of time. They include not only the Member States of the Community ; but also others such as Canada and New Zealand. We urge other governments of the free world to take similar action. These actions do imply a financial loss, but some countries are prepared to meet that financial loss in order to stand by their moral obligations in the interests of the safety of passengers throughout the world.

Of Western nations only the Greek Government has shamefully failed to condemn the Soviets for their crime.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

By their refusal they have lost all credibility in the community of free nations. Never again will this government be taken seriously in any critical judgement of violation of human rights. I dread to think what will happen at the forthcoming session of the United Nations General Assembly if they hold the presidency during that session. They have harmed themselves, the Greek people. The process of European political cooperation, which cannot work without a consensus, must be reviewed in the light of these circumstances.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Several days after the incident, still little is known, but gradually facts are being revealed which confirm all the well-known characteristics of the Soviets : a combi-

nation of ruthlessness and fear, deceitfulness and suspicion. We earnestly request the International Civil Aviation Organization, to which the USSR is a party, to make a full inquiry into all the surrounding circumstances and to undertake all the necessary steps for a full investigation of the incident in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Chicago Convention of 1944.

But above all, Mr President, we must press the ICAO to clarify and strengthen legislation guaranteeing the right of free passage of civilian aircraft over the sovereign territory of another country. This kind of incident must not happen again.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Israël (DEP). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the whole of Europe has been overwhelmed with immense anguish at the assassination of 269 people in the Korean Airlines Boeing. Our anguish is immense because every member of our civilized populations has put him or herself in the place of these innocent victims, lost in a bitterly cold night and savagely shot down by a Soviet fighter plane. We may even wonder, Mr President, whether this plane really was piloted by a human being, a human being who actually accepted the order from a mysterious political or military command to shoot down the innocent in the middle of the night above the sea of Japan.

The paranoia which seized the Soviet Government on this occasion is extremely serious. It constitutes a warning for all civilized people. Are we to believe that the same kind of thing in similar circumstances could occur again one day, only this time making use of dreadful atomic weapons ?

This is an extremely grave matter, Mr President, and we may well ask ourselves whether the accusation of spying which has been made against this unfortunate aeroplane has any sense to it. Spying by civilian aircraft on the territory of an enemy belongs to the distant past. It is inconceivable that the major powers would for a second imagine using a civilian aircraft in order to photograph military targets. The major powers have other ways of spying on each other.

Has the European Community's response to this situation been an appropriate one ? Unfortunately, the answer is no. Our Community, ladies and gentlemen, has been satisfied with deploring this act, not condemning it. Whose fault is this ? Certainly, we can not blame all the governments, but we can blame the lack of coordination between the Greek presidency and the nine other Foreign Affairs Ministers. To be specific, the Greek presidency has demonstrated its provincialism by not grasping that the interests of the Community were more important than any so-called strategic and individual interests of Greece which might apply in a situation like this one.

Israël

In addition and — which is even more serious, Mr President, — two Community Member States, including my own — unfortunately — have refused to be associated with the measures decided upon by the pilots' associations, which aim at boycotting airlinks with Moscow for at least 15 days. All this is regrettable, and that is why today's debate in this House is so crucial. We have to make it quite clear that the conscience of the people of Europe, represented in this hemicycle, cannot tolerate, firstly, the weakness of our Community's governments, secondly, the lack of coordination between its leaders and thirdly, and above all, this extraordinary silence regarding, and toleration of, an act of violence which is nevertheless an obvious warning of the greatest danger threatening us, namely, an accidental war or an atomic holocaust which might occur by chance in the middle of the night above the Sea of Japan.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Berkhouwer (L). — *(NL)* My Chairman and friend, Mr Bangemann, and I have agreed that I would speak on behalf of our group this morning.

Mr President, what we are talking about is a deliberate massacre which has horrified us. Despite all the distortions coming from the Russians, tapes and Japanese radar recordings have shown this deliberate massacre to be an irrefutable fact. At a given moment the Russian pilot says: 'I am already abeam of the target.' The Russian pilot shouts in exasperation when, short of fuel, he is ordered to draw back and fire.

A Russian commander knowingly gave an order to bring down an aircraft with 269 people in it. Let this new incident again be a warning to many to prove how vulnerable detente really is. And this abhorrent event should make us realize that detente is not possible unless we are prepared to make an effort towards detente. I continuously claim that, without effort, detente is not possible.

Mr President, my group is convinced that, however bad and however sad the affair might be, we have in front of us an extremely well drawn up motion which contains all the relevant ingredients — sympathy for the victims, compensation, and an investigation by the ICAO. Although, to be honest, where the latter is concerned, I have doubts whether many new facts will come to light after all that has been proven about this particular case which, I feel, could be put in the same category as those which the tribunal at Nuremberg labelled 'crimes against humanity'.

Mr President, I would like to add a few more comments. My group has been filled with horror and notes with horror that a certain group in our Parliament — and with that I am thinking of the French

Communists — show themselves in a cowardly fashion to be as it were in sympathy with the Soviet massacre by not sharing our condemnation. One would have hoped that we would have been able to display absolute unanimity in our Parliament. All right then, we shall express our condemnation almost completely unanimously, without them. I think that there is only one word for it, and that is an English word. I think one uses it when someone acts in this way: '*one condones*'.

(Shouts of 'All the Communists!')

It is even worse. All the Communists, note that well! Now we know where we stand with these ladies and gentlemen!

Mr President, I conclude with a remark addressed to the Greek Government. Throughout the rule of the Colonels, we in this Parliament did everything to try and restore democracy in Greece. When this eventually came to pass, we worked constantly to try and get Greece to join the Nine as the tenth country. And what do we have now, Mr President? I heard the Greek Minister for Foreign Affairs speaking on Tuesday and I could not believe my ears. I felt as if I were following in the footsteps of Socrates and Plato, as if I had to argue against a sophist. This minister tried to defend the Greek position with an improbable and unmoveable sophistical argument, disregarding the fact that the President of the EPC is not there to take sides but to try and reach agreement. I am glad that this presidency will not last until the Greek calends but will have come to an end within a few months.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Harris (ED). — Could I ask, Mr President, where is the President-in-Office of the Council for this important debate? I understand he is in the building. Surely he should be here listening to this important matter?

President. — It is up to the Council, Mr Harris, to decide who is normally to represent it at our sittings.

Mr Segre (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, we Italian communists have strongly condemned the shooting down of the South Korean aircraft by the Soviet Union, and, shocked and horrified at the number of victims, would like here to restate our condemnation.

We have therefore submitted our own motion on this issue, since we are not in full agreement with the majority's joint motion, since we believe that our motion goes beyond the sentiments expressed just now by Mr Berkhouwer, who advocates a move to which there is all too often recourse, i.e. a request for sanctions.

Segre

A 15 day ban on Aeroflot flights cannot compensate for those deaths or help us to recognize the lessons to be learnt from this tragedy. Furthermore, we cannot agree with the heavy attacks on the Greek presidency contained in this document and mentioned in this debate, since apart from the problems which undoubtedly exist, they can only make the process of political cooperation and more general cooperation between the Ten, more difficult.

Leaving aside the many aspects which still remain unclear and the large amount of factual and political perplexities still surrounding the drama of the aircraft which was shot down, the greatest need in a situation like this which has further heightened international tensions is to provide a clear, firm political response to this course of events in which mounting reciprocal distrust, the arms race and the frequent prevalence of military considerations over political ones lead to agitation and pessimism which, although they are nothing new, are intensified by modern technological progress.

The world is set on a terrible and suicidal course. Let us hope that these poor victims will at least convince us all of the need to adopt all possible means, each person within his capabilities, to turn over a new leaf, and that this will put pressure to do the same on the major military powers who do not hesitate, in the present climate of distrust which exists in the world today, to use military strength when they believe, rightly or wrongly, that their own security is at risk!

We must break this vicious circle and one way of doing this would be to use harsher and more severe language than that which we have been led to use in the motion put forward by the majority, albeit out of a sense of legitimate and just indignation. Otherwise the feeling of insecurity of each one of us will increase, and we will slide down the slippery slope towards a state of international ungovernability in which we can only expect the worst.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, the reaction to the barbaric crime of the Soviet Union, the shooting-down of an unarmed Korean airliner with the cold-blooded murder of its 269 passengers, has crudely demonstrated the world situation to us. Quite apart from certain communists — as, for example, the DKP in Germany, but, thank God, not our Italian colleagues — who have approved the violent act of the Soviet armed forces, many Kremlin experts like Professor Leonhard are busy prettying everything up and presenting us with a kindly, lovable KGB Andropov.

The story put about by such people was that the shooting-down was an action by the armed forces to deflect the ruler of the Kremlin from his liberal and peace-loving path. No evidence was brought forward, only the argument, which has been repeated *ad nauseam*, that in the Kremlin there is a liberal and a hawkish faction, friends of peace and warmongers. I still

remember how the appeasers and agents said exactly the same about Hitler before 1939. There is nothing new! Just that people seem unwilling to learn from history. But if one tries to do this today, one is called a Cold Warrior.

I can remember from my own experience how I was described as a communist because I spoke about Hitler exactly as I do today about his imitator Andropov. After all, the truth is that the shooting-down has shown us the true face of a system which scorns humanity, which, since the end of the Second World War has subjected 13 formerly sovereign states to its hegemony, of which nine in Europe alone. In the same period this regime was responsible for the deaths of more than 20 million people.

The 269 passengers are simply the last link of a long, as yet unfinished chain. Everyone must be aware of that today unless they are determined for ideological reasons not to see the truth.

That was unfortunately the case on the part of the Presidency of the European Council. What happened in Athens is a shameful scandal, for, in this instance, the Council Presidency made itself the indirect mouth-piece of the Kremlin.

(Applause — Mixed reactions)

In so doing, a sin was committed against the spirit of the Community in a way which, thank God, has never been the case before, and which, hopefully, will never be the case again. Once again it becomes apparent...

(Applause — Mixed reactions)

that the driving force of one Community body has to contend with the obstructiveness of another. The Council has once again shown that in its present role, it is a totally incompetent absurdity, that is to say, as long as the *liberum veto*, that is the rule of unanimity, stands. Were it not for this, the will of the European people would have prevailed, and we would have been spared the shame of seeing the Council condemned to silence on an important issue by a blinkered demagogue.

For this reason it is our duty as representatives of the people, to say what our people really think, and to make clear to the world that a Charalambopoulos is an unfortunate occupational hazard and not a legitimate spokesman for Europe — nor I hope for his noble Greek people.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Mr Glinne (S). — *(FR)* 'A brutal, indescribable, shocking, overwhelming and incredible act...'. The Socialist Group, Mr President, would like to borrow these words of the French Minister, Claude Cheysson, to condemn the destruction by a Soviet military plane, of a civilian aircraft belonging to Korean Airlines, causing the terrible death of 269 innocent civilians.

Whatever the circumstances, which have not yet been completely disclosed, the behaviour of the Soviet authorities goes against all established and respected principles held by the international community.

Glinne

In the face of such an act, the international community owes it to itself to record its profound disapproval by concrete measures such as the temporary but nevertheless as widespread as possible isolation of Aeroflot within international civil aviation. Another concrete step that must be taken is for the International Organization of Civil Aviation to make a thorough inquiry into the incident and to draw up new rules which make it possible to guarantee the safety of civilian aircraft in the future. Appropriate compensation for the families of the victims must also be demanded and obtained from the Soviet Union.

That being the situation, and as indicated by the attitude of the majority of Western Governments, this time of indignation can and must also be one of calm. That is why we attach great importance to paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution, which emphasizes, in this grave moment of international tension, that it is vital — in spite of everything and perhaps now more than ever — to encourage opportunities for dialogue and negotiations to resolve all differences.

In addition, at the legitimate request of quite a number of our members, Mr President, our group is asking for a separate vote on paragraph 6 of the motion for a resolution.

(Applause from the centre and the left).

Mr Croux (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I do not want to dwell any longer on the human suffering, the unease and the threat to peace that have been caused by this serious incident near Sachalin, rather, in the very short time that I have been allotted, I would especially like to speak to you about paragraph 6 of the motion.

To my disappointment I just heard Mr Glinne say that his group wants a separate vote on this text. We were nevertheless of the opinion — and this is what we were trying to achieve — that we were all of one mind about this, and we watered down the initial texts considerably in order to overcome certain misgivings. We certainly believe — and I think everybody in Parliament agrees with this — that the text of the motion is an infinitely better interpretation of feelings in Europe regarding this event than the ineffectual outcome of the political cooperation meeting of the 10 foreign ministers in Athens under the present Greek presidency. This disappointing outcome has shocked us greatly and has left us perplexed. We believe that it is the duty of Parliament to underline this, because we feel that the present presidency has not handled this correctly in the light of what was recently said at Stuttgart. It is a well known fact that the Greek Government has distanced itself from certain paragraphs of the Stuttgart declaration, namely paragraph 2.2.3. concerning the strengthening of political cooperation. But that is not to say that the Greek Government has renounced other paragraphs in the

Stuttgart declaration — namely in the preamble, where it says 'convinced that, by speaking with a single voice in foreign policy, including political aspects of security, Europe can contribute to the preservation of peace'. Nor has the Greek Government expressed any reservations about paragraph 1.4.2, concerning the objectives of political cooperation, where the same word is underlined once again in even clearer terms, and where even the political and economic aspects of security in the service of peace are mentioned as the common objective.

We feel that matters have not been dealt with according to the recent Stuttgart declaration, and that is why we are disappointed, that is why we are perplexed. And we are all the more surprised because the Greek Government, who hold the presidency, launched an initiative concerning the negotiations in Geneva in that very same period. Where is the political logic in this? We doubt very much whether any can be found. It is not that we oppose initiatives being launched to promote peace. On the contrary, look at the Haagerup report, which the great majority of us accepted and which contains the Parliament's point of view on this matter. We applaud the fact that Europe is more active on the subject of peace, but the circumstances in which this has happened in the last few months, Mr President, sadden us. We expect a country such as Greece, just as we expect small countries, to play a more progressive European role. Being small does not preclude one's playing a major role. The performance of some heads of government and statesmen in the Benelux countries shows that small countries can make their voices heard more loudly in the European context, and we had expected the same from the present presidency.

Mr Fergusson (ED). — Mr President, it falls to the Community's Parliament, not to its Council of Ministers, to express on Europe's behalf its horror and disgust at the heartless execution of 269 civilians in a civil airliner merely because it had strayed from its proper path. It falls to us to call for the extended exclusion of Aeroflot from the world's airspace.

When this massacre happened, it seemed that all that was needed was the admission of a terrible mistake, an offer — which the Soviet Union could well have afforded — of sympathy and reparations, a meticulous investigation of the circumstances of what happened and a promise so to organize the chain of command and communication that it could not recur. To Moscow's disgrace the only truth to have come out of Russia so far is the evidence of the twisted, dangerous nature of its government, paranoid, brutalized and, most alarming of all, stupid. We have seen again their folly and hypocrisy in accusing others, in this case the countries of the victims, of responsibility for yet another Soviet atrocity.

Fergusson

We are reminded once more that in the madness of Soviet Communism truth is neither more nor less than the State declares it to be. Peace is war. It is the sane who fill the psychiatric wards, it is the human soul itself which is the enemy. The State that is still occupying Afghanistan cares nothing about people. Now whether or not the Soviet population, starved as they are of political honesty, believe that any real attempt was made to exchange signals with the Korean aircraft, whether or not the Soviet population can believe it is necessary to use a civilian airliner to spy on their country, it is certain that the rest of the world does not believe that story.

As we have heard, in fact, that is not quite true. There are precisely two sovereign States — *sovereign* States — whose governments have refused roundly to condemn this odious act. One is the Soviet Government; the other, unbelievably and shamefully, is the government holding the presidency of the Council of Ministers. The Greek Foreign Minister, Mr President, has dealt a blow to the whole idea of political cooperation for which he will not easily be forgiven either by us or, I hope, by the Greek people, who, too, can only watch with alarm a foreign policy more closely aligned with Moscow's than with those of Greece's European friends!

(Applause)

Time and again this week the President-in-Office of the Council has been asked whether or not he was prepared to condemn this action, the shooting down of an airliner. But to extract an answer from this man has been like trying to nail jelly to a ceiling! We must therefore ask our absent President-in-Office, as the rest of the Council certainly wanted to know, from whom that man is taking instructions. On whose behalf did he wreck the political cooperation in Athens? How can we ever have confidence in him again? As more bodies are washed ashore in the Sea of Japan, albeit rather distantly now, we are interested to know whether the President-in-Office of the Council is moved to any anger. We hope at least to hear from President Karamanlis later this morning what our friends, the Greek people, really feel about it all.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Denis (COM). — *(FR)* We too feel justifiably upset at the Boeing disaster and profoundly disturbed by the grave questions which have still not been answered.

Right from the start we called for light to be thrown on this affair from all sides and for an international committee of enquiry to apportion responsibility. It is also essential — a French proposal, this — for the civil aviation bodies to take measures to ensure that such a drama does not occur again. It is, precisely, our awareness of the human consequences of the event and the need to draw lessons from it which prohibits

us from following a text which seeks to aggravate tensions and tries to point an accusing finger at one of the Community governments.

One of the main lessons, surely, is to appeal to everyone's sense of responsibility, and particularly ours, as elected representatives, so that we can promote dialogue and understanding. This tragedy is a stark illustration of the terrible reality we live in. Tensions and the arms build-up may plunge humanity into disaster at any moment.

We are told that it was not possible to prevent the death of these 269 unfortunate people during their two and a half hour flight over Soviet territory. But if there is no successful outcome tomorrow — because it is already tomorrow, gentlemen — to the Geneva talks, the placing of new missiles in Europe will reduce to six minutes — yes, only six minutes I said — the risk of a nuclear catastrophe, which would cause the deaths of tens of millions of people. How can we avoid doing everything we possibly can, helping each other as Europeans, to reach an agreement which will prevent the installation of any new missiles and reduce the number of those which already exist both in the East and in the West, while maintaining a balance of forces? Millions of people are demanding this, as you know full well. They belong to all different populations and subscribe to various religions and political tendencies. They cannot comprehend how those who have proposed today's text could have withdrawn the debate on missiles from yesterday's agenda, which is a matter of life or death. Yes indeed, the lesson to be learned from the Boeing tragedy is that we must all act to stop the arms race, promote détente and safeguard humanity.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Bonino (CDI). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it would seem fairly self-evident from the reconstruction of events put forward by the more serious and qualified newspapers that the Boeing was involved in espionage. However this detail, far from diminishing the horror felt by all of us at the cold-blooded murder of 269 people by the Soviet Government, only intensifies these sentiments.

But what can it show us? In my opinion it only goes to show that we have witnessed a farce in which both the imperialist super powers, albeit in different ways, have shown total contempt for human life, the one by using people in an underhand way, and the other by brutally murdering people. This can be the only explanation for the Reagan administration's timid sanctions against Russia. If Reagan's administration was really so innocent, can you imagine what would happen!

However, on the contrary, ladies and gentlemen from the Right, the American Government has, for example, taken enormous care not to stop supplying grain to this murderous Russian Government — I say murderous, since it is a government which murders

Bonino

both its own citizens and non-Soviet citizens. But the American Government continues to send millions and millions of tonnes of grain to these assassins.

Another incredible aspect of this farce, which seems to me to be self-evident, and of which I cannot approve, ladies and gentlemen, is the attitude of the European Community, which cannot even manage to adopt a common stance. This is therefore another aspect which merits condemnation: the impotence of the European Community, and its lack of unity which, quite frankly, make even the sanctions which have been taken lose their credibility.

President. — There may be Members who wish to comment on what has been said by one or other of the speakers, but no provision has been made for this. If anyone wishes to make a personal comment, he may do so at the end of the debate.

Mr Paisley (NI). — Mr President, the Soviet Union by its cold-blooded and callous action in shooting down a civilian airliner with 269 passengers on board, including a member of the United States House of Representatives, has demonstrated once again, by violating the basic principles of accepted international behaviour, its contempt for international standards adopted and adhered to by all civilized States. The refusal even to explain the circumstances of the disaster in an open and honest manner serves only to compound the guilt of a régime which has yet to express any remorse whatsoever over these totally unnecessary deaths. Rather it has sought to support and defend the indefensible, whilst shielding the real proof of what happened even from its own people.

The Soviet Union talks of the right to defend its borders against intrusion while denying to 269 innocent people the most basic and fundamental right of all, that of life itself. It is to the shame of certain countries in Europe, including some Member States of this Community, that they have been so reluctant to translate into determined action the outrage of people everywhere over this crime against humanity. In this I include the State which at present holds the presidency of this Community and which alone stood in the way of a united Community condemnation of Russia. It is not enough merely to offer sympathy to the families of the victims of this disaster: what is needed is action, which alone will deter a repetition of this type of murder. At the very least, there should be a total exclusion from EEC airspace of all Aeroflot aircraft until the Russian Government acknowledges its wrongdoing, apologizes to the bereaved families of the victims of its actions and agrees to pay full compensation to them.

Mr Plaskovitis (S). — *(GR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I share completely the feelings of our Parliament for the loss of so many human lives. We

cannot know which forces have, at this critical time, an interest in preventing any attempt to achieve success at the Geneva Conference and to limit the nuclear arsenal in Europe.

The Greek people is gripped by deepest anxiety at the gloomy prospects for the maintenance of peace in the world, and it knows that incidents such as the loss of the South Korean airliner, from wherever they may originate, are capable of lighting the fuse of an unstoppable catastrophe which will not cost only two or three hundred lives, but millions.

All those who are combining in one way or another to the efforts of the forces for peace in the world at this time should take note. My own generation and that of many others here has lived through successive provocations which led to two world wars. The position of the Greek presidency is one of deep anxiety and expresses the views of the Greek people. The fanatical tone in which certain people inveigh against my country, impresses me, and it is not the first time. There are certain people who think that Greece does not have the right, as a small country, to have a foreign policy, and that it should fall in behind those powerful countries which have led the world into two world wars.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Fergusson, you must know that my country, which had 500 000 dead during the Second World War, followed you, followed the policy of your government, followed the policy of the powerful governments, and paid for it with the gravest sacrifices with which you are familiar.

(Applause from the left)

You ought then, to have more respect for the Greek people and the government which represents it today, and to remember the millions of victims which the Greek nation had together with those who fought for democracy in Europe.

Therefore, Mr President, I would like once again to draw your attention to the fact that the intentions of the Greek Government, the intentions of Greece were good intentions, they were intentions aimed at maintaining a state of detente, a state of calm in this world, and at avoiding the renewed nightmare of war, the significance of which perhaps some cannot yet conceive, and I cannot believe that certain people — perhaps outside this Parliament — are striving to bring back this nightmare to our memory and imagination.

Mr President, this Parliament discusses matters of political cooperation. You know very well that yesterday, motions were rejected which simply and solely asked for a debate within the context of political cooperation, on the Greek initiative calling for the non-installation of the missiles and the extension of the Geneva talks, if no compromise can be reached.

Plaskovitis

In other words, an effort clearly aimed at maintaining peace was considered not even worthy of discussion in the context of political cooperation, and today Greece stands accused, because in the very same context of political cooperation it was not able to agree with the others. However, it was not only Greece. You know that, on the imposition of sanctions against Aeroflot, France too was in disagreement as well as another country which is particularly popular here — Turkey.

I strongly request once more that you understand that, under a Socialist government, Greece is entitled to have a foreign policy of its own and she is not going to fall in behind the foreign policy of others, as happened under the governments of the Right. I am absolutely certain that the hopes of Mr Fergusson will be disappointed.

(Applause from the left)

Lady Elles (ED). — It is a point of order, Mr President, because there are certain rules in the conduct of a parliament which have to be observed, and I would ask Mr Plaskovitis to withdraw that scandalous and fallacious statement about the rôle of the United Kingdom in the last war.

(Applause from the right)

I would remind him that at one stage during that regrettable war, the United Kingdom and Greece were the only allies fighting for freedom, and many of my generation died in your country saving your people.

(Prolonged applause)

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, I can understand Lady Elles' emotion. I can also understand Mr Plaskovitis' emotion and that of everyone in this House who is personally affected. But it is my job to see to it that this debate is conducted properly, so I am afraid I must say that what Lady Elles said was not a point of order. I have requests to speak from Mr Haagerup, Mr Kallias and Mr Enwright. I am convinced that all three of them do not wish to raise proper points of order either, and so I cannot allow them to speak.

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, we feel emotion and sorrow that more than 200 people have lost their lives, and to that extent we agree with all those who have tabled the motions and all those who have spoken. However, we disagree radically and are categorically opposed when they want to exploit this emotion in order to satisfy a manic anti-Soviet passion and to promote a conspiracy which is developing against the Greek presidency, my country, and the Greek people.

Mr President, the circumstances of the destruction of the Korean plane allow it to be stated most reliably that this aircraft, posing as a civilian aircraft and under

the pretext of a civilian flight, for two hours demonstrated a behaviour totally out of keeping with that of a civilian aircraft. Furthermore, it appears from all the evidence at present available to all of us that it was receiving instructions from and being observed by imperialist planes which did not protect it precisely because they had sent it on a dubious mission. If, then, there is anyone responsible for the loss of the lives of these people, if there was an attack against a civilian airliner, the guilty ones are those who used it for their own ends. Therefore, Mr President, if the Greek presidency has played a role in ensuring that the European Council in Athens did not take an irresponsible and one-sided decision, then this conduct of the Greek presidency is worthy of praise as a contribution to the cause of peace, dialogue and objective examination of such circumstances.

And finally, to our British friends, we must say: when, at one time, everything had collapsed in Europe under Nazism and their island was threatened with invasion, my country, our people, stood at their side and fought against Nazism. Therefore, they should take care when referring to Greece.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Pesmazoglou (NI). — *(GR)* Mr President, I want at this moment to express my deep emotion at the destruction of the South Korean airliner and also to add that the thoughts and positions of the great majority in the European Parliament are absolutely appropriate and I sincerely share them.

The whole matter has three aspects: one is the human aspect, the loss of life, the second is a tactical aspect, the safety of air traffic, and there is also a third, very serious political aspect, namely how the decisions are taken which can lead to such a disaster as the destruction of the South Korean airliner.

The problem is extremely serious, and I share fully the emotion of all groups in the European Parliament. However, Mr President, I want to refer principally to the substance of European Political Cooperation. Establishing a common European foreign policy is a matter of peace for all our people. And when we talk about a common foreign policy we do not mean reduction of this foreign common policy to the lowest common denominator. On the contrary, such a common foreign policy must express the resultant of the political wills and of the position of the 10 Member States. I am sorry, but I am compelled to disagree with the present government of my country and with all that Mr Plaskovitis said a short while ago. It is the duty of the presidency to look for a way to express the common political will of the 10 countries of the Community.

(Applause)

Pesmazoglou

This does not mean that each country cannot have its own views, but in the foreign policy of every country, one basic element is the establishment of a common foreign policy. It would be possible for any government not to agree with the views of the majority, but it would not be logical to frustrate the expression of the views of the nine countries when, on a matter of general significance, they are so similar and so weighty.

(Applause)

I emphasize these things, Mr President, because I consider them significant for the foreign policy of all our countries, including Greek foreign policy. The common foreign policy of the European Community is a matter of peace, security and progress for all our peoples, including the Greek people. And I believe, Mr President, that this is also the will of the great majority of the Greek people.

Mr Plaskovitis, as well as the Greek Government, have a duty to express the views of the majority which brought them to power. But, at the same time, it is the duty of all of us, and the duty also of the Greek opposition — and I belong to the opposition — to express their views on this matter. I think, then, Mr President, that the joint motion which has been tabled by most groups in Parliament is just, we must vote for it, and I shall vote for it. However, I submit one suggestion and one request.

In paragraph 6 direct reference is made to the Greek presidency. I beg to suggest that this reference be deleted. As you heard, I disagree with the action and the position of the Greek Government, but I do not think that the decision which we take this morning need contain a rebuke against the Greek Government. The Greek Government conducts its foreign policy as it perceives it. I do not think that any rebuke against the Greek Government should be contained in such a motion, and I would ask, Mr President, that paragraph 6 be put to the vote separately. I shall not vote for it as it stands. The reference to the Greek presidency can be deleted and the rest can remain.

The assertion that no joint decision expressing the political will of all our countries emerged will, I think, serve as a clear reminder to all of us and for those who care to take note of it in Greece.

Mr Fergusson made a reference to the President of the Greek Republic, who will be addressing us this morning. I want to say the following: the President of the Greek Republic, Mr Karamanlis, represents the nation, represents the whole of the Greek people, and I am certain he will speak in accordance with all that has been passed up till now by the Greek Parliament. I would remind you that the accession of Greece into the European Community was passed with a large majority in accordance with the Greek constitution.

Consequently, it represents the political will of the great majority people, and any departure from this general direction is neither in the spirit nor in the letter of the Greek constitution. However, every Greek Government can of course apply its policies. I believe, then, that Mr Karamanlis's speech will rise above the political differences in our country and will express the general direction of the great majority of the Greek people, and this is what I expect us to hear at 12 o'clock.

I hope, Mr President, that this joint motion will be adopted. However, I request once again that the reference constituting a rebuke against the present government be deleted.

(Applause from various quarters)

Mr Kyrkos (COM). — *(GR)* The Soviet Union bears a major responsibility for the shooting down of the passenger aircraft and for this tragedy which has stunned the world. However, it is not the only one, and Europe would attain a certain stature in the consciousness of its peoples if it also emphasized the major responsibility of the secret services of the United States, which is becoming increasingly clear. Europe, I repeat, would have absolutely no reason to serve the interests of anyone, and she would attain a certain stature amongst the peoples of Europe if she stood up for herself in the way in which the Greek presidency has tried to urge upon Europe.

It is lamentable today that certain colleagues are trying to replace the principle of unanimity in political decisions, and of dialogue, with the principle of subordination, and I would like to make clear to every one that the Greek people is not going to be disciplined, nor will it take lessons from the arch-reactionaries of Europe. The Greek people is committed to the preservation of peace and cooperation and, in this respect, we ought to unite our efforts instead of addressing impertinent disapprovals to a government which draws its power from the great majority of the people and expresses the policy of this majority.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Alexiadis (NI). — *(GR)* Mr President, I too express my abhorrence at the murder of 269 innocent passengers of a civilian airliner. I shall not use adjectives to describe the act. Those that exist are mild and inadequate. At the same time, I shall not hide my regret at the position of my government which has prevented the unanimous condemnation of the barbarous incident. I do not accept the justification by some of the British 'our country, right or wrong'. In the matter of the condemnation of the shooting down of the South Korean airliner my country is in the wrong, and I condemn her position, without, in spite of that, approving the issuing of a special rebuke against the Greek presidency.

Alexiadis

The Soviet Union thought perhaps that the shooting-down of the South Korean airliner represented a show of strength. On the contrary, however, it represents a provocation and a show of panic in view of the stationing of the new Cruise and Pershing missiles in Western Europe. My colleague and old comrade-in-arms in the struggle against the armies of occupation, Mr Plaskovitis, argued in favour of the initiative of the Greek Government for the postponement for six months of the stationing of the Cruise and Pershing missiles. May I ask Mr Plaskovitis if the 25-year period since 1958, during which disarmament has been discussed in Geneva, is not sufficient, and will the six months be sufficient? It is a question which I think allows of only one answer.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Almirante (NI). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall just say a few words on behalf of the Members of the Italian Destre nazionale party, to show our support and appreciation and, at the same time, bitterness and concern.

We support and approve of the responsible, firm and serious attitude which the major political groups have finally had the courage to assume on this very important occasion.

We feel bitterness and concern because of the fact that unfortunately, Europe and its institutions have not even on an occasion like this had the courage and the opportunity to show its integrity by opposing atrocities, no matter who the perpetrator. This is not a matter of showing support for the United States of America or for the other countries which have suffered this blow. It is a matter of showing support in Europe and throughout the world for those who defend civilization and peace; and peace should be defended with unanimous courage which, unfortunately, the European institutions have not been able to show even on this occasion.

Mr Kallias (PPE). — *(GR)* Mr President, I asked to speak on a procedural and personal matter. Mr Plaskovitis was perfectly entitled to support the policy of his government and of his party. However, he did not have the right to attack former governments of which I was a member, saying that they fell in behind the foreign policy of other countries, whereas in fact they followed a purely national policy for the benefit of national interests. I wanted to say this, Mr President.

(Applause)

President. — Mr Kallias, that was a personal statement and not a point of order.

Mr Haagerup (L). — *(DA)* Mr President, there is nothing personal in my statement. I merely wish to draw the President's and Parliaments' attention to the fact that yesterday we voted expressly not to put on the agenda the Greek motion opposing the stationing of missiles in Europe. I therefore think it is wrong that Members should combine the question of the Greek motion with that of the shooting down of the Korean airliner as if there were a connection between the two. Even though they can, of course, express their common concern about the political consequences of the shooting down, I consider that they have infringed the rules, Mr President. I therefore beg you to impress this upon these Members who have, nevertheless, brought up in the debate a subject that we yesterday voted not to put on the agenda.

President. — That's just what I'm trying to do, Mr Haagerup.

Mr Plaskovitis (S). — *(GR)* I would simply like to state, Mr President, that there was no offence meant against Mr Kallias personally, and that the views I expressed described current Greek policy and how it differs from the policy followed before. It was not a personal matter, and I think Mr Kallias must understand this.

President. — The debate is closed.¹

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, I move that we establish a quorum. My request is seconded by the following Members: Mr Plaskovitis, Mr Kyrkos, Mr Nikolaou, Mr Papantoniou, Mr Pantazi, Mr Ouzounidis, Mr Ziagas and Mr Lagakos.

I request that a quorum be established and have read out the names of those Members whose support I have. Thank you for the vote on Article 6.

President. — Mr Alavanos, a quorum exists as the vote has shown. 145 Members voted.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, you have no right to make such statements. Rule 71(3) of the Rules of Procedure states:

... unless the President, on a request made before voting has begun by at least 10 Members, ascertains that the quorum is not present.

You cannot ascertain it afterwards. You are obliged to ascertain whether a quorum is present according to the Rules of Procedure — ask your advisors.

(Ten Members stood. The President ascertained that a quorum was present)

¹ For the vote, see Annex I.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (*GR*) Mr President, I think the way in which you carried out the check on the number of Members present is invalid. The relevant part of Rule 71(3) reads as follows :

... the electronic voting system cannot be used for this purpose. The doors of the Chamber may not be closed.

I would ask you to keep to the Rules of Procedure and to check whether a quorum is present in the way laid down by them.

President. — Mr Alavanos, we have counted the number of Members present in accordance with your wishes and have ascertained that more Members were present than voted. Since there were 162 Members present, some of them must obviously have refrained from voting.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (*DE*) Mr President, I was merely concerned that those who were present and did not vote were also included, and with a roll-call vote you could, of course, not tell until later.

President. — That is what we have just done.

After the adoption of the resolution

Lady Elles (ED). — Mr President, have we voted on Amendment No 1 as a whole, or only on the last paragraph ?

President. — Lady Elles, we have voted on everything. Before the vote we discussed how the vote should be taken. It was proposed to take a roll-call vote on the preamble and paragraphs 1-5 and then to take a separate roll-call vote — because many Members of the House wanted it — on paragraph 6. I know that several groups had requested a vote on the amendment as a whole, but all agreed to adopt this procedure. Then we agreed that, since paragraph 7 did not give rise to any disagreements, we would vote on it by a show of hands. I think that everything has now been voted on.

Lebanon

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

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-682/83) by Mr De la Malène on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats on the resumption of hostilities in Lebanon ;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-696/83) by Mr d'Ormesson and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party on the situation in Lebanon ;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-704/83) by Mr De Pasquale and others on the situation in Lebanon.

Mr Cousté (DEP). — (*FR*) Once again, Mr President, the traumatic situation of Lebanon is going to hold the attention of this House. We in the European Progressive Democrats Group have never stopped showing not only our interest in, but also our deep feelings towards this problem, through the voices of Mrs Fourcade, Jean de Lipowski, Messrs Israël and de la Malène. As the Chairman of our Group, the latter gentleman has today submitted this motion for a resolution. The feelings aroused in us by this problem, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, have been further strengthened by the pathetic appeal yesterday from the mayor of Deir-al-Qamar, where 40 000 men, women, children, and old people are suffering from cold and hunger. We are not talking about 269 people, but tens of thousands faced with the threat of death, and of dying in the most terrible way. This human tragedy and distress can only arouse in all parts of this House a feeling that we share, but we cannot accept what some people are saying, namely, that it is a civil war. Some say that it is a war between the Druze and Christians with massacres on both sides. There have of course been a number of massacres and a number of incidents like those at Chatila and Sabra. All this is undeniably the result of the departure from the Chouf region of the Israeli troops.

But to say this is to forget — and sometimes people forget a little too easily or for reasons of political calculation or strategy — that there is a Lebanese State, a national Lebanese assembly, a Lebanese army, that there are, in other words, responsible people in the country and that we are not therefore talking about a civil war, but a war which has known a great deal of foreign interference and in which two different conceptions of the world and of freedom are clashing.

Given these conditions, we are entitled to ask ourselves whether the international buffer force — in the form of armed contingents from three Member States, namely the United Kingdom, Italy and France — can continue to remain inactive when organized military attacks are made on it, resulting in a number of wounded and sometimes even fatal casualties.

The drama taking place in Lebanon is not just a problem for that country but is one for the entire international community, and particularly for our European Community.

We cannot therefore content ourselves with being passive and complacent observers, but must participate in this drama and take the necessary action. That is why, in our motion for a resolution — with the help of this House — we are asking for the Presidency of the Council to convene the Ten as a matter of extreme emergency to discuss the Lebanese problem, so that a general and immediate ceasefire and appropriate accompanying measures can be put forward by the United Nations.

Cousté

We support, and must support unanimously, the legal government of President Amin Gemayel and its efforts at liberating Lebanon and restoring national sovereignty throughout the territory of Lebanon. We are well aware that only political solutions can be brought to bear on the highly complicated and complex problems of the Middle East. Let us at least count ourselves among those who have analysed the problem, understood its complexity, and who want to see the Lebanese State restored to its former self, so that the entire Mediterranean area can be a peaceful one for all men.

Mr d'Ormesson (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, the civil war in Lebanon is of benefit only to the interests of outsiders. Who profits from this civil war? Israel? The accusation is not founded. Israel only entered Lebanon last year after 14 years of attacks on its frontier populations by the PLO and Syria.

Does it benefit Syria? Certainly, because this country has never disguised its desire to annex the Bekaa Valley, namely the granary of Lebanon, which would kill off the country in the process.

Consequently, we must not regard the fighting between the Druze and the Christians at the present time as the mutual slaughter of two communities, but must seek out the influence of foreigners, the part played by Syria, and behind Syria, the USSR, which provides it with weapons.

That is why, given the serious nature of the events, three countries of the Community and the USA decided to send a multinational force to Lebanon. But what use is a force which keeps its weapons by its side and yet nevertheless suffers casualties, as my friend Mr Cousté pointed out just now?

It is time that the Ten agreed to encourage these countries to give orders to the multinational force to assist the legally elected President of Lebanon and his government, and consequently his army, in reestablishing order throughout the territory.

Knowing the resources at the disposal of the multinational force, I have no doubt that it could achieve this within 48 hours, rather than continuing to sustain casualties and standing by while the situation deteriorates even further.

It is time for will-power and courage. Today we have demonstrated our feelings following the horrible assassination of 269 civilians as a result of a Soviet attack on a Boeing aircraft. But we could save many more lives in Lebanon tomorrow, if we had the courage and will to do so. The assassins have had their own way for far too long.

Mrs Cinciari Rodano (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we Communists believe the situation in Lebanon to be very serious, both because of the suffering of the Lebanese people, to which there

seems to be no end and because of the risk of the multinational peace force becoming involved in open warfare. A peaceful solution to the Middle East problem seems to be becoming ever less probable, thus endangering world peace.

We would express our deep sorrow for the Lebanese victims and those of the multinational force, European soldiers and officers, who have lost their lives while carrying out this delicate and dangerous task. We would appeal to the forces fighting within the Lebanon to stop the fighting and to find a political solution through negotiations.

We would repeat our view, expressed several times in this House, that Lebanon's territorial integrity should be re-established and defended, and would once more stress that first and foremost all foreign armed forces must withdraw.

However, we cannot agree with the compromise motion put forward by the other groups, especially in view of the arguments that have just been put forward.

We cannot ignore the fact that the Lebanese drama should be seen within the larger context of the Middle East question, and that unless a solution is found for the Palestinian problem, there can be no hope of finding a peaceful solution for the whole region which would ensure that all the States of the Middle East, including Israel, would live together in peace and security.

Secondly, it should be realized that the diplomatic mediatory and peace-making attempts made during the last year have failed. We cannot pretend that the conditions under which the multinational peace force was called upon to operate have not changed. The peace force cannot take sides. The dangerous request that it should be allowed to operate in other Lebanese zones and be entrusted with other tasks should therefore be rejected. It would be very serious if the news was confirmed that President Reagan had accepted such a move and had requested authorization from American Congress to use the American forces in battle areas.

The representativity of the multinational force should be extended and placed under the aegis of the United Nations, which would be able to find a point of agreement for all the parties concerned. I believe that some European governments have already made a move in this direction, but what is needed is a more efficient, incisive and independent initiative from Europe as a whole. The Ten have made many declarations (the Venice declaration, etc.) but have done little. Today we must urge the Ministers of Foreign Affairs involved with political cooperation to adopt this initiative. The dramatic situation of the Lebanese people, the dangers of the situation and the risk of the multi-national force becoming involved make it impossible for Europe to deny its responsibilities.

Mrs Charzat (S). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on the occasion of this debate on the current situation in Lebanon, the European Parliament must use all its authority to ensure that the massacres which are turning Lebanon into a blood-bath are brought to a halt. Every opportunity must be seized to produce an immediate ceasefire so that Lebanon can recover its sovereignty, integrity and unity, and so that, in particular, the senseless massacres and killings are made to cease. To this effect, the peace negotiations, based on UN resolutions Nos 242 and 425, must be pursued so that the Middle East States — including Lebanon — can live in peace and safety. It is in this spirit of constructive peace that the European Parliament must praise the multinational force, a European intervention force, which is trying through its presence to preserve the chances for peace in Lebanon, whatever else happens, and in highly difficult conditions. I should like solemnly to evoke the memory of five French soldiers, including Lt. Col. Salaire, who were killed in Lebanon in the course of the peace mission, as the result of random bombardments. May their sacrifice serve the cause of peace which all — and I mean all — the populations of Lebanon so ardently need.

In the same humanitarian spirit, the European Parliament must ask the European Community for an immediate and massive contribution, in the form of foodstuffs and medicines, to be made to the tens of thousands of refugees and besieged villagers in Lebanon. Aid cannot be delayed. All the communities severely affected by the last attacks must receive humanitarian aid distributed by the International Red Cross Committee.

Ladies and gentlemen, this issue is of top priority and urgent and the European Community must deal with it without delay.

(Applause)

Mr Nordmann (L). — (FR) I should like to stick up for the joint compromise motion, which appears to me to be an essential basis, in spite of its inadequacies. It is an essential basis, firstly, because it helps to break down the wall of indifference which has been raised too often — let us remember 1976 and the following years — towards the martyrdom of Lebanese Christians. It is also essential in order to combat certain distortions of information which continue to flow regarding the Lebanese question. Many of us have talked about defending the reality, integrity and unity of the Lebanese State. But let us not forget that, a year ago, Israel was a convenient scapegoat and to a number of people appeared as the only factor to be blamed for Lebanon's weaknesses and crises. But where is the reality and very existence of Lebanon being contested today, and by whom? While many deplore the fragility of the country, too rarely are questions asked about the sources of challenge to its exist-

ence. In connection with this, I should like to stress the extraordinary discretion displayed by the media in the West on the role of Mr Jumbblatt in contesting the Lebanese State, almost as if the fact of having been adopted by the International Socialist Movement was enough to assure a kind of immunity.

I should like to add that this text, despite its essential quality, would have been somewhat vague if Mr d'Ormesson had not clarified it with his remarkable speech. It is true that the Lebanese reject the expression 'civil war' and they are quite right. And we can never say it enough: it is threats and attacks from outside which today jeopardize a Lebanon assured of safety on its southern frontier by an Israeli-Lebanese agreement. The threat hanging over Lebanon is that of a return to the country by Palestinian terrorists, and above all a threat from Syria which, let us not forget, has never admitted the existence of Lebanon. It is all very well to say that we must defend the Lebanese State, but we also have to say against whom we defend it.

As long as the Council continues to display on account of its presidency, a singular timidity — to say the least — in international affairs, Mr President, I believe that it is up to this Parliament to speak the truth, to call a spade a spade and to point the finger at Syria.

President. — The debate is closed.¹

Chad

President. — The next item is a motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-667/83) by Mrs Veil and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group on the situation in Chad.

Mrs Veil (L). — (FR) Mr President, today's emergency motions are true portraits of what is happening in the world. What are this morning's issues? The destruction of the Boeing, the drama of Lebanon and the unwarranted intervention by Libya in Chad.

These events are, alas, significant and should warn us that Soviet hegemony is manifesting itself everywhere and — in my opinion — the European Community appears strangely absent in the face of these multiple attacks.

Nevertheless, in Stuttgart recently we again solemnly proclaimed — or rather, our governments did — how much it was necessary to strengthen political cooperation. Hence, since we are talking about Chad, which is the subject of the motion for a resolution before this Assembly, I must express surprise at the fact that, up to now, the Foreign Affairs Ministers have not managed to unite in their opinion over the highly serious events in Chad, because this problem concerns

¹ For the vote, see Annex I.

Veil

not only France, even if France felt it had to assume its responsibilities and was right to do so. This is a problem which concerns the entire Community.

We are linked with Chad through the Lomé Conventions and the ACP countries are counting on us to give them assistance when their rights are threatened. For, if Chad is being subjected to Libyan aggression today, it is not just its political situation but the whole of its economic situation which is threatened, and thus the cooperation which we give it. If we did not know how to cooperate among ourselves as Community Member States in order to show our solidarity when a serious problem affects one of us, I believe that we would be giving proof that political cooperation was merely an empty word. We are talking about far away events which do not affect us directly, but when one of our Member States is directly involved in a conflict because it is committed to uphold bilateral agreements, when it is accused by some of neo-colonialism or of defending its national interests, we must show that it is in fact the defence of cultural, political and economic values belonging to our entire Community that are being threatened and that the Community must therefore demonstrate its solidarity and its interest with regard to Chad.

(Applause)

Mr G. Fuchs (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to expound to you for a few minutes the position of the Socialists on Chad by answering four questions.

Firstly, why have the French intervened in Chad? To begin with, it is true that it is a response to Libyan interference on a massive and indisputable scale, both on land and in the air. Next, this involvement is in accordance with a military agreement signed in 1976 which guarantees the country's safety. A failure to adhere to this agreement would have perturbed not only Chad but the entire region below it.

Secondly, who benefits from this commitment? The legal government of Chad, without any doubt. We can, and of course must regret that this government is not yet the product of an election, but it is nevertheless recognized as legitimate by the Organization of African Unity, which expresses the political views of the continent. Our commitment is also useful in that it respects the rules of international law, which are fundamental in our eyes, and in particular the rule — taken up by the charter of the Organization of African Unity — which sanctions frontiers inherited from the colonial period.

There is a third question, however: who will not be served by our involvement? Our involvement will not be used to intervene in Chad's internal affairs, to the benefit of one or another faction who are disputing their right to represent the country. France has not intervened in the internal affairs of African States since May 1981, and, I hope, that it will never do so

again. Neither will it be used as an attempt to launch some kind of anti-Libyan crusade. We expect Libya to respect the territorial integrity of Chad. We expect a negotiatory and not a warlike attitude from Libya. We expect no less and we desire no more from that country.

Our fourth question, then: what is to be the purpose of this involvement? Firstly, to stop the fighting — this has basically been achieved — and to re-establish a solid basis for negotiations to be undertaken which will respect international law. As you are aware, the French government has initiated a large number of consultations with all the parties concerned, primarily the OAU, which for us represents Africa's interests. We are not hoping for any swift results from these consultations, but on the other hand we are hoping that such results will be long lasting.

To conclude, we should like to remind you that our desire is for peace and not for war, that it is our wish to give Africa aid when it asks for it while respecting its sovereignty, aid which can promote — particularly to the south of the Sahara — development and non-alignment, two concepts which are indissociable in our eyes. A reiteration of support by the Community for the targets I have just outlined would therefore be of great value to us. Hence, we will be voting in favour of the emergency motion for a resolution before us.

Mr Schall (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have all known for years that Libya, under the dictatorship of Mr Ghaddafi, is being driven into dreams of becoming a great imperialist power which, in view of the actual strength of the that country, can only be described as the monstrous product of delusion. Nevertheless, the consequence of this adventurist policy is a continual threat to peace in North Africa, a ruthless annihilation of people, indeed exploitation of his own people, which serves the dictator as a tool. Some time ago, he did so against Egypt, against the Sudan at the same time against Morocco by supporting the Communist Polisario, and today against Chad, the poorest country in Africa. In a world which is dependent on peaceful development, on the fight against hunger and on economic aid in emergencies and for self-help — particularly to the peoples of Africa — Mr Ghaddafi's plans for conquest are not merely acts of madness. Because they are carried out with military means without consideration for human life, they are crimes against international law, and against humanity.

The European Community, with its close ties to the fate and future of the free peoples of Africa, carries a particular responsibility in this matter. Is the process which began with decolonization, namely progress towards freedom, self-determination and a peaceful future for the peoples of Africa to be replaced by warlike conquests, by renewed enslavement, by terror and the extermination of human life?

Schall

Is a bloodthirsty, power-mad fanatic in the style of centuries long past, yet equipped with the most modern military technology, to be allowed to lash out in all directions ?

We must thank France for not evading her particular responsibility to Chad and for making efforts, with material sacrifice to herself as well as the deployment of personnel, to uphold the autonomy of the inhabitants of this particularly poverty-stricken State of Chad. It must be the task of France's partners in the European Community not to leave her alone in these efforts and not to look on more or less disinterestedly as a conflagration started by Ghaddafi spreads even further. The guarantee of stability, of peaceful development towards a better future for all the peoples of Africa is a matter for us all, the responsibility of us all in a Europe which knows, after the bitter experiences of the past, that there is only one aim for which it is worth fighting; the peaceful coexistence of all nations.

(Applause)

Mr M. Martin (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, Chad is linked to France through clearly defined agreements and to the Community by the Lomé Convention. It is also one of the poorest countries in the world and our basic concern must be the fate of the people of Chad and the need to help this country develop by cooperating with it.

Having said that, the grave political problems raised today are conditioning the future of Chad itself and, to a large extent, that of the entire region, when not the whole of Africa. Today, a decision is to be reached on the possibility of a political solution under the auspices of the Organisation of African Unity, and we must be glad about this. The OAU is cooperating with the French government, with Libya and with others. The French government and Libya are said to have accepted the idea of supporting direct negotiations between Messrs Habré and Ouéddei. The idea of sending OAU observers to follow developments if a ceasefire were to occur is being aired. Finally, discussions are also said to have touched on the idea of sending a Pan-African force to maintain peace.

Consequently, we feel that it is vital to do nothing which might hamper these efforts at reconciliation. The US Government and a number of French sabre-rattlers are continuing to exert pressure to drag our country where it does not want to go. We are opposed to these warmongering intrigues. The motion for a resolution proposed by Mrs Veil risks having for effect the aggravation of tensions in Chad instead of the fostering of peace in that country because of its unilateral stance; it is practically a caricature. What is more, Mrs Veil's motion for a resolution does not even mention the OAU.

I should like to point out that, in a totally similar way, the motion for a resolution just adopted on Lebanon

— thanks to the right — also seems to seek confrontation rather than a political solution. We voted against the text on Lebanon because we want to see peace in Lebanon. We'll vote against Mrs Veil's text on Chad because we have made our minds up to do everything we can to promote peace in Chad.

Mrs Scamaroni (DEP). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, let us be quite clear. The situation in Chad is serious. Colonel Gaddafi's strike is an attack on the integrity of a sovereign State and it was vital, just and urgent for France, which is linked to Chad through preferential agreements, to oppose such aggression. It is even to be regretted that Paris was not able to come to a decision more quickly and respond to the appeal by the Chadian government to help it oppose the Libyan offensive. France has, of course, chosen a difficult path, but it was the only one open to it on account of its commitments. What is more, we are talking about defending the interests of a population already suffering heavily from hunger and poverty, aggravated by a civil war that has been going on for some years already. We shall always approve of any action which aims at helping a people regain its sovereignty, territorial unity and through these means, peace. Let us not shirk the fact that the Community is involved. We hope that political cooperation is a reality and that everything will be done to reach a diplomatic solution as quickly as possible. We will therefore support without reservations the motion for a resolution tabled by the Liberal and Democratic Group, as it goes a long way towards re-establishing peace in this region.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.^{1, 2}

Chile

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

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-698/83) by Mr Deschamps and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party on the situation in Chile;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-700/83) by Mr Fanti and Mr Piquet on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group on the situation in Chile;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-705/83) by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group on the massive and continued repression of the Chilean people by the Pinochet regime and the need to help the victims thereof.

¹ For the vote, see Annex I.

² For the Members of Committee of Inquiry on toxic substances, see the Minutes.

Mr Barbi (PPE). — *(IT)* If our emergency debates have any meaning, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is because there are certain undeniable facts, situations and principles regarding which our statements and our votes are emblems of our freedom and solidarity.

Today, both we and the world as a whole are confronted with the sorry state of the Chilean people, who can be seen sinking further every day into the abyss created by an obtuse dictatorship. These people have no freedom and yet they raise their heads with the courage of despair, in the hope that someone will give them a hand in some way.

Our solidarity with the Chilean people is total. We are right behind the new 'Alleanza Democratica' — led by Gabriel Valdès, the President of our Party, the Chilean Christian Democrats, — where the authentically democratic forces of Chile are represented.

If you do not mind, I should like to quote what Gabriel Valdès said on 7 September, on the eve of new clashes between the Chilean people and the military junta, during a courageous press conference: 'The régime is on its last legs. In the last 10 "sad and futile" years we have been governed by means of repression; a political régime has never been constructed. Now our rulers must reap what they have sown ...' Pinochet's régime has sown blood, grief and suffering, beginning with the assassination of the last President, Salvador Allende, to whose memory we bear homage in these days surrounding the anniversary of his sacrifice.

Ten sad and futile years. This is how it is: about half the population is unemployed, inflation is continually going up by 25 % leaps, salaries are low and — what is more — have been held at the same level for two years, there is 25 % less industrial plant than there was in 1970, agriculture is in difficulties, and countless numbers of Chileans have disappeared, fled throughout the world, been persecuted or are in prison.

Talking about these matters in this House signifies that this Parliament is unanimous in its will to make every effort possible to restore to this population, before anything else, the dignity of free and democratic peoples. Secondly, it means restoring to Chile its history as a democratic country, the first in Latin America to have an elected Parliament. Finally, it means saving the philosophy of 'revolution in freedom' advocated by the late Eduardo Frey, according to which both people and government were to work together for the country's progress.

Chile did not and does not deserve those 'sad and futile' years. We appeal, therefore, not just to the

people we represent for them to continue with us in expressing their solidarity, but also to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, so that steps can be taken, directly and with international agreement, to effectively and efficiently ensure that the Chilean military junta be pinned to the wall for its weighty responsibilities as quickly as possible.

(Applause from the centre)

IN THE CHAIR : LADY ELLES

Vice-President

Mrs De March (COM). — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it is in homage to the memory of President Allende that I shall speak today. I render homage to all victims of fascism and to the courageous struggle of the Chilean people, as well as to Mrs Allende, who came to Strasbourg yesterday to testify to the horror of repression which has existed for the last 10 years in the country, ever since the military coup fomented by the CIA, took place.

All these incidents of torture, deaths, disappearances, children and young people assassinated in the name of democracy and freedom for Chile have aroused international disapproval and condemnation, year after year. That is why we give our total support to all democratic forces — without any exceptions — and to all those Community Member States which are trying to ensure that the Chilean dictatorship is politically and militarily isolated, since this dictatorship brought to an end the democratic process initiated by President Allende.

The cohesive nature of our motion for a resolution indicates why we cannot accept paragraph 3 of the compromise motion put forward by other groups, which puts exclusive blame on the forces of the left — communists, socialists and others — who have made a very heavy contribution to the struggle for democracy by resisting within Chile for years. We are therefore asking for a vote item by item. When Mrs Allende addressed this House yesterday, she told us to go to Chile, where we would find things in a sorry state, with unemployment at 32 %, and an atmosphere of total stagnation and discouragement which affects even the well-off classes now, even though they originally welcomed the coup d'état. Our active solidarity with Chile is thus the motive behind our motion for a resolution.

Mrs Macciocchi (S). — *(IT)* On behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr President, my intention is to pay tribute to Mrs Allende, who is honouring us with her presence in this House by following our debate on Chile.

Macciocchi

I am too an eye witness of events in Chile having been there in the days leading up to 11 August, together with the leader of the Socialist Group, Ernest Glinne. Together, we were forced to be directly aware of the murderous violence of acts of repression through our meetings with the Chilean Committee for Human Rights, Solidaridad, Cardinal Enriquez Silva, politicians from all the opposition groups, a number of trade unionists, including the leader of the copper workers union and finally, with the *Alianza Democrática*. We witnessed the birth of this organization in the Casa della America Latina and were deeply moved by the impressive number of opposition representatives thus mobilised.

We personally witnessed the violence of State terrorism which, in 1983, led to arrests, arbitrary detentions, the disappearance and torture of twenty thousand Chilean citizens, not to mention the deaths on 11 August and 9-10 September.

Santiago struck us as a dreary, bare and forlorn town with empty shops; the people were dressed poorly, just like in our own countries in the far away days just after the war. You can cut the atmosphere of fear with a knife, but the people have decided to rebel against it and we in this House want to bear witness to the courage not only of the most wretched citizens of Santiago, but also to that of the lower and middle classes who have engaged in battle against the régime.

After 10 years of dictatorship, the foreign debt has reached 22 thousand million dollars — the highest in the world in relation to the size of population. Gross national product went down by 15% in 1983 and 30% of the population is unemployed. This desperate and forlorn picture is the result of 10 years of an economy led by the so-called *Chicago Boys*, based on unbridled monetarism, and which was supposed to give birth to a miraculous 'post-Allende' period.

We are therefore witnesses of the people's will to revolt. We are asking Parliament to vote unanimously for this motion for a resolution so that the Chilean people can be reassured that their struggle for democracy and against the dictatorship is a just one.

We are calling for the formation of an international committee of enquiry to look into the crimes committed in the last 10 years. Finally, we are asking for practical financial measures to be introduced to assist those who have been the victims of repression. We are also demanding — in the spirit of the motion for a resolution adopted on the 15 December 1977 — that all political and above all military aid to Chile be suspended, as was requested by Mrs Allende yesterday. Mr Glinne and I knelt at Allende's tomb to render homage to this nameless grave on behalf of Europe.

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

Mr Van Miert (S). — *(NL)* Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to remind you of a few matters in these

two minutes. Ten years ago a democracy was overthrown, aided by outside pressure. It is sufficient today to read, amongst others, Simon Hearst's book about this period, 'The Price of Power'. This murder of a democracy was planned months before with the help of CIA millions, various multinational connections, and some factions of the Christian Democrats in Chile. Facts are facts, and I repeat: it was done with the help of the CIA and the multinationals, whose love of money, profit and power was much greater than their love of democracy. That is what caused the overthrow of a democratic government 10 years ago. And we must not forget that when we listen to the fine words here today. Because yet again the politics of power have forced themselves forward in the same way. I would wish that those who join us — rightly so — in being incensed by the Polish situation, should also be so, today, where Chile is concerned. People there also live under a dictatorship, trade union activities are also forbidden there or stifled at birth, indeed, there is no normal political democracy there. Experiments that date back to the 19th century have taken place there in the field of economics, experiments that were also welcomed by some people in this Parliament.

Well, the time has now come to draw up the balance-sheet. I hope that, today, as on other occasions, Parliament will vote with a big majority to take a definite stand on this matter and, that, this time, it will also come out clearly in favour of sanctions against the military government, against the support still being given by the West. I hope that people will speak up clearly today, as they have done on behalf of Poland in the past. That is what I urge Parliament to do on behalf of my Group.

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

Mr Penders (PPE). — *(NL)* Madam President, do you think Milton Friedman realized that his theories would lead to the possible restoration of democracy in Chile in the foreseeable future? What an ironical going of history! In the latter half of the Seventies, Pinochet surrendered to the 'Friedman boys' and thus caused the eventual emergence of the economic and social chaos that has left the Pinochet regime, we hope, with its back to the wall and not knowing which way to turn.

We passionately hope that the transition from dictatorship to democracy will happen as quickly and as peacefully as possible. My group, the European People's Party, has given its opinion on this. This opinion was partly based on information gathered by the Chairman of the Dutch Christian-Democrats, Mr Buckman, on a trip to Chile. We see the Christian Democrats in the forefront of attempts to form a transitional regime without Pinochet. We support Valdés

Penders

and Zaldivar, the architects of the restoration of democracy and the leaders of the *Alianza Democrática*.

Europe must help. This could be achieved politically during the forthcoming assembly of the UN, where the EPC must demand the issue of a statement censuring Chile. And it can be achieved economically by making it clear that the Club of Paris is prepared to give a helping hand with the restructuring of Chile's foreign debt once the road to the restoration of democracy and human rights has been embarked upon to our satisfaction.

Mr Van Minnen (S). — (NL) Urgent debates should be about things that are happening today, and thus our urgent debate about Chile this morning is least of all a commemoration of the crime that General Pinochet and his people began to perpetrate against humanity exactly 10 years ago, against the Chileans in particular, against humanity in general. The united front which we now present in respect of the situation in Chile is not entirely founded on historical roots, but now it is there I hope it will produce some results. When, moreover, group chairmen from a parliament such as the Dutch one, group chairmen from all parties, not only go to Chile together — after all, it is not the first time they have gone somewhere together — but also return having drawn the same conclusions about the atrocious conditions in that country, then this leaves nothing to be desired where clarity and obligations are concerned.

Our debate this morning reflects 10 years of state of emergency in Chile. The only possibility for Pinochet to stay in power is illustrated by the fact that he reinstated the state of emergency after first abolishing it only three days previously. Tortures are being applied in a more sophisticated way, actions against the unemployed in the shanty towns become more ruthless, there are more and more deaths, missing persons, prisoners, a list that goes from bad to worse. All meetings these days, and this is something that we have been able to see all over our own countries, emphasize these gruesome developments. Political leaders, church leaders and trade union leaders have all made it clear that this situation can no longer be tolerated. And when our united European Parliament endorses this, then this creates for us at the same time our own obligations.

The Community bears certain specific responsibilities for Chile. The expressions of revulsion have unfortunately weakened rather in the last 10 years, and imports of Chilean apples and sales of all types of Chilean products to our Community and elsewhere have risen. This has played into the hands of Pinochet. When we reiterate this morning that we want the solidarity and united will of our parliament expressed, then I hope that this means that, after the

adoption of the joint motion, we will turn these words of solidarity into actions.

Mr Pedini (PPE), Chairman of the delegation to Latin America. — (IT) On behalf of the delegation to Latin America, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I support the motion for a resolution and the spirit behind it. I should like to take this opportunity to express my sympathy for those colleagues who went to Chile, particularly Mr Fanti, and state my disapproval at what happened to them, which only confirms the intolerability of the situation in Chile. When talking about Chile and the problems of Latin America, I should like to express the hope that this Parliament was able to make an objective reassessment of the historical conditions which led to a situation in which a dictatorship could occur; alongside the merits of Frey, I am sure that the mistakes made by the popular government, which have also been mentioned by Mr Berlinguer in Rome recently — a rather interesting source in this respect — would also emerge.

But my primordial wish, like that of Mr Penders, is that, faced with these events and with the prospect of an unquestionable return to democracy in Chile, Argentina and other countries, that our Parliament will devise a general and practical policy on economic, financial and commercial aid. In this way, once they have returned to democracy, Latin American countries will be able to achieve the economic and social stability without which all our wishes will remain empty words with no concrete results.

President. — The debate is closed.¹

Death sentence passed on Mr Yermak Lukianov

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution by Mr Beyer de Ryke and Mr De Gucht, on behalf of the Liberal Group on the death sentence passed on Mr Yermak Lukianov (Doc. 1-664/83).

Mr Beyer de Ryke (L). — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the name Yermak Lukianov probably does not — or did not — mean very much to you, just as it did not for me hardly a few weeks ago, but it is a name which evokes despicable and absurd events. Indeed, it is worthwhile tracing the history of this man in a few words.

Lukianov is of Tartar origins. His paternal grandparents and his maternal grandmother were assassinated under Beria. Despite that, he became a Red Army Officer during the war. He was taken prisoner by the German army. From that moment on, the versions differ. I must say right now, in all honesty, that I do not know which is the correct one. He says that he

¹ For the vote, see Annex I.

Beyer de Ryke

was incorporated into the Germany army by force. The Soviets assert that he went over to the Germans lock, stock and barrel and is guilty of war crimes. I do not know where the truth lies.

At the end of the war, he was taken prisoner by the Americans. He was sent to a mine in Wallonia and having obtained his freedom was granted Belgian citizenship after a certain time. Then, in 1967, since he wanted to see his native land again, he went to the Soviet Union. Nothing happened. In 1968, he went to the Soviet Union again, and this is where the drama began to unfold: he was taken prisoner at the Russian-Polish border and separated from his family. He was declared mentally ill and sent by the Soviets to a psychiatric hospital. He stayed there for 15 years — 15 years, mark you. Then, thanks to the miracle of Soviet science, after 15 years and at the age of 70, he was declared cured. Oh, wonders of Soviet science! And since he was cured, he was sent before a court in Elista in the Kalmuk Republic, a court which condemned him to death. He is currently awaiting the death sentence in a Soviet prison. It is questionable which strikes us more — the odious or absurd nature of the case. His daughter is due to go to the Soviet Union at the end of the month to ask for a pardon.

Do not be deceived into thinking that this is merely a theoretical death sentence. I would remind you that last year, according to the reports by Amnesty International, five Ukrainians were condemned to death and executed by being shot in the back of the neck, like those at Katyn who had fought against the Red Army during the war.

So, whether we are talking about the Boeing disaster, or the case of Mr Lukianov, or other death sentences, I call on this Parliament to say to the President of the Council and the Foreign Ministers that they should turn to the Soviet Union and say: 'Stop! Don't shoot!'

(Applause from the Liberal and Democratic Group)

Lord Bethell (ED). — Madam President, Mr Lukianov is a citizen of our Community, and therefore especially deserving of your protection in this matter. I will not make any judgment about the crimes that Mr Lukianov is alleged to have committed, except to say that if the Soviet Government were to sentence to death every person who collaborated with Nazi Germany during the Second World War, they would have to execute at least 5 million of their citizens. That is the conservative estimate of the number of Soviet people who put on some German uniform or another during that period. As Alexander Solzhenitsyn has said, 'they would never have done such a thing against their own country had they not been driven beyond the bounds of despair, beyond the final limit, by the strains of life under Joseph Stalin.'

I do not know to what extent Mr Lukianov committed crimes. I will only indicate that the fact of having

lived a peaceful life in Belgium for more than 20 years and then returned voluntarily to the Soviet Union — not once but twice — as a tourist hardly seems to indicate a guilty conscience. There is also the matter of his mental health. Is it really conceivable that someone can be in sufficient health, under the various international obligations that the Soviet Union and other countries have entered into, to undergo the death penalty after 15 years of incarceration in a mental hospital? There is the matter of his age: he is in his 70th year. There is also the fact that he has a large family in our Community.

I must draw Parliament's attention also to the extent of the operation of the death penalty in the Soviet Union. In peacetime it is applicable not only to crimes such as treason and murder, but also to forgery, bribery and theft. Therefore, like my colleague Mr Beyer de Ryke, I ask this House to urge clemency for Mr Lukianov and his liberation so that he may join his family in Belgium for the last years of his life.

I very much hope that the Council of Ministers will take action in this case. To the best of my knowledge, this is the first time that a citizen of the Community has been under sentence of death in a Soviet-bloc country. I think it would be wrong for the Council of Ministers of the Ten to leave this matter on one side and not to intervene. Will they, I wonder, come back next time in October or November before this House with the risk that this citizen has been executed? I beg them to intervene in this matter. I beg the Soviet Government to grant clemency.

President. — The debate is closed.¹

Mr Israël (DEP). — *(FR)* I suppose that you are now going to suspend the sitting, so I would like to ask you to tell the Bureau on our behalf that the selection of motions to be dealt with by urgent procedure was somewhat restrictive, since we still have 35 minutes left. I myself tabled a request for urgent procedure for a motion on a terrorist attack which was committed in the European Community against a Turkish aircraft, and I would have liked Parliament to react on this matter. I would therefore ask you to explain to the Bureau that they should be rather more generous in their selection. And if one or two motions for resolutions cannot be dealt with, that is less serious than having time on our hands when there are urgent motions waiting to be dealt with.

President. — Mr Israël, as I explained yesterday, the motions for resolutions are not decided by the Bureau but by the President and the chairmen of groups and then voted upon in this Parliament as happened yesterday. It is the decision of this House that fixes the number of resolutions, the order in which they come and what they shall be.

¹ For the vote, see Annex I.

President

I should inform you, Mr Israël, that I still have four motions for resolutions on the order-paper which have yet to be spoken to. Of course, as Members know, speaking-time is allotted to the groups, and it is not always easy to know exactly how much time is going to be spent on each resolution. We have had one or two major motions for resolutions before the House today, and the political groups had every opportunity to speak within their speaking-time on those subjects. It is therefore up to the political groups to work out their speaking-times for the subjects which they wish to put before this House.

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — From your remarks, Madam President, may I take it, then, that a decision of this House could restore the situation where we do not delegate the decision on which topics for urgent debate can come before us to the persons whom you listed, in view of the fact that this week these topics have been limited to foreign matters? I am not against discussing foreign matters, but we have limited our discussion to foreign matters, whereas matters such as fishing and shipbuilding, of burning and urgent and eminent concern to many people in this Community, have not even reached the agenda. As it turns out, we could have discussed some of these matters. May I therefore take it that a simple resolution, passed by a majority of this House, would be sufficient to reverse the practice by which we have delegated the choice to the persons you listed?

President. — Mrs Ewing, you are perfectly right in your assessment of the situation. At 3 p.m. on a Wednesday, a vote is taken on the number of urgent topics which are to be debated in this House on the Thursday morning, and any group can object to that list by either omitting or adding items. By that vote, therefore, the Members of this House decide on the final proposal made by the chairmen of groups together with the President. What the President and the chairmen of groups do is only to make a proposal to the House, and the House has the right, at 3 p.m. on the Wednesday, to make its decision. The House took that decision and I must observe it. But I must remind Members that there are still four motions for resolutions on the agenda.

Natural disasters

President. — The next item is a joint debate on four motions for resolutions:

- by Mrs Duport on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the consequences of the drought in Isère (France) (Doc. 1-677/83);
- by Mrs Poirier, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on emergency aid following the violent storms and floods in the Basque Country (Doc. 1-689/83);

- by Mr Baudis and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the consequences of the floods in the Basque country in France and Spain and in the north of the Burgos and Santander provinces (Doc. 1-694/83); and
- by Mrs De March and others, on the urgent need to improve measures to combat forest fires (Doc. 1-690/83/rev.).

Mrs Poirier (COM). — (FR) Madam President, the storms that ravaged south-west France and north-east Spain at the end of August have really caused considerable damage. Firstly, there are the human lives lost: six dead and three missing in France and about fifty in Spain bear witness to the violence of the disaster. Naturally, considerable sums of money are at stake. Fifty municipalities in the Basque country and the Département of Landes have been officially declared the victims of natural disasters. The Préfecture of Pyrénées Atlantiques has estimated the damage to roads alone at 40 million francs. To that must be added the contamination of beaches from the Pyrénées Atlantiques to the Médoc area by waste which is not just voluminous but also highly hazardous since thousands of barrels have had to be removed, including 150 containing toxic products, and 40 or so substances based on cyanide. That does of course give rise to other problems, but in the immediate term, a cleaning up operation has to be undertaken and that also costs a lot of money. I am therefore asking the House to give its agreement to the request for emergency aid on behalf of the French regions affected, as provided for under Community regulations, and I am also asking for a study to be made of ways to give effective and practical aid to the regions of Spain that have been victims of the same disaster.

Mrs Duport (S). — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, no doubt you are thinking that disasters are innumerable and the one which I want to talk to you about does not merit your attention in comparison with a number of others. Nevertheless, it affects a region where agriculture is based mainly on small holdings and the intense drought that has lasted for two months is leading to a drop in production which is going to be highly detrimental to farmers. I should like to quote some figures given by their professional organizations: the wheat harvest is down by 30 %, barley by 40 %, colza by 10 % and maize by 50 %. In the Département of Isère, in particular, 71 % of farms are less than 20 hectares and 45 % less than 10 hectares. In other words, the incomes of these farmers who grow several crops are low. The French government has taken some steps on behalf of these farming communities, but it seems to me that you could — that the Commission could — retain the principle of complementary aid for this region, which has been much more affected than others by drought.

Duport

It may be that some of you are shocked by these requests for aid for farmers, but it seems to me that, if our agricultural policy were different and based on principles other than those on which it is currently based, we would not be reduced so often to having to make an appeal for these specific items of aid, which do in fact make us look as though we were passing around the begging-bowl. Agriculture is a highly uncertain occupation because it depends on climatic conditions. For this reason, it ought to benefit extensively from an updated common policy, which has been completely redesigned and which allows our regions to live from agriculture.

In these areas, agriculture is a basis for many other activities and we will not be able to emerge from the disastrous situation which everyone here denounces so regularly if we do not have an overall vision of the problems facing these activities. Indeed, agriculture is one of the corner-stones of economic development in our regions.

Mr Baudis (PPE). — *(FR)* Madam President, the French and Spanish Basque country was the victim of terrible floods at the end of August, leading to the death and disappearance of more than 70 people and the destruction of thousands of farms and businesses, as the water level reached 8 metres in Bilbao, in particular.

Economic disaster is added to this human tragedy, for unemployment in the Spanish Basque country has risen from 18 % — already a high figure — to more than 30 %. There is therefore an urgent need to rebuild the economy right away.

The insurance companies can only pay out for 10 % of the losses sustained. The Spanish State and the independent Basque Government cannot alone tackle this situation, as the damage exceeds 550 thousand million pesetas, not counting the losses suffered by individuals.

The European People's Party is asking the European Community to demonstrate its solidarity with the French Basque country seriously affected by this disaster, and the Spanish Basque country, by granting emergency aid and loans from the European Investment Bank.

France and the young democracy of Spain are turning their eyes to Europe in the hope that it will not remain indifferent to the human tragedy which the Basque country has just experienced.

Mrs De March (COM). — *(FR)* Imagine, if you will, behind the text of the motion that we have tabled for this emergency debate, the lines of fires which have ravaged 40 000 hectares of Mediterranean forest. I have seen them go up in smoke, covering the sea with a carpet of black ash, this summer, in the coastal areas of the South of France. But I wonder how many thousands of hectares have disappeared in this one year 1983 alone from the forests of Italy, Greece and the

Iberian peninsula, which up till then were alive, teeming with flora and fauna? I firmly believe that it is not in the natural order of things that men who fight fires should perish. I believe that we have to safeguard the future wealth represented by our forests and their fauna. I will once again ask the members of this Parliament to vote unanimously in favour of this urgent motion, so that the decisions taken last June may be implemented.

Protecting our forests means above all strengthening preventive measures, and introducing at Council level effective regulations and budgetary measures as early as 1984. I therefore strongly urge that emergency aid be granted to the affected areas, since investing in retardants means protecting our fire fighters, guaranteeing their effectiveness, maintaining our forests and forestalling all the attacks which they are otherwise liable to suffer.

I therefore request emergency aid when decisions are made on the budget, since the consequences of these so-called 'natural' catastrophes may be contained if we decide to release the funds needed to avoid such catastrophes.

I also agree with Haroun Tazieff when he says that prevention is profitable. Indeed, ladies and gentlemen, it is to our benefit, since the future of the human race and the generations to come which will still need our forests depends on our budgetary decisions. Indeed, their right to live and work in our regions, in France and in all the other countries of the Community is at stake.

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission, (FR). — The questions which the Commission has been asked are varied, and I am almost tempted to run through again for the benefit of Parliament the available means of granting help or emergency aid.

However, I will merely mention certain relevant points and come back later to the substance with reference to a report which I will mention in a moment.

Concerning Isère and Mrs Duport's speech, I should like to point out to her that emergency aid as it is at present defined is not intended to be used for situations resulting from cyclical climatic changes, which, even if they affect the current harvest, do not endanger the very existence of individuals, nor even in the long term, the future of the regions concerned.

If this must be my answer concerning the effects of the drought in Isère, it is because the situation is entirely different from that which 39 French departments had to face a year ago when they suffered flood damage. The Community intervened to grant substantial aid because there was destruction and because the situation was critical for those living in the affected areas.

Pisani

For the same reasons, I should now like to mention problems raised by two questions about the floods which have devastated the Basque region on both sides of the French/Spanish border. In the Basque regions of both France and Spain emergency measures have been taken, and only yesterday the Commission discussed a grant of 500 000 ECU to the Basque region of Spain as a symbol — for that is the meaning of emergency aid in such situations — of Community solidarity. Does this mean that Community aid will cease with this one grant? It simply means that we have decided to step in in view of the current state of our knowledge and to enable these areas to cope with the known and immediate human disaster. It does not mean that, if other facts emerge later, we shall not again step in and grant aid in other forms.

And now I come to question of forests. In our definition of this kind of emergency aid — and I repeat it yet again today — it is clear that aid for forest areas would be inappropriate. However, given the dramatic and selective nature of such catastrophes, we have asked that a study be made. It will be available shortly and it could mean that we will change quite radically the position that we have adopted up to now on this specific point. If the regulation which we have drawn up and which is with the Council at the moment were to be adopted, and likewise the report for which we are waiting and which is along the same lines, then there would be consequences for the budget which would have to be taken into account, in the one case for the 1984 budget and in the other for the 1984 supplementary budget. But concerning the forests, I should like to say to Mrs De March that over and above a policy to deal with catastrophes in the usual sense of the word a whole range of policies should be defined for forestry in the dry regions of the Community, and that action would have to be taken in the very long term. As you know any action would touch on property rights. It is not a matter of endangering these rights, but rather of persuading the owners to coordinate the management of the whole forest area. But that is for another debate, and I simply wanted to tell you that in the present circumstances we are unable to answer this question, but that our investigations will probably put us in a position to take these problems into account.

President. — The debate is closed.¹

We now come to the end of the topical and urgent debate. The formal sitting in the presence of Mr Karamanlis, President of the Greek Republic, will be held at 12 noon.

*(The sitting was suspended at 11.45 a.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)*²

* * *

¹ For the vote, see Annex I.

² For the item concerning membership of Parliament, see the Minutes.

3. Formal sitting³

* * *

IN THE CHAIR: MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

4. Special committee on economic recovery

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-569/83), tabled by the President on behalf of the enlarged Bureau pursuant to Rule 91 of the Rules of Procedure, on the setting up of a temporary special committee to draw up a report on the economic recovery of the European Community.

Mr Bonaccini (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, given the present situation the motion put forward by the President of this House is most appropriate. Professor Albert's publication and the Press Conference itself which was held here have demonstrated the utility and the importance of the work that has been carried out.

Quite frankly, on a personal level, if asked what procedure to follow, let us say a few months or so ago, I do not know if I would have expressed the same opinion as now. It is however clear that under these conditions the President's motion is, I repeat, even more appropriate. I only have one objection: the date chosen, i.e. 15 December, does not seem to tie in with the deadline set by the European Council for the end of the debate on the economic recovery policy, which is 6 December.

We should also take into consideration the need to support the European Council with this Parliament's authoritative opinion. I therefore believe that the report, mentioned in point 3, should substantially anticipate, at least by 10 days or so, the deadline of 15 December.

As regards the proposed amendments which have been submitted, I would mention one in particular upon which, by the way, mine is one of the signatures, which was drawn up when this Committee had not even been thought of, and when nothing had yet been done. Now I find it in the guise of an amendment to the Committee's motion for a resolution. I hope that my other colleagues will withdraw it, and in any case ask that my name be withdrawn from such a motion that we will not vote for. I also believe that, though the spirit in which it is meant can be appreciated the other proposed amendment, Number 4 presented by Mr Bangemann and Mr Nord, provides no indication of the procedure by which the Parliament can discuss this issue, and hence of how progress

³ See Annex II.

Bonaccini

can be made when there is no report or preliminary examination of these conclusions, even though, as the final words of the amendment say, a lot of material has been published on the subject.

We are therefore in favour of the motion put forward by the President, apart from the matter of bringing forward the 15 December deadline. I need hardly say that for us this subject is of vital importance for the development of the Community, as our vote yesterday was able to illustrate!

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — I wish to say to colleagues that the object of the exercise that we went through was always to get it back as rapidly as possible into the parliamentary arena, because however distinguished Professors Ball and Albert are, they do not represent anyone but themselves, and until we pronounce upon it ourselves, I do not think we can say that this is the position of the Parliament and put behind it the full weight and authority of Parliament, and that, while I understand the Liberal amendment, is why I really do not feel that our group can go along with it. I can understand that they want a more general discussion on the subject, but on something as important as getting 12 to 13 million unemployed back to work again, we absolutely must take a parliamentary position before we cease to be a parliament. I entirely agree with Mr Bonaccini that it is necessary to have this as soon as possible.

Now, the reason why the Socialists have put in their amendment I entirely understand, and that is that having nominated Mr Albert, they do not actually like what he has produced. I am personally not responsible for Mr Albert: I did not nominate him: I nominated Jim Ball. Jim Ball said the kind of things I would have expected him to say, whereas Mr Albert obviously said things that the Socialists did not expect him to say, but that is not our fault. So if you do not like it on the Socialist benches, I entirely, of course, understand all that, but what I would say to my Socialist colleagues is this: we have considered extremely carefully the speed with which we can get this back again and we have come to the conclusion that it is not possible to do so in time for a debate in January — which I think must be the time for a debate — it is not possible for any committee chairman to guarantee that a rapporteur will produce a report by a certain date. I know, I am a committee chairman, and I spend my time trying to get rapporteurs to produce their reports by a particular date. There is no rule under which this can be done. Therefore it is necessary to meet our deadline and, before we start an election campaign at the beginning of next year, and while Members are still representing their constituencies, to adopt a view on this matter.

This, I think, we ought to take extremely seriously. We in this group feel that it is of absolutely overriding importance to get a European view. We

adopted a view on the constitution yesterday, and we in this group feel that on that subject we went a little fast. We should like to see what Europe can do together. The pragmatic British like, before they give power to an institution, to see what the institution is for. Now, one of the things I agree with Mr Albert about is that this cannot be done. Economic recovery cannot take place unless Europe acts together, and it is necessary, therefore, for us as a European Parliament to say to the national governments, you have got to act together: if you do not act together, there is no other way out.

I therefore do commend to the House this small committee to report, as Mr Bonaccini has said, as soon as possible — to dissolve itself thereafter — to advise the House on a way to get our 12 million people unemployed back to work again.

Mr von Bismarck (PPE). — (*DE*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, following this initiative on the part of its President, this Parliament has no choice but to deal with this matter as pragmatically as possible. We have to fulfil two conditions. Firstly, those involved in this question must be competent, i.e. they must understand the arguments of those responsible for the report and be capable of judging them while at the same time we must keep to the timetable. There is no point whatsoever in the whole business if we will only be able to get around to discussing the question next spring. It would be pointless to refer the matter back to the Economic and Monetary Committee — which is really the committee responsible, since it is already totally bogged down in its work. We already have a substantial backlog and have despaired of completing our work programme as it stands now let alone of dealing with this question to boot, which is supposed to be over and done with in six, five or even three months time. The Committee simply has not got the time and Parliament would not be competent.

Ladies and gentlemen, you are well aware of what goes on here, of who listens and who does not, and of the fact that genuine discussion between people on completely different wavelengths is simply impossible. Thus, we as Parliament would be making fools of ourselves if we were to deal with this very well thought out report as if we did not take its contents seriously.

It would, I think, be very much in the interests of everyone concerned in our preparations for the electoral campaign next year if this Parliament could sort out which aspects of the report are feasible, and which are impossible owing to lack of funds. The latter should, moreover, also be brought to the attention of the experts.

I am very much in favour, therefore, now that the report is there, to take the only path really open to us, i.e. let us set up this special committee, and have it

von Bismarck

meet at short intervals and submit an opinion to the plenary assembly at the end of the year. I would find any other course of action absurd and I therefore urge you to vote in favour of this motion for a resolution.

Mr Nord (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, I would quickly like to elucidate the Liberal Group's proposal which was submitted to you in the form of an amendment, and which aims at having the debate we want prepared by the groups directly, and not by one or more committees.

Mr President, we think that the document prepared by Mr Ball and Mr Albert is extremely important. Every now and then one finds something that one likes to read amongst the mountains of paper that Europeans are subjected to, and this is the case with this particular document. It is an exceptional piece of work, and it is not a question of whether one agrees with the contents — for indeed Mr Ball and Mr Albert do not agree with each other on every point — but it contains a wealth of data and sums up the situation in Europe in such a way that I doubt whether any report from any Parliamentary committee could ever manage to do the same. We all know what our Parliamentary committee reports look like. Everything is included in them and that usually means that they have nothing or next to nothing to say, and they are always drawn up in such a way that they will please everyone, so that even someone who has just got out of bed runs the risk of going back to sleep again after he has waded his way through 20 or 25 pages.

We would find it a pity, Mr President, if this first-rate piece of work, which has moreover enjoyed a great deal of publicity — people have heard about it and written about it — were to be snowed under by the well-known verbal avalanches which are regularly produced in this Parliament by our committees, and which have to be produced, because that is built into our system. For this reason we request that a major debate be held in Parliament in the near future — we suggest November, but we do not insist on this — and that the data contained in this document serve as a basis for that debate, and that, furthermore, the various groups put forward motions that can be treated here as Parliamentary texts. We believe that we would then have a debate which would attract public attention, in which the important political points would stand out better and with which we would prove to be of better service to the European cause. That is why, Mr President, we have submitted this proposal to you under Amendment No 4.

Mr Enright (S). — I had wished, Mr President, under the appropriate rules, to ask Sir Fred Catherwood a question, and I wonder if we might stretch the rules slightly while still remaining within them so that I can ask him now rather than in the middle of what he was saying at the time.

First of all, I am delighted that the Catherwood conspiracy has now come out into the open and that we

are at last making, metaphorically speaking, an honest woman of Sir Fred. But I should like to say to him that Mr Albert was not the choice of all Socialists by any means: my more right-wing colleagues in the British Labour Group might approve of him, but I, who am to the left of them, do not necessarily do so. So I hope he will acknowledge that there are other more left-wing and radical socialist possibilities.

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — I would just like to say that I entirely accept that there are a lot of very radical left-wing Socialists in the Labour Group.

(Laughter)

Mr Seligman (ED). — I just want to intervene very briefly, after Mr von Bismarck's speech, where he was really saying that the better is the enemy of the good. We can wait for years to get out a full, detailed, thoroughly authoritative and well-researched report, but if it comes three years after the next election it will be useless. No issue is more important than this at the moment, and we must have a clear message from this Parliament at least in time to use it properly in the election campaign. Twelve million unemployed persons will not be very interested to hear that we are too busy to finish this thing off as a matter of priority. I agree with Mr Nord that we must have a resolution, or resolutions, in as soon as possible.

Mr Rogalla (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, I must say that for once in spite of your usual great objectivity as President, I am somewhat confused in that I simply do not understand what is going on here. One Member after another is being given the floor to speak on this subject while the authors of the Amendments are being neglected. This was my first objection. Secondly, I should like to stress that, as far as I am concerned, it is perfectly in order if this matter is rushed through fairly quickly. However, I have my doubts as to whether the Committee headed by the seven Chairmen of other very busy autonomous Committees is in any position to guarantee the requisite speed.

My third point concerns the book by one of the experts consulted, i.e. Mr Albert who by bringing out this book has at least obscured the original character of the which the President might possibly initially have had in mind when he took this initiative, i.e. a job for Parliament. Thus, if we give this matter special attention in a special committee we would be also giving this undoubtedly distinguished economist extra publicity. I am opposed to this idea and would also disagree with Sir Fred Catherwood who made out that the Socialist Group had some sort of vested interests in the conclusions drawn by this independent expert. I feel, therefore, that it would be most compatible with the dignity of this House, and our firmly established guidelines if this work was to be referred to the competent committees with instructions to deal with it with due speed, i.e. a deadline must be set.

Rogalla

Unlike Mr von Bismarck, I very much feel that the Economic and Monetary Committee of which I am a representative and regular Member, is perfectly capable of dealing with this matter within a suitable time.

Mr Glinne (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group, I would like to state that, as the members of the enlarged Bureau already know, our Group is opposed to the setting-up of a special temporary committee as provided for in Amendment No 2.

Joining seven committees together into one special committee seems to us to be an impossible task; in fact, a little parliament would be formed and there is no guarantee that it would be duly protected from the slowness of its own procedures and debates.

We are also opposed to Amendment No 4 which asks the political groups to make preparations for a debate planned for the part-session in November. In principle and in practice the political groups always prepare the debates. I do not see why it should be necessary to depart from the normal procedure which consists of referring a question to the Parliamentary committee responsible, namely the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, which can obtain the opinions of other committees. Indeed it could be that additional hearings are necessary, all the more so since, apart from any sympathy on my part for the arguments it puts forward, a part of the two experts' report has in fact now been published in the form of an interesting and stimulating book, accessible to anyone who understands French. This book is called 'The European Gamble'; I have just examined it with great interest and it seems to me to raise a large number of questions. I agree with the basic arguments of the work and I really do not see why we should not follow the regulatory procedure set out in Rule 47, which requires that the question be referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs as the appropriate committee that opinions be sought from other committees and that the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs should, in addition, hear the opinions of other experts.

I would be very unhappy if in this matter it seemed that Parliament was merely rubber-stamping the opinions of the experts. I have the greatest respect for learned expertise which can indeed be very relevant, as is Professor Albert's — and I am giving my personal opinion here — but it would be intolerable if it seemed that Parliament was accepting without question or debate the opinions of specialists, however famous they may be in their field.

Mr Harris (ED). — Mr President, somewhat to my embarrassment, I find myself in complete agreement with the Socialists on this matter. I am confident,

however, in that I am in the good company of Mr von Habsburg.

I take the simple old-fashioned view that committees really do not achieve very much. When I go around and give talks in my constituency on the workings of the European Parliament, I am sometimes embarrassed when I show the slide with which we were all issued when we first came here. That slide shows, I think, that Parliament had 12 committees. I am not even quite sure how many committees we now have in this Parliament, because we keep adding to them. Yesterday we saw the fruits of adding to them when we took up an enormous amount of time — for what purpose I am not quite sure — because of a little subgroup that grew into a full committee in the form of the Committee on Institutional Affairs.

Yes, of course, each one of us can find a very good reason for setting up a committee on a subject in which he or she is particularly interested. Indeed, Mrs Ewing has a motion down right now to set up a committee on fishing. Now I happen to be passionately interested in fishing. Normally I would like a committee on fishing, but I will vote against her motion for a resolution just as I will vote against any proposal at this stage of the Parliament to set up still more committees. I think that should be the line followed by Parliament. We should say no, particularly in this case, where there is a competent committee. Let that committee get on and do the job!

Mr Nyborg (DEP). — *(DA)* Mr President, I should like to point out that this proposal cannot be implemented since it is in conflict with Rule 98 (1) of the Rules of Procedure. Under this rule alone it would be impossible to set up a committee along the lines described in the motion for a resolution and, apart from that, I endorse what Mr Glinne has said to the effect that this is really a matter for the Economic and Monetary Committee. This is absolutely correct and if anything is to be done the question should be referred to that committee.

President. — As I understand it, you maintain that this motion for a resolution is contrary to the provisions of Rule 98. I have just reread this rule and do not quite follow. Do you really mean Rule 98?

Mr Nyborg (DEP). — *(DA)* I am referring to Rule 98 (1) which states that a committee can have a maximum of three vice-chairmen. In other words, it is not permissible to set up a committee with a chairman and six vice-chairmen.

President. — Thank you, Mr Nyborg. I understand now. This Rule does not prohibit the setting up of a committee but the election of a bureau of the kind proposed. This is a different question and one which must be resolved by the Bureau of this Parliament.

Mr J. Moreau (S), *Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs*. — (FR) Mr President, I am intervening at this point in my capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, and there are several points I would like to make.

The first concerns the way in which the work has been carried out. I would like to remind this Assembly that the task undertaken by the experts was assigned to them by the Bureau, with the agreement of six committee chairmen. For my part, I would like to give the experts full credit for the work that they have done even if, in our work as a Parliament, we have to make our own choices and to define our own point of view in the light of the work done by the experts.

But I would like to make a second point — and if I asked to speak, it is as a consequence of Mr von Bismarck's comments. Mr von Bismarck, you cannot seriously say that we need a debate in November, for we all know that we will not have a debate in November, we all know that, even if we agree to set up an extraordinary committee, we will not have a debate in November, in view of the commitments which people have already: we will have this debate in February or in January, not before. Whichever procedure we adopt, I think we must not mislead the Assembly. Unless we accept the arguments as they stand in the report of Mr Albert and Mr Ball — and this would mean not carrying out our work as a Parliament — it is impossible today to say 'in November we will indeed come before the Parliament and define our position. It would not be a responsible attitude. At the chairmen's meeting we decided — as I think the Bureau did too — that this debate will take place either in January or in February. And I must say that we need that much time to work in a more or less normal way if we want to take different opinions into account and at the same time try to draft a text collectively.

Remember that it took more than a year to agree a definitive text for the Spinelli report, even if we may sometimes have differing opinions on this text.

I, for my part, think that whatever Parliament decides, we must realize that a certain minimum time is necessary and that we will have to organize hearings anyway. If Parliament opts for the special committee, this will have its own administrative machinery and our decisions on that will depend on the timetable of various people, because we know very well that those who would be on a special committee — don't forget — will be committee chairmen, that is people who already have a full timetable. If we opt for the special committee — we will need a certain amount of time to make progress and to do a normal job. If we opt for the usual procedure it is obvious that — and personally in my capacity as chairman of the Committee on

Economic and Monetary Affairs, I will do everything to ensure that we are in a position to present a report at the January or February session — we will ask the Bureau to arrange some additional meetings so that we will indeed be able to hold the necessary hearings.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

Mr Hord (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President, it does seem to me, from my reading of the Rules, that Mr Nyborg was correct in drawing your attention to Rule 98(2) in regard to this proposal to set up the temporary committee. I would suggest that this House should not be concerned with Rule 97, because, as I understand it, the proposal is not for a subcommittee, which is covered by Rule 97. It is for a temporary committee, which would be regarded as a temporary full committee, and therefore Rule 98 is the operative one, particularly Rule 98(2). I would suggest that yourself and the Bureau should consider the original point made by Mr Nyborg.

President. — As I have just pointed out, the proposal which has been submitted to us does, in fact, contain something which is contrary to the Rules of Procedure, that is clear. Anything which is not in accordance with the Rules of Procedure cannot be applied but, as regards setting up this committee, there is no objection.

5. Statute of Members of the European Parliament

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-566/83), tabled by the President on behalf of the enlarged Bureau, on the Statute of Members of the European Parliament.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think it is vitally important that Parliament should, before the end of this legislative period, discuss the Statute of Members with the Council. There are various people in this House who think that this should be left to the new Parliament, which is yet to be elected, but this would be putting both the old and the new Parliaments in a completely impossible position. By the time we reach the end of this legislative period, we will have had five years to settle this question. Our new colleagues must be clear as to the conditions under which they are taking up their work and in view of this need for clarity it is vital that we give the enlarged Bureau a mandate to negotiate with the Council.

The motion for a resolution before us contains such a mandate and reflects the need for a basis for negotiation. A working party, with members from all the various political groups, has reached a common position on even very small details. Obviously, things can always be added and further advice obtained from one

Klepsch

person or another but one thing is clear, i.e. if the enlarged Bureau of this Parliament does not receive a negotiating mandate now, it never will during the lifetime of this Parliament.

For this reason, my Group takes the view we should make the necessary decision here today, and I urge you to take this step.

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I agree with Mr Klepsch that the matter we are dealing with today, as prepared in the working documents of the Working Party on the Statute of Members is important enough for all of us. However, the Socialist Group takes the view that the enlarged Bureau has not — with all due respect to all the parliamentary wisdom assembled in that body — taken the right path towards the objective Mr Klepsch mentioned.

Obviously, this cannot come under Rule 48 — in view of the subject matter alone but also because it was not tabled in accordance with the procedure provided under that rule. Thus the enlarged Bureau itself has shown that it is not a motion for a resolution under Rule 48. What is it then? If no explicit reference is made to Rule 4 — which concerns expenses and allowances — it can only be a motion for a resolution pursuant to Rule 47. This means that it must go to the committees — and there is something to be said for this since the legal basis in the motion for a resolution tabled by the enlarged Bureau is incorrect or uncertain.

There can be no doubt that it is incorrect to quote Article 13 of the Act on Direct Elections as the legal basis, since this whole business really has nothing to do with election procedures. There are two legal elements contained in this motion for a resolution, i.e. on the one hand expenses and allowances paid to members — a question which Parliament can settle itself if it wants to, as indeed it should rather than passing the buck to the Council which will then have its own things to say in connection with the parliamentary budget during the budgetary procedure — and on the other hand, the question of immunities and privileges, which can only be dealt with jointly with the Council, since in this case the legal basis is the Treaty establishing a Single Council and a Single Commission of the European Communities in that the Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the Communities forms an annex to that Treaty.

We therefore feel that this reference to Article 13 as the legal basis should be deleted so as to unravel the procedural tangle, and this is the point of our first amendment, i.e. Amendment No 2. In addition, the matter should be referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions as the committee responsible and to the Legal Affairs Committee and

Committee on Budgetary Control for their opinions. In order to meet Mr Klepsch's wishes, which I share, our Amendment No 3 reads as follows 'the European Parliament expects, given the preparatory work which has already been done, that the draft can be debated at an early date so that the final vote may be taken in plenary before the end of this year'. Our procedural proposal, which does not in any way concern the substantive aspects is, I think, reasonable and feasible and therefore deserves to be adopted. I do not regard the other approach as legal and procedurally admissible.

Mr Price (ED). — Mr President, my group thinks that this motion raises some very important constitutional issues. We are not happy with the way that the Bureau has so far dealt with it or the proposal that now comes before Parliament today. Amongst the important issues are the whole independence of Members of this Parliament from influence by national governments. It is intended that we should be independent, and that is very closely linked with the privileges and immunities of Members of the European Parliament.

The other important point is that the protocol is now very much out of date. It was adopted at a time when the Members of this Parliament were all members of national parliaments and they had privileges and immunities in that capacity. The situation is now entirely different, and we need to have a properly thought-out approach to this whole area.

Mr President, we have some sympathy with the point of view put forward by Mr Sieglerschmidt in his amendments. Certainly, the important legal issue which he raised is one which, I must say, I heartily agree with in that the Bureau is relying upon an article in the Act of 1976 which provides that the Council can pass the legislation necessary to bring into being the directly-elected European Parliament.

Now, by definition, we have been brought into being. How can something be necessary now in order to bring this Parliament into being? By definition, that article is spent, and when we have available to us a valid legal basis for action, why use such a spent force as the Act of 1976? This Parliament is entitled to administer its own affairs, and insofar as it is acting in detail about the provisions for Members internally, it should use that as the basis, and that is the point upon which there is some agreement with Mr Sieglerschmidt. But, of course, this whole question goes a lot wider: it deals with the public legal rights and status of Members as well, and those are matters upon which this Parliament cannot act alone.

Therefore, the conclusion we have reached is that the approach needs to be thought through again from the beginning by the Bureau, and for that reason we are not able to support the motion now before the House.

Price

I should add, Mr President, that in consequence we also withdraw Amendment No 1 put forward by our group.

Mr Leonardi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in my long career in this Parliament, I have witnessed various discussions on this subject which I believe to be vital to the working of the Parliament itself. For various reasons, the situation has remained unchanged, I should say, for about 15 years, i.e. ever since I have been fortunate enough to be able to be in a position to follow Parliament work. Observations are always being put forward, whether legal or political, and there has always been a problem of public opinion etc., but the fact is that various Members in this Parliament have completely different privileges and we, as directly elected Members of Parliament, do not have a common statute. I believe this to be a disgrace.

I do not wish to dwell on why, in my opinion, this situation has gone on for so long, and why so many committees and working parties have been involved in this issue, in this Parliament and the proceeding one. I do, however, believe that a stop should be put to the situation. The motion for a resolution which has been submitted to us is obviously not without its faults — I believe that Mr Sieglerschmidt is right in maintaining that Article 13 should not be revoked. However, to refuse to vote in favour now would mean that once more this problem has been avoided. I therefore believe that it would be advisable to vote on this motion for a resolution, making amendments where necessary, but at the same time demonstrating that there is the political will to solve this problem, which I believe to be critical, especially in the light of the coming elections.

Mr Bangemann (L). — *(DE)* Mr President, I should like, first of all, to make a preliminary remark of a procedural nature. We could avoid a lot of these discussions in plenary if the individual groups took the trouble of finding enough out about the work done by their representatives in the various committees and working parties. It is clear that many people do not make this effort since the points made by Mr Sieglerschmidt played an important part in the discussions in the Working Party on the Statute of the Members of the European Parliament. Naturally, a Member our group was also present — the Chairman of the Liberal Group to be precise, who was also the Chairman of this Working Party. I will leave it at that, since I must obviously make a few substantive points as well.

Firstly, there is the question of the legal basis, on which there are clear differences of opinion between the Council and Parliament, and even within the Working Party. At a colloquium held between the enlarged Bureau and the Council in November 1981,

the then President of the Council, Lord Carrington, made it quite clear that any arrangement concerning not only immunities but also indemnities must be based on Article 13 of the Act as otherwise it would not be in due legal form. We do not share this view and for this reason the Working Party on the Statute of Members of Parliament decided on a procedure according to which this House would instruct the Working Party and the enlarged Bureau to submit a proposal. If the Council failed to adopt this proposal in good time — and we need a proposal of this kind before the next direct elections — we would take up the problem ourselves once more.

Obviously, it would be ideal if we were to receive a proposal from the Council — though this would of course mean considerable work for that institution — since such a proposal would certainly have a legal basis. There is also a tactical element in such a procedure, Mr Sieglerschmidt, in that if the Council regards Article 13 as the proper legal basis, it would be obliged to adopt a corresponding proposal, after which we can submit a substantive proposal. If it then fails to take up this substantive proposal — which must obviously be discussed and decided jointly with the Council — in good time, then we will, I think, be free to do whatever is necessary to guarantee the freedom and independence of Members of this Parliament.

That, briefly sums up the whole problem, and we could I hope make do without this debate and further remarks since it always undermines our position when strategic or tactical problems are made public. We could avoid this if the representatives of the Socialist and other groups who keep turning up in these bodies could, with the approval of the various groups in question, finally get round to informing their own colleagues. However, they do not — which is why we repeatedly spend hour after hour in the plenary assembly discussing matters which you, Mr Sieglerschmidt should have settled long ago in your own group.

(Applause)

President. — Thank you, Mr Bangemann, for your introductory remark and I must say that I fully agree with you. Knowing you as I do, I am sure you will see to it that you set a good example in your own group.

Mr Nyborg (DEP). — *(DA)* Mr President, I should like to begin by saying that I go along entirely with what Mr Bangemann has just said and I should like to add a few brief observations.

If it were to happen in a company that two persons doing exactly the same work for exactly the same hours at the same point on the assembly line did not get paid anywhere near the same pay, this would immediately trigger off a reaction in the form of a strike or something similar, claiming equal pay for equal work.

Nyborg

If, furthermore it turned out that the only reason for the difference in pay was that the two workers were of different nationalities, this would immediately lead to legal proceedings and the employer would be found guilty of racial discrimination. There is no excuse for Members of Parliament, who in principle have exactly the same job to do and exactly the same working hours, being paid such different amounts as is currently the case. There is no reason why an Irishman sitting next to a West German should only be paid one fifth of what the German receives. I am not saying that one of them is getting too little or that the other one is getting too much, but simply that the principle of equality is not applying here, although we are constantly advocating this principle in this Parliament when it is a question of equal pay for men and women. Why then should there be this discrimination among Members of Parliament? For this reason, I can wholeheartedly support this attempt to introduce a common statute for all the Members of the European Parliament.

Mr Bonde (CDI). — *(DA)* Mr President, it is very interesting to see Mr Nyborg who, in his election manifesto, advocated economy measures — i.e. a manifesto which maintained that the best place for citizens' money was in their pockets and that we should exercise restraint or preferably cut public spending — getting up here today and calling for a system of pay which will mean in practical terms that the Danish Members of Parliament will in future receive three times, I repeat, three times, as much as they do now. At least, this is what will happen if the Council of Ministers meets the request by this famous Working Party. According to this proposal, the Danish Members would be paid approximately Dkr 30 000 per month after tax, quite apart from all the existing fringe benefits, i.e. allowances amounting to Dkr 927 per person per day during part-sessions, which in three days amounts to what a person receiving a Danish State pension is supposed to live on for an entire month, an additional Dkr 3 000 for every single flight from Copenhagen to Strasbourg and a similar allowance — or perhaps slightly less — for a whole series of other flights, secretarial expenses and all the other fringe benefits with which Members are so familiar. I am not one of those people who are against pay rises in general but I think if anyone is to get an increase we should start with people in greater need than the Members of this Assembly.

Mr President, the People's Movement feel that fixing the salaries of the Members of the European Parliament should continue to be a national affair and we will under no circumstances associate ourselves with the proposal aimed at trebling Danish Members' pay.

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — *(DE)* Mr Bangemann, you should not jump to conclusions before checking

whether or not your assumptions are correct in the first place. The Socialist Group knew perfectly well what it was talking about when it discussed this matter and came to the conclusion I outlined just now, and I am sorry you were not in this Group, since if you had been, our opinion would have been even more clear-cut. The way you described it, the procedure appears even more ridiculous.

(Applause)

Mr Nyborg (DEP). — *(DA)* Mr President, I must reply to the Danish gramophone record, which appears to have got stuck. I did not say anything about increasing Danish or other salaries to a particular level anymore than I said that other salaries should be reduced to a particular level. I simply made a plea for equality. However, a Danish Communist is obviously incapable of understanding that.

President. — I take due note of your statement, Mr Nyborg.

Mr Bonde (CDI). — *(DA)* A point of order, Mr President, since I must obviously have misunderstood Mr Nyborg, I should be grateful if he would explain how much he thinks Danish Members of the European Parliament should be paid according to this proposal. It is merely a question of understanding, so he can put me right on this point.

President. — Mr Bonde, that is not a point of order. I would ask the Danish Members to settle these questions among themselves behind the scenes.

The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

6. Calendar for 1984

President. — The next item is the draft calendar of part-sessions for 1984.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I merely want to make a few remarks regarding the amendments which have been tabled to the calendar submitted by the enlarged Bureau. These amendments basically fall into three categories. According to the amendments tabled by Mr Moreland, Mr Griffiths and the European Democrats, the May part-session should be brought forward. I find this idea extremely attractive, but impossible in practice for the simple reason that we cannot leave such a long gap between the May and July part-sessions, during which the Parliament will not meet and will therefore not be able to deal with certain urgent matters. Perhaps we could contemplate making this May part-session briefer and more concentrated, but to bring it forward would, I fear, be a big mistake.

Habsburg

Other amendments proposed postponing the July part-session until 17 to 20 July. The same argument can apply here too. The long gap between part-sessions would militate against efficiency in the work of this Parliament. Finally, there are the amendments by Mr Hopper, Mr Enright and Mr Estgen who are once more trying to smuggle in the question of *where* Parliament should meet next year when what we are really talking about is *when* it should meet. Firstly, I find it unfortunate that the American technique of the rider should be used in order to smuggle in an amendment to a quite specific decision of this Parliament by the backdoor, so to speak.

Secondly, Parliament has made a clear decision, but one which — let us not forget — will be valid only as long as this Parliament exists. The new Parliament can decide differently, but for the time being we should stick to what has been decided and not try to put any constraints on the subsequent Parliament.

Mr Enright is very much in favour of Brussels but I think that the dreadful meeting which we did hold in Brussels on one occasion should be a strong argument in favour of Strasbourg.

President. — As you know, as President I have no right to intervene in the debate. Nevertheless, as a member of the enlarged Bureau, I feel I must explain a few points. A session has been planned for May by the enlarged Bureau. We have no idea whether it will in fact take place or not — that depends on the work. However, we must plan ahead and this is why we have envisaged a May part-session. As regards the July part-session, I feel I must inform you that the Treaty places us under a certain obligation in this respect too, i.e. Parliament cannot meet until the Tuesday following the first month to elapse after the new elections. In saying this, I do not wish to interfere in the debate but merely to clarify the situation. As regards the amendment aimed at changing the venue for the plenary meetings, this question must be decided by whoever is in the chair when the vote is taken. I have made my own views clear on this point. As I see it, it is unacceptable that amendments concerning the meeting place should be tabled when what we are discussing is the dates, as would appear to be the case here. Again, I am saying this merely to clarify the situation.

Mr Nyborg (DEP), Chairman of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. — (DA) Mr President, we have been asked by the President of this Parliament to give our opinion on the admissibility of Amendments Nos 3 and 4 concerning the calendar for 1984. Following the sitting of 12 and 13 July we stated the view that it was for the President, pursuant to Rule 54 (3) to decide on the admissibility of amendments and that, for this reason, the Committee could only in this case act in an advisory capacity. However, since the calendar specifies a number of precise dates

for meetings, and since Amendments Nos 3 and 4 make no reference whatsoever to dates but rather to the job of the enlarged Bureau in connection with the venue, the Committee concluded that these two amendments were out of order if only on the basis of their form. There is, therefore, no point in discussing them further.

President. — Thank you, Mr Nyborg. I entirely agree with you.

Mr Fergusson (ED). — Mr President, this matter arises from the fact, which we all know, that we shall all be fighting a Community election campaign in June. That is the reason for suggesting that the date be brought forward.

I would like to know if Parliament could be told whether it is technically possible, because of other people using this building and so on, for the part-session to be held at the time when we suggest it might be. Is it technically possible?

President. — Mr Fergusson, I did not quite understand. What dates do you have in mind?

Mr Fergusson (ED). — The suggestion, Mr President, was that the May part-session be brought forward and held earlier in May than at present proposed. That would give us a longer time to fight the next election. Apart from the Rules of Procedure, is it still technically possible for that to be done if we wanted it?

President. — I think Mr Nyborg cannot answer your question, because it is a technical question that must be and has, I think, been examined by the administrative staff. We certainly will give you the answer at six o'clock.

Mr Mart (L). — (FR) Mr President, the Liberal Group has asked me to state our position on the calendar for our 1984 part-sessions. My Group agree with the dates proposed by the enlarged Bureau, apart from that for the month of May. Mr Griffiths' proposal to hold the May session from the 7th to 11th seems to us to be reasonable and we approve it.

The adoption of Miss Hooper's and Mr Enright's Amendments Nos 3 and 4, one of which proposes holding the sessions on agricultural prices in Brussels and the other holding at least half of the sessions in Brussels would automatically entail a great deal of unnecessary expenditure. I am surprised at the amendments put forward by our British colleagues. We know perfectly well that Brussels does not have the necessary accommodation and equipment for the plenary sessions of Parliament to be held there. Brussels does not have a hemicycle and Parliament can no longer be content with improvising as it did in June 1983. Our Parliament has two hemicycles available, one in Strasbourg and the other in Luxembourg. There is

Mart

therefore no reason for holding plenary sessions in a place of work which does not have the necessary infrastructures.

It is not a matter of being for or against, but of adopting a realistic attitude. We must also take into account the financial aspect of this matter. I have just said that Parliament has available two hemicycles which provide all it needs to function properly. So why should it spend millions to meet in Brussels in makeshift conditions, in a city where it does not have the equipment and accommodation which it requires? All Members must be aware of our Community's enormous financial difficulties. We have insufficient resources and the financial situation is going to deteriorate still further. In such a situation, can Parliament allow itself the luxury of spending additional millions, I might even say squandering millions, at a time when we ought to be saving money? This irresponsible attitude is just not acceptable.

The Liberal Group therefore rejects Amendment No 3 put forward by Miss Hooper and others and Mr Enright's Amendment No 4. If Parliament expresses the wish to hold sessions in some place other than Strasbourg, they could very easily take place in Luxembourg, in the hemicycle which has just been built right next to our Secretariat. This would enable us to save millions.

That is why the Liberal Group proposes accepting Amendment No 8 tabled by Mr Estgen and others.

(Applause)

Mr Price (ED). — Mr President, I asked to make a point of order when Mr Nyborg was concluding. I cannot at this moment see him, which is unfortunate because it is a point which can only be dealt with in his presence. I did mention to him a second ago that I was going to raise that point and I am still waiting to see whether he is in fact in the Chamber — but I cannot see him.

Mr President, the point really is this and it needs to be put on the record. Mr Nyborg's account of the deliberations of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions was to refer to the substance of Amendments Nos 3 and 4 as being out of order and then to quote the actual decision of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure which was that they were out of order 'if only on the basis of their form.' The point is that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure deliberately decided not to make part of its decision the substance of whether one can put forward an amendment relating to venue. What the Committee on the Rules of Procedure decided was that it was not necessary to address that question since the form of the amendments did not relate to amending any particular part of the text and an amendment must relate to and must amend part of the text. So the committee's ruling was simply on the question of form and

did not prejudice in any way any future decision as to the admissibility of amendments on the question of venue when discussing the calendar. I think it is very important that that be put on the record.

President. — It is good that you should have raised this point since it enables me to outline the situation once again.

You are indeed right in saying that only the person in the Chair at the time can rule on the admissibility of amendments. The President saw fit to consult the Committee on the Rules of Procedure when he should not have done so. The committee in question gave an opinion. The President always remains free to decide on the admissibility of these amendments. I said a moment ago that I would not accept them since the rule in our Rules of Procedure stipulates that an amendment must relate only to the subject before Parliament. The issue before Parliament in this case is the dates and not the places. You will be informed at 6 p.m. today whether the Chair accepts or rejects these amendments.

Mr Enright (S). — Mr President, I do, of course, accept your ruling, but I find it a little strange that you cannot give a definitive ruling now but you say that it is the vagaries of the presidency at 6 o'clock which will decide. I would far rather that you gave a definite ruling now so that I can respond. Whatever the ruling you give, I will accept it because I am well known for accepting the rulings of the Chair.

President. — Mr Enright, my answer is that I am in the Chair with a fixed agenda. My job is to preside over a debate in this House and I respect everyone's opinion, including yours, even though I do not share it. If I am still in the Chair for the vote at 6 p.m., I shall tell you now what my attitude will be then: I shall not accept these amendments, but the person in the Chair is sole responsible. I cannot now prejudge the decision of whoever will be in the Chair for the vote. I am solely responsible for the proper conduct of this debate, I respect the Rules of Procedure and I respect all the Members present.

Mr Enright (S). — I am sorry that you disagree with me, Mr President, because the only view that I have put forward so far is the view that I always accept the rulings of the President. If, therefore, you are suggesting to me that I should not hold that view and that you disagree with that view, I find it very strange coming from the President.

If it is to be ruled out of order, that is fine, but there is something which is clearly implicit in that ruling and that is that the presidency or the enlarged Bureau should ultimately bring forward the venue for these meetings and then we can put down our amendments. Therefore, I take any ruling which says that Amend-

Enright

ments Nos 3 and 4 are out of order as suggesting that at the next part-session there will be brought forward the question of where we will hold these meetings.

I turn to some of the comments that have been made. Mr von Habsburg — and I am sorry to see he has departed, it seems to have become a custom in this House that people make contributions and then rush off before the end of the debate — has said that we should clearly stay in Strasbourg all the time. And yet I have, and there is on public record, Mr von Habsburg's signature to a motion that I put down suggesting that we attempt a part-session in the town of Batley. Therefore, I presume that he is allowing that still to stand and that instead of Brussels he will accept Batley.

I find Mr Mart's statements extraordinarily odd. I well understand why he made them. But to say that we should be realistic is to say that we should not be living in cloud-cuckoo-land.

Frankly, this Parliament as a directly-elected Parliament is living in cloud-cuckoo-land if it thinks that it can work effectively in either Luxembourg or Strasbourg. That is not to say anything against two delightful cities which I personally find charming: it is to say something about the work that we do. If, in fact, we want to express mere wishes and live in a rarified atmosphere, as we did to some extent yesterday with the Spinelli report — on which I personally abstained, I was not against it and I was not in favour of it — then we can come to this rarified atmosphere. If we wish to do the real work of the Parliament, then we have to be where the powerful organs of the Community are; and they are in Brussels, both the ambassadors and the Commission. I think it extremely important that we ultimately should be there.

In practical terms, I certainly accept what Mr Mart said: it may not be possible at this moment so to do, but it is certainly possible for the part-session on agricultural prices and it certainly worked extremely well for the debate on unemployment. If you happened to think that those conditions were unacceptable, then the 'Mother of Parliaments' in Westminster works under much worse conditions than that. I think we should look seriously at the way in which we are presenting ourselves to the electorate next year and come down to some sensible decisions.

President. — I must say once again that I fully respect your opinion even if I do not share it. You have obviously gone out to provoke me on a point which I hold especially dear: I would ask you — and I can now say so as President — to withdraw your amendment because it does not comply with the Rules of Procedure.

Mr Enright (S). — Mr President, I always obey the rulings of the Chair. However, the President's ruling also demands that at the next part-session the Chair should submit a proposal on venues for the part-sessions. On that understanding, I certainly withdraw the resolution and will assist the presidency, as I always do, in whatever way possible.

President. — I note your proposal.

Mr Irmer (L). — *(DE)* Mr President, I have asked to speak on a point of order because in the agenda I have before me this item is entitled 'Draft calendar of part-sessions for 1984'. In listening to the honourable Member, Mr Enright, I did not hear a single word about dates. If we are going to start having debates on inadmissible amendments — and here I agree with you — we shall still be here this evening. In my view, once it has been ruled that amendments are inadmissible, a debate on them is inadmissible as well, and I would ask the Members who are about to speak to refer to the dates of the 1984 calendar.

President. — Mr Irmer, I fully agree with you and I also said at the outset what the debate was about, what was admissible and what was inadmissible. Members who wish to say something outside the scope of the subject before us should be allowed to do so. But then they must put up with the accusation of the House that they are not speaking on the subject under debate.

Mr Enright (S). — Mr President, I am sorry but I must come back on a point of order because you yourself stated that there may be a different ruling at 6 p.m. Therefore, as a result of that, I did speak about it instead of withdrawing it at that point. The moment that you invited me to withdraw, I did, in fact, withdraw. So Mr Irmer perhaps did not have a good translation, though his English is sufficiently good to understand the meaning of what was being said. I am sorry that, unusually, he is being so illogical and unfair.

President. — But I asked you to withdraw the amendments, Mr Enright.

Mrs Lentz-Cornette (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should nevertheless like to know whether Mr Enright is withdrawing his amendments. If so, there is no point in my speaking. If they are not being withdrawn, I should like to speak.

Mr Enright (S). — Mr President, I made it quite clear to you that at your invitation — because I always obey the President — I withdraw my amendment since it has been ruled out of order, on the understanding that the question of venue will come up at the next part-session.

President. — Thank you, Mr Enright, for this clear and detailed statement.

The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

7. Next ACP-EEC Convention

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-605/83) by Mr Irmer, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the contents of the future ACP-EEC Convention to follow Lomé II.

Mr Irmer, (L), rapporteur — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, today some weeks before the start of negotiations on the new cooperation agreement between the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries and the European Community, I am speaking to you in my capacity as rapporteur for the Committee on Development and Cooperation in order to inform you of the opinions and proposals of this Committee as regards the contents of this convention.

We have arrived at these opinions in close cooperation with the Commission, and we hope they will be taken into account in the negotiations. The fact that we are discussing this matter well in advance of the negotiations proper is a reflection of the great importance which this European Parliament as ever continues to attach to development policy. It is a fact that in recent years — and to a greater extent if anything since the direct elections in 1979 — development cooperation with the countries of the Third World has, quite rightly, always been a priority issue in this House.

There are three main reasons why we in the European Community should take cooperation with the countries of the Third World as seriously as we do. Firstly, it is quite simply realistic. It is simply the only rational approach to the world in which we live, partly — I will make no bones about it — with a view to protecting our own interests. We all realize that we cannot maintain and increase the prosperity of the industrialized northern countries in the long term if the south is just left to rot in poverty and misery. Unless we achieve a steady two-way exchange of goods between North and South and make the southern countries strong economic partners, if we go on letting these countries sink into poverty, we must bear in mind that there is a great risk of us being dragged down with them and being powerless to maintain our own prosperity.

A second reason, and one which I regard as even more important, is that it will only be possible to maintain world peace in the long term if all the various peoples, including those in the south, can live under conditions fit for human beings. Poverty and misery, hunger and illness are among the worst

enemies of peace and we must fight them on a broad front. Development policy, therefore, is primarily peace policy.

Thirdly, there are humanitarian reasons. The most elementary humanitarian demands place us under an obligation to uphold human rights throughout the world, and could we imagine anything worse from the point of view of human rights than the destitution of entire peoples, as we can unfortunately still witness today in the countries of the south. However, anyone fighting for human rights in general — as is our duty — will also have to do his bit for individual human rights, and from this point of view I am very confident that our partners from the ACP countries will also be prepared to incorporate the human rights clause, which it is up to us to propose, in the new convention and themselves undertake to see to it that no serious infringements of human rights occur in their countries. We undertake to do whatever we can to help combat the gross affronts to human rights in the form of hunger, poverty and disease.

All three of these reasons lead to what must be the fundamental guiding principle for new negotiations. A profound respect for the independence, right of self-determination and cultural identities of our partner countries must continue to be our prime consideration. The greater our respect for these things, the greater will be our success in the material aspects of development policy too. The more we endeavour to promote independence, the right of self-determination and cultural identity, the more effective our aid will be, and in this respect the European Community approach differs, in a very positive direction as I see it, from many attempts on the part of the super powers to extend and consolidate their spheres of influence by means of their Third World policy and to obtain strategic advantages to which these countries are simply unable to react in the way expected of them. We must be fair and independent partners and our prime concern must be the well-being of the poorest of the poor in the world.

Not least for these reasons, Lomé I and subsequently Lomé II were welcomed as breakthroughs — they were described as models of cooperation. Not everything has turned out as we wished, a great deal came to nothing and many things have been relatively unsatisfactory. This resulted partly from the worldwide economic crisis, but also from the inadequacy of the instruments provided for in the Convention. We are trying, in our motion for a resolution to indicate ways of improving our performance in the future, and our main objective in this cooperation must be to try and help the developing countries achieve self-sufficiency and what can only be adequately described by the English expression 'self-reliance' which means helping the countries to help themselves.

Mr President, my group has allocated extra speaking time to me on their behalf in addition to the brief five minutes I am allowed as author of this large-scale report.

Irmer

Basically, the aid we provide should in due course make itself superfluous — this is the ultimate aim of our development aid. Self-reliance means that programmes and projects which we carry out should not be judged exclusively on their intrinsic merits, i.e. whether they run smoothly, whether they are rational and whether they, technically speaking, offer everything which might be expected of them. The real question is whether or not these programmes and projects contribute towards improving the overall economic situation of the countries in question, and if we are to achieve this objective we must — this idea originates with Mr Pisani — discuss questions of policy in depth with each country and region with a view to determining in advance precisely what we hope to achieve during the cooperation period, and an unambiguous criticism of the sectoral approach would be in order at this point, since this has often led to development efforts getting into a rut.

In the natural run of things, independent development begins and ends with rural development. Industrial development must in virtually all cases merely fulfil a supporting role to agricultural development. If the various countries are to become self-reliant, efforts must be made to promote the development of small and medium-sized undertakings in particular and to encourage individual involvement in these efforts. There is no point in simply transporting any old large-scale project by western standards lock, stock and barrel to developing countries without taking account of the different conditions. Trade too is, in this sense, a means to an end rather than an end in itself. However important the acquisition of foreign currency may be, trade too must also be used to promote the development of self-reliance. We call for increased emphasis on the finished and semi-finished products sector and together with unrestricted access to the European markets for products from the ACP countries, which would at any rate involve a mere 0.5 % of the products, as all the others already have free access to the European markets. The economic implications for the European Community are relatively small, while the psychological effect on the ACP countries would, I think, be quite considerable.

Ladies and gentlemen, in view of the limited time available I must now restrict myself to the broad issues. I should like to mention a few points which have not hitherto received sufficient attention and which we should give particular emphasis in the new Convention. Firstly, there is the integration of all the various measures into the socio-cultural context of the countries. The individual and his well-being must take pride of place. Traditions and cultures cannot simply be pushed aside and the achievements of civilisation dumped in their place. We must try to adapt things carefully and very gradually and cautiously bring the people of these countries to an awareness of what is expected of them.

This is directly connected with the question of education. We must place more emphasis on training people on the spot to cope with and operate themselves the projects we offer after the foreign helpers have left.

We have neglected environmental problems in the past. Let us have no illusions — the sands of time are running out. We must do something to ensure the conservation of natural resources and processes in the developing countries too.

Regional cooperation is another vital point which, I think, one of the sub-rapporteurs will go into shortly.

Finally, I should like to mention a few financial aspects. As we see it, better provisions should be made for this convention. However, this point should not complicate or impede the negotiations from the outset. The question of quality is more important than the question of quantity. The objectives must be determined in a rational manner and we can always talk about money afterwards. We emphatically call for inclusion of the next European Development Fund in the general budget of the European Community partly with a view to ensuring that this House is in a better position to exercise its powers in the administration of this fund. We expect consultation under the Luns-Westerterp procedure — we have received promises to this effect in the Stuttgart declaration, *inter alia* — and we wish furthermore for ratification of the new Convention by this Parliament.

I should also like to take this opportunity of thanking my co-rapporteurs who worked on this motion for a resolution and report with me — in particular Mrs Focke, Mr Wawrzik, Mr Pearce, Mr Vergès, Mr Israël and Mr Pannella.

Mr President, I should like to make the following point of order — and I hope you will not count this as part of my speaking time. I find it regrettable that this House could only find five minutes for the main rapporteur on such a crucial report which is supposed to define the form which cooperation between the European Community and the ACP countries is to take for the next five years. I find it really deplorable.

(Applause)

.. and unacceptable. Finally — I could have said a lot more but there is not time left — I would like to wish the Commission luck in the negotiations. You have our backing and we hope that you will keep us informed of developments and consult us. As you know, we attach great importance to this matter. If the negotiations for this convention are a success, this will be a good thing for both the ACP countries and the European Community. We hope that we may, in this way, be able to make a small contribution towards improving the human condition and towards world peace.

(Applause)

President. — Mr Irmer, I can assure you that I will see to it that your objections are discussed in the enlarged Bureau.

Mr Pranchère (COM), draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture. — (FR) Mr President, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, I have the honour of presenting to you the opinion which we have adopted unanimously.

Agriculture is without doubt one of the major features of Community policies. It is clear that the same applies to the policy of cooperation between the EEC and the ACP States, and I should like to add that Commissioner Pisani's recent proposals strengthen our conviction that the food and agricultural sector is one of the mainstays of cooperation on development, one which has a vast snowball effect on the industrial sectors. I shall not forget, either, the moral duty that we have to act when hunger and poverty are killing 40 000 children a day, according to Unicef figures. That is why the Committee on Agriculture felt that it had a particular responsibility when it proposed to add to the Irmer report a series of concrete measures. The measures proposed take into account, of course, the balance sheet of the Lomé I and Lomé II conventions, which everybody agrees did not even succeed, at least as far as food and agriculture are concerned, in halting the progress of famine and the decline in agricultural activity in the ACP States, particularly as regards food production.

Our Committee does not deny the importance of the instruments that were instituted by Lomé I and Lomé II, such as Stabex, but it is clear that any thoughts on Lomé III must take as a starting point the failures, insufficiencies and shortcomings which have been noted in the way the previous conventions have or have not worked.

That is why our Committee considered it necessary to draw up a balance sheet of the Lomé I and Lomé II agreements as far as agriculture was concerned. Our Committee considered that any agricultural cooperation between the EEC and the ACP States must be based on three principles: short-term security as regards food, self-sufficiency in food, and development of trade.

In this spirit, Stabex ought to play a vital rôle. Our Committee earnestly hopes that it will be reinforced and extended to new products.

Moreover, we hope that the new convention will set up a working party to dismantle the price-fixing mechanism for the main basic agricultural products, since there is still much light to be thrown on the route that they take from production to consumption, and the intermediate agencies which are rife in this grey area.

Finally, taking up a request from the ACP/EEC Consultative Assembly, we hope that this working

party will make proposals with a view to stabilizing at a higher figure the prices of the principle basic agricultural products.

Next, our Committee discussed the EEC's policy of cooperation. On this topic, which was fully dealt with in the Irmer report, we remarked that the advantages conceded by the Community to industrialized countries are prejudicial when it comes to realizing the objectives of ACP/EEC commercial cooperation. This comment by our Committee is indeed topical at the moment when the United States are trying to obtain new concessions from us.

Finally Mr President, in order not to take up too much time, I should simply like to draw Parliament's attention to another remark by the Committee on Agriculture which will also be included in the amendments to be put to the vote. It concerns one particular but important aspect of the food trade with the ACP States. We should like the Community to supply to the ACP States its available agricultural produce on preferential terms (cash or credit) in addition to food aid. We also wish to emphasize the advantage for the EEC and the ACP States of long-term contracts for the supply of agricultural products, in particular for planning the food strategies of our ACP partners.

This matter is all the more significant in that the Commission has formally presented a proposal to the Council and that everyone knows that in the Council there are now only two or three countries still blocking this proposal. But I think things are moving. By adopting the amendment on this topic, Parliament would express its hope that the Community will fulfil its commitments in an area which is so important to our ACP partners.

In conclusion, Mr President, I should like to make it clear, as I welcome Mr Irmer's work, that all the amendments which I shall have the honour of tabling on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture have been adopted unanimously by this Committee.

Mrs Focke (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as co-rapporteur for the report by Mr Irmer — whom I particularly thank for his good work and excellent cooperation — I am proud that the European Parliament is providing much needed and timely encouragement and suggestions for solidarity between the European Community and certain Third World countries, which they so urgently need during this time of crisis. I would remind you that some of the countries in question are amongst the poorest in the world and are much harder hit by the crisis than we are.

With an eye to the 1984 budget deliberations, I would stress right away that the European Community cannot afford drastic cuts in this area, i.e. the develop-

Focke

ment budget, over and above all the other things which have fallen victim to the Council's red pencil, nor will the European Parliament accept them. What a depressing sign just before new negotiations which will among other things call for substantial financial efforts on the part of the Community in the interests of development and cooperation with our partners — and Mr Irmer is quite right when he says that there is an element of self interest involved here too. I hardly need to repeat that increasing purchasing power in the developing countries is an essential precondition for more jobs in the European Community too and that periods of economic difficulties consequently demand more development aid rather than less.

For this reason, our motion for a resolution calls for a substantial increase in the appropriations for the new Convention, since if insufficient money is available, it will not only be individual projects and programmes which will suffer, but the entire qualitative objective. I am making this point right at the outset so as to leave no room for doubt that the financing of the new Convention will be an essential factor and that it will not do to emphasize the qualitative aspects of the new Convention with a view to evading the quantitative issue. It is quite true that more money does not in itself lead to more development, but the converse is also true, i.e. any efforts or agreements laying down new and more effective objectives and methods for development cooperation are pointless if they cannot be put into practice because of insufficient funds.

I have made this point right at the start out of alarm at the cuts in the development budget — though I would go along with the Irmer motion for a resolution in advising the negotiating partners not to discuss the question of financing too soon, but rather to wait until a consensus has been reached on the content and objectives of the new Convention. The main thing now in the first few months of the negotiations is quite coolly to take stock of why cooperation hitherto has contributed so little to development, i.e. there must be a broadly-based dialogue on ends and means and that at the beginning of the negotiations those involved must finally get round to doing what we all joined our general rapporteur, Mr Cavalevu, in calling for as long ago as last February, i.e. attempting to reach agreement on these ends and means. Only in this way can we avoid blind alleys such as a premature sectoral approach or a simple extension of the previous convention. Our report rejects the idea of simply continuing as we set out: it calls rather for a step beyond the sectoral approach, i.e. thinking simply in terms of projects and programmes. According to our report, all the various strategies, programmes and projects should be such as to serve the higher purpose of the development of self-reliance and we therefore call on the negotiating partners to agree on this principle right at the start of the negotiations. Obviously, the principle will subsequently have to be maintained and reflected in the individual sections of the new

Convention and later at the planning and implementation stages.

My sub-report concerned the principle of self-reliance as a basis for development policy and the usefulness of dealing so explicitly with the question of the underlying principle is reflected in the line adopted by the report and the motion for a resolution. The question was in fact not at all difficult since, as I have explained in my sub-report the ACP countries themselves brought the matter up long ago and explained their own views on the subject. Whether we take the Lagos Plan, the industrial development programme for Africa, the Caricom Treaty or the Pacific Conference, they all boil down to the same thing i.e. that simply trying to industrialize along western lines without taking account of the individual cultural identities of the countries in question or of the particular characteristics of the areas involved as regards human needs and potential, has not produced the results hoped for but has at best merely led to a small modern sector in the middle of a large backward agricultural area.

Furthermore, this approach to development has resulted in greater dependence on foreign labour, capital and technology and for this reason all the ACP countries' own answers for the future are along the same lines, i.e. they stress the development of self-reliance and of indigenous potential. This indicates a clear break with previous development strategies, which overemphasized purely economic aspects and were too much concerned with so-called efficiency and quantitative growth — which they in fact failed to achieve. It reflects a new approach aimed at involving the population in the development process and adapting the production structure to the needs of the people. It means absolute priority for rural development and self-sufficiency in fodder supply. It means industrialization which is attuned to the rural developments, i.e. the processing and refining of indigenous raw materials. Thus, it means a network of basic industries corresponding to the fundamental needs of the population, decentralized in the rural areas and, with this end in view, indigenous renewable energy sources and an emphasis on training in appropriate technology.

This must all be integrated into a collective effort, i.e. — and we stress this point very firmly in our report — one of the most important guidelines for the new Convention must be regional efforts with appropriate financial resources, which also means more regional markets, more south-south cooperation, changes in the trade flows and products exchanged and a less exclusive concern with the common market, although I would sound a warning — particularly in view of certain points made by the previous speaker — against regarding this as an excuse for protectionism. Quite the contrary — we call for a complete relaxation of all restrictions on trade with the Community even in areas where the competitiveness of our own agricultural products is affected.

Focke

I can only be very brief today. Our attention has been drawn, by our ACP partners themselves, to the need for rethinking our whole approach in the new Convention. Their experience is in line with our own assessment of the situation and it is now a question of translating this new approach into a new Convention. The Committee on Development and Cooperation has provided the necessary impetus in good time before the opening of the new negotiations and we hope to receive your broad agreement and backing.

(Applause)

Mr Muntingh (S), *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection*. — *(NL)* Mr President, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, I should like to thank Mr Irmer for his excellent report, and I agree with him when he says that it is a disgrace that he was only allowed to speak for five minutes on the subject. When I see how people moan on here for minutes, ten minutes or even longer, about whether or not to withdraw amendments, then I think it is a disgrace. Mr President, the Brandt Commission said a while ago in its report that: 'It can no longer be argued that the protection of the environment is an obstacle to development; on the contrary the care of the natural environment is an essential aspect of development'. Brandt *had* to say that, Mr President, because if we think that there will be 6 thousand million people on this earth in the year 2000, if we think that 20 % of all living plants and animals will be extinct in the year 2000, if we think that, 20 years from now, 40 % of our present forests will have been chopped down, just as in the last 20 years 25 % has already been chopped down, if we think that every year millions of hectares of arable land and grasslands are eroded away, if we think that our oceans and our lakes are being polluted, with the result that the amount of fish we now catch is well below the potential, then it is clear that we are living at the expense of the natural environment.

Nobody has said this more succinctly than Mr Pisani himself, who calculated for the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection that the development aid given to Africa by the Community as well as by other countries is only a fraction of what is lost each year in economical terms through the destruction of natural resources. Mr Pisani knows exactly how things stand, and I am glad to say that he takes that into consideration.

Mr President, we feel that in the new Lomé Convention due attention has to be paid to this enormous problem, which has grown to become one of the main causes of poverty, underdevelopment and misery. It has become an independent cause of all these terrible features. That is why we feel that there should be a

new approach in the Lomé Convention towards the natural environment, and we expect the Commission to adhere to the objectives of the World Conservation Strategy which Parliament welcomed in 1980. The three main objectives, as you know, are: the conservation and administration of important ecological systems and processes, the conservation of genetical diversity, and the responsible use of our natural resources. If we, on the basis of these objectives, could introduce an environment policy system to the Third Lomé Convention, an environmental policy system that is, by the way, already quite normal in other big institutions — United States Aid has one, the World Bank has an environmental policy system, and so must the European Community have an environmental policy system — then we may at least be able to do something about this major problem.

In our opinion, Mr President, an environmental policy system should contain four main elements. The first element is that we must encourage the developing countries to control their natural environment in a proper way, that is to say, we must give them the capacity to be able to do that. The second element is that we must make sure to add such criteria as are necessary to the financial criteria we operate at present in order to avoid damage to the environment. Thirdly, we feel that money should be made available to finance projects that could improve and conserve the natural environment in developing countries. Fourthly, and finally, we feel this environmental policy system should put forward proposals to ensure that industry, in its activities in developing countries, also keeps an eye on the ecological criteria, and this could be achieved, for example, if the Commission recommended a type of code for industry.

All in all, we hope that these matters can be incorporated into the Lomé Convention. I do not know whether that should be done item by item or on a sectoral basis, but that is not important. In any case, we, the members of the Committee on the Environment, call on the Commission to do its very best and to make this one of the cornerstones of the new Lomé Convention.

Mr Cohen (S). — *(NL)* Mr President, Mr Irmer's report on Lomé III as it is known, in any case the successor of Lomé II is an own-initiative report by Parliament. I do not think this can be emphasized enough. It is the first time that the European Parliament has not been satisfied merely to express an opinion on Lomé, or Yaounde as it used to be called, after the negotiations were concluded. Parliament feels it should say in advance what the contents of this Convention should be.

I would like to link the debate we are holding this afternoon with the debate we held yesterday and the day before on Mr Spinelli's report. This own-initiative report, quite apart from the development policy

Cohen

aspects included in it, should also be looked at from its institutional aspects. This Parliament wishes, desires, demands more power, in the field of development cooperation as well as elsewhere. We have already said that the European Development Fund should be included in the budget. We insist again that this be done. But even if this is not the case, we feel that, if the Community has the means, methods, technology and money to conclude such a convention, the European Parliament should also have the power to ratify this Convention.

Development cooperation is clearly founded on two main aspects. In the first place there is the humanitarian aspect: the fight against poverty and ensuring that people in the Third World have a decent standard of living. The second point is the promotion of independence, of the economical unassailability of the developing countries, the promotion of self-reliance, making sure that those countries can fight their own battles in the international political and economical system. Both these points are elucidated in Mr Irmer's report. Both principles are accepted by our committee and we hope they will be incorporated in the Lomé Convention.

The Lomé Convention as we have known it up till now has not been equally successful in all areas. Trade relations with the ACP States have not yielded much, trade with other developing countries has progressed much more than that with the ACP States, and one can only wonder as to why. There is of course the problem of the definition of origin. We have not been very generous in this, and we should improve on it in the next convention. The most important problem is of course that the ACP States are amongst the poorest in the world and as yet have so very little to export. In order to give them that opportunity, more should be done about industrialization, and we have made this point clear in our report. More emphasis must be placed in the Convention on the possibilities for industrialization, so that these countries have the chance to promote and expand their trade with the EEC.

Stabex has not been a success in some ways, or at any rate it has not lived up to expectations. It is easy to say that we expected too much of it, but that is not the only reason, even though it may have had something to do with it. The fact is that we must find new means of improving Stabex within the Convention, whilst making sure that we do indeed achieve general stabilization in world prices by entering into worldwide agreements and putting the Community's signature to the Common Fund, and that we do our utmost to ensure that the ACP States are also given the opportunity to earn more with their exports on the world market and in world trade.

Food aid, which has also been discussed, has to be incorporated into the food strategy, as has always been

the case. We have already said this in contexts other than Lomé. It is of course, necessary, as both Mr Irmer and Mrs Focke have pointed out, that more money be made available for the next convention.

What the Council appears to be trying to do with the 1984 budget is quite indicative, and Mrs Focke has spoken about this already. If the Council cannot or does not want to change its views, then we can clearly say right now that we cannot accept the budget for 1984, because we can still live better in the present circumstances with a twelfth of the 1983 budget than with the cuts that the Council has made in the so-called non-obligatory expenditure. We have not yet reached that stage and we have plenty of opportunities to alter what the Council has landed us with. However, I think it useful for the Council to know now where we stand on this point.

Mr President, the Socialist Group has not put forward any amendment to Mr Irmer's report. We agree one hundred per cent with the points made in that report and we support it entirely. We also hope that the Commission, who will soon be negotiating with the ACP States, realizes that this report was not written for nothing.

I began by saying that this was an own-initiative report and that the European Parliament should demand its rights on the subject of development co-operation. We come back to this report. We want the Commission to keep us regularly informed about the negotiations, and we will not refrain from involving the national parliaments if we feel that a Member State or Member States are doing less than necessary to achieve the required result. We wish the Commission a lot of luck. We hope that Parliament will adopt this motion with a big majority. I am sure it will. It is now up to the Commission to put this into action. Parliament is prepared to work together with the Commission, but it will not avoid a conflict should this be necessary.

IN THE CHAIR : MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

Mr Wawrzik (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by thanking the general rapporteur for the work he has done and at the same time assure him that he has my sympathy, since I was the general rapporteur in connection with Lomé II and was given 10 minutes to speak. Following the protests at that sitting, the speaking time was reduced to five minutes. I hope the next time, when a Member comes to report on a follow-up to Lomé III that he will not be left with a mere two and a half minutes.

(Applause)

Wawrzik

Thus I have my own experience with the allocation of speaking times and the relative importance accorded to various areas of policy, but if attendance is any reflection of the importance which this House attaches to this vital question, it is hardly the enlarged Bureau which is to blame if speaking times are kept very brief.

My sub-report concerned trade and markets, which are undoubtedly among the most important aspects of Community development policy. In both Lomé I and Lomé II, the Community gave great weight to this question. Nevertheless, the situation has remained unsatisfactory. The developing countries have been particularly hard-hit by the negative trend in world trade, which has by now dropped back to the 1979 level and the deterioration in the balance of payments situation and the increase in the medium- and long-term debts of the developing countries to approximately \$ 530 000 million are disturbing reflections of this fact.

In particular, it has not been possible to step up trade between the Community and the ACP countries as the Community would have wished. True, our markets are virtually 100 % open to ACP products, with the exception of a few sensitive products in the agricultural sector — but the ground should be prepared for better results by means of extensive abolition of customs duties and other protective measures. Nevertheless, 60 % of the ACP products which end up in the Community come from a mere 5 or 6 ACP countries while some three quarters of the total exports are accounted for by about 14 products.

If the results are unsatisfactory in spite of all the preferences accorded, we must draw the appropriate conclusions for the follow-up convention to Lomé II from the shortcomings of Lomé I and Lomé II, and in view of the limited funds available, we cannot think in terms of ambitious but impractical development models, but rather we must investigate the real practical possibilities for improving the economic situation of the ACP countries. However difficult it might appear, it is up to us who are responsible for development policy to press for complete liberalization of the Community market for processed and unprocessed ACP products. We must help our partners to offer as large a proportion of finished or of highly processed products as possible. So far the total volume of imports to the Community has been so small that we have no need to fear long-term employment problems in the Community but that any improvement on the other side is of major importance.

I should like at this point to comment on the question of why trade expansion did not prove possible. As I see it, the conflict concerning industrialization with appropriate or modern technology is not yet a thing of the past. Time and time again there will be disputes with the developing countries, who get the feeling that when we offer them appropriate tech-

nology we are simply trying to palm off our obsolete technology on them. They want the same kind of modern technologies as we have so that they can keep pace with the world market as regards quality and price. As I see it discussion of this point is far from exhausted. Obviously, if the trade results are to be improved, this will call for more financial aid and technical counselling with a view to improving the marketing system and this in turn will involve more flexible application of the regulations concerning origins and a fundamental reorientation of trade promotion policy with a view to improving the trade results between the ACP countries and the Community. Without transfer of commercial technology and corresponding familiarity with the Community market and the needs of the people of the Community, we cannot expect much success.

As regards the development of regional markets and south-south trade, all sorts of things have been tried, but unfortunately without the results hoped for. However, I nevertheless feel that we should lend a hand in this connection. However, even if we achieve satisfactory results in this respect, there is one problem which we will not be able to solve, i.e. the need of the developing countries for foreign currency, a need which trade of this kind will not be able to meet, so that trade between the developing countries and the European Community will continue to be of the utmost importance for the ACP countries. Trade brings prosperity to all those involved and for this reason, the elimination of the north-south differential will not only contribute towards ensuring that the basic needs of the people of the Third World are met, but is equally in the interests of the people of the Community, and particular attention should be paid to this aspect during the negotiations on Lomé III.

We wish to the Commission luck and a little of the other prerequisite for progress, i.e. understanding on the other side. The Group of the European People's Party, the Christian-Democratic Group, will vote in favour of the report.

(Applause)

Mr Pearce (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President. There seems to be some mistake in the order in which the speakers have been called in that Mrs Focke and Mr Cohen have both spoken on behalf of the Socialist Group. There may be some mistake. Mrs Focke was one of the sub-rapporteurs and I was another. Would you confirm, please, that the time she took to speak will be subtracted from time allocated to the Socialist Group?

President. — Yes, Mr Pearce, I agree.

Mrs Focke (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, I should like to make it clear that I spoke for 5 minutes as sub-rapporteur and had another 3 minutes from my group. I added the two speaking times together so that I could explain my views on the matter.

Mr C. Jackson (ED). — Mr President, may I just clarify that point, because Mrs Focke has just made an important point that apparently sub-rapporteurs get five minutes on this report. I was not aware of that, so perhaps that time could be added to Mr Pearce's speaking-time when it comes to his turn.

President. — I took the Chair when Mrs Focke had already spoken. You are a gentleman. You asked a question and Mrs Focke replied to it. The Bureau will examine whether it is necessary to take account of your remark or of the statement by Mrs Focke. We have lots of time left, since there are still 30 Members down to speak. Nevertheless, if there has been an error, we are obliged to deduct a few minutes of speaking-time.

Mr C. Jackson (ED). — Mr President, this is an extremely important report, and I want to associate myself with the complaints to the Bureau about the absurd allocation of speaking-time to our rapporteur.

My group welcomes the Irmer report, not least because we recognize the ACP-EEC Convention as one of the great achievements of the EEC not just for providing aid but, as those of us who are privileged to participate in the ACP-EEC Joint Assembly know, for providing a forum in which we can enrich and deepen the quality of our cooperation and mutual understanding. Lomé II has been roundly criticized in some respects, but it remains one of the world's most imaginative acts of partnership between developed and developing countries, and we want the successor Convention to build on the successes and to correct the failings. I hope that negotiations will, on both sides, be conducted in the spirit of a genuine desire to make common progress, rather than retreating behind entrenched positions.

I must confess that we did not start off too auspiciously. As a colleague remarked, the approach of the Council to this 1984 development budget is a disgrace, but even before that, it was clear that funding will prove a difficult item in which we shall have to recall our responsibilities to Asia and Latin America, as well as to the ACP countries themselves. I very much hope that, however great our problems are, we will at least maintain our aid in real terms.

The Irmer report highlights two important concepts — self-reliance and policy dialogue. To us, self-reliance is rightly the focal aim of development cooperation. It means working towards independence from the crutches of aid. But I do want to emphasize two small points on this. It does *not* mean encouraging a series of seige economies and it does *not* mean promoting self-sufficiency where that is economically harmful.

I think the policy dialogue will play an extremely important part in the next Convention. Europe faces a very difficult future in economic terms, and we shall

need to justify, both to ourselves and our electors, the effectiveness of our expenditure. We must direct the bulk of our limited resources to countries where they are used to best effect.

Equally, in our view, another part of our dialogue must include discussion of the effects of EEC internal policies on ACP countries. That is a very important new thing that I hope will be carried forward in the negotiations.

It has often been said that we want, through food strategies, to aid food production. As regards Lomé, I hope the Commission will support the United Kingdom proposal to have a food chapter in Lomé III, covering food aid, agricultural production, food pricing incentives and rural development which would try to wrap it all up together. I think this would be a very great help.

I will now deal quickly with three important items. The first is Stabex. Stabex is one of the highlights of Lomé, and despite its problems it is, in many ways, a great success. However, on the one hand, funding problems that we all know about and on the other hand, dissatisfaction with control of the use of funds make, in our view, a far-reaching review essential. The second is population. It certainly is not our business to tell people how many children to have; but if rapid population increases cause problems, let us at least say we will aid those ACP States who seek to develop population policies. Third, industry: we must seek to encourage private enterprise and help the ACP, but we must also help them to have a meaningful dialogue with multinationals so that both sides — investors and the country invested in — feel secure and not exploited. I hope that a combination of codes of conduct and investment guarantees will be considered in this Convention.

We shall support the Irmer report, and we shall pursue our support for ACP countries. We wish the Commissioner well in his negotiations, which we hope will proceed in a spirit of cooperation to a very successful conclusion.

Mr Denis (COM). — (FR) Mr President, on the eve of the new negotiations, the balance sheet which Mr Pisani has drawn up of the situation of our partners is alarming. He has reminded us that among the ACP States are more than two thirds of the least-developed countries in the world. Important international negotiations remain blocked by American intransigence. The failure of the Unctad will have direct repercussions on Lomé III. The rise of the dollar, the burden of debts of the ACP countries and ridiculously high rates of interest all make these negotiations which are just beginning much more difficult, and lead to the conclusion that Europe should finally take steps and act in a way which is more favourable to cooperation with the ACP countries.

Denis

Mr Irmer's report takes into account certain ACP claims, since it refers to the plan adopted in Lagos by the OAU and also takes into account, to a certain extent, the disappointing and sometimes negative experience of the last two conventions. Nevertheless, for the French communists and their allies, the report raises important questions, as do the Commission's proposals. First of all, the essential question of the democratization of international relations. Cooperation means also deciding together, and we are a long way from that at the moment.

Another vital question: funds. Up till now, the Commission has not made any definite commitments as to the financing of the new Convention. In addition the Commission has until now been reticent about the creation of an ACP-EEC financial body whose responsibility it would be to make easily available — to the ACP countries — the necessary funds for their development in conditions compatible with the main features of their economy. On the other hand, the positions adopted by certain Member States — I am thinking particularly of the rapporteur's country — during the latest meetings of the Council of Ministers suggest a decrease in financial aid for development. We believe that a decrease in this aid is good neither for the ACP countries nor for Europe. More than ever, in fact, helping the developing countries means helping ourselves to emerge from the crisis. If the necessary funds are not available, both the Irmer resolution and the Commission's proposals will inevitably appear to those who are suffering to be merely a catalogue of pious hopes and what can one say that is positive about the terrible debt problem or about what the Commissioner calls, quite rightly, the enormity of arms expenditure?

As far as Stabex is concerned, it is obvious to everybody that a reform is vital but on the condition that it is agreed with the ACP countries and respects their wishes. In fact, it is the guarantee that the system to which, as we know, our partners attach so much importance will work in the future. Moreover, we must not delude ourselves as to who is responsible: if Stabex has not worked very well, the reasons lie in the way the world market has been working, particularly in raw materials, and in the lack of agreements for individual products rather than in the internal production methods of the ACP countries.

Certain proposals seem to us to be dangerous insofar as they could be considered as meddling in the politics of the ACP countries and in their right to choose how they wish to develop all the more so when it is a question of self reliance in development. We consider that there is a fundamental principle when it comes to private investment: each nation has the right to sovereignty.

Finally, when hunger is still raging in the world — and we have just published a document on this very

serious matter — we welcome the opinion presented by my colleague Mr Pranchère.

In conclusion, subject to these important comments, we should have liked to adopt a positive attitude towards the Irmer resolution. We have tabled several amendments with a view to improving it. But how can we remain passive when we learn that the Council proposes a draconian reduction in appropriations voted for development? This makes it impossible for us to vote in favour of a text which, under such conditions, would be mere window-dressing, whereas in a few days time we shall have to talk seriously with our ACP partners in the Consultative Assembly.

Mr Sablé (L). — (*FR*) Mr President, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, the opening of major international negotiations is always an important moment in history, especially when the subject is the renewal of an agreement linking the European Economic Community with 63 African, Caribbean and Pacific countries. If the Lomé Convention is considered as a model of North-South dialogue, though it is, admittedly not the whole of European development policies, it is the most successful and the most lasting part.

Having just learned of the fate reserved by the Council for the rest of Community development policies, I really must express at this point my grave anxiety, and I hope that Parliament will conform to the decisions already taken by re-establishing under Heading 9 of the preliminary draft budget for 1984 the appropriations allocated to food aid for the non-associated developing countries and the fight against hunger in the world.

The European Development Fund has not yet been budgetized. Is that why it has escaped the swingeing cuts introduced by the Council? We are not so sure, and Mr Irmer is quite right to ask for a considerable increase in appropriations for the new Convention, in order to make it possible to fulfil the objectives to be determined by this Convention.

In 1984 we are going to stand for election in the 10 Member States. We shall have to present to the electors the balance sheet for the building of Europe, and Community development policies undoubtedly constitute one of the main building blocks. It is not even a matter of whether or not the Lomé Convention is to be renewed, but, taking into account the difficult economic situation in the world and the current failure of the North-South dialogue, Lomé III cannot be merely a continuation of Lomé II. It is a matter of whether or not, in this time of crisis, we shall have the courage to create a new system.

At this point I should like to emphasize the rôle played by Parliament and the institutional bodies of the Convention, even if it would appear wise to eliminate the current duplication of work between the Consultative Assembly and the Joint Committee. On

Sablé

the eve of these major negotiations and on the eve of the Berlin meeting, it is important that Parliament should have the opportunity to express its opinion. We must strive to give a new dimension to the Lomé Convention, to make it more than a simple commercial agreement. I already said as much at the time of our July debate on the sugar problem. What a pity it is that sometimes our dealings with the ACP countries are reduced to the banal problem of importing strawberries or tomatoes when other important aspects of trade could be developed!

Fortunately, we have been able to introduce into our debates new food for thought, thanks to the work done by the Joint Committee and the Consultative Assembly.

Mr Irmer was quite right to emphasize this, by protesting quite justifiably against the shortage of time devoted to problems which are so important for Europe itself. The same thing happened last year, and I joined Mr Wawrzik in his protests.

Today, we agree to refer to the respecting and the application of human rights, we stress ecological problems, we propose to devote a specific chapter of the Convention to the cultural dimension, in particular, we are giving priority to the strategy of self-development and self-reliance.

I should like to conclude by referring to one of the main themes of this strategy: regional cooperation. This cooperation seems to me to be fundamental, especially for the small States which are enclaves or islands.

As the Member for one of the Caribbean islands, I am in a position to tell you how distance and absence of transport and communications constitute a major handicap when it comes to initiating a process of true economic development. Along with food strategies regional cooperation should constitute one of the focal points of the future Convention.

So that these different ideas should be borne in mind and the negotiations begin next week in Berlin under the most favourable auspices, it behoves Parliament to adopt unanimously and I earnestly hope it will — the report presented by Mr Irmer on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation.

(Applause on the right)

Mr Israël (DEP), rapporteur. — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the building of Europe does not consist only of organizing economies for the self-satisfaction of Europeans. Our Community would be built on sand if it did not take into account the vital feeling of solidarity with the developing countries. Since the Yaoundé and Lomé Conventions we have applied ourselves honestly to this task, but now a true philosophy of development has become necessary.

It is not enough merely to affirm our solidarity. We must also defend the independence of our partners. I

shall request permission from our Marxist colleagues to say that a dialectical relationship exists between solidarity and independence. Development aims at reducing dependence, solidarity increases the common destiny of partners. Europe must reinforce its solidarity with the Third World without at the same time limiting the freedom of choice of the different countries to which it is giving aid.

By recalling the importance of the reference to human rights in the Community's external relations, the European Parliament's conception of development aid is taking an important step forward. Too often, in Parliament and in the other institutions, the idea had been prevalent that the Third World and Europe had different conceptions of the freedom of the individual and that the exigences of development made reference to human rights, as they are understood in the West, of secondary importance. Fortunately, the combined efforts of members from all political groups have made it possible for progress to be made in a new direction, without confusing economic negotiations and the problems of human rights.

Thanks to the general report adopted in May, the Penders resolution adopted in Kingston last February, the opinion of Mr Enright on behalf of the Committee on Development, Mr Christopher Jackson and finally to Mr Irmer, the European Parliament clearly affirms that the essential feature of relations between independent States is the happiness of the individual and of societies brought about by reinforcing the immutable principles of respect for the right to life, the outlawing of torture and slavery and the right to be judged by an independent tribunal.

Mr President, we are pleased to note that the recommendations of our Group have been taken into account by the Council. As early as last May, during the debate on human rights in the world, Mr Aloyse Mertes, on behalf of the German Presidency, promised to introduce the problematics of 'human rights' into the Lomé negotiations. Today, the Council is, I believe I am right in saying, granting a mandate to the Commission to negotiate to this end. We welcome this act of faith on the part of the Council and we welcome the goodwill manifested by the Commission as well.

Thus the Community's inherent duty here to aim at solidarity finds its true dimension.

Mr Irmer's vast report conjures up other thoughts. The Community need not be ashamed of what it is doing. Admittedly, there are a few instances of selfishness still rife, a few instances of ineradicable self-interest, and the crisis which is seriously affecting all nations sometimes leads to doubts and stalling. But, compared with what others are doing, compared with what countries under socialist régimes are doing for the Third World, compared with the aid given by certain rich countries in the Near East, the Community's intervention is more than honourable.

Israël

However, the road to north-south solidarity is still fraught with danger.

Community policies are impeded by fragmented and selective bilateral aid. This is a relic of national chauvinism. As we tried to show in the sub-report for which we were responsible, it is vital that Community policies and national policies should be harmonized.

We regret that it is for the moment impossible to create a kind of financial solidarity, we regret that there is no kind of monetary system common to the Europe of the Community and the Third World, as the Pisani memorandum proposes, and we also regret the difficulties inherent in the management of both emergency food aid and ordinary food aid, we support the Commission in its desire to resist the temptation to make Lomé a worldwide convention and we draw Mr Irmer's attention to the fact that agricultural policies pose a considerable problem. We have, Mr Irmer, several reservations about paragraphs 39 and 40 of your motion for a resolution.

One final question to finish on, Mr President: why should the Community and the Third World not establish a permanent political dialogue, along the lines of European political cooperation? This dialogue is both vital and urgent. What would our friendly relations with the developing countries be like if politics were excluded: the politics of security, of international cooperation, of regional collaboration? The renewal of the Lomé convention is an important act in the life of the European Parliament. Parliament is making its contribution with its characteristic sense of responsibility.

Mr Skovmand (CDI). — (DA) There is nothing more offensive than the rich ganging up against the poor and it is particularly repugnant when the rich divide the poor among themselves in order to prevent them from improving their situation by taking a united stand against the rich. This is exactly what the European Community has done with the Lomé Convention. It has taken the poorest of the developing countries and given them certain advantages at the expense of other developing countries, thereby making it impossible for the developing countries to present a united front and, furthermore, the Community has gained an economic and political advantage for its own Member States in the Lomé countries. As far as we can tell, the people involved in producing the Irmer report are well meaning and have the best interests of the developing countries at heart — that is clear from many passages in the report, such as where it advocates the promotion of independence from foreign aid and the mobilization of ACP countries' own human and material resources. However, neither the Committee nor Mr Irmer have drawn the appropriate conclusions from their own considerations. They are happy with the idea of the Lomé Convention, and hence the dependence on the Community which is intrinsic to its continuation. They have failed

to speak out against the almost criminal way in which the Stabex arrangement is administered and they bring up the question of human rights, even though this is merely a front to enable the Community to interfere in internal affairs in the developing countries.

The worst thing, however, is the fact that the Committee does not consider the developing countries as a whole, that it fails to take account of the 90% + of the population of the developing countries who do not live in the ACP countries and that it continues to accept discrimination on the part of the Community between the various developing countries. We in the People's Movement against the European Community cannot go along with this report.

Mr G. Fuchs (S). — (FR) In my comments, I should like to concentrate on two of the objectives of Mr Irmer's report. The motives behind one of them seem to me to deserve explanation, and it does not seem to me that the other was presented in sufficient detail, in view of its importance.

The first of these objectives is support for the development of the ACP countries based on self-reliance. Why do we have this objective and what does it mean? For decades, almost all the present ACP countries were an integral part of European colonial empires, and their development — no doubt it would be more accurate to say their exploitation — was organized as a function basically, of the needs of their mother countries, their need for mineral raw materials, or cheap food products. What was set up in the way of infrastructures, of administrations was based almost exclusively on these needs. Even the frontiers of these States are the results of agreements between European powers, such as the Berlin conference, with arrogant disregard both for the geography and the history of the areas concerned. Then political independence came along and the worldwide trade system set up after the Second World War, which was basically inspired by liberal ideas, has for the most part merely reinforced the previous characteristics of the economies of these new States, on the one hand extraversion and on the other the importance of exporting basic products. Do I need to remind you that even today more than 70 % of the ACP countries income from exports to the Community comes from these basic products? This situation makes it virtually impossible to set in motion true development processes. In the agricultural field, it leads to favouring export crops to the detriment of food crops, and aggravates famines. In the industrial sector it makes it very difficult to create an industrial fabric which is geared primarily towards the internal market.

The clear affirmation of the objective of self-reliant development of the ACP countries which has already been put forward in the OAU's Lagos plan and in the memorandum presented by Mr Pisani, aims at overturning the existing logic of extraversion. It aims to

G. Fuchs

base development upon satisfying first of all the fundamental needs of the populations of the ACP countries, by optimum use of their material and human resources. This is not a logic of economic self-sufficiency; it does not exclude — either a multiplication of regional efforts at cooperation or, at first, at least, a reinforcement of North-South cooperation — on the contrary, often it requires them. There are, in my opinion, two consequences of the objective of self-reliant development. One consequence for the Community, is future support not so much for precisely defined projects as for programmes or strategies — the priority in this field being, of course, support for the ACP countries food strategies. The other consequence is for the ACP States and, although we are in a European Parliament, it is appropriate, I believe, to mention it: it means really getting down to it and working out such programmes, plans or strategies, whatever you like to call them. Here, the responsibility — which is not inconsiderable — belongs to the governments concerned.

The second objective that I should like to mention is the amount of money which the Community will have to devote to the next Convention. The report tells us that there will have to be a considerable increase in funds. For my part, I should like more precise information. I know, of course, of the budgetary difficulties which we have at the moment both on a Community level and in its individual Member States. I know that apparently insuperable restrictions are likely to be invoked before we can manage at best, simply to continue past policies. However, I should like earnestly to plead for a bolder attitude on the part of the EEC, not only in the cause of generosity but also in the interests of us all. We are going through a worldwide crisis. All our economies are slowing down and unemployment is still on the increase. The terrible danger we are facing today is a spiral of deflation and recession where each State is trying to rebalance its economy from below with the incalculable risk of global collapse. Under these conditions, increasing the amount of our financial cooperation is also a way of contributing to the upturn in the world's economy and the objective proposed a few months ago by the Commission of doubling Community aid must, I believe, be maintained and defended.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, if we are to continue to make EEC-ACP relations a model for North-South relations, I believe that the time has come to change the basis of our philosophy and to change the scale of our financial contributions. I hope that I have helped to convince you of this.

Mrs Rabbethge (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of the European People's Party wholeheartedly supports all six sections of the substantial report by Mr Irmer. The unanimous adoption by the Committee on Development and Cooperation was followed by an agreement between the ACP

and the Bureau of Parliament. This aspect was deserving of attention and we have tabled an amendment which we hope you will support. I very much hope and strongly request the Socialist Group in particular, but also the Group of the European People's Party, to think again about rejecting the amendment which concerns in quite practical terms the organization of the work of the future ACP-EEC Assembly and recommends that the work should be organized by an *ad hoc* Committee. This is vital for efficiency.

After more than 20 years of committed development aid on the part of the European Community, the Commission has proposed a new approach for Lomé III. There is nothing wrong in admitting that certain aspects of Lomé II did not work, nor should we be ashamed to admit that it can be more useful to set up a million new cooking ranges in Africa than one impressive factory.

Nor is there anything wrong in admitting that a fully automated telephone system might not necessarily be a priority development aid project. However, a mistake which both the developing countries and we in the Community made in the past was to think that it was possible to skip stages in development. The old-style German wind-operated winnowing machine — a sort of broom used to separate the grain from the chaff — and the modern combine harvester were separated by over a generation and several intermediate technologies and in the same way the ox-plough must bridge the gap between the original jembe — the East African short-handled hoe — and an 80 HP tractor. Otherwise excessive demands are put on everyone. Obviously, the computer has found its way even into part of the Third World — but this means that the people are faced with a leap from the stone age right into the third millennium. The time aspect and natural laws cannot be disregarded where human and social development is concerned. Both partners, i.e. the ACP countries and the Community, should therefore learn from past mistakes and take the opportunity for reform afforded by Lomé III.

In his report, Mr Irmer describes in detail what this reform could mean in practice. Mr Irmer and the other previous speakers have already mentioned the main points of the new approach, i.e. self-reliance, human rights, due consideration for ecological questions and the emphasis on rural development and in the light of these things, I think it is vital, above all, that we broadly speaking resist the temptation to resort to ready-made European models. The proposal to reform the Stabex arrangement is important, as is the old demand, which we repeat time and time again in different forms, and which should now finally be laid down in Lomé III, i.e. that the European Development Fund should be integrated into the general Community budget, since this is the only way in which our Parliament can perform its control duties to the full.

Rabbethge

Also of importance, I think, is the demand for the injection of more private capital or the involvement of non-governmental organizations as well as the call for better protection for private investment of this kind in the ACP countries. The proposal to the effect that the period of validity of the Convention should only be discussed at the end of the negotiations also strikes me as sensible and I am sure that you will approve of the demand to the effect that the new Lomé Convention be ratified by our Parliament.

Certain of the innovations or shifts of emphasis in connection with Lomé III may strike you as over-ambitious and, after all, we who are committed to development aid are often regarded by many people specializing in other areas as having our heads in the clouds. They simply smile at our optimism *vis-à-vis* the struggle for change and improvement in the living conditions in the ACP countries and the Third World as a whole and are sceptical about our confidence that partnership with the people of those countries is a viable proposition. 'You are incorrigible utopians', they say, but I would remind both the sceptics and those of you who share our commitment of the wise words of the statesman, Ben Gurion, who said that today's Utopia is tomorrow's reality.

(Applause)

Mr Pearce (ED), *sub-rapporteur*. — I would like to clarify, before we go any further, that Mrs Focke described herself, in translation, as a co-rapporteur. The term is 'sub-rapporteur': I am a sub-rapporteur, so are Mr Israël, Mr Pannella, Mr Wawrzik and Mr Vergès. Therefore a mistake was made and I hope that this is put right in the records. Mr Irmer is the rapporteur and there were six sub-rapporteurs of equal status. It surprises me that the advisers and the previous occupant of the Chair in which you are sitting, Mr President, did not manage to get that right.

Mr President, this group supports Mr Irmer's report in general terms. It is a good report, but I would like to mention one or two particular points fairly briefly and then offer some comments on financial matters.

We think there are opportunities to improve the dialogue that goes on in formulating the policies that are applied to developing countries, and one particular point that I would like to mention is that since the ACP Committee of Ambassadors is in some ways the power-house of the ACP side, it may be appropriate to have some regular meeting between its members and Members of this Parliament. I hope that something can be done about this in the future.

We would like to see a fuller system of reporting on the development of indicative programmes and projects to the European Parliament. The Commission, in answer to a recent question of mine, said that

full information is given to the Parliament. I think that is possibly right, substantially, but I think that the Parliament itself should do more to process this information so that we can see what taxpayers' money is being spent on.

I should like to underline the need for population policy — that is, birth-control on a voluntary basis. If you look at the arithmetic of population growth and food production in many African countries, you find that there seems to be no way of avoiding starvation on a very large scale unless one tackles both the birth-rate and the production of food.

On the question of finance, my main point is that we have got to be practical. We are not going to increase rapidly the amount of money available. Let us be reasonable. Let us go for maintaining the amount spent on the Convention at its present level, as expressed in real terms. To ask in this Chamber for more is not to be realistic.

Let us look, too, for value for money in what is done. Stabex is not value for money at the present time. We can get much better value for money from the better use of private investments — from co-financing, provided it is co-financing of the kind that brings in additional funds from outside rather than some soggy way of sharing responsibility with the United Nations or what have you.

Let us look at the need, the responsibility, of developing countries to put their house in order. My constituents do not want to go on providing food for countries who run their food production policies in such a way that peasant farmers are discouraged from producing. Socialist agriculture is the curse of the African continent, and I think we are a little tired of trying to clear up the mess that that causes. In the same way, industrial policies in developing countries, which, through State meddling, commissars, nationalization — one thing or another — reduce production, are the responsibility of those countries, and I do not see why my electors and our taxpayers should have to pick up the pieces. So let us put our money into those countries that are really trying hard.

I will conclude with one final comment to Mr Fuchs, though I do not think he is with us. He had some sad words about colonial history. As regards British colonial history, I am quite proud of it. I reckon the British Empire did a great deal of good in the world, and I would like the world to know that.

President. — You referred to Mr Fuchs by name. In doing so you have actually given him an invitation to speak for another three minutes in reply to a personal statement. I must draw your attention to this. You always pay close attention to the time, but you greatly exceeded your speaking time with the assistance of the President.

Mr Pearce (ED). — I withdraw the word 'Fuchs'.

President. — You are a very good colleague and a gentleman.

Mr Ferrero (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I believe that at a time when negotiations are beginning for the renewal of the association between our Community and the ACP countries, it is appropriate and important that the Parliament should adopt a stance and establish a few basic political points with which to inspire the coming Convention.

I believe that Mr Irmer's motion, for which we will vote in favour, signified that the goal set for itself by the Committee on Development and Cooperation a few months ago has more or less been reached, and it is for this reason that we Italian Communists have not presented amendments and will wholeheartedly vote in favour of this motion.

The important thing, once this motion has been approved by the Parliament, is to act in such a way that the Committee on Development and Cooperation, and Parliament, should be empowered to follow negotiations as they evolve at first hand, with the prior knowledge that the negotiations will be extremely difficult: difficult because they are taking place in an extremely difficult and negative context.

What is this general context or background? We are well acquainted with the background. I believe that Commissioner Pisani will recall the basic points of which there are basically two. The first point is the failure — there is no other word for it — of the development strategies of the last few years, a failure which is illustrated by the fact that the gap between the industrialized countries and developing countries has widened, and that underdevelopment and the overall dependence of third world has increased. It is a failure illustrated by the dramatic situation, which is catastrophic in many cases, of the so-called poorest developing countries; a dramatic situation in which hunger — a factor that we should never forget — is only one of the aspects of the problem. This is one side of the coin; the other is that not only are no new and adequate measures being put into effect to cope with this total disaster but, on the contrary, efforts made towards development and cooperation have suffered a reverse, and overall public aid for development is diminishing.

As regards the North-South dialogue, global negotiations have been blocked for years, in spite of the many attempts which have been made in the past few years to encourage them. The most serious aspect of all is, I believe, international tension: tension between the East and West has increased and is increasing to perhaps previously unscaled heights, especially in terms of the nuclear arms race. This tension is weighing more and more heavily on the situation in

the Third World and on the relationships between the Third World and the developed world.

If this is the background, what is Europe's task, duty or rather interest? There is no room for doubt: Europe should give whole new impetus to its own policy of cooperation for development, beginning with cooperation with the ACP countries. However, in order to do so, and to perform this task, first of all the difficulties encountered by the Association in the last few years must be examined.

Firstly, the so-called structural limitations of Lomé and its inadequacies should be taken into consideration. The structural nature of the limitations is, I believe, illustrated by the worsening of the situation in many ACP countries during these years that they have been associated with Europe. It has been an absolute disaster. I do not hesitate to use such a blunt term in this case either, in view of the many indicators which indicate the presence of a real economic and social disaster in many of the ACP countries, especially in African countries South of the Sahara. Naturally all this came about not because of Lomé, but certainly in spite of Lomé.

Experience has taught us in these last few years in our contacts with these countries that many of the problems which must be faced could not, cannot and will not be able, I believe, to find a lasting solution even within the limited framework of e.g. Lomé, or even Lomé III. They can only be solved on a world scale by means of a new international and economic order, towards the construction of which, and I wish to stress this fact, Mr Commissioner, the Community has so far failed to contribute by assuming any strong initiative. This being so, i.e. if the disaster affecting so many countries has many causes, which are, first and foremost, as I said before, scandalously unequal world relations, as well as the fragility of the political, social and domestic system of these countries, nevertheless we would strongly emphasize the evident inadequacy of Lomé in dealing with the large scope of these problems.

All this means that, yes, it is necessary to consolidate the positive results of Lomé, but it is also necessary first of all to surpass Lomé, and to effect a few changes. The Commission is aware of this, and has told us so many times. The Parliament and the Committee on Development and Cooperation have expressed similar sentiments.

Furthermore, the steps that we should be taking have been indicated very precisely in the Irmer report and above all in the reports of the Working Party. Four principal steps should be taken: the independent development of these countries should be concentrated upon; any sort of sectorial approach should be abandoned; the development of agriculture for food production should be given priority and the need for regional cooperation should be stressed.

Ferrero

Mr President, I too, like my colleagues, raise a final problem; that of financial resources. It is true. Mr Focke is correct in reminding us that development is not principally a matter of money of policies and appropriate choices etc.

The lack of proportion between the present financial resources and the problems which have to be solved is too evident and in fact by this time has become one of the main factors restricting the Community development policy.

More could be said on this point, Mr Commissioner, as well you know. Negotiations are beginning badly and they are beginning badly through the fault of the Community and the Council of Ministers. They are beginning badly because of the enormous cuts which have been made, and which could certainly be corrected in the drawing up of the next budget. It is, however, unthinkable that the Community should sit down at a negotiating table with 63 countries of the Third World when it is reducing its own development budget by about a third in monetary terms. How will Commissioner Pisani be able to face these countries during the next few days at these negotiations? With what credibility can we continue to put forward ambitious proposals and set ourselves ambitious objectives?

These Community budget affairs, as we well know, originate outside the development policy and other Community policies but, in my opinion, may strongly influence these decisive negotiations. Therefore it should be clearly stated that without adequate financial commitments, even the most serious proposals, in spite of the good intentions behind them seem foolhardy, which is dangerous, not only because they do not succeed in solving the problems, but also because they strike at the roots of Europe's political image in the eyes of the Third World.

(Applause)

Mr Maher (L). — Mr President, I am pleased to add my voice to those who have congratulated Mr Irmer and his colleagues on producing this report and who have stressed how important it is for the European Community and for the countries of the Third World.

I fully support the idea of helping to make these countries, as self-sufficient as possible in all areas. But I shall confine my remarks in the short time I have to the rural situation, particularly in relation to the production of food. I believe that unless we can galvanize the people on the spot to take their destiny more into their own hands, then we shall never succeed in being self-sufficient. We learned that lesson in Europe. It was only when farmers organized themselves through cooperatives and other kinds of organizations that they succeeded in controlling their own destiny. Indeed, at the moment they are embarrassing the European consumers with food — and the European consumers do not appreciate that embarrassment, of course, as we well know.

Mr President, I would say to Mr Pisani that there is a wealth of experience in Europe — and indeed elsewhere, but in this connection in Europe — to be found in farm organizations, in cooperatives. Human nature is the same all over the world. The policies that can be used and are successful in Europe can also appeal to Africans, Asians and others. There is a wealth of experience there to help these people to organize themselves better, to be better educated, to control their own destiny so that they cannot be exploited by *gombeen* men, as we call them in my country — people who benefit a lot more from their efforts than they do themselves. If we can use that experience more, then we can help these people really to raise themselves up by their own bootstraps. That, I think, is exceedingly important.

A point has been made already, and I would like to re-emphasize it: we should not try too rapidly to force modern technology, particularly in relation to agricultural production, on people who are not ready for that technology. I myself travel a good deal, for instance, through African countries, and I have been pained at times to see modern equipment made in Europe, at least a year old, lying rusting in the fields because there was a welding job needed but there was no electricity in the area to do the welding; there was no expertise to maintain these machines. So they were lying there idle, not doing anything, after costing a great deal of money. We should try to supply these people with the basic tools, the basic machinery, that they know how to use. There is not even an industry left in Europe any more to produce those kinds of tools. But this is the kind of basic way we should look at that problem.

Mr President, even in spite of our best efforts I would say that the people in those countries are still going to need, for a long time to come, direct food aid from places like Europe. There is no question about that — there are going to be a thousand million people on the continent of Africa by the turn of the century by all accounts. Anything we can do about birth control or other measures is not going to stop that — it is programmed almost, it is going to happen. These people are going to be hungry — a lot of them are going to be hungry — and I would like to see the agricultural policy of the European Community having a real ACP dimension to it so that we can try to produce the kind of foodstuffs in surplus that are suitable for these people. A lot of the surplus we have, I admit, is not suitable. We should orientate the production more towards those foods that are suitable and necessary for these people and that they can consume rather than producing products that are not essential.

My final point, Mr President, is that we have to pay more attention to the distribution mechanism. It is not enough any more to give these people the food and hope that the internal mechanisms will bring it to

Maher

the areas and to the people who need it most. There is much that is rotten in these countries — a lot of the wrong people get the food and it is used against those who are trying to produce indigenous supplies. We have to insist in future that if we supply them with food, then we have to see that it is distributed properly.

Could I say to my English friend, as a final observation, that I come from a country that was colonized. We still have not succeeded in pushing out the colonizers, but they did not do a great job in our country anyway. Indeed, they have been thrown out of most of the countries of the world that they colonized. If they were doing so well, why had they to be thrown out?

(Applause)

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — Mr President, may I congratulate Mr Irmer, for whom I have a great deal of respect for his Lomé work and for the self-sufficiency strategy, which is based on the fact that food aid alone cannot solve the problems of nutritional self-sufficiency and securing basic food supplies.

I like the definition in the report from the Prime Minister of Fiji. He defined this self-sufficiency strategy as 'Let us build on what we have and let development plans do likewise'.

Now it seems to me so important. It may be all right and straightforward to talk about cutting back the development budget in this forum, but when we go to Berlin next week, I am sure all who go will agree in that forum that it is a totally indefensible matter.

There has been no specific mention today of fish, so I hope Mr Irmer will not be too surprised if I refer to his reference to the working parties and his wish that they be more precise. I have no objection to that, but I feel that when we are talking about the problems of feeding the people it is necessary to mention fish, because here we have a partial solution. I do think it cannot be lumped with agriculture, because some of the solutions involve questions of the law of the sea and so on. There is a threat to the fish as a source of proteins which close the gap in the starving world. The threat is the greed of man. One in eight of the fish is still going to the USSR, who are still doing very little to train or help the development of fishing potential in the 63 Lomé countries. There is also the threat from pollution.

I would like to ask the Commission whether they could explain to me the delay with regard to the examination of the rules of origin, because this does affect the work of the working party on fishing, on which I serve. I think there has been ample time. But we are still in the dark, so that we can only do a partial report in Berlin, looking to doing a full report in Brazzaville. Now that is a problem that we really have to

face. Fishing, of course, can help land-locked countries as well as seaboard countries. Small is sometimes beautiful — I would like to follow Mr Maher here. Sometimes it is simple ideas like putting a refrigerator in a river turbine that is there anyway, or using a wind-mill in the plateau above Kenya to pump water that are effective. Often a very simple device can bring enormous advantage. The same is true in fishing, of course. Simple methods of smoking fish near the lakes can be developed using local things like palm-nuts which are long-burning or even the use of a winch on the shores of Mauritania — instead of requiring people to haul things in by hand. It is very often necessary to think in a small way, and I congratulate our Commission delegates in the many countries I have visited for their efforts to do this from the bottom up, and on their very many excellent micro-projects.

Lastly, as one who is on the visit to the frontline States I should like to welcome the fact that Mozambique and Angola will be participating as observers and that they are to get the benefit of SADCC now. I think that is a very important thing for us all.

On training, which Mr Irmer mentioned, it really is very sad to me to belong to a State which has in effect closed university places to many students of the Third World. I hope that will be changed. It is a source of great grievance to all the Lomé countries.

IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

President

President. — Since it is now voting time, we shall suspend the debate until after the votes.

8. Votes⁽¹⁾

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION TABLED BY THE PRESIDENT ON BEHALF OF THE ENLARGED BUREAU (Doc. 1-569/83 : SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC RECOVERY)

After the vote on the second part of Amendment No 3

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, we are faced with a problem. It must be said that the resolution as proposed by the enlarged Bureau and the text as just adopted by Parliament are not incompatible. Then we have Amendment No 2 by Mr Curry on behalf of the the Committee on Agriculture, an amendment which is also compatible. So we shall vote first on Mr Curry's Amendment No 2.

¹ See Annex.

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — (DE) I do not know how we can remedy a mistake we may possibly have made. But we are aware of the problem which can arise when an amendment is tabled which seeks to replace the original amendment, making it very difficult to vote on the individual sections. I assume that we have adopted the first part of the amendment and that the amendment intended to replace the motion for a resolution has also been adopted.

President. — No, that is not at all so, Mr Sieglerschmidt, since the motion can only be replaced by the amendment as a whole. What now remains of the amendment is completely compatible with the proposed text. That is the problem.

Mr Forth (ED). — Mr President, could you confirm that what we have so far decided is that there will be a debate on this matter during the January 1984 part-session? That is what we have so far decided. We are now going on to consider whether a committee should be set up at all. We have made one decision that there will be a debate. We are now going on to consider whether there will be a committee and, if so, how it will be composed. Is that correct?

President. — That is exactly the situation.

Mr Geurtsen (L). — (NL) Mr President, I think you have rather loosely interpreted what we have just done. There was an amendment to replace the complete motion. That amendment has been reformulated by the voting, but it remains the same amendment, an amendment to replace the complete motion. There are no more amendments left on which to vote. The original resolution has been replaced by a resolution that, I agree, has little content. But this House has formally decided only to adopt a resolution that states that a debate will be held on this subject in January. There is no time to do anything else after that.

President. — Mr Geurtsen, I have already explained that in my opinion there *is* time for this because the half-adopted and half-rejected amendment related to the procedure to be followed. In other words, it was the intention of the amendment to take a decision on the procedure. That element is no longer applicable. There are a few more amendments that relate to the procedure to follow. Parliament is completely free to reject these amendments, and we will then be left with what we have already decided, namely the first part of the amendment we have adopted.

Mr Geurtsen (L). — (NL) I am sorry, by rejecting the second part Parliament has decided that there will be no procedure. You cannot fall back on other motions that have been tabled and which were to be replaced by the amendment on which we voted last. I think you have missed the point entirely . . .

Mr President. — I would suggest that we now go on and put to the vote Amendment No 2 tabled by Mr Curry.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, my group requested a separate vote, and our motive was solely to add Part 1 in order to make the date clear. Therefore we voted only for the first part and not for the second part, since it was our intention to make that point clear.

President. — The situation is perfectly clear. Anyone can still achieve what he wants to achieve if he has the necessary majority.

After the adoption of Amendment No 2

President. — Since Amendment No 2 by Mr Curry has been adopted, the initial motion for a resolution is no longer valid.

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — (DE) Mr President, can you inform me how what we have just decided can be compatible with Rule 98 of our Rules of Procedure, which states that one, two or three deputy chairmen are elected for a committee but not seven?

President. — Mr Sieglerschmidt, you are quite right. The Rules of Procedure are clear and we must abide by them. Thus the passage in Mr Curry's amendment which is not in accordance with the Rules of Procedure must be brought into line. We must find a solution which works politically as well as that proposed by Mr Curry.

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION TABLED BY THE PRESIDENT ON BEHALF OF THE ENLARGED BUREAU (Doc. 1-566/83 : STATUTE OF MEMBERS OF THE EP)

Recital A — Amendment No 2

After the show of hands

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, in the show of hands at least 40 Conservative Members and 60 Socialist Members voted for the amendment, but the electronic system suddenly showed only 60. This means that there must be something wrong with the machine.

President. — It would indeed be difficult to suggest that there is something wrong with the Members, but I do think the machine was right.

(Laughter)

We shall now take an electronic vote on Recital A.

CALENDAR FOR 1984

President. — At its meeting yesterday the enlarged Bureau decided to take over the amendment tabled by Mr Estgen seeking to hold the July part-session from 24 to 27 July 1984 instead of from 17 to 20 July.

President

Consequently the Bureau's proposal is accordingly modified and Mr Estgen's amendment no longer applies.

Amendment No 5 by Mr Nord has been withdrawn.

As regards the May part-session, the enlarged Bureau, after having discussed the matter, proposes that a normal part-session be held in May. Since this was very close to the European elections, the length of this part-session would be limited and only urgent matters would be dealt with. Since it was impossible to fix the length of this part-session, the programme for it would be decided at a relatively late stage so as not to interfere with the proper working of the legislative process in the Community during the electoral campaign.

We now come to Amendments Nos 3, 4 and 8 on the venue for the part-sessions. These amendments — and I have consulted the Committee on the Rules of Procedure on this point — are not admissible because the calendar gives no indication of venue.

Mr Enright (S). — On a point of order, Mr President. It is extremely boring to some people, but highly relevant to the elections if this Parliament intends to be meaningful ultimately. I withdrew, at the insistence of the President, Amendment No 4 earlier today. It was not at that time known whether the presidency would continue to rule in exactly the same way, and I am pleased to see it is being consistent, as it turns out. But I was given the understanding that the actual place of meetings would be brought up at the next part-session. So I want to know whether the presidency is being consistent in this, or whether I was conned.

President. — Mr Enright, the enlarged Bureau displays an enormous degree of consistency, because we work on the basis of decisions taken by the Parliament and Parliament has pronounced itself extremely clearly on where we meet regularly. In that connection we have proposed a calendar — and that is what we are voting on.

Mrs Van den Heuvel (S). — *(NL)* Yes, Mr President, you are right in saying that Parliament has pronounced itself on the regular meetings. I can therefore assume that the Bureau will produce a proposal on a possible part-session to deal with the fixing of agricultural prices.

President. — Mrs Van den Heuvel, I cannot assure you on this at the moment, since we are now voting solely on the normally programmed part-sessions, and the Bureau has not yet discussed other matters.

9. Committee on toxic substances

President. — This morning Parliament was informed by the Presidency of the Bureau's proposals on the

membership of the Committee of Enquiry on Toxic Substances.

Since I have not received any amendments by the time limit, I think that there are no objections to appointing the members of this committee.

Mr Glinne (S). — *(FR)* I am not objecting, but I think I am expressing the wish of the majority of the political groups when I say that the work of this special committee should begin immediately.

President. — If there are no objections, these appointments are ratified.

10. Next ACP-EEC Convention (continuation)

President. — As indicated by the Presidency a moment ago, we shall now continue the debate on the report (Doc. 1-605/83) by Mr Irmer.

Mr Vergeer (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, I am taking part in this debate with a sense of irony. Shortly before the recess we adopted the Jackson report about the new development philosophy of the Community. We will undoubtedly this week accept the Irmer report on the new approach for the convention, when simultaneously the Council presents us with a draft budget for 1984 in which development cooperation will have to be cut by a double figure percentage. This does not augur well for the European Development Fund, which is yet to be founded. It would be a disgrace, Mr President, if the indecision of this Parliament were to lead to even greater misery for millions of our fellow human beings. Throughout the years the Community and the Member States have built up a cautious policy and have made interesting initiatives from the political and other points of view. I am thinking of aid to Central America, to the countries around South Africa, to the non-associated developing countries and, last but not least, to our Lomé Convention. Just at the point when the Commission is suggesting bringing in a new concept, known as political dialogue, the means available are drastically cut.

I am, of course, referring in particular to the Council which, while it agrees with the Pisani memorandum — a mandate for the negotiations for the new convention, out of which, it is said, the Commission comes very well — then goes and introduces these drastic cuts; this looks very much like hypocrisy to me. And all this at a time when, particularly in Black Africa, the food shortages rise year after year. According to the FAO, 20 million people are dying of starvation in 18 Black African countries and, according to the World Bank, 60 % of the African population does not have a diet that will keep them alive in the long run. I do not blame the Council for these facts, Mr President, but the fact that this terrible situation continues to exist must have something to do with our activities.

Vergeer

We realized rather too late, Mr President, that the shipment of ever-larger amounts of food was not the one and only solution. I am not going to refer back to the whole chain of events from the report on hunger in the world in 1980 up to and including the Pisani memorandum, but at first reading the decision of the Council ignores these facts and events. As I have already said, we agree with the Irmer report in principle. Thanks are due to the rapporteur and the draftsmen of opinions. The development of rural areas, the motivation of the poorest groups of people, the marginal farmer, everything that is done to guarantee the supply of food, the accent on education and training: these are all building blocks from the prolonged process of development that slowly forms a road to experience.

I would like to consider four other points. The motion for the resolution emphasizes the need for dialogue on the subject of human rights on the basis of the practically unanimous decision reached by the Joint Committee at Kingston last February. Such a dialogue requires true reciprocity. The discussions in the working parties of that Committee — as well as in Parliament for that matter — about, for example, the position of migrant workers, or students and their families from the ACP States, demonstrate to all and sundry that our actions should also be the subject of discussion. Human rights touch upon not only the traditional security of the person, but also the circumstances in which one lives and works.

We would therefore like to flesh out these ideas of dialogue by indicating how they could take place. I say this so carefully because the precise structure does not seem to be the most important thing at the moment. What is important is the start, the first step. We would find it of the utmost importance if such a step were taken during the negotiations. If I understand correctly, Mr President, the mandate also talks about this problem of human rights, and I may refer in this context to the amendment tabled by my colleague, Mr Mommersteeg.

Mr President, we would prefer to employ private organizations wherever possible. We not only see possibilities for such an expansion in the existing sector, but also possibilities for a new approach. I would like to mention one aspect, namely the implementation of any initiatives coming from the poorest groups of people in rural areas; I am thinking of food producers in the context of the problem of guaranteeing food supplies. Rural development and care for the poor can thus be linked. I think it is worth considering the setting-up of extra and distinct financial facilities for private organizations to deal with projects of this type. It is after all the large-scale approach of traditional institutions that prevents many of these initiatives from getting off the ground. This plan was — as you know — recently presented to the President of the European Parliament on behalf of a number of European non-governmental organizations.

The concept of 'coherence and coordination' is also brought up in this report. Coherence, for instance, between the various policies of the Community, e.g. the common agricultural policy and the development policy; or coordination between, for instance, the various donors. There is a lot to do, in short, and I wonder whether the Community really is fulfilling the role of central coordinator and catalyst for aid which it could play in implementation of the Paris Conference on the least developed countries.

The report also mentions ecological problems. This was taken up in the recent General Report on the ACP-EEC. The degeneration process of which we ourselves only slowly became aware, is to be found equally in the ACP countries. Problems such as deforestation and erosion are disastrous in the long term. The means of recovery are hardly available to them, and that applies to both financial resources of scientific and technical know-how.

In short, this is a good report, but it unfortunately arrived at a time when there are serious attacks on the common development policy. I feel that the adopting of this report in no way signals the end of the story. The budget debate at the end of 1983 will be the moment of truth. I therefore call on all my colleagues to keep this in mind constantly over the next few months.

IN THE CHAIR :
MRS CASSANMAGNAGO CERRETTI

Vice-President

Mr Turner (ED). — Madam President, I want to talk about the Consultative Assembly and the Joint Committee rather than about the realities of development and cooperation with the ACP. I believe that cooperation between the ACP and the European Parliament, through the Joint Committee and the Consultative Assembly, has worked well. It is probably one of the most novel institutions that the EEC has set up: it is actually a parliament which bridges Europe and the former colonies.

I think we in the ACP Joint Committee are too modest — we are hypochondriac, probably because our colleagues in the European Parliament are always telling us that we are not doing it right. I believe we have done very well in the Joint Committee and it has worked well. I thoroughly agree that the idea of having both a Consultative Assembly and a Joint Committee was unnecessary, and I thoroughly agree with the proposal that we should have a single body in future, but I do believe that the idea of a Parliament between the ACP countries and ourselves is absolutely right. If you stand back and look at what has happened over the past four years alone, the deve-

Turner

lopment of a consensus between us and the ACP countries and the opinion-formers there on development and priorities and food aid and cultural issues and education and rural needs and even technical matters such as sugar, becomes extremely impressive. Those of us who take part in this Joint Committee have learnt an enormous amount from the ACP, and I hope they have learnt something from us. There is only one thing that mars it all, of course, and that is our debates on South Africa, but that is only to be expected: on everything else I believe that the institution has been effective.

Now, of course, we can double the amount of work we do in future if we cut down from a Consultative Assembly and a Joint Committee and simply have one body. We should have our two meetings each year and double the amount of work we do. That would be an extremely good thing, but what I feel very strongly is that the work of whatever you call it, the Joint Committee or the Consultative Assembly, has grown to depend entirely in the last two years on the work done behind the scenes by working-parties that have been specially set up: without them, and without the definition of problems and the assembling of information and the thrashing out of ideas and refining of them and coming to conclusions which has occurred in small working-parties of the Joint Assembly, I do not believe the Joint Assembly would have been any good at all. So I would make a plea that in the new Lomé Convention we provide scope for an amplified system of working-parties, because without that the Assembly itself becomes mere empty talk. As chairman of one of these working-parties, I know that it has been exceedingly difficult to find times for meetings and that the burden of the work in those working-parties has fallen on a very few people. I hope that in the new Parliament, and with the new Convention, we shall find ways of improving working conditions so that these working-parties will service the new unitary parliament that we intend to have between the ACP and the EEC.

Mr Vergès (COM). — (FR) Madam President, my first words will be in appreciation of the quality of Mr Irmer's work, which is such that in eight months he has been able to complete research, analyses and critical comments which, in our opinion, in conjunction with the opinions of the Committees on Agriculture and the Environment, constitute positive information from the Assembly.

Because I have been allocated only a brief time in which to speak, I shall emphasize only a few important points: it is not possible to discuss the context of the future convention to follow Lomé II without referring this problem to the more general context of so-called North-South relations. No genuine positive solution is possible in ACP-EEC relations if no progress can be made within the larger framework which I have just mentioned. From this point of view,

the figures are irrefutable and force me to the conclusion that North-South relations are regressing rather than progressing. At the very beginning of the mandate of the current Parliament, during the debate on hunger in the world, it was emphasized that the developing countries were already suffering considerable deprivation: the fact that the economies of the colonized countries, based on only one or a limited number of export products relied on external rather than internal support; the massive rural exodus and frantic urbanization; the fact that the Third World was becoming overrun with shanty towns, the existence of chronic undernourishment and malnutrition; the increasing burden of debts which had become intolerable, the constant encroachment of deserts and frequently irreversible damage to the environment; the high oil bills of the non-petroleum producing developing countries, increases in population which meant that, despite its frequently deplorable state of health, the population doubled in less than 25 years; and cultural domination which meant that it was often impossible for nations to develop in ways which answered their specific needs. Since then, these various factors have rapidly become worse. This is mainly because the industrialized countries have rejected all the proposals from the group of 77. The failure of the recent Unctad in Belgrade following that in Manila a few years ago and the drastic decrease in IDA is reflected in the Council's decision to reduce Community allocations for development in the '84 budget, when the allocations for aid per capita in the ACP countries already decreased during the years when Lomé I and II were in force.

Under such conditions, how can we hope to improve the already negative situation in ACP-EEC relations? With decreasing trade, the deficiencies of Stabex, the stagnation of equipment and capacities, the ACP countries are not only caught up in a vicious circle but are trapped in a spiral which, if nothing is done about it, will close in and suffocate them in the end. Thus the report and the memorandum, with their incontrovertible idealism and long-term views, run the risk of suffering a terrible confrontation with reality and appearing as merely exercises in rhetoric.

Madame President, ladies and gentlemen, we have to try to imagine future relations between the 260 million inhabitants of the Community and the 350 million inhabitants of the 63 ACP countries, who in less than two decades will number almost 700 million in a world where 80% of the population will be living below the poverty line. We believe that, faced with such a prospect, what is needed is a genuine revolution in the prevailing attitude in Europe with regard to relations with the third world. Two years ago exactly, I said to you on this same problem that 'our world has never been so sharply divided, so torn apart as it is now, but equally there has never been the same feeling of solidarity, since if the Third World were to founder, the developed world would sink with it'.

Vergès

I should like to believe that everywhere in Europe there exist forces for progress which are capable of taking the future in hand and setting the seal on this new solidarity with the third world, on a more elevated plane and in the long term, for such solidarity alone will enable everyone to pass through the strait gate which leads to the new millenium.

Mr Bersani (PPE), Chairman of the ACP-EEC Joint Committee. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in these few minutes I will dwell on only a few points of this excellent and exhaustive report drawn up by Mr Irmer with his usual competence and enthusiasm, and for which I should like to express my own personal gratitude. We are discussing this report at a crucial moment, as we have all emphasized, i.e. at the beginning of negotiations.

First of all I would like to emphasize the political significance of Lomé at this particular moment in time. On the basis of long experience we must, I believe, admit that between the Commission and ourselves on the one hand, and the Council of Ministers on the other, there is a profound difference of opinion on this particular central issue which concerns a political appreciation of the significance and value of the Lomé experience.

We are convinced, and the Rapporteur puts it very well, that a policy of cooperation for development represents an essential component of European policy, and is of the very essence of the European Community (as is referred to in Chapter 4 of the Treaty of Rome) its world image, its international role and its very credibility especially in the eyes of the peoples of Europe and the rest of the world. What is missing is a systematic proposal based on ideas which we have formed together with our associates, and have worked on together and created together, with due respect for those values which form the basis of a humanistic vision of the relationship between individuals and peoples and their civilizations bearing in mind the possibility of collaboration destined to encourage the development of democracy justly and peacefully. The European Parliament, in association with our partners and colleagues, has provided an important creative boost to this scheme and its continuing development and represents, we are totally convinced, one of the finer pages in the Parliament's history, of which unfortunately most people are unaware. Obviously this scheme is imperfect and inadequate and the Rapporteur and the co-rapporteur have very efficiently pinpointed and presented all the deficiencies, delays and inadequacies of the present scheme.

The dramatic situation existing in such a large part of the world, the tragic reality of hunger and disease, and the development particular to only some areas, are

making us more aware every day of the inadequacy of our proposals and efforts. There are insufficient resources; there are serious difficulties in coordinating the bilateral policy of the Member States, which still accounts for almost 90 % of the budget, leaving us with only 10 %. The Community's participation in international efforts aiming for more appropriate solutions on a world scale is weak, as the recent failure of Unctad has clearly shown.

The Irmer report proposes two fundamental objectives. The first is a change in the conception of our entire policy, a change which does not deny the past, but places our experiences at a higher level, being based more or less on the suggestions put forward by Commissioner Pisani in his Memorandum, for which we can never show enough gratitude, and following in the wake of the proposal for domestically centred development which is behind the philosophy of the Lagos programme. We agree with this and also agree that there should be active resistance to the tendency apparent here and there to base the new negotiations on, at best, substantial retention of the status quo. We fully agree with the general idea of a system of self-reliance, with all its implications in the various sectors, i.e. the economy, social life, civilized and cultural life and development. Such an idea represents a change and we wish to view it as such: it is a challenge for us to reflect more deeply, critically and committedly on these fundamental questions.

Obviously, on this issue, in our group we tend to emphasize the importance of problems connected with rural development, and I personally would tend to forecast, or hope for a step forward which would form a better link, within the stimulation of the agricultural policy, between the various instruments at our disposal, from production development to Stabex, the formation of human resources, trading policy and the centre for technical assistance, which, in my opinion, are still today kept too far apart and are not coordinated in a single strategy.

Mr President, with reference to the adjustment of financial resources, I agree with those of my colleagues who have pointed out that the declarations and attitudes of the Council of Ministers have put us in a very difficult position and have above all made things difficult for those who, headed by Commissioner Pisani, will have to negotiate.

I believe that this House's speeches, attitude and vote here in Strasbourg are significant and clearly show our position. It is inadmissible that we should assume a retiring attitude towards this policy which represents the central theme of an age and of ages to come, an attitude which basically denies the resources needed for this policy.

Bersani

I will terminate, Mr President, by remembering a dear friend, President Georges Spénale who died a few days ago, and who dedicated such a large part of his life to this policy, providing an important contribution. I should like to remember his work and the man himself and express my sympathy to his family.

(Applause)

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, the relationship between Greece and the ACP countries is radically different to the relationships which these countries have with all the other Member States of the Community and the Community as a whole. Greece has not been a colonial power in the recent past and so she does not face these countries as though they were her former colonies. Happily about 2 000 years have elapsed since the existence of Greek colonies. Greece is not in the position of an industrial country facing the underdeveloped ACP countries. Greece's situation — although not identical — is closely akin to that of the ACP countries, because the dependent nature of the relationship between the ACP countries and the Community also applies in the case of Greece although in a different manner and to a different extent. From this point of view we must underscore a special Greek problem: our presence in the Community has created and exacerbated the contradictions between Greece and the ACP countries in an artificial manner, because our production and economic structure are not complementary to theirs, as is the case for the other Member States, but are to a large degree comparable. In our view the way we tackle the problems concerned (Community preference, sugar, etc.) should not turn us against the ACP countries but against the rules imposed by the EEC.

We see many positive elements and many positive proposals in Mr Irmer's report. However I would like to stress that these proposals are at odds with basic Community choices on fundamental issues. Nevertheless it is precisely the way in which the fundamental issues are tackled which will make it easier or more difficult to solve the problems facing the ACP countries. In particular I am referring to a series of questions which form part of the wider global problem of the international economic order, such as the democratization of international relations, the establishment of equal relations, the possibility of genuine development for each country in line with the model it selects and in line with its own real needs, the problem of overindebtedness of these countries and so on. Nevertheless, as my colleague Mr Vergès was quick to point out in his speech, we know the really dramatic situation which the ACP countries are facing. For this reason we will support every measure proposed in the report and every amendment which improves, albeit marginally, the situation which these

countries are facing. Depending on the outcome of the vote on the amendments we will decide what stand to take as regards the motion for a resolution as a whole.

Finally, we have serious reservations not so much as regards the principle and the thinking behind point 8 of the resolution, but as regards the way in which the issue of human rights will be employed as a criterion in the relationships between the Community and the ACP countries. We know the one-sided, unjust and narrow way in which the Community treats the question of human rights and for this reason we cannot but express our serious misgivings on this issue.

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — *(FR)* I should like, Madam President, to second the words of President Bersani who expressed his feelings at the announcement of the death of Georges Spénale.

He presided over this assembly and, usually, this man, who had begun his career as a colonial administrator, set us in Parliament an example of great humanity and open-mindedness. Both personally and in my official capacity I should like to pay homage to him here.

We have reached a very opportune moment in the debate which has been taking place and I can imagine no debate more in keeping with the spirit of our institutions. It could not come at a better time, since the negotiations will begin on 6 October and the Council of Ministers will draw up the definitive version of the guidelines for negotiation which the Commission will have to apply, on Monday (next) 19 September. So, before the European position is defined and before the negotiation itself begins — and the start of the negotiations will be important — Parliament will have been able to say forcibly what it thinks. This debate is the culmination of exemplary efforts in that, since the ideas put forward by the Commission and by Parliament are largely in agreement, it is the conclusion of joint efforts aiming at a renewal of the spirit of the Convention, its reinforcement and its greater effectiveness. I must admit that when I read Mr Irmer's report and the excellent contributions of the co-rapporteur, I could not help wondering whence this idea came. Did it originate with the memorandum which actually set it in motion, or did it, on the contrary, begin with a debate which we had amongst ourselves? We in the Commission are firmly convinced that we are in close agreement with Parliament on most of the problems raised here. That is why, in expressing my gratitude to all those who have reminded us of it, I should like to stress the importance, in these circumstances, of the budgetary debate and the decision, or, rather, the preliminary decision, which has been taken by the Council to cut appropriations allocated for development much more stringently than it has cut any other appropriation, as if the only new feature of the 1984 budget

Pisani

were the European Economic Community's refusal to continue its efforts at development, whereas it should be increasing them.

I thank Parliament — for I am sure that it will agree with all those who have expressed the same opinion — for saying forcibly that the choice which has been made cannot be upheld for, if it were upheld, it would call into question the spirit of the contract which binds the European Economic Community to the ACP States.

In fact, beyond its legal content and its financial instruments, the Convention is a fundamental pact between Europe and the South, a fundamental pact by which Europe makes clear to the South its intention to increase its efforts to help it to emerge from the wretchedness and poverty which it has not managed to overcome during the past 20 years.

I should therefore like to express very earnestly to all those who have said this, and therefore to the whole of Parliament, the Commission's gratitude for the position that Parliament has taken on the matter of the budget. It augurs well for the attitude which Parliament will adopt in future in other debates.

Moving on to the financial aspect, I should like to reiterate the Commission's belief that the Convention's funds have to be increased. But there are two remarks that must be made. The first is that the effort that we are going to make to improve our development aid qualitatively cannot be allowed to conflict with the need to increase the available funds quantitatively. The fact that we shall improve the return on our aid does not mean that the amount of aid must not be increased. I would even go so far as to say that, to a certain extent, it is precisely because we will have improved its return that we should be justified in increasing our aid, since it will be sure of being more effective.

The second remark that I should like to make on this point concerns the call made for private credit — an idea which is forcibly defended in the report — namely that bank credits can, under certain conditions, make a useful contribution to development. This idea, which we support, must not lead to the conclusion that private credit can be a substitute for public credit. On the contrary, we must make it absolutely clear that we shall only achieve a satisfactory pattern of development if, in addition to public credits which must themselves be increased, private credit is made available and if these credits are used jointly in such a way, as to obtain the best possible result. It would be unrealistic to believe that private credit can in itself ensure that the necessary basic infrastructures are built, that men are trained and that the kind of organizations which constitute the social strength of a country are set up in countries where, as we are only too well aware, the present level of development is not

sufficiently high. These countries can only be financed by public credit. As soon as these credits enable a society to look after itself better, to diversify its own systems, to train men, then private credit finds its rightful place and the society is henceforth more in control of itself, better capable of commanding its own destiny, and thus of developing its economy along suitable lines.

And so, as far as finance is concerned, I shall emphasize three points: the necessity for increasing funds, the necessity for better use of these funds by more suitable development aid and the necessity for the additional use of private capital which will complement — but not be a substitute for — public development aid.

Is it justifiable at the present time, to ask as you are doing, for an increase in funds? And are we requesting this increase in funds merely out of a feeling of charity or solidarity? Are our reasons for increasing Community aid solely the result of moral considerations?

I believe that they are the result of moral considerations, but also of a very strict economic analysis. As many of you have said, the current situation in the Third World and particularly the situation in the ACP countries is such, their burden of debts is such, that they will no longer be able — indeed they are already no longer able — to invest where they ought to invest in order to escape from their destitution and dependence. But by helping the developing countries, in one way or another, by granting them increased financial aid, by giving them the ability to invest, that is to help in their own development, we are also giving them the ability to acquire from us the technical facilities that they need. And so, by helping them to develop, we are helping ourselves.

Remembering the Belgrade meeting, I should like to continue with a more profound and more detailed reflection on this point. We have been told that the upturn in the economy of the United States was such that the rest of the world would also soon be pulling out of the recession, and that this would lead to rates of development and growth similar to those we used to know. We have also been told that, beginning in the United States and extending to the rest of the developed world, this growth would, as a matter of course, without let or hindrance, involve the most deprived countries in new development. It has not yet been proved that growth in the United States is such that it will soon carry along with it the rest of the developed world. It has not been proved that if the developed world itself were to embark on a new period of growth, the developing world would follow. Neither has it been proved that, in order to embark upon a period of growth, the developed countries do not need the underdeveloped countries to start moving again, that is to say to use the aid which we

Pisani

must bring to these underdeveloped countries. If the developed world believes that all that it needs to do is to embark upon a new period of growth on its own, being self-centred and egoistic, and concentrating on its own markets, without having at the same time to involve the rest of the world — whose needs are enormous — in the same process of growth, then I believe that the developed countries will have to change their tune one day, because in their selfishness they will have missed the opportunity of shaping their own economic destiny.

(Applause)

So, for various reasons, we shall have to ensure that the next Convention provides new funds. But funds for what? I am extremely grateful to the rapporteur for having laid so much emphasis on the concept of self-sufficiency. I believe that this is the focal point of the investigations that we have conducted together. It is the centre point of the realities which we have to work out with our ACP partners. It has become apparent that the guidelines which we worked out when we granted our aid have not led to development, even when they used extremely sophisticated instruments. It has become apparent that by supplying instruments adapted to our own needs and not to those of our partners we have increased their burdens without leading to growth. Development must be reinvented taking each case on its merits and using as a starting point the historical and cultural reality, the geographical and natural reality of these countries. And that goes for the cultural problem too.

The culture of which we are thinking is not folklore, it is not only the setting up and transference of technology, it means taking into account the human factor and the whole of a country's heritage as a major dimension on which the future of that country will be based.

That is why we hesitate to work out one particular instrument for cultural cooperation. We much prefer, at this present stage in our deliberations, that the Lomé convention should take as an instrument for development the cultural dimension, that is the human dimension, going back to the grass roots.

Self-sufficiency and self-reliant development, depend, it is clear, on the priority accorded to agriculture and food production. Too much has been said and too many excellent reports have been presented to this Assembly for me to dwell too long on this subject. I shall therefore emphasize only one point.

When we say that agriculture is a priority area, we do not mean that it is simply a matter of helping in the sowing and reaping; we do not mean that it is only a matter of helping to rear animals. We mean that agriculture is the focal point around which overall development should be centred in most of the countries which are our partners in the convention. For it is

only starting with the ability of agriculture to ensure the subsistence of a country and, from this subsistence, its ability to develop crafts, commerce, a system of infrastructures and trade, that agriculture will appear in its true dimension, the dimension which it had in our own countries a century ago, that is to say the organizational pivot, the central pillar in the development of a complete society. Then after that, industry, in its most varied forms, will take its rightful place. But how does one achieve all this?

I should like here to say a word about food strategies, and in particular link food strategies with the dialogue on policies.

Concerning food strategies, I will say only that they consist in drawing up a specific contract with a State, and usually, after that, with a region, so that when this State or region has defined its own objectives, its own growth process, we can intervene to support this strategy and these policies, and not by introducing only instruments which could be unsuitable for them.

The dialogue on policies is not a policy dialogue in the traditional sense of the term, it is not a dialogue on the global policies of a government but a dialogue at the policy-making level on the priorities and processes of growth which our partner country, or the area which becomes our partner, has chosen as its development plan. We should, I believe, beware of translations from one language to another. Whereas in French we say 'dialogue sur les politiques' ('dialogue on policies') to make it clear that they are varied and that there may be a policy on energy alongside an agricultural and food policy, in English we say 'policy dialogue', as if the dialogue were global and aimed to impose on our partner country a complete discipline exceeding by far any particular aspect of its growth. I lay great emphasis on this apparently minor and yet essential aspect, which enables me to reply to some of you: the dialogue on policies is in no way comparable to the dialogue which the great international institutions such as the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund are carrying out with the countries on which they intend to impose economic or monetary discipline. It is a system through which, by our common efforts, we are trying to help a country better to work out its options and then better to realize its objectives. Many times, in this Assembly, I have had occasion to say that the dialogue on policies and food strategies adhered to an unacceptable moral code. By that I meant that if tomorrow, under the terms of a debate, one of the ACP countries were to tell us that, after all, what we are proposing, the goals towards which we are trying to lead that country, is not suitable and that it wishes to return to direct aid for its projects, we shall not penalize it because it has chosen to continue along traditional lines. We shall simply feel that we were not persuasive enough.

Pisani

Now, to finish this already long speech, I should like to deal with a few of the points on which I hope that the motion for a resolution can be altered. I shall talk first of all of Stabex, which has a direct bearing on the agricultural problems with which I have just dealt and the problem of trade. Stabex is a very fine instrument in which weaknesses have appeared; there is, however, no question of rejecting it using these weaknesses as an excuse; it must be stated first of all that these weaknesses are due to the fact that there has been no forward movement in world markets whereas Stabex was founded on the assumption that they would develop. Taking into account the experience we have acquired over eight or nine years, the problem now is to adapt this instrument to make it more effective. More effective how? Is our objective to help the balance of payments — and this help could be provided by Stabex — or is it primarily to help a system of production which has been found wanting either to increase in productivity in order to become competitive again on the world market, with the help of Stabex, or to re-orientate itself and tackle new areas where the country concerned does not have the strength that it ought to have? I do not believe that the time has come when we can say that Stabex will cover all agricultural products, including processed ones, for all end uses. I think, in fact, that it would then represent a burden which, in the immediate future, would exceed the capacities that negotiations will create for Stabex.

I believe that we are on the right road. But in these negotiations at least, we cannot claim to fulfil this too far-reaching ambition.

All the same, concerning trade, I believe that the guidelines drawn up by the resolution are steps in the right direction: increasing the freedom of trade, so that we and the ACP countries will constitute a vast area within which there is free movement of goods. But, whilst not wishing to do too much too soon and immediately demanding that the free movement of goods should be total, and admitting that there is already to a large extent free movement and that an increase in this freedom could, in the present state of our agricultural policies, raise completely insoluble problems, I believe that we should maintain our present course, though we cannot be too idealistic about our ability to attain these objectives in the immediate future.

However, we should be aware that we all envisage the moment when the situation in Europe and the development of the ACP countries themselves will make it possible for goods to circulate freely from one Continent to another or from one to all other Continents, and this free circulation will show that large economic areas, if properly organized, lead to results that are vastly superior to those which the various countries can achieve in isolation.

I should like, in conclusion, to concentrate on two simple ideas and emphasize their importance. The first concerns the regional dimension. Many of you have emphasized this point. Insofar as we have forcibly reaffirmed our conviction that Lomé is a uniform package which must not be compromised or divided and insofar as it appears quite clearly that the unity of Lomé is for us the main concern, then, economically, it will be necessary to derive the best possible benefit from the sense of solidarity that exists between certain countries in order to promote development such as no country could achieve on its own. Developing the regional dimension does not mean violating the unity of Lomé, it means strengthening areas in order to promote their development.

But I will speak in conclusion about the problem of human rights. I will do so because I believe that this problem is fundamental in that it means that two groups of countries which have achieved different levels of development, have different histories and yet are cooperating together, question one another as to their ultimate aims for society and political action. This debate must take place, but on condition that we do not put ourselves forward as moralizers, on condition that we agree to take into account the fact that other countries may have ideas which are different from ours, on condition also that we realize that the history of these countries which have recently emerged from colonization may still have a great influence on their social organization and that it is not fitting that those very countries which colonized them should here preach to them sermons which they could well have read to themselves a little earlier on.

The problem of human rights is a basic one as far as we are concerned. I am convinced that it is also so for the ACP countries. I believe that we can debate this subject, on condition that we are able to show that we respect each other and that we affirm this respect not only by cooperation in development, but by respecting the inherent identity of each country.

(Applause)

Mr Pearce (ED). — Madam President, under Rule 64 I was hoping to have your permission to ask a question of the Commissioner. It concerns his comments on Stabex, which I have appreciated. I wondered if he would be able to comment on this. He said Stabex is a good instrument. I wonder whether he is really so ready to reaffirm that, bearing in mind that quite a lot of the money under Stabex is not paid to the industries which have suffered falls in prices, also that Stabex was meant to be a rolling fund and that in good years countries would pay back into it as well as taking out of it in bad years. This is a feature which is hardly ever implemented. Would the Commissioner kindly comment on that point?

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Stabex is a good instrument, which worked well during the first Convention, but badly during the first two years of the second Convention. We are therefore reaching equilibrium.

Stabex was conceived in the context of a worldwide market organization which could cope with price fluctuations, so that Stabex would only deal with shortfalls in the revenue of the developing countries.

We are concerned with the problem of how to improve this instrument and, subsequently, how to extend it to cover new spheres. The debate is open. I believe that new ideas are beginning to circulate and that the negotiations on the future convention will enable us to make progress.

As for saying that the objective of Stabex was to be a rolling fund, this expression is not entirely accurate, since a large proportion of the Stabex funds was allocated permanently, even if another — lesser — portion of the funds was constituted in the form of reimbursable loans.

That concludes, Madam President, the few comments — no doubt too rapid — that I wished to make to Mr Pearce.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

11. *Vredeling Directive*

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

— oral question with debate (Doc. 1-601/83) by Sir Henry Plumb and Mr Patterson on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Alber and Mr Brok on behalf of the Group of the European Peoples' Party (Christian-Democratic Group), Mr Bangemann and Mrs Tove Nielsen on behalf of the Liberal Democratic Group, and Miss De Valera on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, to the Commission :

Subject : Progress on the 'Vredeling' directive

Speaking to the US Bar Association on 14th February, Commissioner Richard referred to consultations with both sides of industry continuing until the end of February, after which the Commission would move to a final decision on the directive.

Can the Commission now tell Parliament :

1. What has been the scope of the consultations, and what conclusions have been drawn from them ?
2. When it expects to send Parliament its final version of the draft directive ?
3. Whether the Commission is willing to hold further discussions with Parliament on the

changes it intends to make to the original draft, in particular on those points on which, according to Commissioner Richard, it does not intend to follow Parliament's amendments ?

— oral question with debate (Doc. 1-671/83) by Mr Frischmann and Mr Ceravolo on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, to the Commission :

Subject : Procedures for informing and consulting employees of undertakings

The revised proposal for a directive on procedures for informing and consulting employees contains numerous provisions which represent a clear retreat from the position adopted in the original proposal, which was itself limited in scope. For instance, the elimination of the 'by-pass' procedure, the application of the proposed directive to undertakings with more than 1 000 employees and the close on the non-divulgence of secrets give rise to the gravest doubts with regard to the effectiveness of the new proposal.

- (a) With regard in particular to the provisions on the secrets of undertakings does the Commission agree that all important information may in future be described as 'secret' by the management so as to prevent its disclosure to employees ?
- (b) Can the Commission state how many undertakings would be affected by the new proposal, given that it would now apply only to undertakings with at least 1 000 employees (instead of 100, as provided for in the original proposal) ?

I would also inform the House that I have received a motion for a resolution by Mr Adam on behalf of the Socialist Group, with request for an early vote pursuant to Rule 42 (5) of the Rules of Procedure, to wind up the debate on oral question Doc. 1-601/83, on the responsibilities of multi-national companies (Doc. 1-707/83).

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

Mr Peters (S). — (DE) Madam President, I originally wanted to ask the authors to withdraw the oral question because the three questions it contains have been settled. The first question was about the outcome of the talks with trade unions and industrialists. The results are before us. The second question was about the final version of the draft directive. This final version is also before us. Thirdly, it was asked whether the Commission was willing to hold further discussions with Parliament on the changes. The amendments have been made and the outcome is clear.

Peters

But if the authors are not willing to withdraw their oral question, I request postponement of the debates until the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment has dealt with the matter next week. The Committee on Social Affairs and Employment has this subject on its agenda, and it would surely be logical for the debate to be held in Parliament after the committee has met.

President. — In accordance with Rule 87 I must put Mr Peters' proposal to the vote.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Madam President, I find Mr Peters' request very curious — to adjourn a debate on a question to which he has not yet heard the answers. Nothing seems to have changed since Monday, when we adopted the agenda of this Parliament. Mr Peters has not adduced any new reasons why now suddenly we should take the question off the agenda.

I do not know why he does not want to hear the answers to the questions we have put down. I am sure most of the House does. Commissioner Richard has come here to tell us what his procedure has been, leading to the new text of the directive. I must say I am also extremely interested to hear the answers to the questions put down by Mr Frischmann and Mr Ceravolo, particularly (b). I hope therefore, that the Communist Group will not withdraw its question either.

If Mr Peters insists on putting this to the vote, I give notice that I intend to ensure that it does take place by calling for the establishment of a quorum on his vote.

Mr Van Minnen (S). — *(NL)* Mr President, in contrast to Mr Patterson, I must say that I find Mr Peters suggestion self-evident. After all, it is not only a matter of answers to simple questions, it also concerns the agenda point: 'oral question with debate'. There is some confusion here. The matter is, moreover, too important to be dismissed like this. The Committee on Social Affairs and Employment is really the most obvious place to discuss Mr Patterson's doubts. It is also the place where the answers that Mr Patterson hopes will be as reasoned as possible should be prepared. This is why Mr Patterson, we have Mr Peters' request to refer this discussion to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment — a request that seems to me to be entirely logical, especially when one considers the enormous interest shown in it at the moment by this House.

President. — Pursuant to Rule 87 of the Rules of Procedure we must now vote on the request by Mr Peters. Only if it is rejected can we continue the debate.

(Parliament rejected the request for postponement)

Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE), Chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. — *(GR)* Madam President, before the debate begins I should just like to say that today's debate in the House does not mean that the committee responsible, the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, cannot deal with this matter.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Madam President, I understood that the usual procedure was to hear the Commissioner's answers to the questions first. We can hardly have the debate until we have had the answers.

President. — Mr Patterson, you must confine yourself to presenting the question. If you do not wish to do so, I shall call the next speaker.

Mr Patterson (ED). — I will almost certainly wish to speak, Madam President. However, as I say, the usual procedure in this House is for the Commissioner to answer the questions, after all, my questions have been printed and circulated since March, there is no need for me to re-emphasize them — then the debate begins. But if you intend to have a different procedure, then I will speak now.

As I pointed out, this question was tabled as long ago as March and refers in the first instance to Commissioner Richard's consultations with interested parties on the Vredeling Directive, particularly in the United States. We wished to know when he was going to report to Parliament. We also wished to know whether he is willing to enter into further consultations with Parliament.

We still need to know the answer to those questions, although, as Mr Peters pointed out, the second one has been answered. At least the Commissioner has published his document. I would like, in relation to that document, to thank the Commission for the generally constructive attitude it has taken to the amendments which Parliament voted to the directive. This has indicated that Parliament's amendments were themselves constructive and gives the lie to the rather hysterical reactions of some Socialists who have accused Parliament, for example, of 'gutting a great breakthrough in international social history,' to quote Mrs Clwyd.

The amount of change made by the Commission itself indicates how bad the original Vredeling proposals were. They were appallingly badly drafted, almost certainly unenforceable and would have led to international legal conflicts with Europe's trading partners. The text Parliament adopted was a vast improvement, and the Commission has wisely accepted many, indeed most, of our amendments I say most, but, regrettably, not all.

Patterson

This brings me to my final question, No 3, which is: Will the Commission enter into consultations with Parliament on those aspects which have not so far been accepted? I want to mention two of these aspects.

The first is the question who the employees' representatives are to be. In an ideal world, perhaps, employees would not need representatives. All would receive directly information about the company in which they worked, and there would be full democratic participation in consultation. Many firms are indeed moving in this direction. Failing this, however, Parliament very clearly stated that representatives should be elected by secret ballot directly from among the employees and by the employees. I take it that Commissioner Richard is not against this principle, only against its appearing in the directive. Indeed, he has told the House that. So I put it to him that this directive is largely about harmonizing the arrangements for information and consultation across national frontiers. Is it not reasonable that those who receive the information and are consulted should be selected on roughly an equivalent basis in different subsidiaries of the same company? The Commissioner says he wants to rely on the laws or practice of Member States. Yet he goes on to overrule the laws and practice of Member States on a whole series of other matters. Why not on this one as well?

Secondly, there is the matter of the rights of the management of a company to take decisions. Here I am referring specifically to Article 6 of the directive. As we in this Parliament voted it, management should not be able to implement a decision before proper consultations have taken place. The Commission has ignored this and seeks to prevent the taking of the decision itself. This may seem a matter of semantics. Paragraph 3 of Article 6 talks about 'implementing a proposed decision', which is an interesting logical concept because it implies that decisions might be implemented before they are taken. But it is more than semantics. Indeed, the Commission's text could be extremely damaging, not least to the jobs of the employees themselves. Management decisions often need to be taken quickly; otherwise contracts fall through and jobs are lost. It would have been far better if Parliament's position had been accepted straight away, and that is that provided the employees are protected against the possible harmful consequences, management can take the decision.

In conclusion, I want to return to the more general matter of Commissioner Richard's own consultations, which is the first part of the question we have put down. The question I want to ask him is: has he yet persuaded management in general on both sides of the Atlantic of the wisdom of his proposals? Judging by the evidence we are receiving from such organizations as UNICE, he has not yet convinced everybody of the wisdom of going ahead with this draft directive. In such circumstances, the Commission must recog-

nize that a directive of this kind cannot be imposed on a uniformly hostile industrial management. There has to be an element of consent throughout industry on both sides. If the Commission does not recognize this, we in Parliament do and, I suspect, so does the Council.

In this context we arrive at the present constitutional position. Parliament of course, has no further legal right to revise the directive unless specifically asked to do so by the Council. However, we do have the right to enter directly into conciliation with the Council in order to protect our position. This, I suggest, we might do if the Commissioner's answers are not satisfactory.

If the Commission were wise, in any case, when that time comes, it would support all the proposals which this democratically elected Parliament democratically adopted. I look forward to hearing the Commissioner's answers both to the original question and to the supplementaries I have now put.

Mr Frischmann (COM). — (*FR*) Madam President, we simply wish to remind Parliament that we French Communists and Allies made our views quite clear when we informed you of the moderate feelings of satisfaction which the first so-called 'Vredeling' proposal aroused in us, a proposal whose contents appeared to us extremely modest, however. But we are deeply disappointed by the new watered-down, garbled version of the initial proposal. Emptied of its substance, it appears to be a blank proposal aimed basically at filling the column marked 'social' in the Commission's proposals. But — and let us state this quite categorically — if it takes such pains to reassure the directors of the multinationals, this proposal has little chance of winning over the workers. It obviously will not nourish the hope that Europe will make the headway it ought to make in the social field in the months to come. The cuts made in the initial text have in fact shown, quite clearly, the power that the multi-nationals exert over the choices made by the Community institutions. I will quote rapidly the most significant examples: the threshold for the number of wage-earning employees which firms will have to have before they are covered by the Directive has increased from 100 to 1 000; the time lapse for information to be passed has been increased from six months to one year and the contents of this information considerably reduced; the workers' representatives are to be denied access to information concerning parent undertakings and, in particular, the clause concerning secret business information has become the main focus of the new text. Thus the reforms which were initially worked out have been dismantled and we are left wondering what impact which the modified proposal could possibly have. The workers and their organizations which are mainly affected by this proposal have a right to be told how far-reaching its effects are likely to be. For this reason, their questions must be answered.

Frischmann

These questions are as follows: how many undertakings will be affected by this Directive? What means will be used to avoid the fraudulent use of the clauses concerning the minimum number of employees or the question of secret information? It is only right that the Commission should give precise answers to these questions. However, taking into account what has been said today, and in the present state of affairs, we consider that it would not be acceptable for the Commission text, even in its modified form, to get bogged down once again in the tortuous maze of procedure, or for these procedures to drag out for several more years, as has been the case with other directives, and which would mean fulfilling the hopes of those who defend the interests of the multinationals who consider that the text is still too restrictive.

We therefore request that the Council give an immediate pronouncement on this reform and that it should be possible to judge its effectiveness in practice, although we really have no illusions on this point. The important thing is that this would be a first step which would make it possible to submit subsequent proposals with a view to making improvements.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Madam President, I am a little surprised, may I say, to find myself standing up again in Parliament and making a speech on this directive. Parliament will know that the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment considered it over an extended period of time. It came to Parliament in October of last year, I think. Parliament passed either 188 or 288 amendments — no doubt Mr Patterson will have the figures at his fingertips. Once the amendments had been considered, Parliament did not then vote the resolution on the amendments because they wished to hear the attitude of the Commission. We then had an adjournment of the affair for approximately one month. I came to Parliament in November and on behalf of the Commission made what I think most people who heard and took part in the debate agreed, at least at the time, was a detailed response to the amendments and the opinions that Parliament had expressed. Parliament then said that it wished for more time to consider what the Commission had then said. They did not vote on the resolution in November. Again, that was perfectly fair, I make no complaint about it whatsoever. In December the matter comes back into this plenary session. Then, no doubt, if Parliament had wished, it could have taken up what I had said in November, it could have complained about those parts of what the Parliament had said that I was not accepting and it could, no doubt, have given me some encouragement on the parts I said I was accepting and it could have complained, as it no doubt would have done and did in fact do. What it then went on to do, having considered the matter yet again — it has there-

fore been three times in the plenary, in October, November and December — was to vote on the resolution.

Mr President, with the best will in the world Parliament cannot expect the Commission now — some nine months after they voted on the resolution, after two-and-a-half years' consideration on this very important issue by the Parliament — to come along and admit that they were wrong in May of this year in doing exactly what they had told Parliament they were going to do last November.

It seems to me that there are two major sets of issues here. One is a procedural matter and the other is a matter concerning the merits or otherwise of the Commission's proposals.

Let me deal with the procedural matters. As far as procedure in this Parliament is concerned, it is not a matter for the Commission. It is entirely and solely a matter for this House to decide how it wishes to organize its business in what it considers to be the most efficient and effective way. That is absolutely right. However, at the same time, it is also for the Commission — when we have gone through the procedure which the Treaty enjoins on us, when we have indeed consulted with the Parliament in ways perhaps greater than the Treaty enjoins on us — to take its responsibility seriously and carry on with this procedure.

Now let me deal with where we are today, because I am perfectly prepared to discuss...

(Interruptions)

Well, I am sorry the honourable Member does not believe it, but it does seem to me that in these circumstances I am at least entitled to put the view of the Commission. We listened and took a great deal of account of what Parliament had to say on this matter, and I am fortified in my view that the Commission did take a great deal of account of Parliament not only by what Mr Patterson has said in this Chamber today but also by what he has written in a letter published in the *London Times* today, where — perhaps unusually, but I am delighted to say — Mr Patterson congratulates me on my wisdom in accepting such a large part of what Parliament had to say.

(Interruption)

Not all indeed; the honourable Lady is absolutely right.

It is interesting that I am congratulated by Mr Patterson on my wisdom and I am accused by Mr Frischmann for my folly.

In a situation in which I find myself attacked by the British Conservatives on my right, and by the French Communist Party on my left, I am bound to say to this House that it is a two-pronged attack which slightly fortifies me in my view that, on the whole I have listened to what I should have listened to and I

Richard

have not listened to what I should not have listened to.

Now it is also true, and Parliament will know this well because I have said it to Parliament often enough, that we always said it would be necessary to have a further consultation with the social partners on the basis of the revised text. This, Madam President, we have done, and we have done it indeed in some detail. We also had another look at the structure and logic of the proposals to see whether further improvements could not be made. Let me just go through them: perhaps it will help the House.

One structural change which we did feel able to make — I hope people will agree that this was sensible, though I do not think it was a parliamentary amendment — was the removal of the old section 3, which dealt separately with multinationals and complex undertakings operating within one Member State. As redrafted, the articles of the proposed directive apply equally to both situations without the need for duplication.

One addition is a more detailed preamble which takes account of recent developments in Community labour and company legislation. In particular the revised text, I think, profits from the recent adoption of the Seventh Company Law Directive on consolidated accounts for the definition of 'parent undertaking'. No longer referred to as the 'dominant undertaking', it also defines the concept of an 'establishment not legally independent of the undertaking'.

Madam President, the amended proposal lays the emphasis on information and consultation rights for the employees of any subsidiary in the Community when a total of at least 1 000 workers is employed in the Community by the parent undertaking and its subsidiaries taken as a whole. This, I think, followed the majority of Parliament's wishes — it quite clearly did not follow Mr Frischmann's wishes.

On information, the amended proposal provides that the management of the parent company should transmit to the management of each of its subsidiaries in the Community information of both a general and a sectorally specific nature on the company structure, on its economic and financial situation, the probable development of the business (production and sales), the employment situation and probable trends and investment prospects. I would point out too that the 1980 proposal referred to production and investment programmes, where again, I think, there was some complaint or at least a little unease.

The revised version differs from the 1980 proposal in using a simplified list of information to be supplied; in requiring information to be passed annually rather than six-monthly — again, something the Parliament had urged us to do; in adding a requirement for specific information on a particular sector of production or geographical area; in specifying that the right

to approach the parent undertaking for information not received from the subsidiary is limited to an approach in writing — again, an amendment that the Parliament passed and which we accepted; and in limiting the information to be passed in order to take account of the need for secrecy — again, I think, in line with what the majority of this House wished us to do.

On consultation, the new proposal establishes the procedures to be followed where consultation is made necessary by a proposed decision of a parent undertaking 'which is liable to have serious consequences for the interests of the employees of its subsidiaries in the Community.'

The new text extends the list of circumstances requiring consultation; it provides for the exclusion of secret information in the same terms as apply to the procedure for informing workers, and it establishes a specific consultation procedure to come into play where information has been withheld on grounds of secrecy. This latter, may I say, is an addition which results directly from my consultations with the social partners.

The new proposal also revises the procedure to be followed during the period set for the delivery of an opinion. It is now a minimum of 30 days, rather than 40 days, from the communication of the required information so as to make it perfectly clear that the proposed decision may not be implemented within this given period unless and until the opinion of the employees' representatives has been received. This provision replaces the bypass provision in the 1980 proposal, allowing workers to open consultations directly with the management of the parent undertaking. The tribunal procedures grafted on by Parliament as an alternative system of redress are intended chiefly to ensure that the management of the subsidiary fulfils its obligations *vis-à-vis* the employees. There is no provision for extending the given period once the required information is communicated, and the Commission is insistent following its exchanges with the social partners, that this should be generally understood. I must say, Madam President, that in some of those consultations it became perfectly clear that that was not generally understood. Perhaps I can repeat it for the sake of clarity. There is no provision for extending the given period within which consultation must take place, once the required information has been communicated from the subsidiary to the workers. That is the point.

It is important to note, too, that in the case of both information and consultation procedures, the amended proposal provides for a lower limit on the size of the subsidiary or establishment which is both flexible and optional in place of the fixed threshold of 100 workers. It also provides for the possibility of informing and consulting workers directly in enter-

Richard

prises where no system of workers' representatives exists. Both changes increase the flexibility and thus increase the practicability — the workability, if the House prefers it — of this directive.

Now to take account again of the views expressed by Parliament, the provisions on secrecy and on confidentiality have been expanded. Management may, in both information and consultation procedures, withhold certain secret information and may require employees to treat information which has been given to them as confidential.

The amended proposal nevertheless introduces a definition of secret information as material which if disclosed could 'substantially damage the undertaking's interest or lead to the failure of its plans'. It retains the original proposal's provision that disputes concerning the secret character of any information withheld are to be settled by a tribunal or other competent national authority. But even when facts are secret, workers' representatives must still be consulted before any decision is carried out which directly affects employees or their conditions.

Finally, we come to a point where we have not followed the Parliament. It is a point I raised in November, so I do not think Parliament when it passed the resolution in December could have been under any illusion as to what the Commission's position was. This is, of course, the direct election of workers' representatives. I hope the House will recall what I said in my statement to the House in November last year. I do not wish to repeat it all, but I did try to make the position clear. We are entirely in agreement with the Parliament that it should be possible to designate workers' representatives by direct election and secret ballot in all Member States, but I do not feel that this directive is the place to achieve that objective by compulsion. That is, in effect, what Mr Battersby is asking us to do. We said last year that we were not attempting to modify the systems of industrial relations themselves with this text. We have underlined this by making special provision for informing and consulting workers as individuals in the new text — a step massively in the direction I would have thought Parliament might have wished us to go.

That, I think, rather than direct elections was the concern of the social partners. May I say a word about consultation. I have had extensive consultations with both sides of industry, both in Europe and in North America. As we talked to them, I met frequent requests from the employers that the directive should not impose — and this was a common theme coming to me from the big companies — rigid and perhaps adversarial representative machinery in enterprises which have developed good lines of communication without it. I must tell the House that I was impressed by some of those arguments, because in some of the

companies I went to where there were no elections of workers' representatives, there were nevertheless, as confirmed by the workers, extremely good lines of communication between the management and the people who were employed in the plant. A number of companies said to me that they did not wish elections, whether direct from among the workers of the plant or of union representatives or, indeed, whether one was bringing in a union structure from outside as the other partner in the negotiations: they did not wish adversarial relationships to be introduced into the consultation machinery and the lines of communication they already have.

Of course, most companies will use representative systems of one kind or another. Most Member States will set down in their legislation how the representatives of the workforce should be selected. Perhaps they may even set down how representatives of the management might be selected too. At this stage in the process the Commission prefers to assure the maximum flexibility to Member States in relation to the structures which can be used to implement this important directive in 10 Member States with different traditions, different backgrounds, different histories and indeed different types of industrial relations.

I seek Parliament's understanding on this point. I am bound to say that in the two-and-a-half years that I have been responsible for this directive as Parliament will know, I was not responsible for the original draft, indeed it was with the Parliament at the time that I became a Member of the Commission — I have been very conscious of two things. One is the need to ensure that Parliament's opinions are respected and are given due and proper weight — and we have tried to do that.

The other is that we should produce this legislation only after the fullest consultation with both sides of industry. As to Mr Patterson's question asked, perhaps, slightly frivolously — whether I had yet been able to persuade all the multinationals of the benefits that would accrue to them if this directive were passed, the answer to that is, of course, no. It would be, I must say, a delight to me, but I should be extraordinarily surprised if I could get up in front of this House, or indeed any other audience, and say that the CBI in Britain had passed a resolution approving of the Vredeling Directive, or that UNICE had now said how much they valued legislation in this field and were looking forward to implementing it. Of course, I am not going to get that.

We are still in a process of discussion and negotiation with the Council of Ministers and in the Council of Ministers on how this piece of legislation is going to come out. I conclude with this one sentence. I think that anyone looking at the history of the last two-and-a-half years of this directive would come to the conclu-

Richard

sion that the Commission had treated Parliament with the utmost respect and indeed had given Parliament's views the utmost consideration.

(The sitting was suspended at 8 p.m. and resumed at 9 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR : MR LALOR

Vice-President

President. — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on the 'Vredeling' Directive (Docs 1-601/83 and 1-671/83).

Mr Peters (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, two and a half years ago, as Mr Richard quite rightly said, when the Commission submitted the proposal for a directive on information and consultation of workers in multinational undertakings, this document scarcely constituted a social revolution. It was, at the most, a step towards Community labour legislation for workers which exists in all the individual Member States anyway and is provided for in the Treaty.

The reaction of the employers' organizations at that time was unprecedentedly polemical and militant, and finally resulted in American multinationals withdrawing investments, threatening to introduce counter-legislation in the United States and putting pressure on European Parties and Members of this Parliament. The upshot was that, particularly thanks to the conservative contingent in this House, the already meagre beginnings of workers' rights contained in the directive were cut back, toned down and generally took a turn for the worse. The proposal has become a watered-down compromise typical of what the workers are generally fobbed off with. Nevertheless, we regarded this directive as an initial step and called on the Commission not to simply follow a number of incomprehensible and unacceptable resolutions by the European Parliament as they stood, but rather to modify them — which, I am glad to say, the Commission has in fact done in a number of cases.

I should like now to explain my views on the individual points. First of all, there should be no standard system for electing workers' representatives, contrary to the wishes of the majority of this House. This was a piece of *lex britannica* with the British trade unions in mind to the exclusion of the entire European system of workers' representation and the matter has, I am glad to say, been set right. The question should be settled in the individual Member States, including, of course, the United Kingdom.

Secondly, the special arrangement for charitable, political and other organizations, which is a Federal German feature, should be eliminated. This right of information and consultation — an unacceptable and anti-social provision — has been deleted, thank God, and this is something which we support.

Thirdly, Parliament's decision to the effect that the directive should only apply to undertakings employing a total of at least 1 000 persons and 100 in the case of each subsidiary has been made practicable. However, it is unacceptable that a subsidiary with only 50 employees should not come under this directive if it is shut down by a multinational of this kind. This deserves our support.

Finally there is the whole question of secrecy. Parliament had decided that the provisions should not apply to trade secrets. In the interests of rational protection of business and trade secrets, the Commission has proposed verification of the situation, i.e. by a Court rather than a simple declaration.

However, there is still the fact — and we are not entirely happy about this that, in cases where the management of the subsidiary does not provide reasonable information, the employees' representative can only take the matter up with the parent company in writing, i.e. via the 'by-pass' procedure. This is a very regrettable shortcoming and an unfortunate outcome which should be improved on in future work on this matter.

Ladies and gentlemen, this directive — which the Commission has, I think improved in certain respects and made more practicable — must now be submitted to and adopted by the Council. However, I am fairly certain that the British Conservatives, who really wanted to put paid to this directive, will try, through their Prime Minister, to ensure that it never becomes law. If this should be the case, we know why, and we in the Federal Republic will put pressure on the government. If we do not succeed in achieving a minimum of employees' rights in multinational undertakings in Europe — merely simple information which affects their very existence, since they might be dismissed or the works might be shut down etc. — if we cannot achieve even this minimum, we can forget about Europe!

Mr Ghergo (PPE). — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, our Group and, I imagine, the Parliament as well, appreciate the Commission's efforts to simplify the proposal for a directive, which is certainly more coherent now than the original draft submitted to us. Our Group also appreciates the fact that the Commission has borne in mind — to no small degree — the amendments supported by a majority of this Parliament. I refer in particular to the limit of one thousand workers, the exclusion of religious, political and charitable institutions, the reduction to one year, the deletion of extra-territorial provisions, and so on.

However, by moving away from the Parliament's text with regard to the consultation system and by extending its scope, the Commission is seriously jeopardizing the approval of the text by the Council.

Ghergo

Not only can the former not bank on the Parliament's support on these points but it will find it awkward to explain how it can accept the Parliament's text when it comes to decisions of a confidential nature and then reject it in other cases, on the grounds that it is ambiguous or cannot be implemented. Our Group, which is in favour of the early approval of the directive, therefore recommends to the Commission that it give consideration to the remarks I have made.

Mr Spencer (ED). — Mr President, Mr Patterson spoke accurately on behalf of my group and I endorse the points that he made. I speak as a kind of phantom — a sort of ex-rapporteur, a kind of spokesman for my group. Perhaps it would be safer to assume that I am luxuriating in speaking for myself on this occasion.

I think it a little unfair to censure the Commissioner on points of constitution. I think so far as the constitution is concerned, he has behaved impeccably. I think you might have a quick snipe at him as regards courtesy. I do think it would perhaps have been nicer and more friendly if he had, when he produced the new text, himself initiated an opportunity for a further informal discussion with Parliament, either in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment or here. But Mr Patterson's question has given us the opportunity for that discussion and I welcome it.

I feel I must point out, however, that the Commissioner's position is constitutionally correct, and those rumours which reached me that members of the Socialist Group want to re-open the whole Vredeling file and write another report on the document which the Commission has now sent to Council fill me with nothing but worry. Had we wanted to do that, we should have exercised our constitutional prerogative and not completed the consultation in December. We may not like everything that the Commissioner has said. It is not perhaps what we wanted, but it is what we were promised, and when we were promised that we took a conscious decision, accepted it and completed the consultation in December. Now had the Commissioner — he would never have done so, of course — departed from the word which he gave to this House on 18 November or had he introduced new ideas of substance, or had he even taken any new ideas from those interested parties that he is so fond of consulting, then we might well have found ourselves in a more difficult position. But he did not, and we do not have any case for a re-consultation on this matter. It goes before the Council. Parliament, as I understand it, stands where it stood at the time of the December vote. We still believe that we were closer to what was correct on matters of confidentiality, less open to the charge of hypocrisy on the matter of election by secret ballot and right on a variety of other points.

I am glad indeed to end this whole dialogue with Commissioner Richard on a point of agreement. I was going to spend a few seconds considering the question of the implementation of decisions and the whole business of Article 45. You, Sir, have saved me the trouble. You have made it absolutely crystal clear in your statement this evening — even to the representatives of UNICEF that we are not talking about co-determination.

Commissioner Richard, thank you very much.

Mr Bonaccini (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as you all remember, my Group was not enthusiastic about the original outcome of the debates on the Vredeling proposals, which in my opinion undermines, as it were, the logic behind the directive. In any case, I too feel it is rather a waste of time to re-open the file at this stage.

There is one remark I would like to make, namely that I belong to a group of Members who came to Strasbourg from Italy convinced that there was work to be done in social as well as economic relations.

I should point out that this was a minority view in my party and throughout the left generally in Italy. In the end — and we are now coming to the end of this Parliament — the two major opportunities for worker participation which were open to us, the fifth directive and the one we are still discussing, have turned out to be mountains bringing forth mice big and small. Results certainly fall far short of the original objective and are incapable of bringing trade union and worker participation structures closer, as I had hoped. That being said, however, what can we reasonably resolve to do at this stage? Mr Richard's remarks are, I think, sensible and reflect the viewpoint of someone who has considered the matter and as Member of the Commission, has weighed up the points on their individual merits. Let it be clearly understood, we do not basically disagree with him. Frankly I cannot see how he could have acted otherwise. Nor can I see what sense there could be in forever putting off a final conclusion on the subject. We do not particularly like this number of 1 000 workers, but at this stage we might just as well give it a trial, let the decision go ahead and the procedure be carried through to a conclusion. So let it go to the Council of Ministers and, if necessary, should there not be the agreement we all hope for, maybe Mr Patterson's suggestion could also be applied and efforts be made towards conciliation with the Council of Ministers to get some progress.

Our conclusion is therefore to keep the proceedings going and achieve some results, at least by the end of this Parliament, on which future action may be based.

Bonaccini

I must reiterate our misgivings about the results which can be achieved, but I do not think there is any alternative to a solution of this sort. There is one point in what you said, Mr Richard, which I frankly do not understand, perhaps because the translation was inaccurate. You said that consultations were continuing. What consultations? At this stage we must really draw the line. You said that you have held so many consultations. Fine, let us keep to the course of action we decided on before, and try to draw as much experience as possible from it so that we have some results to show for our work, which can be evaluated later in a more considered manner. The suggestion I am putting to you and the Members of this Parliament is therefore that the procedure should be followed through. There is admittedly nothing special about this proposal, but it seems to fit in with the others put forward by various Members.

Mrs Nielsen (L). — (DA) Mr President, I was amazed when I heard Commissioner Richard's introduction since I got the impression that he really failed to understand why we should be discussing this matter. We were told how many months we had been discussing the question of informing and consulting employees in multinational companies and it is quite true that we have discussed it on many occasions. The reason, Mr Richard, why we have discussed this matter very seriously and on repeated occasions in committee and subsequently in plenary is that this Parliament is very much concerned about it. It is obvious, therefore, that we cannot understand why after it has been deliberating on this point for month after month, the Commission cannot give us its reaction to the opinion issued by Parliament in September last year. I would point out, Mr Richard, that, for example, in March of this year — that is to say several months after the months mentioned by the Commission — I asked the Commission at the beginning of the Monday sitting when we could expect to hear its reaction to Parliament's opinion of 1982 — which was issued several months before the end of 1982 to boot. We were told that it would be sometime in April, I would point out, however, that the revised proposal we have received from the Commission is dated 8 July. Is it strange, therefore, that several members should have signed a question addressed to the Commission aimed at finding out what has been going on all this time?

But rest assured, I will do what I can not to cause you a sleepless night since I do not really think you will be all that bothered. Even if one is attacked from both left and right in the political arena it might well be that one has nevertheless done a good piece of work. However, it is, I think, impossible to please everybody in politics. I am certainly not happy, but there is something which we in the Liberal Group find sensible in the new proposal, and there are other things which we do not find sensible. I do not think, however, that the Commission has done such a bad job. What we really

find positive is first and foremost the fact that the Commission has really understood Parliament's rôle, since Parliament has endeavoured to modify the worst starting point imaginable, namely the Vredeling directive. Perhaps this was a good starting point for the very reason that it was so bad.

We have had good opportunities to improve it and we are pleased that the Commission has taken heed of what Parliament has had to say. We are pleased that at Parliament's suggestion, the upper limit for the total number of employees has been fixed at 1 000.

We are also pleased at the elimination of the 'by-pass' procedure since it can have a devastating effect on the work if people go outside the subsidiary and deal with the parent company directly. I should like to mention a few points. We are also pleased, for example, at the fact that it is not intended to cripple undertakings with a vast amount of paper work as originally proposed, i.e. requests for information twice a year, but that the proposal put forward by the vast majority of this Parliament to the effect that such requests should be made only once a year has now been adopted. There are, Mr Richard, a number of positive aspects, and I think it is vital to stress the point that the Commission should realize that if we in this Parliament emphatically state our views on certain points, it should note and try to take account of them.

However, there are also a few points which, as we see it, should be rectified. As we know — and as the Commissioner has pointed out here this evening — we have reached the point in the procedure where negotiations must take place with the Council, and for this reason my next point is addressed to that institution. In our view, we should have the lower limit of 100 as we proposed. We continue to advocate secret votes and for this reason, we are very much concerned about the questions which have not been clarified and the debate which could very easily arise as to what is meant by consulting or providing information in good time? What does 'in good time' mean? What, for example, is 'secret information' or 'information which may have damaging effects for the undertaking as such'? We are afraid that we are letting ourselves in for some large-scale discussions which might ultimately mean that the very thing which was supposed to be for the benefit of us all — i.e. society as a whole, employers or employees alike — will end up by causing us to lose important orders and hence becoming less competitive, whereas what we need is the exact opposite. We must have more and more orders, we must be competitive and we must create the many extra jobs which Europe so vitally needs.

Miss De Valera (DEP). — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we in the Community believe that further consultation between employers and employees is both desirable and necessary to prevent a breakdown of communications, which leads to closures and redun-

De Valera

dancies. We must protect the employee by protecting his job, and in order to do this we must encourage improvements in efficiency, productivity and increased competitiveness. We must also ensure further investment.

The importance of good industrial relations cannot be over-emphasized. In the last debate that took place on this draft directive, there was much talk about the unwholesome and unhealthy power of multinationals, and it was suggested that this directive was the only effective measure that could be taken against them. Let us be realistic here, in the case of Ireland, we are talking about small subsidiaries of major undertakings. Under this directive, these subsidiaries will be liable to the same proposals as the parent company, yet they will only have a fraction of the work-force. We need the jobs that these subsidiaries provide. As we have the highest unemployment rate in the Community, we cannot afford to put these jobs at risk. The draft directive would have an adverse affect on competitiveness because of the inadequacies of the protection for confidential information. This might well introduce further conflict where there should be cooperation.

The draft directive will give rise to litigation about such matters as rights to consultation, the timing of and the confidentiality of information, which in turn will lead to further delays and loss of competitiveness. There will be a grave danger that information about new products, the mode of operation and marketing proposals may be leaked to rival firms, and the direct result of this would be a further loss of jobs. If such a directive were in force, it would offer far less attractive prospects to foreign investors such as the United States and Japan. We must face the reality by acknowledging that we, especially in Ireland, rely on such investments to provide employment as foreign investments account for 33% of employment.

We in Ireland depend to a far greater extent than any of the other Member States on foreign investments, and if we do not recognize this we are signing away the hope of lasting employment for our people.

The proposed directive is very unsatisfactory on a number of points. There is no definition, for example, of confidentiality. The penalties for non-compliance with the directive are not outlined, and the Commission have neglected to incorporate the European Parliament's amendments with regard to a secret ballot among the workers' representatives. In my view, the secret ballot is a fundamental right of the workers which must be clearly established and protected.

With that, Mr President, I have been delighted to take the opportunity of expressing the views again, not only of the Irish members of the EPD, but of all members of the EPD Group. I look forward to the Commissioner's reply to this debate.

Miss Quin (S). — Since this debate is taking place, I am glad to have an opportunity to speak, since I wish to bring to the attention of the Parliament a vivid illustration of the issues involved in the Vredeling debate and an illustration of why a strong directive is needed.

On August 31 in a town in the north-east of England, it was learnt that an American multinational the Caterpillar Tractor Company, was to make a thousand workers redundant and close the factory. The workers learnt of this decision, not from the management of the firm, but from the local newspaper, to whom the information was leaked. The news came to them like a bolt from the blue and was particularly shocking since the workers concerned had negotiated new working arrangements with the management only a couple of months before the closure announcement — negotiations which had resulted in a loss of earnings for many of the workers, in order, the workers thought, to ensure the long-term survival of the company.

The treatment of the workers in this case was contrary to Caterpillar's own printed code of practice; it was contrary to the OECD code of practice and shows the total inefficacy of voluntary codes of practice of this kind. It also shows why it is important to have legal provisions to make sure that workers do have some say over their own future.

It should be further added that the Caterpillar Company was extremely active, at the time when the European Parliament was considering the Vredeling proposals, in lobbying against the directive and doing its very best to ensure that if passed at all it would be passed in a greatly weakened form. In a letter they sent to British Members of the European Parliament, the firm states that it believes that companies should inform and involve employees in matters of concern to them and that it makes a substantial effort to do so. It then goes on to say:

There have been instances in which some multinational companies have failed to communicate adequately on matters of concern to employees, but the vast majority of multinational companies should not be judged or penalized for the shortcomings of a few.

We then learn that by their actions they make one thousand workers redundant without any consultation whatsoever.

This letter that I have read out is a supreme example of hypocrisy and bad faith on the part of the company concerned. Now it is widely rumoured that the company is not even to be concentrated in other parts of the United Kingdom but is going to transfer some of its production from this plant in the north-east of England to Korea — for obvious reasons.

Quin

What has happened in this case is not some unimportant or trivial local example but is a frightening instance of the problems that workers employed by such firms experience and their difficulties, unless there is some directive, in having any say over their own future. I hope the Parliament will show a proper sense of outrage at this event and condemn without any equivocation the actions of this company — actions that even under the feeble form of the Vredeling directive which was passed by this Parliament would be completely illegal.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Before the honourable lady sits down, I wonder if I could ask her a question?

President. — Yes, Commissioner.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Would she be kind enough to send me the details of this whole affair, since I well remember the position that Caterpillar took in relation to the lobbying on this particular issue? I think it would be right, therefore, if I could have all the details, for me to get in touch directly with Caterpillar and ask them for an explanation.

Miss Quin (S). — Mr President, I would be delighted to do that.

Mr Spencer (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President. If we are going to pillory a company like Caterpillar — and I say nothing about the particular occasion — if the accusations that the honourable Member has raised are proved on closer inspection to be untrue, there should be an opportunity to set the record straight. I am sure that the Commissioner implied that when asking for information about this case.

President. — I note your question: it was not quite a point of order.

Mr Brok (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I do not think I need to stress in detail yet again that I personally and my Group as a whole regard this directive as necessary, since this point was, I think, made very clear last year in the work preparatory to the various decisions taken by Parliament, and there is no need for me to repeat the arguments we stressed in that debate.

I find it intolerable, however, that Mr Peters should thank the Commission for not following the recommendations of this Parliament. From a real parliamentary point of view I cannot imagine how he can possibly single out as positive the very points in the Commission's argument which are at variance with Parliament's decision while at the same time accusing those Members of this House who have put forward views different from his own of knuckling under to

American capitalism. I do not think this is the way we should talk in this House, Mr Peters.

Our questions — and I was a co-signatory of this Question — concern Parliament's right to be constantly informed on developments and I cannot, therefore, understand the Commissioner's surprise at being asked to adopt a position on these questions once more after having done so orally on the previous occasion. As Mrs Nielsen has already pointed out, we have, in this Oral Question called for a written and hence binding text for discussion in connection with an Oral Question with debate of this kind.

It is clear that the Commission has adopted several of Parliament's viewpoints and that we can cooperate very closely in these areas. The fact that there are other points on which no agreement has been reached is something which we will perhaps have to debate elsewhere. I am referring, for example, to the provision contained in Article 4 (2) which relates to questions on cooperation with other undertakings or where, for example, in connection with the substantial modifications to the activity of the undertaking the word 'Unternehmenstätigkeit' has replaced the word 'Betriebszweck' in the German version although the latter term was used in the original Commission proposal and the Parliamentary decision.

However, as I see it, what has happened as regards the voting procedure is the decisive question. That the employees should in one Member State enjoy an undemocratic right to delegate is not compatible with our fundamental democratic principles since, as far as I am concerned, democracy implies secret and direct voting. If it is possible in a particular country to circumvent this principle or adopt a different approach, fair enough. But what we are discussing here today is a directive with international implications, whereby the employees of one Member State can influence undertakings in another Member State, and this is, therefore, unacceptable from the point of view of my country, for example, since the absence of direct and secret ballots shows that the employees are not credited with the necessary competence to make sensible decisions off their own bat.

When I see that the European Parliament is in favour of a democratic voting procedure, that, as far as I know, all 10 governments of the European Community are also in favour of a democratic voting procedure, but that unfortunately a 25% opposition party in one Member State is not in favour of a democratic voting procedure and that it is perhaps simply our bad luck that the Commissioner belongs to this party and that this might lead to the directive not being amended so as to provide for a democratic voting procedure it is not, in my opinion, acceptable that the Commission should, because of Mr Richard's party-political proclivities, contribute towards a denial of democracy among employees.

Brok

I should like to make this point very clearly partly as a member of a party which as far back as the 50s had a considerable hand in the genesis of a co-management Law, a law on the constitution of enterprises enabling employees to take part in the decision-making process. I am convinced that, with this procedure, Mr Richard has not made it easier for all the Member Governments finally to reach agreement so that this directive can actually come into force and that we in this Parliament must endeavour, together with the governments of the Member States and by means of a consultation procedure as already mentioned here today, to bring about a modification of the Commission proposal so as to bring the directive really in line with the democratic principals of this House.

Mr Harris (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President. If one looks at the notice, surely Mrs Ewing — who I think is a member of your group, Mr President — is next to speak on the list. Is she not here? Well, in that case I wonder if you, as a member of the same group as Mrs Ewing — who, as you say, is not here to take her place — would allow me to defend Commissioner Richard against the attack made against him by Mr Brok?

President. — No, I do not think that is a point of order.

Mr Eisma (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, I am pleased to have also been allowed to speak. I found Mr Richard extremely aggressive in his answer and in my opinion his argument was wrong, because the Commission obviously needed the long period between November and December 1982 and mid-July 1983 to work out its position with regard to this directive.

If the Commission had acted consistently after December and said: 'We will or will not take Parliaments amendments into account' then this could have been completed within a month. But no, as the Commissioner also said, there was consultation between the two sides of industry. And I assume that this consultation was not held for nothing, and that the Commission drew its conclusions from it and made alterations to the directive. And that is why Parliament is now quite justifiably asking to debate this directive once again and to be consulted on it. I will return to this in a short while.

But I do now want to say, in order to avoid any misunderstandings, that we do not want an entirely new consultation. Nor do I believe that the Socialists want an entirely new consultation. This was said to be the case, but I thought it was a false accusation. We regret, of course — and this is a political aspect — that the Commission has leant rather too much towards the right-wing majority in the Parliament.

We do all recognize, after all, that now that the quantity of work is decreasing, the quality of work should be increasing; and that surely means maximum information and consultation for employees. In addition to this, we are going to have to deal with a large number of closures and redundancies, and workers should really be involved as much as possible in such decision-making. In our opinion this is not handled satisfactorily in the text of this directive before us.

We also regret the fact that the size of the workforce has risen from 100 to 1 000. By accepting Parliament's amendment for 1 000 employees, the Commission shows, as I said earlier, that it leans rather too heavily towards the conservative side, the right-wing side of Parliament. In other cases the Commission is capable of acting more independently of Parliament, but it has unfortunately not done so in this case. It surprises me, however, that the Commissioner did not answer the written questions about this matter which was submitted to him. He was, after all, asked how many companies this threshold of 1 000 employees involved. In last year's debate the Commission was also unable to say how many companies were involved in the threshold of 100 or 50 workers. Will the Commissioner tell us this time how threshold companies are affected when he sets the threshold at 1 000? We naturally regret the fact that the question of secret information is cropping up again, for it provides an alibi for certain employers who do not wish to provide any information at all. The questions tabled by Mr Plumb and others are of course now superfluous, because they were tabled on 7 July and on 15 July the commissioner produced his final views on this matter.

A question that remains interesting — and with this I want to conclude — is Question 3. It requests renewed consultation on those Parliament proposals which the Commission does not accept. We regard it as essential for this consultation to take place, as a continuation of this debate, between the Commission and the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment before the forthcoming meeting of the ministers of social affairs holds an initial informative discussion. My final question to the commissioner, then, is whether he can promise us that he will talk to us, at least in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, about the results of this directive.

President. — The joint debate is closed.

We now proceed to the request for a vote without reference to committee on the motion for a resolution by Mr Adam.

Mr Harris (ED). — On a point of order. Mr President, there have been attacks made on the Commissioner. Surely he must, in his own honour, have an opportunity to reply to those attacks.

President. — Mr Harris, I have already announced from the Chair that the debate is closed. I have had no request from the Commission to speak again.

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, as I understand it, this is an oral question with debate. As you rightly say, the debate has come to a conclusion. It seems to me sensible and appropriate that the Commissioner should now reply to this question, since the Parliament has had the debate. I think that the least we can expect of the Commissioner is that he would pay the House the courtesy of replying to the debate.

Mr Van Minnen (S). — *(NL)* Mr President, this is a rare case in which I can fully agree with Mr Hord, at any rate on this procedural point. Questions have been put to the Commissioner, and there was one a moment ago by Mr Eisma. The least you can do is ask the Commissioner if he himself perhaps wishes to reply to the question. That is a logical way to wind up a brief parliamentary debate.

President. — I was not in the Chair when this debate commenced, but I am aware that this was discussed at the beginning of the debate and it was decided that the House wished to hear from the Commissioner before the debate began. Now we want to have the Commissioner's statement at the end as well as at the beginning. I had no request from the Commission for an opportunity to reply. I have declared the debate closed and I will not reopen it, irrespective of the demands that have come from various Members. I am putting to the vote the request for an early vote on Mr Adam's resolution ...

Mr Beazley (ED). — Mr President, when you have taken the vote you might find yourself in dire trouble, because this House has voted already on its order of business and when it is going to vote. In my view, therefore, it is out of order to change what this House has already decided.

President. — I am willing to take the risk of getting into the very serious trouble referred to. However, I have now already stated that I have put to the vote the request for an early vote ...

Miss Quin (S). — Mr President, it is a genuine point of order. According to the Rules governing oral questions with debate, when there is a request for an early vote of this kind it has to be taken at voting time and not after the debate.

President. — I cannot allow the debate in the House to be turned into a joke. I am ruling under Rule 42(5) and I am putting to the vote the request for an early vote.

(Parliament rejected the request)

The motion for a resolution will be referred to the competent committee.

Mr Harris (ED). — I have not got the Rules in front of me, but I believe the Rules give the Commission the right to ask for the floor at any time during our proceedings. Now I am afraid I am not armed with the exact Rule on this point but in view of the attack made on the Commissioner by my colleague Mr Brok, I am absolutely sure, knowing the Commissioner, that he would wish to respond to that challenge. The Rule is No 66. I am sure, in fairness to the Commissioner, that we must give him the opportunity of defending himself under Rule 66 if he wishes to avail himself of this opportunity.

President. — Mr Harris, this is the third time you have expressed your desperate anxiety to be fair to the Commissioner.

(Laughter)

I wonder about that desperate anxiety. I have no right to dictate to the Commission. If the Commissioner had sought to reply, he would have been given every facility to do so.

12. Pharmacists

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Malangré, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee (Doc. 1-485/83) on the

proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-934/80 — COM(81) 4 final) for:

I. a directive concerning the coordination of provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in respect of certain activities in the field of pharmacy;

II. a directive concerning the mutual recognition of diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications in pharmacy, including measures to facilitate the effective exercise of the right of establishment relating to certain activities in the fields of pharmacy; and

a Council decision setting up an Advisory Committee on Pharmaceutical Training.

Mr Malangré (PPE), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the matter before us has no party-political implications or encumbrances but it simply concerns hard facts which have long since been dealt with in the Legal Affairs Committee and the Commission. I assume that the Members of this House who intend to remain for the rest of this so-called debate have, so to speak, inside knowledge of the entire problem and that there is therefore no need for me to go into it further. Having dealt with the midwives, nurses and doctors and so on we can now finally round off the whole question of the medical professions by finally dealing with pharmacists too. The fact that the volume of legislation is small permits a great deal of freedom of movement and the

Malangré

realization of an important aspect of the Treaty of Rome, particularly from the point of view of the young citizens of our Community.

The Commission has spent a long time working on this project and the Legal Affairs Committee also did a great deal of work on it, I should like to ask you all, therefore, regardless of which group you belong to, to help us, when we come to vote tomorrow, to make this step. It is not a leap forward, but, as I see it, a step in the right direction is also deserving of all our efforts. If these proposals for directives are adopted, this will mean harmonization of pharmaceutical training throughout the Community, and hence we will achieve mutual recognition of diplomas and freedom of movement for all persons employed in the pharmaceutical profession. It will mean, finally, that throughout the Community, existing pharmacies can be taken over by anyone who has obtained the Community diploma.

It has not, however, also been possible as yet to settle the question of the right of establishment throughout the entire Community, since the legislation in this area varies considerably from one Member State to another and in some cases the legislation is mutually incompatible or constitutionally protected. It is unlikely that any of the governments involved will give ground on this point and we have, for this reason, not been able to do what might have been desirable, but have probably nevertheless done what is possible for the time being.

As regards the amendments tabled, Mr Prag has in one case helped us to close a further loophole. On the question of taking over existing pharmacies it would be quite possible for figure heads to set up businesses in countries with freedom of establishment only to hand them over shortly afterwards to citizens of other Member States. Abuses of this kind could, I think, be avoided by means of the two amendments tabled by Mr Prag who proposes a period of two years. I should like to ask the Commission to consider whether this period is appropriate or whether it should be changed. I feel, as rapporteur, that these two amendments tabled by Mr Prag are absolutely in line with the views and conclusions of the Legal Affairs Committee and therefore recommend you to adopt them.

However, I cannot, from the point of view of the Legal Affairs Committee, advocate the amendments proposed by Mr Clinton, for whom I otherwise have the greatest respect, as they would make this compromise come to nothing and afford less freedom of movement. Furthermore, they are in fact unacceptable for at least half the Member States.

I should therefore like to urge all of you who are still present to play your part in bringing about a large majority in favour of the directive with the amendments tabled by the Legal Affairs Committee and the

two amendments tabled by Mr Prag when we come to vote tomorrow.

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — (*DE*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is probably more important to eliminate obstacles to the free movement of workers, the freedom of establishment and the free movement of persons than to draw up ambitious drafts for a real European constitution and the establishment of a genuinely united Europe. As the rapporteur has just pointed out, this directive is aimed at really eliminating obstacles, albeit in a restricted area.

The Socialist Group supports this compromise arrived at by the Legal Affairs Committee and we feel that, in view of the fundamental differences in the legislation governing the establishment of pharmacists in five Member States compared with the other five — a problem which it will in all probability prove very difficult to solve — the proposals put forward by the Legal Affairs Committee probably represent the best possible approach under the circumstances.

We also go along with Mr Prag and I should like to add, for the benefit of Dr Narjes and perhaps more explicitly than the rapporteur, that for various reasons which will be obvious to anyone who knows anything about the question, we feel, as Mr Malangré has already mentioned, that it would be worth considering extending the period proposed by Mr Prag in his amendments to perhaps five years. However, for reasons of time, we have not been able to table an amendment to this effect and since this period has in fact been specified in the existing amendment, we will vote in favour of it. Nevertheless, as my Group sees it, the Commission could well give some thought to the question of whether or not it should fix a different period.

I should like to make one point which is not directly connected with the debate, but which Dr Narjes will, I am sure, understand. If the Commission is aiming at greater harmonization in the difficult field of medicines, it should bear in mind that medicines do not only present a commercial problem but that there is also a health aspect. We would be very pleased if a large majority in this House were to give its support to this compromise devised by the Legal Affairs Committee together with Mr Prag's amendments.

Mr Tyrrell (ED). — Mr President, I am happy to say that I find myself in complete agreement with every word that has been spoken by the last two speakers. I would like to put this directive into context.

This is another step, small but significant, towards the creation of a single market in services. The Commission know as well as we do that there is a long way to go. They also know that progress has been very slow. I believe the Commission share our disappointment that it has been so slow, because in this field almost all the problems are technical problems. Of course,

Tyrrell

technical problems can be overcome if there is the political will to overcome them.

The profession of pharmacy bristles with such technical problems. On the one hand, one has the employed chemists who are entitled to demand harmonization of their qualifications to enable them to avail themselves of their rights conferred by the Treaty. Furthermore, self-employed pharmacists are equally entitled to harmonization to enable them to capitalize on the rights of establishment which they enjoy under the Treaty. What has stood in the way in the pharmacy profession has been the different organization of that profession in the various Member States. Thus, five have had their geographical distribution system, that is, a kind of licensing system that spreads pharmacists out where there is a need for them, and five have had a completely free market. This form of organization has caused great problems in reaching a directive for pharmacists.

In practice, conferring the right of establishment untrammelled would be likely to mean that pharmacists from Member States where there is a geographical distribution system could set up in those where there is not, but there would be no flow or very little flow in the opposite direction. The Legal Affairs Committee has come forward with a compromise. I would like to pay tribute to the rapporteur, Mr Malangré, for his very patient and careful approach throughout the committee's deliberations in realizing this compromise. The solution advanced would deal with the problem on the basis that half a loaf is better than none. We can secure harmonization of qualifications, which would mean freedom to provide services. However, as far as freedom of establishment is concerned, we can only go part of the way, because it would be open to one Member State to refuse to recognize the qualification of a pharmacist who came from another Member State if he was intending to open a new pharmacy. Mr Prag's amendments close a further loophole there by defining what would be a new pharmacy.

I welcome this as a small step. I congratulate the pharmacists on being, I think, the sixth profession to have achieved this free movement, at least in part. I would like to conclude by saying more generally that I do hope the Commission will press on with all possible speed with its harmonization programme for professional qualifications. I say that not only as a matter of general principle but because I think it will discourage those professional bodies right across the Community which are at this moment putting up the shutters against new entrants. They are doing so under the threat of unemployment. It is unfair to the young. It is an abuse of the monopolistic position that the professions enjoy in almost every Member State, and I hope that this harmonization programme will discourage and deter them from that inbuilt tendency.

IN THE CHAIR : MR FRIEDRICH*Vice-President*

Mr Lalor (DEP). — Mr President, I am a little worried about the content of both the Malangré report and the Commission directives. I have listened to a very concerned rapporteur outlining the case, and I find myself wondering whether I have not been reading this report and the Commission recommendations somewhere wrongly, because I am disturbed by the proposal for a directive concerning the activities of pharmacists and the opening, as I see it, of pharmaceutical businesses by non-qualified operators. That does not seem to be what Mr Tyrrell hopes for either.

Ireland has at present the highest number of pharmacists per head of the population in the EEC, and we are rather proud of the quality of the service provided by our highly-qualified Irish pharmacists. The proposal, as I see it, from the Legal Affairs Committee, while aiming to improve on the Commission's proposal, nevertheless allows for the commercial exploitation of the situation by companies and non-pharmaceutical persons in certain Member States, including Ireland. It is hardly necessary for me to say, therefore, how concerned I am, on behalf of the Irish pharmacists, at the possible economic effect of an influx of non-Irish, non-qualified pharmacists, without any realistic system of control, from those countries which do have such controls. It would require only a very small number of migrating chemists to stifle and, in fact, reverse, the limited improvement in this profession in Ireland in recent years.

Now, I am conscious of the fact that a number of amendments to cover the objections of the Irish EEC pharmacy group have been submitted by my colleague Mr Clinton, and I was a little disappointed to hear Mr Malangré saying that he did not think he could accept any of those amendments, despite the fact that my reading of one of them is that it is similar to the Prag amendment which Mr Malangré is willing to accept. But I certainly will be fully supporting the Clinton amendments, and I would appeal to all Members of the House, no matter how fruitless the appeal would appear to be at this stage, in the interests of the health and well-being of our population at home, in my island anyway, to support the amendments of Mr Clinton and Mr Prag.

Mr Prag (ED). — My colleagues, if many of them were here, would perhaps think that I had already spoken quite enough this session, but this time I shall not take much of the House's time, and it is agreeable after the emotional strains of the past few days to be non-controversial.

Prag

As has already been explained, five of our ten Member States have a geographical distribution of pharmacies and five do not. Those which do regard pharmacies as a public service and provide a degree of protection against the establishment of new pharmacies; the other five do not. It is important that freedom of establishment should not result in the setting up of a rash of new pharmacies, for small expert pharmacies in several Member States are already suffering heavily from the establishment of large chainstore pharmacies selling such a wide range of goods that they are more like department stores than pharmacies and do not provide that personal service characteristic of the small pharmacy.

As regards my amendments, No 5 is to the proposal for Directive No 2, not No 1 as is wrongly printed on the amendment, and No 6 is to the resolution. They define new pharmacies as those which have been open for less than two years. You will notice that the first half of Amendment No 5 is, indeed, exactly the same as the Legal Committee's Amendment No 4, and the second half provides the precise definition which would prevent the Legal Committee's intentions from being circumvented.

I hope the House will find this aim acceptable, and will vote unanimously for my amendments, Nos 5 and 6. I also hope that the Commission will accept them. Finally, I thank Mr Malangré, Mr Siegler-schmidt and Mr Tyrrell for their support

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) I should like to begin by thanking the rapporteur for the objectivity, prudence, tenacity and constructive approach with which he has tackled this difficult subject together with his colleagues in the Legal Affairs Committee. I am very pleased that this matter can be settled objectively and without regard to intra- and inter-party conflicts.

The proposals before Parliament this evening are among those rare measures which involve giving the citizens of Europe tangible advantages of Community membership in the form of new rights enabling them to practice their professions throughout the Community. These proposals supplement the existing set of directives concerning the mutual recognition of diplomas in most other areas of the health system.

The mutual recognition of diplomas is not only a political matter — it is also very much a long-term affair. I should like to remind you, if I may, that work was first started on the question of pharmacists at expert level in 1964/65, i.e. some 19 years ago. Thus there is a long history behind the current Commission proposals, to which I am glad to say the rapporteur, Mr Malangré devoted particular attention in his report. I can go along with the observation to the effect that the current Commission proposals are certainly less ambitious than those tabled in 1969 and

subsequently withdrawn in 1972. Whereas the first proposals were aimed at introducing standard regulations governing pharmacists throughout the Community, the present proposals should certainly be more in keeping with the current state of integration in the Community.

This approach is in line with the policy regarding approximation of legislation developed by the Community since 1974, not least as a result of suggestions from this Parliament. The Chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee, Mrs Veil, made the very apposite point during the discussions in committee that Community law is subsidiary to national legislation and that, in consequence, the legislation in the various Member States should only be harmonized and aligned to the extent necessary for the attainment of the objectives set out in the Treaty.

Is harmonization of national regulations concerning the practising of pharmacy, particularly those relating to the geographical distribution of pharmacies, really a necessary, not to say essential, precondition for the mutual recognition of diplomas? As the Commission sees it, the answer is 'no'. Each Member State must be able to maintain its regulations governing the distribution of medicines, but immigrant members of the profession must be able to practice under the same conditions as the nationals of the State in question. Furthermore, it would be difficult to bring about harmonization of this kind, since coordination of the regulations concerning the geographical distribution of pharmacies would affect and inevitably change the entire health policy and medicine-distribution system in the Member States and as things stand at the moment, this would be a recipe for disaster.

The decisive question, as we see it, therefore, is as follows: should we make an initial step with the mutual recognition of diplomas, even if the differences in regulations on the opening of pharmacies in the various Member States are to remain, or should we rather opt for impracticable harmonization, which would rule out the possibility of progress in the field of freedom of movement for pharmacists? This fundamental question, which the rapporteur also returned to in his introductory remarks, was dealt with in depth by the Legal Affairs Committee, for which I am grateful.

We in the Commission welcome the fact that, following their deliberations, the Legal Affairs Committee and its rapporteur share our views and are prepared to deal separately with the question of mutual recognition of diplomas on the one hand and harmonization of the provisions governing the establishment of pharmacies on the other. However, while sharing the Commission's views on this basic question, the Legal Affairs Committee has amended the proposals in such a way as to enable the Member

Narjes

States to exclude the establishment of new pharmacies from the scope of the provisions concerning the mutual recognition of diplomas in pharmacy.

This amendment is intended as a reassurance for those who have apprehensions of a mass exodus of pharmacists to those Member States which permit free establishment of new pharmacies and a resultant imbalance. The Commission regards these fears as exaggerated, particularly in view of the extent of migration which has taken place by virtue of existing directives concerning the mutual recognition of diplomas — especially that relating to doctors, which has been in force since 1977. It is clear that the mobility of the free-lance professions is and should remain a general phenomenon, which is restricted to individual cases. However, it remains to be seen whether or not we are correct in our observations and conclusions, and for this reason the Commission can understand the fears of the Legal Affairs Committee without, as I said, entirely sharing them. However, since the implications of the safeguard proposal are limited from the quantitative point of view — i.e. very few new pharmacies are set up in the Member States compared with the number of existing pharmacies closing down — the Commission has decided to adopt this amendment and will therefore submit a new draft proposal for a directive, amended accordingly, to the Council pursuant to Article 149 (2) of the Treaty.

In the same spirit, the Commission could go along with Mr Prag's amendment. With a view to avoiding malpractices, he proposes that newly opened pharmacies should not be regarded as 'existing pharmacies' which can be taken over by an immigrant pharmacist. However, it strikes us as going too far to restrict the application of the proposed directives to wage-earning pharmacists, as proposed in Mr Clinton's amendments, which we cannot go along with nor, unfortunately, did I find any objective reasons for concern that the quality of pharmaceutical services in Ireland should suffer. In fact there are no regulations in any Member State by virtue of which persons wishing to set up as independent pharmacists by taking over existing pharmacies are subject to restrictions. A Community arrangement forbidding a wage-earning pharmacist who had obtained his diploma in a Community Member State from taking over an existing pharmacy in another Member State in which he is practising his profession would not be justifiable from the economic, legal or political point of view.

I should like to add in connection with the remarks which have been made in this debate concerning the periods proposed by Mr Prag, that I was grateful to note the points made by Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mr Malangré and Mr Prag concerning the possibility of extending this period if necessary. We will look into this matter again in detail, and if it seems advisable, take your request as an encouragement to extend the period as appropriate.

As regards Mr Sieglerschmidt's observation to the effect that medicines should not be discussed as a purely commercial question, I should like quite simply, without anticipating a future debate, to point out that we are of course aware of this aspect but realize, on the other hand, that it is in the interests of the large number of sick persons for whom science is far from being able to provide satisfactory medicines to establish commercial conditions permitting new medicines of this kind to be developed as swiftly as possible. That is the economic aspect of a efficient supply of pharmaceutical products ...

(Interruption)

... Indeed, but surely an increasing research and development effort must be financed too. This is what I meant when I spoke of the commercial conditions.

This is a Community-level problem. In the long term, it is, I think, incompatible with the Community's commitment to solidarity if, as a result of public price control, pharmaceuticals rank very low in one Member State with a result that the entire research and development costs must be borne by the population and social insurance systems of other Member States as this could easily result in a temptation to undercut one another at the expense of the sick, which is indefensible from the point of view of both public health and Community solidarity. However, this is a subject which the next European Parliament will, I am sure, have to discuss in detail.

Mr President, I should like to thank you for this debate and repeat how grateful we are to the Legal Affairs Committee that it proved possible to deal with this difficult subject during the lifetime of this present Parliament.

IN THE CHAIR : MR LALOR

Vice-President

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

13. *Carriage of goods by road*

President. — The next item is the report by Mrs von Alemann, on behalf of the Committee on Transport (Doc 1-465/83), on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-969/82 — COM(82) 718 final) for a directive amending Directive 65/269/EEC concerning the standardization of certain rules relating to authorization for the carriage of goods by road between Member States.

Mrs von Alemann (L), rapporteur. — (DE) What is the purpose of amending this Directive with the long title? Basically and simply, what we want is the possibility of multilateral authorizations for removals

von Alemann

between Member States. The whole business has been dragging on for years now and one wonders why the question was not settled long ago when one considers that the first Directive on standardization of rules for certain forms of goods transport between Member States was adopted as long ago as 1962 and included two Annexes which are still in force, at least in a slightly modified form.

According to Annex I, certain categories of transport should be exempted of all quotas and authorization requirements while other categories, as specified in Annex II, should also be exempt from quotas but could nevertheless still require authorization. This is what we are concerned with today, since this obligation to apply for authorization and the corresponding form were subsequently laid down in a Directive dating from 1965 which showed what the two different forms required for this authorization should look like.

As I have already mentioned, what we are concerned with is multilateral authorizations for removals, which theoretically speaking would already be possible by virtue of the first Directive. However, in practice authorizations have been almost exclusively bilateral and these bilateral authorizations obviously not only entail substantial administrative work, but also lead to waste of time or the haulage companies settling for major detours under certain circumstances in order to avoid having to go through a country for which they have no authorization.

As one can imagine, this causes problems and with a view to doing something about this situation, the Commission proposed, as long ago as 1980, that all of the categories of transport specified in Annex II of the first Directive of 1962 should be eligible for multilateral authorization. However, the Commission subsequently withdrew this proposal which the European Parliament had adopted under a procedure not involving a report. A new proposal has now been submitted but in this case it does not involve amending the first Directive and taking the categories specified in Annex II of the first Directive, but rather amending the Directive specifying the form involved, i.e. the Directive of 1965.

The whole business is so complicated — as I have unfortunately just had to explain — that I, as rapporteur, was extremely confused in that I wondered right from the outset why under these circumstances no notice was taken of Parliament's views on these two Directives and why they were not amended in such a way as to take the category 'removals' from the one and the authorization form from the other, or to amend the model for the form. However, we have only been consulted on the 1965 Directive so I felt obliged, in view of this somewhat peculiar procedure, to propose to the Committee that in the absence of an amendment to the Directive, i.e. the first Directive of

1962, the whole procedure as I saw it could and under certain circumstances would, have a prejudicial effect on forms of transport other than removals and accordingly I said that this was not on, that the first directive would have to be amended and that we should consequently not follow the Commission's proposal.

I am telling you all this for one reason, namely that it is apparent that sometimes our right hand does not know what the left hand is doing — and this is not funny. The members of the Committee on Transport who are present here this evening will know what I mean but I should nevertheless like to explain once more for the benefit of everyone else. The fact was that the Council in the main took the same or more or less the same view, i.e. that this was the wrong approach with the result that the Council and the Commission, which were in the meantime ready to see eye to eye with each other, came to the conclusion on 7 June of this year that something should finally be done, that they could in fact agree to some extent, but since the European Parliament had not yet been consulted, it should be entered in the minutes that Parliament had not yet been consulted so we should simply issue guidelines. So apparently we have not come to any agreement — but we have!

However, I had in the meantime submitted my proposal to reject the original Commission proposal and was in a rather awkward position, since I had basically dealt with something which the Commission no longer actually upheld. Nor did I learn of this from the Commission itself, I found out from other sources and frankly felt I had been made a bit of a fool of. I then told the Committee that, in my opinion this subject did not warrant a large-scale procedural conflict, I should like to repeat quite simply what I thought on the matter. There is simply no point in having a bust-up with the Commission because of this problem of multilateral authorizations for removals, which are both necessary and important, even though the Commission would have deserved it, since it was not right to let us go on working on a proposal that it had itself withdrawn!

I realize that it is difficult from the procedural point of view, but we should really give some thought as to how we can solve this problem in future. At any rate, we then proceeded as follows. We members who are responsible for transport discussed the matter in an amicable spirit and wondered what to do next. We then proposed what I had originally had in mind, i.e. to amend the first directive by taking removals out of Annex II and making this quite clear once more in the amendment to the 1965 directive, which is what we are really supposed to be deciding about.

I should like to ask you this evening to adopt this somewhat complicated procedure and at the same time urge the Commission to inform us in good time if at all possible whenever a Commission proposal has been withdrawn or is likely to be withdrawn. It is no

von Alemann

fun for the rapporteur, but it has often happened on previous occasions that the Committee on transport has worked on something which was already basically a thing of the past. Secondly, if it should turn out that you have to amend two directives, please give us an opportunity to adopt a position in both cases. Two directives were involved here, one concerning the forms — which I might refer to briefly as the 1965 directive — and the original directive, which we were never consulted on!

That is all I wanted to say. I hope it was not too complicated. We regard multilateral authorization for removals a very sensible idea and that is the main point I wanted to make. We find it an excellent idea but we also feel that if all forms of transport are to be totally exempted of the obligation to obtain authorization this will call for substantial efforts of harmonization which, I hope, we will hear about in future.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

Mr Lalor (DEP). — My purpose in asking to speak at this stage on this particular resolution — in view of the fact that it has specifically to do with a directive on the carriage of goods by road between Member States — is to ask the Commissioner, when dealing with this resolution and the directive, to set my mind at rest with regard to representations that have been made to me over the last few years by our showmen and our circus people — the people who entertain us and have to travel around a lot from country to country and are running into great difficulties with the regulations on transport and, of course, excise and duties, though here we are dealing with transport. Given Mrs von Alemann's resolution and the Commission directive, is the transport operation of our showmen and our circuses going to be made any easier and are facilities going to be provided which would enable those people to move from place to place and from State to State a little more easily than they have been allowed to up to now? I hope that the Commission can enlighten me in this regard and that when dealing with the resolution the Commissioner may be able to elucidate some points there.

Mr Buttafuoco (NI). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, Mrs von Alemann, whose remarks and criticism I endorse regarding the failure of the Commission to provide certain information, is submitting to the Parliament for approval today a report on the proposal from the Commission amending the Council Directive on the standardization of certain rules relating to authorizations for the carriage of goods by road between Member States.

The carriage of goods by road is a fundamental problem in the transport sector. We dealt with it to some extent last year with a report, for which I was responsible, on the carriage of goods by road through third countries, which was approved unanimously by the Committee and then by the Parliament. This illustrates the interest which the subject arouses, and the ambition we all share to develop a truly common transport policy.

In view of the favourable opinion of the Commission, Mrs von Alemann recommends that carriage by road should not be subject to any Community quota system and may be carried out on the basis of multilateral authorizations.

Both authorizations relating to removals between Member States and removals in transit through the territory of Member States must abide by this recommendation.

We should also point out that removals by road do not compete with other modes of transport; to the contrary, they streamline administrative procedures and facilitate free exchange.

The report also calls for the introduction of multilateral authorizations for the carriage of other goods by road.

Along with the others in my Group, I intend voting in favour of this motion and hope that what was agreed to in principle by the Council will be approved by this Parliament, so that quite apart from the technical advantages, this leads to some genuine liberalization in the sector.

Mr Eisma (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, I am greatly alarmed when I see what great effort was expended to get 18 different types of transport totally liberalized over a period of 20 years. What an incredible amount of detailed work must lie behind this inching forward step by step towards a liberalized European transport policy!

In 1980 the Commission tried to get a proposal through the Council to liberalize four types of transport which are no longer restricted by quotas, but which are still subject to authorization. However, the Commission did not succeed.

We must fervently hope today the mini step forwards that has now been determined will find favour with the Council. It will be clear that we support the Commission's proposal along with the rapporteur. The multilateral document for removals is simultaneously a transit document, something which is both beneficial and important for this type of transport. We trust that this priority for removals will not stand in the way of further simplifications, especially for the type of transport that is no longer subject to quotas.

Eisma

Mr President, with reference to this matter, we are interested to know what the Council and the Commission are going to do with the Dutch memorandum on the EEC transport policy. The adoption of this Dutch memorandum, which has been with the Council for some time now, would signal a great step forward and would relieve Parliament of having to discuss these minimal proposals.

We once calculated that, at the present speed, it would take until the year 2130 before all the implementing directives against water pollution would come into effect. How long do the Commission and the Council think it will take before European transport is liberalized?

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) Mr President, you are aware that I am standing in this evening for my colleague, Mr Kontogeorgis, so that I can be somewhat more impartial in giving my views on this evening's specific example of the tragedy of transport policy in mini-steps and in noting the enormous political leeway still to be made up in integrating this sector. We are therefore all the more grateful for the patience of the rapporteur and for her ability to plough through these procedures, as well as for the patience and the stubbornness of the members of the Committee on Transport, because this really is laborious policy-making.

I would therefore very much like to make it clear that it is not the Commission which is responsible for the delays and for these mini-steps — that is the sole responsibility of the Council of Ministers. I know of no analysis of the weaknesses of European transport policy which does not give the hairsplitting of the Council of Ministers as the real reason for the missing or slow progress.

Having said that I can be brief. As far as I can see, all the speakers agree with the Commission on the substance. The aim of our proposal is to facilitate the organization and handling of international removals by road by introducing a multilateral authorization which entitles the holder to carry out such removals between all Member States of the Community. Although this kind of carriage was liberalized under the 1962 Directive, i.e. no longer subject to the existing quotas, it has remained subject to authorization. Up till now, however, these authorizations have in practice had to be applied for and issued bilaterally for each individual transport. In future, a single authorization will be issued by the authorities of the carrier's own country, and this will be sufficient.

Mr President, as regards the technical solution, the opinion of the Committee on Transport does not quite follow the Commission's proposal. It is more in line with the arrangement the Council of Ministers is toying with in that, like the Council, Parliament would like all the regulations governing removals by

road incorporated into one single directive — i.e. not only this proposed introduction of a multilateral authorization but also the exemptions from all quotas laid down for removals in another directive in 1962. The main thing is that both ways lead to the same goal, that of making cross-frontier removals within the Community easier and more profitable. That is the deciding factor, and that is why the Commission has no difficulty in accepting the changes proposed by the Committee on Transport.

Mr Lalor raised the question of the legal position of showmen's transports. In this context I would draw his attention to paragraph 6 of Annex II to the First Directive, which provides for total exemption. I quote:

Carriage of material, properties and animals to or from theatrical, musical or film performances or sporting events, circuses, exhibitions or fairs, or to or from the making of radio or television broadcasts or films.

I think this general exemption covers all the fears raised and that you can therefore give your correspondents a satisfactory assurance.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

14. Telephone calls

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-502/83) by Mr Marshall, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the introduction of reduced rates at weekends, on official holidays and after 8 p.m. for intra-Community telephone calls.

Mr Marshall (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, I should like first of all to congratulate Mrs Théobald-Paoli, whose motion was the cause of this report's being written and who has been indirectly responsible for this modest measure, which I hope will help to bring Community citizens closer together.

I am particularly pleased at being appointed the rapporteur on this motion for two reasons. The first is that a large number of my constituents work in one of the most modern telephone factories in the world — STC, at New Southgate. Having recently visited that factory and seen the revolution in production that has been undertaken there, I find it is clear that the revolution in the role of telecommunications is only beginning and that we are going to see many major changes in the future. But I believe that if we are going to enjoy those major changes, as we say in the explanatory statement, we must have a liberal policy in respect of telecommunications throughout the Community. It is terribly important that all the State monopolies liberalize their purchasing policies in the way envisaged in the telecommunications bill currently going through the House of Commons.

Marshall

The second reason why I am pleased to be making this report is that it is a field where there has already been a measure of progress toward what we are seeking in this resolution in what is already common practice in France, Italy, Germany and the United Kingdom. We are sometimes told in my country that we are not as *Communautaire* as others would like us to be. I would point out that in this respect the United Kingdom has moved ahead of six other Member States of the Community. Moreover, what is asked is in line with the opinion of the International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee in their report of 1977. It is surely an anomalous situation that when Parliament is in session in Strasbourg we could, after this debate, go out and phone our wives and get concessionary rates because we are in France; but if we were at a committee meeting in Brussels and went out to do the self-same thing, there would be no such concession for intra-Community calls. It is surely strange that Luxembourg, the centre of many of our European institutions, does not give the same concessions as France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom.

There is no doubt that the telephone is an important means of enabling people to keep in touch with each other, with their relations and with their friends. In the nineteenth century, our great leaders wrote letters, and you can read the letters subsequently published as books. Nowadays, perhaps, we are too lazy, or the television distracts us at times when we could be writing and we now talk — in fact, listening to some Members in this House, one may think we talk at great length. We are now a talking people, and therefore it is the telephone to which we look as a means of keeping in touch.

If we were to have a Community concession scheme so that all intra-Community calls at off-peak times were at a concessionary rate, it would encourage more Community citizens to speak to each other and it would get rid of those anomalies which niggle people. Why should they get a benefit in one country and not in another? Therefore I hope that when we vote on this tomorrow, the House will be unanimous.

The amendment that has been put before us does, I think, go slightly too far. The author of the amendment and I have had a fruitful discussion and I think we shall, tomorrow, be able to reach an accord. I hope, too, that the Commission will support this resolution and that we shall get action from those six Member States who unfortunately do not grant this concession yet.

(Applause)

Mr Moorhouse (ED). — Mr President, may I first compliment my colleague, Mr Marshall, on what I consider to be a very useful report and also on his down-to-earth speech. Together with the original ini-

ator of the report, he has highlighted an important issue, telecommunications, which I do believe needs closer attention from Members of this House in the coming months and years and, indeed, by the Community as a whole.

The point, as Mr Marshall has said, is that the telephone system within the Community is essentially State-controlled. It tends to become a State within a State and almost a law unto itself, and therefore almost impervious to consumer pressures. For this reason, while we certainly support Mr Marshall's proposal favouring reduced intra-Community telephone charges at off-peak periods — the weekends, official holidays and after 8 p.m., and especially in Brussels and Luxembourg — we will also support the bulk of Mr Rogalla's amendment calling for a Commission regulation or directive. Otherwise, I fear, we may not get much of a response from the telephone authorities, unless, of course, Member States are prepared to follow the excellent example of the United Kingdom and privatize the telephone system, an approach which is already doing wonders for the telephone user in the United Kingdom.

Mr President, we beg to support the report and the motion for a resolution.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — *(DE)* I should like to start by once again thanking the rapporteur and Mrs Théobald-Paoli for this move and for presenting this major question to the house for a vote so that it can — we hope — be approved unanimously tomorrow, which will give the matter the necessary political weight.

We have for some time now been aware of, and concerned at, the problem of the differences in telecommunications tariffs between the Member States, with particular reference to telephone calls and data transmission. The Commission's view is that harmonizing certain tariffs, particularly for telephone calls — as the most important telecommunications service — and for the new telematics services, is of major importance for the creation of an efficient telecommunications infrastructure in keeping with the size of the Community. I say this because our comprehensive proposals on telematics are known to the House, and these show that we should like to have the whole problem settled as consistently as possible and as soon as possible with a view to achieving an integrated European telematics infrastructure.

The Commission is aware of the complexity and difficulty of the problem, but it feels that progress can already be made in some sectors, and it notes with satisfaction that progress has in fact already been made here and there. This is particularly true of telephone traffic, where the Member States mentioned in the report by the Committee on Transport are applying the domestic reduced rates to calls abroad at night, at weekends and on national holidays.

Narjes

These countries have already taken similar measures with regard to other countries outside the Community. The Commission regards the extension of the existing tariff systems — with the reduced rates for calls at night, at weekends and on national holidays — to all telephone traffic within the Community as being of major importance, since this would be seen by people as a visible sign of increasing integration. Seen in this light, it would even be a good thing if decisions could be reached before the European elections, so as to show that European politics has the interests of the people at heart.

For this reason the Commission very much regrets that not all Member States have yet introduced these tariffs. Changing the complicated tariff structure in the field of telecommunications is a difficult business. Despite the fact that recommendations for harmonization of telephone rates in international traffic have been available for years now from the International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee, their successful implementation requires repeated political pressure at both national and international level.

We welcome the move by the Committee on Transport in tabling this motion for a resolution and we would welcome its unanimous — as I said before — approval, so that this resolution can help us in exerting renewed political pressure on the Council of Ministers and the national governments.

I have reservations about accepting Mr Rogalla's amendment at this stage. His motion contains one difficult legal problem, namely the question of whether we are empowered to influence the tariff structure and the pricing powers of the Member States by means of a directive. I would agree, however, to have this matter subjected to a detailed legal examination, so that we can establish whether this instrument might achieve results which we cannot achieve through our efforts at persuasion, political declarations of intent and consensus.

I should therefore be grateful if we could approve this motion tomorrow with the greatest possible majority.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

15. Status of the mobile trades

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-462/83) by Mr Deleau, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the status of the mobile trades.

Mr Deleau (DEP), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, I am introducing a motion for a resolution from the DEP Group this

evening on the status of the mobile trades whose representatives are here in the gallery and whom I take this opportunity of welcoming.

The mobile trades are a very significant and worthwhile sector of the community, providing valuable local services to the consumer. These tradesmen know Europe like the palm of their hands. They are always crossing its internal frontiers and they are particularly familiar with the various State administrations, whose many rules and regulations affect their livelihoods. There is still no real internal market and annoying frontier formalities continue to exist, added to what are sometimes discriminatory national regulations. It is therefore a good thing that we should be considering their situation and looking at solutions. That is the aim of this report and of the motion for a resolution.

Mobile tradesmen play an undeniable economic and social role. According to statistics, 27 to 30 % of housewives shop at public markets and 30 % of distributed goods are sold by them, particularly in rural and mountain regions. From this point of view, their role is almost equivalent to that of a public service. Some of them also play a social and cultural role since they include people working in travelling shows, fairgrounds and circuses, travelling from town to town and bringing with them, particularly to country areas, an atmosphere of jollity and entertainment and, where needed, a bit of joy to the lives of our fellow citizens. They liven up the public market squares of our villages, which would lose some of their character without them.

These tradesmen are facing difficulties arising from the changes in modern society, which, in the name of efficiency and rationalization, all too often puts a ban on itinerant trades, forces mobile tradesmen to the margin of society and subjects them to formalities which are often discriminatory.

Lastly, like the SMUs, mobile tradesmen are ignored by the Community, which should undertake to provide them with better legal and economic status than at present. In Item 3 of the motion for a resolution, we call on the Commission to examine the legal status of mobile tradesmen within the Community to ensure genuine freedom of movement for them, unhampered by interference and discrimination. The Commission could no doubt also continue the work it has hesitantly undertaken towards harmonization in this field following the directive approved by the Council in June 1975. In this respect, we repeat and stress the benefit that the introduction of a European passport, a European driving licence and some recognized economic status would bring to these categories of tradesmen.

We considered it necessary, as shown by Item 4 of the motion for a resolution, to take steps to harmonize the conditions under which these tradesmen compete,

Deleau

improve their situation in respect of taxation and financing, promote vocational training and safeguard their places of work. Equality of conditions under which mobile tradesmen compete with each other and against non-mobile tradesmen implies a certain number of measures, particularly with regard to access to markets, which differs from one State to the next. The introduction of a register of fairs and markets open, without discrimination, to itinerant tradesmen seems vital. Similarly, it would seem advisable to make it compulsory for traders to obtain a licence valid throughout the Community, to preclude discrimination and control non-regulated markets more satisfactorily.

The need to improve financing goes without saying. We need only pay heed to the representatives of small and medium-sized undertakings, who are faced with serious difficulties in obtaining the finance they require. Mobile tradesmen are no exception. On the contrary, I would say that, on account of the itinerant nature of their work, their predicament is even worse. Steps to improve their access to finance must be considered. Similarly, we recommend harmonization to enable travelling show people to benefit from the lower rate of VAT already applied in most Member States in view of the cultural nature of their activities. This is how the fifth indent of paragraph 4 of the motion for a resolution should be understood.

However, improving the economic status of itinerant tradesmen also implies improving vocational training and safeguarding markets and places of work. Market places are all too often ignored in modern town planning, which prefers totally anonymous department stores to such traditional sites.

Lastly, a report should be as comprehensive as possible, and it would have been a mistake to ignore one recent development in the mobile trades and not review direct selling very briefly here — hence Item 5 of the motion for a resolution. Direct selling, which is often carried out by major companies and not by self-employed tradesmen, is a modern form of mobile trade. It has been enormously successful with certain categories of products, such as household appliances, beauty care products and books, and it has considerable advantages for the consumer since it saves him time and allows him to consider his decision.

Nevertheless, the main problem in this respect is to harmonize the conditions governing direct selling whilst providing the consumer with the greatest possible degree of protection. That is why the Council should approve without further delay the proposal for a directive to protect the consumer in respect of contracts which have been negotiated away from business premises — one which Parliament already approved — in order to promote the equality of conditions for competition for direct selling companies which have already undertaken to respect the right of the customer to consider his decision and cancel

orders. I have the latest report of the European Direct Selling Federation before me, and it appears that the number of complaints from customers to purchasing goods by direct selling is extremely small and those affected have obtained satisfaction in all cases.

Mr President, I am now coming to my conclusion. There can be no doubt that in 1983 — the year of the SMU and Craft Industry — mobile tradesmen, travelling showmen and all those professional groups, whose vital economic, social and cultural function we have reviewed in turn, appreciate the view taken by the European Parliament and hope that this report will enable them to have the same rights and obligations as regards taxation and in the social and professional fields as non-itinerant tradesmen on all markets throughout the Community. Ladies and gentlemen, I hope you will back this report and this motion for a resolution which received the practically unanimous approval of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) The Commission is grateful to Parliament, and particularly to Mr Deleau for his motion for a resolution and his thorough report, which are of special importance in the year of the SMU and the Craft Industry. No category of tradesmen should be neglected, and the mobile trades have a right to benefit fully from the advantages of the common market and to be taken into account in the development of the internal market.

At the Commission's proposal the Community has already adopted a number of measures to help the mobile trades. There was a directive in 1964, another in 1975, and there were the directives harmonizing the quality of products. I would remind you that the provisions of Article 52 of the EEC Treaty, concerning freedom of establishment, are held to be directly applicable by the Court of Justice and can therefore be appealed to by individuals in cases before the competent national courts. The Commission is also ready to propose further measures as soon as this appears necessary.

We have a choice of two procedures. Firstly, there is the creation of a uniform European legal status for all mobile tradesmen. If I have understood it correctly, this is the approach preferred by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that such a general ruling to facilitate the cross-frontier activities of the mobile trades may have consequences which are not always desirable for the other trades. We may have to look into whether the number of cross-frontier mobile traders is large enough to justify a measure which would not be welcomed by trade as a whole. It is a matter of weighing the interests carefully and then justifying any decision.

Narjes

The second possibility is to recognize that the national rules governing the activities of the mobile traders at present are on the whole satisfactory, but that there is a need for supplementary measures to do away with those obstacles still hindering the cross-frontier activities of the mobile traders. Before the Commission finally decides on one or other of these two methods, it will have to acquire a much better knowledge of this branch of economic activity, so that it can reach an objective decision and work out proposals. There are already contacts between the Commission and the Presidents and General Secretaries of the relevant European professional bodies.

The rapporteur raised a number of specific points, and I should like to comment on them. Directive 80/1263 of 4 December 1980, concerning the European driving licence, came into force at the beginning of this year. As regards the length of mobile traders' vehicles, this is normally exceptional and much greater than the size of vehicles normally used for goods transport. The Commission is therefore making efforts to have adopted the directive on weights and measures which has been before the Council for years now for a decision. It is quite aware of the problems of itinerant traders and proposes that the simplified procedures currently applied in some Member States such as the United Kingdom, Belgium and the Netherlands, could also be introduced in other Member States, for instance France.

In questions concerning the approximation of conditions of competition it is the national authorities which are competent, and it is not for the Commission to take any steps in this field — unless there is discrimination between domestic and foreign members of this trade, when it would naturally be obliged to take the necessary measures.

In fiscal matters harmonization currently extends only to the structures and the basis of assessment for certain major taxes. There is thus no comprehensive harmonization of taxes, and this will not be possible until integration as a whole has made more progress. The rate of value-added tax is a matter for the national governments, and the Commission has no plans to propose harmonization of the VAT rates for any particular branch of the economy.

As regards financial aid for undertakings in this sector in the form of interest rebates, you will be aware that our scope is of course limited. The only possibility at present is conversion loans from the ECSC, which are available to small and medium-sized undertakings as comprehensive loans with an interest rebate of 5% as from 13 July 1983. Moreover, these loans are restricted to the ECSC conversion regions and are dependent on the creation of several workplaces for

former iron and steel workers. On the whole, therefore, this is an instrument with an extremely limited field of application in practice.

The Commission is also aware of the opportunities available for the education and vocational training of the children of mobile traders and other itinerant population groups such as bargees, fairground workers, etc. Up till now, only a start has been made on solving these problems. These population groups play an important economic role which should justify their children being given more equality of opportunity than is currently the case in practice. The investigation proposed by Mrs Viehoff would therefore be not only worth while, but also essential, since it would undoubtedly have an economic and social dimension, and the Commission intends to initiate this study as soon as possible.

Nor are there any grounds for pessimism, since the Member States, having been convinced by these arguments, have decided to introduce a passport of uniform design as from 1 January 1985. This should make crossing the border easier for mobile traders. I would also point out that a draft decision transmitted from the Commission to the Council of Ministers in July 1982, and concerning the easing of intra-Community border checks, should bring progress. In the question of maintaining jobs for itinerant traders at markets, the Commission intends to keep drawing attention to this problem in its regular contacts in the context of town planning and the environment.

Finally, you raised the question of direct selling. The Commission notes with satisfaction that the European Parliament has renewed its call to the Council of Ministers to adopt the draft directive on direct selling. In our view the discussions within the Council have produced a broad consensus on this proposal. However, the Commission is aware that the legislation of all Member States contains provisions forbidding the direct selling of certain products or services. These national systems — which are partly the result of the differing weather conditions in the Community — will not be affected by the draft directive in question. The Commission is prepared, once the draft directive on direct selling has been adopted, to investigate whether there is any point in proposing harmonization of the legislation.

Finally, I would point out that the selling of products or services to individual consumers by mobile traders also raises problems involving guarantees and after-sales service. I hope you appreciated my going into detail on your questions, since I feel that this profession is so seldom the subject of a parliamentary debate and deserves intensive discussion of its individual problems.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

16. *Beef, veal and buffalo meat imports*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-451/83) by Mr Seal, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on

the proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-228/83 — COM(83) 152 final) for

- I. a Regulation on a Community tariff quota for imports of high quality fresh, chilled or frozen beef and veal falling within subheadings 02.01 A II (a) and 02.01 A II (b) of the Common Customs Tariff;
- II. a Regulation on a Community tariff quota for imports of frozen buffalo meat falling within subheading 02.01 A II (b) 4 (bb) 33 of the Common Customs Tariff.

Mr Enright (S), deputy rapporteur. — Mr President, it is delightful to be under your presidency again. I hope you will tell your *alter ego* what you said earlier today so that he can correct his errors. However, on behalf of Mr Seal, I refer to the written text and to Amendment No 1, by Mr Diana.

Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group, which is slightly different from speaking on behalf of the rapporteur, I should like to stress most strongly, from a development angle, that we are concerned that this report has even come before Parliament. There is no reason whatsoever why it should do so, because the agreements contained here are part of a general agreement on trade and tariffs which has been negotiated by the Commission, on behalf of the Community, and it is therefore absurd that we should consider this topic again and bring in a report upon it.

I will grant you that a large part of the buffalo meat that we are talking about comes from Australia. But a large part of the pressure on the export of buffalo and other meat can only be understood in the light of Sir Fred Catherwood's excellent report on the common agricultural policy — and it is not often that I praise him — and the report earlier today by Mr Irmer on the new Lomé III agreement — except that I hope it is not going to be Lomé III, I hope it will be a new initiative and a new name. Those reports oppose the attempt by some people in this Parliament to change our committed agreements. That attempt is a disgrace. It destabilizes international markets and a destabilization of international markets does not affect Australia, which, perhaps, some people are trying to attack, but does affect very strongly the least-developed countries, whose basic products are the price of entry into the European Community and therefore our price for export to them. They sell these basic commodities to us. They therefore have money which they can spend on our so-called more sophisticated products.

Therefore, I am very worried about this happening and I hope that Parliament will unanimously adopt the report and ignore my very good friend, Mr Diana, who has tabled an amendment. It is very nice to have Mr Buffalo Bill Diana table an amendment and the mozzarella that he produces from his buffaloes is superb. Nevertheless, the doubt that he casts on his report is not acceptable to this Parliament and should not be passed in any way whatsoever. If we are going to talk about, for instance, Zimbabwe, then we should be talking about the stability of its exports, so that it can have a stable home situation. That is very important in this report.

I appeal to Parliament to adopt it unanimously, and I am sure that my comrade, Mr Eyraud, is going to back me in absolutely everything that I have said, to show that we have solidarity between the Socialists of France and the Socialists of the United Kingdom. Indeed, looking at Sir Fred's report we also undoubtedly enjoy the solidarity of the Conservatives of the United Kingdom too.

President. — Mr Enright, I do not think there is any need to insist that there is sometimes no difference between the British and French Socialists.

(Laughter)

Mr Eyraud (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, there are indeed very few differences between the British and French Socialists, as you will observe once you have heard the remarks I have to make on Mr Seal's report. The proposals for a regulation which have been submitted to this House for approval involve the same quotas for 1984 as for 1983, that is 29 800 tonnes of beef and 2 250 tonnes of frozen buffalo meat. The Council of Ministers approved these two proposals on 11 July 1983. They arise from tariff concessions, agreed under the 'Tokyo Round', of 21 000 tonnes of 'Hilton beef' and 2 250 tonnes of buffalo meat.

I would nevertheless like to point out to Mr Enright that, following the accession of Greece to the EEC, negotiations were entered into with certain countries which were obviously affected by the application of the Common Customs Tariff, in accordance with Article 26 of GATT. Whereas the initial request of the countries concerned — Argentina and Uruguay — amounted to 30 000 tonnes of frozen meat, the Commission offered an additional quota of 8 900 tonnes of 'Hilton beef' a product which competes less directly with Community beef. From this point of view, and in view of these negotiations, maintenance of the two proposed regulations is quite simply an international obligation on the part of the Community.

Nevertheless, I would like to make two comments on this subject. As far as I am concerned, this is another

Eyraud

example of the Community's having to 'pay' for Greece's accession while the granting of credit is contested by the United States. GATT would thus be a one-way street if Community were to give in all the time, and that is why, Mr President I sometimes say things for which I have at times been called a hard-liner, on foreign trade policy with the United States and certain third countries.

Secondly, the cost of this concession may be estimated at a loss of 70 million ECU to the Community. However, the French Socialists will be very happy to approve the Commission's approvals, as a conciliatory measure and as a contribution towards helping products from developing countries.

We would like though to make a final remark to the effect that it is worth while encouraging the production of buffalo meat, particularly in certain underprivileged regions in the Community, which this would help to develop.

Lastly, I would like to say that these proposals perhaps go part — a very small part — of the way towards solving the problem or an increasing food shortfall which is the main reason for imports of beef.

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — (FR) In view of the commitments entered into by the Community under GATT, the Commission asks Parliament to reject the amendments by Mr Diana and to adopt the report by Mr Seal as it stands.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

17. Noise emitted by household appliances

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-495/83) by Mrs Krouwel-Vlam, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-995/81 — COM(81) 811 final) for a directive concerning airborne noise emitted by household appliances.

Mrs Krouwel-Vlam (S), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President this proposal for a directive from the Council is designed to achieve harmonization in the fight against noise with a view to improving the quality of living conditions. This directive concerns specifically noise produced by household appliances. Within this framework directive more detailed implementing directives would be drawn up for various types of household appliances. With this end in mind draft standards for measurement procedures are indicated in Annex 1. The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection wholeheartedly supports the efforts to reduce noise. This is also entirely in agree-

ment with the contents of the second environmental action programme that was accepted by this Parliament. Moreover, some Member States are preparing legislation along lines similar to this directive. A harmonizing directive is essential to avoid barriers to trade. Of course there are many sources of noise that are often more irritating. This happens particularly in the case of outside noises, for example, traffic noise, recreational noise, industrial noise, not to mention the loud noise from various types of construction machinery.

Social behaviour is also the cause of the noise, as in the case of loud radios, parties outside and lawnmowers at the weekend. But it cannot be denied that the noise level of various household appliances is also very important for the consumer. Washing machines and dishwashers are switched on late at night in many households, especially in those areas where there is cheap electricity at night. In the silence of the night noise is more noticeable than during the day with all the noise outside.

The consumer does not place this type of noise very high on the environmental action programme's list of priorities. When purchasing household appliances the consumer does not pay particular attention to the noise level. He does, however, pay special attention to the energy consumption of the machine. After all, this affects his pocket much more. At what point does noise become a nuisance? A spin dryer, for instance, makes an annoying sound at a level of about 65 decibels. But a conversation between two people is 60 decibels and yet it is something we all enjoy and do not regard as annoying.

The Commission on Economic and Monetary Affairs wonders whether this draft directive on protection against noise is intended to help the neighbour of the consumer. This is a cheap argument because the consumer is also somebody else's neighbour. This Committee thus also rejects the draft directive, with other less weighty grounds as well. As rapporteur I will therefore be voting against all Mr Beazley's amendments, because these are in conflict with the views of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, and I sincerely hope that Parliament will do the same. The Economic and Social Committee has, I am glad to say, come out unanimously in favour. This proposal puts into effect part of the environmental programme. moreover, this proposal is of great significance from the point of view of a consumer policy that is directed at protecting and informing the consumer.

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection believes that efforts to lower noise levels should be encouraged, even if the noise levels of the household appliances referred to represent a relatively small problem compared to that of general noise. At least it is a step in the right direc-

Krouwel-Vlam

tion, and we hope that more steps will be taken soon in this direction.

Mr Ghergo (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, proposals of the sort before us are open to criticism from many sides to the effect that there is no real justification for the introduction of Community legislation.

Thus when the need for protection against irritating noise is mooted, noise pollution produced by household appliances is not the first to come to mind. In other words, one assumes that what is meant is noise at places of work or produced by motor-cars and aeroplanes. Apart from the level of the noise and who exactly is to be protected (people using the appliances or their neighbours), one may indeed echo the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs in its opinion on this proposal for a directive and say that

noise emission at a satisfactory low level and of an acceptable character is a normal sales requirement of household appliances

and

it is not necessary to compel the producer to publish the noise level.

Having stated this, I consider nevertheless that the proposal for a directive should be approved as part of the implementation of the principles according to which all possible information should be made available to the consumer.

The original wording of the proposal from the Commission actually went much further insofar as it made provision for Member States to suspend the marketing of appliances where it was found that the noise level indicated was higher than that determined following a check.

A provision of this sort could certainly create barriers to trade, particularly in the wake of the numerous legal disputes which would arise.

It should be borne in mind that measurement methods are not completely reliable in view of their technical complexity and the findings are not easily reproducible, so it is easy to foresee disputes hampering trade. One may also add that no provision concerning any obligation to indicate energy absorption levels on appliances for sanctions of this sort is made in the proposal for a directive and certainly no one can claim that noise is a more important consideration than energy consumption. Consequently, Amendment No 1, tabled by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, deleting the second indent of Article 7 of the proposal for a directive, which makes provision for this possibility, is very appropriate.

Furthermore, Mrs Schleicher and myself have put forward Amendment No 9 calling for the deletion of Annex 1, which lays down criteria and technical procedures for noise measurement.

When the Commission drew up the proposal for a directive, the European Committee on Electrotechnical Standardization had not completed its work on the harmonization of the aforesaid criteria. These criteria have now been defined in Document HD 423-1, and Annex 1 may thus conveniently be replaced. Lastly, we are against all the other amendments submitted.

To conclude, my group is in favour of Mrs Krouwel-Vlam's report and the proposal for a directive as amended which I have had the honour of introducing.

Mr Beazley (ED), draftsman of an opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. —

Mr President, speaking on behalf of my group, and as draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, the first point I wish to make is that although the substance of this proposed directive concerns airborne noise emitted by household appliances, the reason why it was written was an attempt on the part of the Commission to avoid the setting up of a technical barrier to trade. In January 1975, the French Government informed the Commission that it intended to adopt an administrative provision to limit noise from electrical household appliances and, in August 1977, to take special measures to deal with dishwashers and washing machines. Meanwhile, different noise legislation was being formulated in France, Germany and Holland, and the proposal of the Commission to issue European-wide legislation sufficed to delay or stop national legislation. This was a good thing.

This Commission proposal was first considered in the special subcommittee of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs handling technical barriers to trade. After detailed discussion in the special subcommittee of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs handling technical barriers to trade. After detailed discussion in the presence of the responsible Commission representative, that subcommittee firmly rejected the desirability of this proposed legislation. The grounds were, firstly, that whilst differing national legislation might well form the basis of a technical trade barrier, the grounds on which it was based the noise level of household appliances was totally unjustified.

Secondly, whilst there had been some consumer reaction to the noise levels in France, this was certainly not general. In fact, there were contrary views elsewhere where ladies were stated to enjoy the sound of their vacuum cleaners!

Beazley

Thirdly, evidence taken before the British House of Lords European Communities Committee from officials of the Commission confirmed that 'no comprehensive evidence of the nuisance caused by domestic appliances has been found, although the French Government had apparently given notice of it.' The British Department of Industry in the same enquiry stated: 'What troubles us in this country is that we can see no justification for the initiative' and 'the evidence in the UK would indicate that the French, if their evidence is the same as ours, have very few grounds, environmental or any other noise grounds to draft this legislation.'

Fourthly, statements from the Trade Association showed that there is very little evidence of problems caused by noise from domestic appliances. In one study, 84 % of housewives were indifferent to such noise. Both the technical barrier subcommittee and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs itself consider that the noise level of household machines was a competitive sales point and that market forces would take care of the problem and remove any necessity for legislation.

Fifthly, the committee considered that particularly as Cenelec, the Community's electrical standards bureau, was in an advanced stage of producing its own standard, which has now appeared, it was most undesirable for the Commission to produce 32 pages of an annex detailing in the most complex way methods of determining airborne noise emitted by household appliances.

Thus, the parliamentary committees consider this to be illustrative of the sort of work which gives us the bad name with the public and with the media which, I hasten to say, should not be the case with the majority of the excellent work which the Commission does.

My six amendments, which I strongly recommend to this House, are intended to delete irrelevant paragraphs — and some of them are quite irrelevant to the heading of the directive — and to point out why total rejection of this directive is proposed.

Finally, since 1975, when this proposal started, I believe that we have seen many other cases where protection of national industries has been cloaked behind all manner of well-sounding environmental and other causes. Housewives are the best buyers of all, the best informed and the most selective. They will reject noisy household instruments without all the labelling and testing proposed. There is an abundant supply of excellent and highly competitive products and no chance of any manufacturer forcing a housewife to buy any unsuitable machine. Let the Commis-

sion accept the Cenelec standard and the trade will not only respect it, but beat it by miles. May the Commission just ensure that free competition in household appliances throughout the Community is not blocked by State intervention. Should it be worried about noise in high-rise buildings, let it impose controls on the volume buttons of radios, let it prohibit children practising scales on the piano and brass band cornet players playing the Hallelujah Chorus. May it perhaps issue labels to snoring husbands and prevent them awaking their *tüchtige Hausfrauen* who love the sound of their vacuum cleaners.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) The Commission would first of all like to thank the rapporteur and Mr Ghergo for speaking in favour of the Commission's proposals, and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection for its excellent report. It agrees with the committee that the fight against noise, particularly noise emitted by household appliances, must be continued, and that technical barriers to trade in this sector must be removed.

After listening to Mr Beazley I fail to understand how the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs — which should in fact be the guardian of the internal market — can arrive at an unfavourable opinion. As I see it, the opposite should be the case, since you quite rightly say that we must apply Article 100 in order to remove barriers to trade. The instrument for implementing Article 100 is a directive, and that is precisely what we are proposing. I think that once you have listened to me you will find that we want to achieve the same objective and that there is no course available to us other than the one we have proposed. I will come back to that.

The proposal for a framework directive before you does not lay down limits for noise emissions, but provides for the harmonized publication of objective data on noise emissions from household appliances. This is to enable the purchaser or user to have the knowledge necessary to make a reasoned choice, while at the same time reducing noise emission by lowering the noise level in his environment. This will aid market transparency. Contrary to your experience, I can tell you for my part that we have in Germany what is called the *Stiftung Warentest*. This foundation, through its magazine with a circulation of almost 500 000 — it may be even higher now — has the important task of providing these very housewives and other purchasers of household appliances with reliable and verifiable data on noise emission, power consumption, technical suitability of the design, etc., because the external appearance of a device no longer provides

Narjes

any indication of the technical quality of the motors or other components. The purchaser needs help and information from experts if there is to be the market transparency he requires to make an intelligent choice — and both of us want him to do that, Mr Beazley, in the interests of competition and equality of chances.

With reference to paragraph 6 of your motion for a resolution, the proposal for a directive also aims to combine the information on the noise level with that on the energy consumption. In response to paragraph 4 of your motion, the Commission will ensure that the implementing directives take account of your wish to provide the consumer with clear and full information.

As far as the field of application is concerned, the Commission's view is that, in view of the wide variety of household appliances on the market, an adequately framed definition of household appliances is to be preferred to a positive list, although this could also be considered. This proposal is for a framework directive. The first directives implementing this proposed framework directive will relate to electrical household appliances whose launch might be jeopardized by regulations and standards currently being drawn up in the Member States. I am thinking in particular of France, the Federal Republic and The Netherlands, where such measures are planned.

The Commission notes that the principal committee rejects the negative attitude of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. The Commission regards its directive as essential in view of the fact that the Member States I have just mentioned have introduced national measures and are intending to do so with a view to making manufacturers lower the level of noise emissions from electrical appliances. These national regulations will lead to technical barriers to trade, and the Commission therefore feels that the application of Article 100 is inevitable.

The Commission is very glad that Mrs Schleicher and Mr Ghergo have tabled an amendment replacing Annex I of the proposed directive with a binding reference to the harmonization document HD 423/1 produced by the European Electrotechnical Standardization Committee. This is totally in line with the Commission's approach of keeping its proposals as simple as possible. In the field of standardization this means referring to existing standards as often as possible. As I see, this is also in line with Mr Beazley's approach.

The same is true for Annex 2. I would point out to the House that, in the context of Annex 2, an international committee for electrotechnical standardization is drawing up appropriate standards. Once this work

has produced generally acceptable results, the Commission will propose that Annex 2 — if things have got that far — also be replaced by a binding reference to the international standard. This means, Mr Beazley, that both annexes will then be replaced by standards, and that it will then have been possible to do away with what you call a long list of unpopular measures, since the standardization bodies will have been forced to take action in view of the threat to publish this list. That is the political significance of what we intended to do.

The Commission was greatly interested in Mr Ghergo's amendment proposing that Article 7 (2) of our proposal be deleted. This article can be regarded as a sort of protective clause. It enables the Member States to suspend the marketing of domestic appliances if a check shows that the data on the noise level were inaccurate. In view of the misuse of such a clause and the possible negative consequences, the Commission would be prepared to accept its deletion if the majority of Parliament votes to do so tomorrow.

I think these few remarks are sufficient to conclude the matter as far as its substance is concerned. To enable me to give a full report on the debate in the House of Lords which was mentioned here, I would ask your permission to quote part of the statement by the British Government representative, the Earl of Avon, so as to convince the Conservative Members of this House that it is in the interests of their government in London to approve this directive. On page 293 of the report of 21 October 1982 he says :

It must also be remembered that the main aim of this directive is to remove barriers to trade, and we already have at least one Member State anxious to introduce mandatory noise levels. It is important, therefore, that we establish harmonized methods of measuring and quoting noise emissions so that we do not find ourselves having to submit household appliances to a number of testing authorities in order to export to other Member States. This is a most important consideration. We believe, therefore, that we should support the introduction of this directive, if only to prevent the emergence of barriers to trade.

In view of these remarks by the British Government, I strongly recommend that the Conservative Members also vote in favour of this directive tomorrow.

Mr Beazley (ED). — May I have your permission, Mr President, to ask a simple question of the Commissioner relevant to this point ?

President. — Since the Commissioner agrees, you may ask your question.

Mr Beazley (ED). — I have the very report with me which, of course, he has. But paragraph 58, in answer to question 89, specifically states that Commission officials informed the committee that they have no comprehensive evidence of the nuisance caused by domestic appliances, although the French Government has apparently given instances of nuisance.

The point that our committee made was that we are certainly most anxious to stop any technical barriers to trade and we are most concerned that DG IV should support us in every way there. But, on the other hand, if the Commission officials at an inquiry before the House of Lords had no comprehensive evidence of it, surely that supports the point we made that in fact you are not concerned with the noise because there is no comprehensive evidence of it. Certainly, in our view, the trade association satisfies us that this is a competitive matter and housewives will not select noisy instruments. Therefore, surely, we are speaking purely about a technical barrier to trade.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) Many thanks for the question. Case No 1: a Member State introduces regulations either limiting the noise emissions from domestic appliances or laying down a noise level which can be verified and may thus provide grounds for subjecting imports from other Member States to certain tests, with the result that barriers to trade arise. In this case the mere fact of the existence of such regulations is a barrier to trade — regardless of whether the government which introduced this directive has submitted a comprehensive declaration or not. Governments are free to do what they like. The fact that scientific investigations have not been conducted as thoroughly as possible is immaterial as regards the question of whether or not there is a barrier to trade. If there is such a barrier we must react.

Case No 2: it is possible that there was no specific scientific investigation into each individual domestic appliance, from vacuum cleaners to washing machines. What we do have are adequate scientific investigations into the deleterious effects of the overall noise level of our urban environment. This noise level is made up of the most varied noises, and I do not think that the Member States I mentioned before — France, the Federal Republic and The Netherlands — and who are actively engaged in a noise abatement policy would make these major interventions in the industrial production process without being convinced that these various devices can have consequences affecting health.

This is what our measures must take into account. In practice, however, Mr Beazley, I think it is possible, by making widespread use of references to standards, to take this problem out of the realm of theory and

arrive at a useful and respectable solution which will give satisfaction to both the housewife and the manufacturer through having a clear basis.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

18. *Financial activities of the ECSC*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-464/82) by Mr Gabert, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the financial activities of the ECSC.

Mr Gabert (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful to the gods for being able, despite the noise level, to present my report in my capacity as a poor rapporteur who has had to attend two night sittings in order to present a unanimously adopted report in the space of three minutes. I hope I can manage it.

The Committee on Budgetary Control has looked into one specific aspect of the financial activity of the ECSC. The basis for this was a report from the European Court of Auditors and the opinion of the Commission on this draft. It is to be noted with pleasure that, since the audit of the 1980 budgetary year, the Commission has implemented many of the suggestions made by the Court of Auditors and Parliament. This applies, for instance, to the ruling that public guarantees in this sector are regarded as national aids and are thus subject to the rules on aids. The Commission and the Court of Auditors agree on the need to introduce some accounting improvements, particularly as regards issuing costs.

The Committee on Budgetary Control — and I think this was the main point — has stated quite clearly that, particularly in view of the current situation on the steel market, the use of ECSC resources to finance surplus capacity cannot be justified. This remark was prompted by an actual event in 1980. The Committee on Budgetary Control hopes that the new general objectives in the steel sector will be published as soon as possible and was informed that work on drawing them up is already in progress.

The committee also concerned itself with the question of monitoring the implementation of financing projects and welcomed the fact that the Commission has initiated an initial programme of on-the-spot checks. Moreover, the committee looked into interest rebates and stressed their importance for promoting restructuring and job creation. However, it suggests that the 'social clause' in interest rebates for conversion loans be amended to take more account of regional problems.

Gabert

The motion was adopted unanimously and no amendments have been tabled. I should like to thank the European Court of Auditors and the Commission for their cooperation. In a number of detailed discussions arranged at the request of the rapporteur it was possible to reach agreement on many points, with the result that I expect future reports to be still shorter.

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — (FR) The Commission appreciates the thorough and open-minded approach behind the report and expresses its gratitude to Mr Gabert. The Commission is prepared to endorse the basic points in this report where it is in full agreement with its contents. I will try and explain what I mean.

The report notes that with regard to the vital question of national aids — Items 1 and 2 — the procedure applied complies with Community rules. It also notes the improvements made to procedure. In practice, the Commission draws a close link between general objectives and specific decisions, that is opinions relating to investments, the granting of loans and authorizations for aid. The Commission's views and decisions on these issues are worked out by three of its members, who discuss each case before coming to a decision.

The general objectives, which were revised last year and very largely approved by Parliament during a recent debate on Mr Wagner's report, suggest that surplus capacity is jeopardizing the Community steel industry. Consequently, a priority aim of this policy must be to work towards restoring balance to the industry's productive potential. That is the rule which the Commission has laid down for itself, however harsh it may be. The general objectives will be published officially in the near future. As the Consultative Committee of the ECSC has completed its deliberations, only the final version remains to be drawn up.

Since the 'Court of Auditors' report for 1980, the Commission has taken a certain number of steps to ensure suitable monitoring of the implementation of the projects financed, as mentioned in Items 7 and 8 of the motion for a resolution and also by Mr Gabert. Furthermore, an initial series of on-the-spot checks has been conducted with representatives of the Court of Auditors.

The legal basis used for loans for conversion, as mentioned in Items 9 and 10 of the motion for a resolution, that is Article 56 (2) (a) of the ECSC Treaty, appears unquestionable to us inasmuch as the situation calls for far-reaching structural changes, and in view of the fact that market conditions are principally responsible for an enormous number of jobs lost in the industry. The rapporteur, however, does not support the criticism of the Court of Auditors in this respect and he takes a different position from that of the Court regarding the legal basis, which the latter considers insufficient for interest rebates, as mentioned in Item 11 of the motion for a resolution.

Nevertheless, he does stress, and rightly so, the value of this instrument in promoting conversion activities in regions hit by the consequences of restructuring in the steel industry. The Commission is in full agreement with the rapporteur on this point.

The rapporteur suggests that the 'social clause', mentioned in Items 12 and 13, be amended to take more account of regional problems. The Commission will give careful considerations to this suggestion. However, it must be borne in mind that Article 56 of the ECSC Treaty aims to stimulate employment by means of loans and investments, thereby creating real opportunities for re-employing former coal and steel industry workers. Any solution adopted must satisfy this requirement, which everyone will agree is vital.

With regard to the important point concerning financial planning in Item 14, a misunderstanding must be avoided, or rather a fairly flexible interpretation must be given to this expression. Financial planning in the area we are talking about is of necessity subject to limits. The funds required for a lowering of interest rates depend on budgetary resources and there is no need to go into the difficulties encountered in this respect by the ECSC. Most of the financial operations involve loans without interest rate subsidies. Highly unpredictable conditions on the financial markets and widely varying financing time limits from case to case make financial planning very difficult if planning is done too strictly in calendar terms. It should be added that the Commission's activity in this field depends first and foremost on the applications for finance which are submitted to it. Furthermore, borrowing and lending must be in line with the general objectives, as this is the end they serve. Efforts should also be made in this field to take account of points of regional policy.

Lastly, I would like to inform you on behalf of the Commission that the draft ECSC budget for 1984 will include a section on borrowing and lending.

That is all I have to say in reply to Mr Gabert's report, which, as I mentioned, coincides largely with our own concerns and raises questions which we very much wish to answer. To make it clear to Parliament how important the subject is, I would like to point out that borrowing during the first half of 1983 continued at the same rate as in 1982, when it amounted to 550 million ECU for the year. Late payments, which have been mentioned, amount to about 50 million ECU, which represents only 1 % of the amount borrowed. This is an important matter which the Committee on Budgetary Control has dealt with in accordance with its usual practice.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.¹

(The sitting was closed at 12 midnight)

¹ For the agenda for the next sitting, see Minutes.

ANNEX I

Votes

The Annex to the Report of Proceedings contains the rapporteur's opinion on the various amendments and the explanations of vote. For a detailed account of the voting, see Minutes.

MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS 'DESTRUCTION OF THE KOREAN AIRLINES BOEING 747'

- LADY ELLES (Doc. 1-672/83)
- DE LA MALENE (Doc. 1-683/83)
- BANGEMANN (Doc. 1-692/83)
- GALLUZZI (Doc. 1-701/83)
- HABSBURG (Doc. 1-708/83)

replaced by Amendment No 1, which was ADOPTED

* * *

MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS 'LEBANON'

- DE LA MALENE (Doc. 1-682/83)
- D'ORMESSON (Doc. 1-696/83)
- DE PASQUALE (Doc. 1-704/83)

replaced by Amendment No 1, which was ADOPTED

* * *

VEIL MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-667/83 'CHAD'): ADOPTED

* * *

MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS 'CHILE'

- DESCHAMPS (Doc. 1-698/83)
- FANTINI AND PIQUET (Doc. 1-700/83)
- GLINNE (Doc. 1-705/83)

replaced by Amendment No 1, which was ADOPTED

* * *

BEYER DE RYKE AND DE GUCHT MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-664/83 'DEATH SENTENCE PASSED ON MR YERMAK LUKIANOV'):

ADOPTED

* * *

MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS 'NATURAL DISASTERS'

- DUPORT (Doc. 1-677/83): ADOPTED
- POIRIER (Doc. 1-689/83): ADOPTED
- BAUDIS (Doc. 1-694/83): ADOPTED
- MARCH (Doc. 1-690/83/REV.): ADOPTED

* * *

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION TABLED BY THE PRESIDENT ON BEHALF OF THE ENLARGED BUREAU (Doc. 1-569/83 'SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC RECOVERY'): ADOPTED

* * *

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION TABLED BY THE PRESIDENT ON BEHALF OF THE ENLARGED BUREAU (Doc. 1-566/83 'STATUTE OF MEMBERS OF THE EP'): ADOPTED

Explanation of vote

Mr Pearce (ED). — It seems to me unfortunate that two matters are being confused in this particular resolution. One is the question what kind of a statute, if any, we should have. Secondly, should we be asking the Council to do this for us? It is on the second point that my feelings lead me to abstain on the whole matter. It is quite wrong for the Parliament to hand this additional power to the Council of Ministers. They have not got the power to decide this and I do not see why we should hand this to them. Those who criticize Members of this Parliament for being paid too much do so partly because they think we do not exercise power. That is one of the problems of this Parliament. My concern here is that where we have a power we should exercise it and not just hand it over rather weak-kneed to somebody else. For that reason I shall abstain, Mr President.

* * *

CALENDAR FOR 1984: APPROVED AS PROPOSED BY THE ENLARGED BUREAU

Explanation of vote

Mr Goerens (L). — (FR) Mr President, I approved of your decision not to put Amendments Nos 3, 4 and 8 to the vote. But the manoeuvre we witnessed this afternoon was in very bad taste.

First of all, the authors of the amendments seeking to have Parliament meet in Brussels tried to disregard the Rules Procedure by tabling amendments which had nothing to do with the subject under discussion.

It was not an isolated case in which members of this Parliament wished to deal with the question of a meeting place. Furthermore I believe that it would be in the interest of this Parliament's credibility not to rush ahead too fast in this matter, i.e. we should avoid taking any decision on Parliament's meeting place before we have been presented with all the legal and financial considerations.

I should also like to stress that I shall vote for the calendar as proposed.

ANNEX II

FORMAL SITTING ON THE OCCASION OF THE VISIT BY
MR KONSTANTINOS KARAMANLIS,
PRESIDENT OF THE HELLENIC REPUBLIC

IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

President

(The formal sitting was opened at 12 noon — Mr Karamanlis was greeted by prolonged applause)

President. — *(FR)* In extending a welcome to Mr Konstantinos Karamanlis, President of the Hellenic Republic, I am welcoming among us today a man who deserves enormous credit for having corrected a serious deviation in the course of history.

(Applause)

Mr President, we appreciate the important role that you played in re-establishing democracy in Greece, and all of us, who as Europeans, have inherited the legacy of Greek thought, are grateful for the struggle which you led after choosing exile in order that right should prevail over the power of the dictators.

On your return to Greece, the Greek people recognized the exceptional worth of your authority and perseverance. Those qualities were essential in ensuring for your country, which has so often been torn apart, a happy and relatively calm transition from the rule of force to a Parliamentary form of government which enabled you to pursue your European aims to a successful conclusion.

Mr President, you made an exceptional contribution to Greece's entry into the European Community. It was you who, when Prime Minister, opened the negotiations with a view to the association of Greece and the Community and it was you who, once again as Prime Minister, began the negotiations for its accession.

These were the main reasons why you were awarded the Charlemagne and Schuman prizes.

I should like to emphasize that it was, to a large extent, due to the pressures exerted by the European Parliament on the Commission and the Council that the agreement of association between the Community and Greece was frozen in 1971, as a sign of protest against the dictatorship.

Shortly after democracy was re-established in Greece, it was Parliament which requested that the economic clauses of the association should be unfrozen immediately and confirmed that if the association were to be fully re-established, legislative elections should be organized in Greece.

Our collaboration is therefore of long standing and has already proved fruitful.

Our hopes once again turn to Athens. The summit which will be held there in only a few weeks' time should lay the foundations for another vital stage in the transition to a Europe whose solidarity will bring about control of a new economic reality. On this depend both our independence and the unprecedented social achievements which our democracies have succeeded in attaining.

In the hope that our collaboration will once again be beneficial, it is with great pleasure that I invite you to speak.

(Loud applause)

Mr Karamanlis, President of the Hellenic Republic. — (GR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to thank, first of all, the Bureau of the European Parliament for honouring me with an invitation to present from this official rostrum my thoughts on the future of Europe. I feel this honour even more strongly because I know that it is not addressed only to me but also to my country, Greece, the country which has given Europe its name and offered to it for centuries its word and spirit. I would also like to thank the President of the Assembly, Mr Dankert, for the complimentary words with which he has greeted my presence in this hall and assure him that, if his words have been greater than my deeds. I will try to live up to them in the future, working for the Union of Europe.

(Loud applause)

Addressing the European Parliament I cannot but pay tribute to the prophets and pioneers of the European Idea whose vision should be felt by us all as a moral command.

Ladies and gentlemen, in order to present my thoughts with the easiness and scope imposed by the importance of the subject, I will speak more like a man who believes deeply in the European Idea and less like the bearer of the thoughts of the country I represent. And I consider it a happy coincidence that I am addressing you on the critical issue of the Union of Europe on the day following the debate which this Parliament has held on it. A debate which more than anything else has vindicated the existence of this institution and broken down the barrier of silence and indifference.

As it might be recalled, I have often spoken on this major issue in the past. It is therefore natural, since I will be speaking here on the same subject, to repeat some of these views. In any event, so many things have been said and written about it that it is difficult to propose new and original ideas. And it is not even necessary to propose them, for the issue which concerns us is simple, just as all the great issues are; do we want the Union of Europe or not? That is the question. The answer we will give will set in motion further developments and determine the future of our peoples.

My intention, however, is not to deal with the current and well-known problems which the Community faces today, such as the enlargement, the increase of own resources, the Monetary Union, the Agricultural Policy etc. For I am addressing an audience which is certainly more familiar with them than I am; and because I believe that the solution to these problems depends entirely on the solution to the fundamental and critical issue, i.e. the Union of Europe.

(Applause)

Neither do I intend of course to make proposals about the form and mechanisms of United Europe, although I have some ideas on this. My purpose is to encourage the unionist movement, by proving the need for the Union.

(Applause)

However, before speaking about the future of Europe, it would be useful to examine, briefly, the course which the Community, and more broadly the European Idea, have followed until now. From this historical review we might draw many useful conclusions.

Approximately twenty-five years have elapsed since the time when, under the pressure of events and following the initiative of distinguished statesmen, the Treaty of Rome came into force. Since then the Community, and more generally the Idea of European Union, have gone through many stages. Significant initiatives have been taken at times, like the Conferences of Paris and Stuttgart, and certain decisions have been adopted; these decisions, however, although they succeeded in keeping alive the vision of the Union, have not been able to lead us to our great and final goal, which continues to remain distant.

It is true, of course, that the institution of the European Community initially aimed at ensuring the economic advantages of a wider space and the free movement of persons, goods and capital within it. It is, however, just as true that at the origin of this major enterprise there was the political will to bring about, through the integration of individual sectors, the political unification of Western Europe. For if Union had not been the Community's final aim, we would not have created the Community and, above all, this Parliament which symbolizes and incarnates Unity.

Karamanlis

In any event, the unbalanced promotion of economic as against political goals, and the delay in the process of political unification as compared to the economic, from a certain time onwards suspended not only progress towards Union, but also contributed to the slowing down of our pursuits in the economic field as well. And this is confirmed, over and above everything else, by the very acute problems which the Community faces today.

The founders of the European Communities avoided, intentionally of course, defining the final form and related institutions of United Europe. They simply put in motion procedures of functional integration, mainly of an economic nature, leaving the final phase of this 'creation continue' to time and experience. This vagueness, however, though justified in the past, has proved to be an inhibiting factor for further development, all the more so since the progress of those developments is not promoted, as it should be automatically.

The time has now come to follow the opposite course, however. For the move from partial to total is already facing insurmountable difficulties and acute conflicts of interest, which can be overcome only when we define the final aims of European cooperation and establish the fundamental political principles on which solutions will be based.

(Applause)

Instead of the induction method of Aristotle used until now, it is essential to use the Platonic method of deduction, i.e. the method which facilitates the solution of individual problems through the solution of the main and primary problem, which in our case is the Union of Europe.

(Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, it must be admitted that the European Community, though initially aimed at economic cooperation, had a beneficial impact on the political climate as well and on life in general in Western Europe. It has contributed to safeguarding international peace, preventing European or world conflicts which as a rule originated or were fought out in Europe. Countries which for centuries were tearing each other apart now live in peace and work together creatively. I regret to say that the tragedy of Cyprus constitutes a painful exception to this rule, and the continuation of this situation places a great burden of responsibility on us all. At any rate, the significance of this achievement, that is the peaceful coexistence of the European people, is invaluable. To appreciate it one has only to reflect on what the situation of Europe would be today, if the European Community had not been created.

(Applause)

And this climate has been strongly enhanced by the recently established political cooperation, a cooperation which in spite of its informal character, constitutes a step towards Union and projects the Community as a political power on the international level.

In the economic field, on the other hand, in spite of the well-known petty differences, considerable growth has been achieved in intra-Community trade and in the Community's commercial relations with the rest of the world, as a result of which the Community has become the largest commercial power in the world, spectacularly increasing the prosperity of its peoples.

Finally, the operation of the Community so far has contributed to the awareness of its political and cultural homogeneity, which is a sound basis for the Union. For as Montesquieu says: 'L'Europe est une nation composée de plusieurs' (Europe is a nation composed of many).

More than anything else, however, it has safeguarded and reaffirmed, on an international level, the ideals of the European Idea; Peace, Freedom, Democracy and Humanism, which represent the hope and goal of all peoples.

(Applause)

Karamanlis

Ladies and gentlemen, without wishing to minimize the importance of these achievements, one should also identify the Community's weaknesses. One should note that nationalist prejudice and selfish interests continue to affect the Community's progress, to create acute problems and to pose obstacles dangerous to its future.

Because of all this, the Community has not been able to complete its Economic Union by creating the mechanisms and means which would allow it to deal collectively with economic and social problems that all Community countries face today. It has also failed to develop, apart from the Customs Union and common agricultural policy, common policies in other fields of great importance. Thus, the Monetary Union is still an object of endless debate, while the major issues of defence and external policy which concern the security and independence of Europe are dangerously lagging.

(Loud applause)

Moreover, the financial resources of the Community, which represent just 1% of the national income of its members, are so inadequate to meet its objects and needs that one is led to wonder whether we are serious when we seek solutions to Community problems and debate the future of Europe.

(Applause)

Finally, Community institutions remain antagonistic and weak. The Council of Ministers tends to become an instrument for the defence of narrow national interests, rather than a Community institution.

(Applause)

And the European Commission, which was supposedly conceived as an institution with vast powers, must now remain watchful to avoid becoming, as has been said, a Secretariat of the Council.

(Applause)

The European Parliament, while being the main forum for the promotion of genuinely European ideas, lacks effective powers and finds itself isolated from national parliaments. Finally, the supreme political body of the Community, the European Council, which is convened three times a year for very short sessions, has so little time at its disposal that it is practically impossible for it to go in depth into the great problems of Europe.

(Applause)

I do not know, ladies and gentlemen, whether I have been excessive in my judgement of the Community's slow progress. Please rest assured, however, that if I have exaggerated, this should not be attributed to prejudice but to the anxiety I feel about the future of Europe.

Ladies and gentlemen, this situation surely makes it necessary to revise the policy of hesitation and half-measures followed until now. And bravely confront, in a responsible way, the essential problem of Europe; its Union. It is true that Europe faces many problems today. However, its sole major problem is understanding its problem. And in order to understand it, plain logic is enough. For, as Napoleon said: 'Great politics is to apply common sense to great problems'.

(Applause)

I believe that it would be commonplace to debate the need of the Union of Europe which has already become on historical necessity. There may be differences of opinion as to the form, the scope and the pace of the Union. But there can be no reasonable objection to the Union itself, which is a matter of life and death for our continent. This is why no one assumes the responsibility of directly rejecting it. For no one has an alternative solution to propose.

(Applause)

Karamanlis

In order to better understand the wider importance of the Union of Europe, we should consider it within the context of the realities of our times. As I said in Aachen, mankind is going through a critical period of transition which is marked by universal and intense anxiety. From whatever aspect you look at today's incoherent world you see only dangerous impasses. This anxiety takes on different forms, from anguish to violence. For contemporary man, wherever he may live, is trying to move away from a way of life and looking for a new one.

This anxious search is a force in itself which cannot be ignored. If, during the next few years, there can be a political and intellectual leadership able to control it, this force can prove to be creative. Otherwise it will certainly become destructive.

And this leadership can be provided only by Europe. Not only because Europe has a long political and cultural tradition but also because this leadership will be inspired by the search for an ideal — the creation of a great Community which will combine freedom with order and order with social justice.

(Applause)

Already, in the European Community the second European generation since the Community's establishment is assuming the leading role. And perhaps this is the generation which can offer this leadership to Europe, because it is free of the remnants of historical inhibitions and nationalist prejudice and has grown up in the modern spirit of a more universal conception of the world. And it will certainly give this leadership if it makes the Union of Europe an ideal of its own.

(Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, I know the difficulties, both substantive and procedural, which confront the idea of Union, just as I know the political, economic and social problems which Europe faces today. However, I also know that these problems do not justify the delay in its integration, as some believe. On the contrary, they justify its acceleration, for these problems constitute incentives for, and not obstacles to, the Union since they cannot be solved in the narrow national confines of each country, but only within the wider framework of a United Europe.

(Applause)

There always have been and there always will be sceptics, of course. Most of them react because they are inspired by obsolete nationalist concepts and put petty interests before the major goals of the Union. In other words, they cannot see the wood for the trees.

The fears of these sceptics are clearly due to confusion. Carried away by superficial differences they lose sight of the underlying unity. They lose sight of the common interests and dangers which link Europeans. They forget their common cultural traditions, the closeness of their moral values and the identity of their way of thinking. In other words, they forget the European culture on which we will build the European Confederation. A Confederation which will safeguard the security of our peoples, consolidate our democratic institutions and speed up our material and moral progress.

I believe that the formation of a united Europe will be the greatest political event of our century.

(Applause)

An event which will influence the fate of our continent and the course of mankind. For it will balance the correlation of forces in the world, will safeguard the independence of Europe and will contribute to the consolidation of world order and peace.

Karamanlis

Scientific progress and the extensive and costly development of technology — including, unfortunately, the means of destruction — deprive smaller countries of the possibility of keeping abreast of technical progress in all sectors. Thus, power reverts exclusively to large human societies, with the inevitable result that small nations become dependent on large ones.

In the face of the massive problems that have arisen, all the peoples of Europe, even the most numerous, are small and weak. And there is but one solution for them to move out of this disadvantageous situation. They must themselves create a vast unit, equivalent to the other large political formations of the contemporary world. This is the only way in which they can participate in general progress and consolidate the security and independence of Europe.

The European Community is certainly superior to the Soviet Union in terms of population and economic resources. And it does not lag behind it in technological development. If Europe makes the best of these capabilities by uniting, it will certainly become autonomous and will be freed from its anxieties and complexes. It will then be able to cooperate with the United States sincerely and on an equal footing, instead of being merely dependent on it.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

In addition to its independence, however, just as fundamental for the survival of Europe is its effective economic integration, which will ensure the best use of a vast potential of natural and human resources. It will place the economy in the service of man and not man in the service of the economy. It will secure the kind of development that improves not only the material but also the moral standard of life. Isolationism, tariff barriers and unattainable self-sufficiency are historically obsolete stages of economic and political action and a passive reaction to events.

United Europe, moreover, with its democratic structure and functioning, will also strengthen the democratic institutions of the individual countries. For it is evident that democracy, which is currently going through a dangerous crisis, needs to adapt to the conditions of our times.

Europe through its Union can reform and thereby save the democratic institutions. For democracy may fall in a single country, but it cannot be overthrown in a United Europe.

(Applause)

And this is an additional reason to speed up European unification. If Union is excessively delayed, and democracy falls in certain countries, then the dream of a United Europe might vanish forever.

Finally, through Union, Europe will save and consequently promote European culture. The absence of ideals which is a mark of our times, the confusion of ideas, the relentless pursuit of material prosperity and harsh rationalism have distorted the cultural model of our continent. Europe, which gave birth to all ideas, is the only force that can revive and humanize them again, and thereby create a new renaissance, which the world so badly needs today.

Ladies and gentlemen, the thoughts I have presented above easily lead, I think, to the conclusion that the Union of Europe is a historical necessity. This being so, we should put an end to mere rhetoric and move with courage to serious and concrete acts.

(Applause)

This should not be difficult if we keep in mind that the Union of Europe is in the interests of us all and that we have no other choice. For, we are in fact called upon to choose between progress and retrogression, between dependence and independence. The choice facing us is thus a simple one.

Karamanlis

I believe that the reservations expressed in some quarters are the result not of a logical but of an emotional reaction. We prefer trodden paths to the effort needed to adjust to new situations, even if these situations are better than the old ones. Our hesitation gives the impression that we fear precisely what can save us. Our lack of determination brings Shakespeare's words to mind: 'We have power in ourselves to do it, but it is a power that we have no power to use'.

If it is true that the first blow is half the battle won, then a solemn and binding declaration of our decision to create the United Europe should be the beginning of the process of unification.

(Applause)

At this critical hour, a special summit conference of the Ten, of a Messina type, would be a decisive step towards the political Union of Europe. The purpose of this conference would be to declare, in a binding manner, the decision for European Union and to define the basic principles on which Union could be built.

(Applause)

A five-year period would be sufficient to set up the necessary institutions, ...

(Applause)

... define the powers of the common organ and the consecutive phases of integration, as is stated in the Stuttgart declaration, which — although weakened by the reservations of certain countries — represents relative progress at the government level.

At the same time, if not before, the ten leaders will have to decide: firstly, on the reintroduction of the democratic principle of majority voting, as provided for by the Treaty of Rome and without which no collective body can function; and secondly, on the substantial increase in the Community's resources, without which 'nothing can be achieved', as Demosthenes would say. This has become even more imperative today when Europe, to avoid the threat of decline, is forced, in addition to other fields, to develop the important sectors of research and development.

And there is considerable scope in Europe for an increase in Community resources. While the United States spends 6.6 % of its national income on defence and the Soviet Union 10.1 % Europe, which is much wealthier than the latter, is allocating only 3.4 % of its income to defence. Incidentally, this is why Europe is inferior in strength to the two superpowers.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

I believe that, if these decisions are made, not only will the current problems of the Community be immediately solved, but also the way to Union will open.

In this effort the European Parliament can play a decisive role. Already a new mentality is developing in this Parliament which will positively promote the process of Union, since both the electorate and their elected representatives now feel themselves to be European. And also because it is only this Parliament which can arouse the people and influence the decisions of hesitating governments. The Parliament has already confirmed its resolve to play this role in yesterday's debate.

(Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, it may be that some of the thoughts I have presented to you are still at the stage of visions. They are, however, visions which the force of circumstance, the community of interests and the community of dangers threatening us will gradually turn into realities. We are already moving along this road and have taken several hopeful steps. We have no other choice than to walk along this same road to the end, until the vision fully coincides with historical reality.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Karamanlis

As I emphasized at the beginning of my speech, the Union of the Peoples of Europe will be the greatest achievement in the history of our continent. It will also be a major milestone in world history. It is an enterprise which will serve freedom, peace and progress not only for Europeans but for all the people on earth. Reactionists may oppose it. Sceptics may delay it. But they cannot prevent it for it is, as I said, a historical mandate.

(Applause)

Concluding my speech, ladies and gentlemen, I cannot but remind you all of our historic responsibilities. And, faced with the uncertainty of our options, I wonder with Paul Valéry: 'Will Europe become what it is in reality, i.e. a small appendage of the Asian Continent? Or will it remain what it appears to be, that is the precious part of the universe, the pearl of the earth, the brain of a body?'

Our generation is called upon to provide the answer to this momentous question. And its answer, whatever it is, will most certainly have far-reaching consequences.

(Standing ovation)

President. — I should like to follow Parliament in thanking President Karamanlis for his address.

The formal sitting was closed at 12.40 p.m.

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 16 SEPTEMBER 1983

Contents

1. <i>Votes</i> <i>Mr Irmer; Mr Pranchère; Mr Irmer; Mr Marshall; Mr Rogalla</i>	279	<i>sion); Mr Lange; Mr Pisani; Mrs Boserup; Mr Pisani; Mrs Boserup; Mr Kellett-Bowman</i>	280
2. <i>Management, advisory and consultative committees — Interim report by Mrs Boserup (Doc. 1-446/83):</i> <i>Mrs Boserup; Mrs Kalliopi Nikolaou; Mr Marck; Mr Kellett-Bowman; Mr Price; Mr Patterson; Mr Price; Mr Purvis; Mr Harris; Mr Price; Mr Harris; Mr Lange; Mr Price; Mr Lange; Mr Pisani (Commis-</i>		3. <i>Adjournment of the session</i>	287
		<i>Annex</i> <i>Mr C. Jackson; Mr Pearce; Mr Alavanos; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Moreland; Mrs von Alemann; Mr Moreland; Mr Eyraud; Mr Alavanos; Mrs Théobald-Paoli; Mr Alavanos; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Welsh; Mr Aigner</i>	288

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

*(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)*¹

1. *Votes*²

Irmer report (Doc. 1-605/83/I: Next ACP-EEC Convention):

Paragraph 17: Amendments Nos 33 and 50

Mr Irmer (L), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, I am against Amendment No 50, while on Amendment No 33 I should like to ask for no fewer than six separate votes.

Here I should like to ask Mr Pranchère whether he would be prepared to drop the word 'uniquement' in the third line of paragraph 17 A. If so, I should be in favour of this paragraph; otherwise I should have to ask for a separate vote on the matter. If that were not

possible, I should reluctantly have to recommend the rejection of paragraph 17 A.

Paragraph 17 B I am against: what it says does not correspond to the committee's opinion and does not fit in here as being too narrow.

As for paragraph 17 C, I recommend adoption of the first two clauses:

Regrets the delay in setting up the Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation; calls for it to be permanently established in an ACP State.

The rest is too specific, too technical, and should not be included in this resolution, which is of a general nature.

The committee is in favour of paragraph 17 D.

President. — Mr Irmer, I do not think we should go into too much detail, since then everyone would have to re-read the text attentively in order to see what one was voting on. Cannot we just vote on each of the four paragraphs, as I believe Mr Jackson has requested, without dividing them up?

Mr Pranchère (COM). — (FR) Mr President, I have listened attentively to Mr Irmer and I agree entirely with his suggestions, since they in no way modify what the Committee on Agriculture wants. Personally, therefore, I recommend that we adopt the rapporteur's proposal — unless you have some objection.

¹ For items concerning approval of the Minutes, documents received, verification of credentials, membership of committees, petitions, and procedure without report (Rule 99), see Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

² See Annex.

President. — But, Mr Pranchère, 'uniquement' appears in the text of the amendment so that we should have to vote separately on this word too. If you want to suppress it, the House has to decide.

Mr Irmer (L), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, I am wondering whether one is not allowed to withdraw parts of an amendment. The word 'uniquement' is a part of the amendment, and if Mr Pranchère withdraws it that is in order. If I understand Mr Pranchère correctly, he is also prepared to comply with my suggestion that the second part of paragraph 17 C be withdrawn, and that is also a case of withdrawing part of an amendment. In that case, I can say that with the exception of paragraph 17 B, I agree to all the Agriculture Committee's amendments.

IN THE CHAIR : LADY ELLES

Vice-President

Marshall report (Doc. 1-502/83 : Intra-Community telephone calls) :

Amendment No 1

Mr Marshall (ED), rapporteur. — Madam President, the rapporteur can accept nine-tenths of the amendment, and therefore I would like to ask that you vote on it by indent and paragraph. On paragraph 2, I would like a split vote on the text up to the word 'implemented', which I can accept, then on the text up to 'and at least', which I cannot accept, and finally on the last few words in the sentence beginning with 'to reduce.'

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) Madam President, I only wanted to make it clear that paragraph 2, the paragraph in question, contains two different ideas. One is that calls from one Member State to another should be given the same treatment as calls within any one Member State: this part I now withdraw, and the rapporteur's problem is then solved. The other idea then remains — that concerning calls from one Member State to another at certain times and on Sundays. This clears the matter up and helps to simplify the voting.

President. — Yes, Mr Rogalla, but unfortunately one cannot amend a written text by an oral amendment. We shall have to take about three split votes, I am afraid, on paragraph 2, in order to include your amendment, which I understand seeks to remove the words 'trunk calls' and to delete 'as for domestic trunk calls and'. I think that would solve the problem.

2. Management, advisory and consultative committees

President. — The next item is the interim report by Mrs Boserup, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the cost of the Community budget and effectiveness of committees of a management, advisory or consultative nature (Doc. 1-446/83).

Mrs Boserup (COM), rapporteur. — (DA) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, this interim report, which winds up our work for this part-session, is, as you will recall, prefaced with a preliminary resolution which was adopted in conjunction with the budgetary decision to block 40 % of the funds in Articles 250 and 251. This amounted to 4m ECU. It was stated in the remarks column of this budgetary decision that these amounts will be unlocked in the light of the results of an enquiry by the Committee on Budgetary Control. This interim report has therefore been requested by a majority of the House. I say this simply to make it clear to everyone that the report was not drawn up on the Budgetary Control's Committee own initiative but at the request of the House.

The first problem which arises in an enquiry of this sort is how to limit it. Since the committees of the European Community institutions constitute an enormous and rapidly growing area, it was necessary for practical reasons to limit the first part of the investigations to Articles 250 and 251. There are many committee under other headings.

It was therefore necessary to begin by drawing up this interim report, and in the process I have, I feel, abundantly documented the need for a thorough debate on the uncontrollable growth in the number and activities of committees and for a thorough overhaul of the existing procedures of administration and control. The whole area is I feel, clearly suffering from grave 'elephantitis.'

The first practical step we took in the Committee on Budgetary Control was to draw up a list of 17 questions for the Commission. These 17 questions are set out in an annex to the report. Everyone can see that these are simple, down-to-earth questions which any administration can answer without great difficulty. These questions are intended to establish how many meetings are held and how many people are involved how much they cost, what rules govern their work and how their activities are monitored.

When these 17 questions were sent by the Committee to the Commission in January 1983, the Commission's immediate reaction was to state that it deeply resented that these questions should be put at all. The Commission felt that they were unnecessarily detailed and misleading. The committee was unanimous that these were simple and legitimate questions which the Commission should be willing to answer. The committee received the Commission's answer three months later, i.e., at the end of April 1983. The Commission's answer consisted of 1 850 pages of material, principally in French — which, as you can imagine, makes life easier for me — the greater part

Boserup

of which was, to put it bluntly, irrelevant, meaningless and incoherent. To produce something of this sort was simply a grave affront to the committee. For example, we were sent hundreds of copies of the draft rules of the Committee for Customs Tariff Nomenclature in all seven languages. Even a cursory reading of this chaotic material reveals the lack of effectiveness and control which exists in parts of this area. In the first place, it shows that the Commission has done very little to limit costs or to make the work of these committees more effective.

As my explanatory statement points out, there has been a large increase in the number of groups of experts and committees in the last two years. In 1981 there were less than 500 such bodies; in 1983, there were 650, i.e., an increase of 31 % over two years. Both the material and the Commission's concern to explain the reason for this seem to reflect a general lack of clarity and control. There seem to be no rules for setting up and disbanding committees. Thus, although groups of experts must be approved each year by the Commission, there are nonetheless many working-parties which, so to speak, never meet. This means, of course, that they do not cost anything, but that in itself is perhaps a reason for disbanding them.

There are committees which allegedly have been disbanded but which, nonetheless, appear with the cost, number of meetings and number of members on the Commission's list of committees for 1983. I do not know how to describe an organization which in the official answer of 13 April 1981 to Mr Megahy admitted that two committees — on honey and on bananas — had no reason to exist but which, nonetheless, weeks later allowed these committees to appear in its budget draft. This is scarcely an indication of effective control.

It is impossible here to detail all these obscurities and contradictions in the Commission's material. However, when I queried the facts and figures contained in this material which seemed obscure, I received a reply from the Commission that there was an error in the material. This has led me to fear that these are not isolated examples or regrettable exceptions but indications of a more widespread situation. This impression is perhaps strengthened by the attitude of scepticism, not to say resentment, which the Commission's officials have shown to the whole enquiry.

The drawing up of this report together with the discussion and the adoption in committee took two months from the date on which the 1 850 pages were received. We can hardly be accused of dragging our heels. Nonetheless, while the enquiry was under way the Commission requested the transfer of all of the funds connected with it. According to the regulations, transfers from Chapter 100 can only be made by the Committee on Budgets. That has taken place. Paragraph 10 of the motion for a resolution is therefore

redundant. I propose that it be deleted and that Mr Jackson's amendment on behalf of the Committee on Budgets be adopted.

As I have pointed out, this is an interim report. In the motion for a resolution, Parliament requests the Commission to submit a report to the House before 1 February 1984 on the activities of these committees and working-parties in 1983 in order to determine whether rationalization is taking place. In the light of this, it will be possible to draw up a definitive and more concrete report in spring 1984 which will enable us to give the House a comprehensive assessment. I think the Commission needs to get advice: at all events, I would suggest a good deal of rethinking and interest for new techniques in this area. Perhaps the Commission could be a shining example for others. I hope we shall be able to come back to the matter in peace and tolerance in the new year.

Mrs Kalliopi Nikolaou (S). — *(GR)* Madam President, the exhaustion of the Community's funds makes Mrs Boserup's report very important and timely.

We agree with the need for the greatest possible economies in all the budgetary appropriations. However, we would draw attention to one point concerning the advisory committees, especially the agricultural advisory committees. As we all know, the CAP is currently under revision, and in order for the markets to function properly it is essential, in our view, that the advisory committees, particularly those dealing with certain agricultural products, be allowed to operate unhampered.

Lastly, as regards participation on the advisory committees, we would like account to be taken of the bias which operates in favour of the representatives of Member States neighbouring Belgium who will be still be able to make the journey and express their views even after any cut in the reimbursement of travel expenses. Conversely, any such cut would make it impossible for the more distant countries to send representatives. These countries are Denmark, Ireland, Italy and also, chiefly, Greece.

Madam President, because we cannot forecast what repercussions the cuts in the appropriations will have on the functioning of certain advisory committees, agricultural committees mainly, during a period when the CAP is under revision, we think that particular attention should be paid to this point.

Mr Marck (PPE). — *(NL)* Madam President, I should like to endorse what Mrs Nikolaou has already said, since I favour a thorough inquiry into the workings and the utility, the efficiency, of the various consultative committees and therefore feel that the freezing of appropriations may serve as a means of protection or pressure to achieve this end. But this must be done quite openly, without discrimination among committees, and of course one has to know

Marck

what one wants to achieve. But this clarity is lacking. I have listened to Mrs Boserup's report, both in the Committee on Budgetary Control and here, and I stick to my view that there is discrimination in the way Parliament evaluates the workings of these committees.

My first instance of discrimination is this: investigations are made only into the activities of committees which fall within Articles 250 and 251 and the appropriations for these committees are partially frozen. On the other hand, there are committees, *inter alia* under other budgetary lines such as A 256, B 642 and B 6671, which are not frozen, neither are they subject to investigation. Why is it that some committees are frozen while others are left a free hand?

My second point is that Articles 250 and 251 cover the workings both of the management committees, which represent the Ministers from the Member States, and of the consultative committees, which represent the social partners. Since the Treaty specifies that management committees must be convened to consider various aspects of the agricultural policy, the management committees are indeed convened, but this is no longer true of the consultative committees as there are no appropriations. This is a second case of discrimination which seems to me unjustified. And this second discrimination is more than a merely technical matter — of that I am convinced. We have the impression that the Commission, and in particular the Director-General for Agriculture, see the freezing of appropriations as a means of thwarting the participation of producers and other interested persons from the sector. It is striking that it is primarily the management committees, where the Ministers convene, that are able to meet, but that the consultative committees, which are the forum for the expression of views of the sector, can no longer exercise this function. We are aware that certain people in the Directorate-General for Agriculture are working for this end and systematically organizing it. At the very moment when we find ourselves broaching a reform of agricultural policy and discussions must be started, I consider it highly dangerous to hinder the expression of views by the parties concerned. I would, therefore, urge most strongly that the freezing of allocations be cancelled and that the normal working of committees with clear reasons for meeting be resumed.

As for the future, I should like to propose, in view of the difficulties regarding working as between management committees and consultative committees, that we consider a splitting of this budgetary item so as to make it perfectly clear which appropriations are intended for the management committees and which are reserved for the consultative committees. This, I believe, is the only way we can create transparency in all this unsavory business as it stands at the moment.

Madam President, I therefore intend to vote for the interim report and, in particular, for the release of appropriations contained therein, but I hope we shall

very soon have a final report so as to arrive at a really clear picture of the workings of these consultative committees.

Mr Kellet-Bowman (ED). — Madam President, on behalf of my group, I would like to congratulate Mrs Boserup, who has taken a courageous stand and on occasion has appeared to have taken on the entire Commission in this matter. Really, it is not a report about money, it is more an inter-institutional matter. Parliament has raised the question concerning the Commission's raft of committees of various categories. The Committee on Budgetary Control asked Mrs Boserup to prepare a report because it did not feel it was getting satisfactory answers from the Commission.

In order to assist her and to get more cooperation from the Commission, we recommended that 2 million ECU be put on ice in Chapter 100. Now bureaucrats hate people looking into their affairs, but they hate even more Chapter 100. The numbers of these committees are an unfolding mystery. We began in the 200s and 300s, and now it would seem that they are breeding. There is something like 600. Although bureaucracy tends to hide things, in the Community, when the questions are asked — the secret is knowing which question to ask — you get the answers. One must say of the Commission that they do provide true answers if one can find the right questions to ask them.

The Commission did not seem to be aware of the number of committees, and that was positively frightening. Or of their categories — whether they were *ad hoc*, temporary, permanent or part of the masonry. Whether they were dead and finished or still alive. The lines in the budget only show the marginal cost for these committee meetings. The whole infrastructure is hidden away in other lines. The cost of rent, lighting, heating and administration — all not made open, but concealed by the budget in other lines. Lines 250 and 251 do not give us the full information.

Now how did Commission officials help Mrs Boserup? She is a Dane, obviously very competent in Danish, German and English. So 1 800 pages of material were passed to Mrs Boserup in French! The officials came to the Committee on Budgetary Control; they practically wept when they were telling us how difficult it was to administer these committees when there is money being put on ice. At the same time they carried out what I regard as a mischievous practice. Mr Marck alluded to it. The vociferous lobbies in Europe had their committees restrained, since it was known that their committees would put pressure on the Committee on Budgetary Control and Members of Parliament. That, I do not think, is a proper way to behave. It must be making the internal administration of the Commission even more difficult. Budget Control, I regret to say, by a very small vote caved in and paragraph 10 found its way into the report. The Committee on Budgets were made of sterner stuff.

Kellett-Bowman

They put down Amendment No 1 in the name of Robert Jackson who is the rapporteur for the 1983 budget. My group will support Amendment No 1 and will vote against paragraph 10. But this is only an interim report, and more work is required of Mrs Boserup and more assistance from the Commission. I do hope the Commission will be more forthcoming in the future.

Mr Price (ED). — Madam President, I share very much the objectives which have just been outlined by my friend, Mr Kellett-Bowman, but I would set about achieving them in a very different way. In essence I am in favour of this report only if paragraph 10, calling for the appropriations to be unfrozen, remains in. In that I am in agreement with what Mr Marck said in the speech that he made a couple of minutes ago.

We are all in favour of efficiency; it goes without saying. Clearly it is the job of the Committee on Budgetary Control to turn its attention to different aspects of the Commission's work and to seek greater efficiency in those ways. However, we really must get this into perspective. We are talking about less than one thousandth of the Commission's entire budget. When dealing with this sector, we ought to realize its dimensions. In her report, Mrs Boserup has very helpfully set out tables indicating the number of people who have been involved in the work of these various groups. We can see that there are thousands of people who are responsible in a whole series of sectors in the life of the Community — in the economic sphere, in all sorts of trades and professions in environment, employment, social affairs, education — all sorts of people who have responsibilities for putting things into practice in the Community. There are no fewer than 22 700 participants in this whole system. For me, this Parliament cannot act alone in building a united Europe. It is for us to involve all the people who have responsibilities in all these spheres in helping us, and we know that the limits of the Community budget are so small and so tight that we need action which does not entail Community expenditure by way of coordinating activities in our Community. That is for me what these various bodies achieve at a negligible cost.

Therefore, what I think this report fails to do is to stress the positive aspects sufficiently. Furthermore, we are stating negatives before the investigation has really been completed, has hardly gone any distance at all. Surely we ought, first of all, to be considering all the evidence in detail and reaching conclusions and then putting them into practice. It seems a very odd way of going about it to start with the sentence followed by the trial. Look at the anecdotal evidence put forward so far; for example the case of the consultative committee for honey which Mrs Boserup put forward. It may seem that the Community does not need to be advised on its policy relating to honey. It may seem

self-evident that that would be a fruitless activity. But if one looks at the budget one finds that the amount of our appropriations for support to the sector for honey is actually greater this year than the whole of the amount spent on advisory and consultative activities in 1982 — the whole of the expenditure in Articles 250 and 251, which are the subject of this debate. We spent more on honey than all these activities. Where is the sense of perspective in this report?

Mr Patterson wishes to put a question and I am prepared to give way.

Mr Patterson (ED). — I take the point that my friend is making very well, but I understood Mrs Boserup to criticize the Committee on Honey precisely because it was doing nothing, not because it was advising the Commission.

President. — When you ask for the floor in this way it is usually to put a question. I understand your comment was in the form of a question.

Mr Price (ED). — I think my friend has actually received a response by the negative shaking of the head by Mrs Boserup. That was not her point, it was that the committee should not have been created — as I understand it. That is how it appears in the explanatory statement. But in any event, let me deal with the issue Mr Patterson has raised, and Mrs Boserup raised earlier, and that is, committees which do not meet. Has anybody actually considered that it costs more to disband an organization of that sort than to let it continue?

Finally, Madam President, let me say that I am in favour of paragraph 10 standing because I believe that that is a sensible approach at this point in the year. We should wait for the final results of the committee's work before we take such a decision. And that was, of course the point of view held by the Budgetary Control Committee. I therefore hope Mrs Boserup will recommend the rejection of Amendment No 1, because she spoke in a personal capacity a moment ago in advocating its acceptance. It was, of course, the majority view of the Budgetary Control Committee to leave paragraph 10 in.

Mr Purvis (ED). — My only purpose in standing up at this juncture is to register a point on the research side, for which I am primarily responsible in my group. On the research side we fully recognize that it is much better to use advisory committees of experts on scientific and research matters than to try and provide these facilities full time in the Commission. So we have no objection — in fact, we greatly favour the idea of advisory committees in research.

The trouble is that over a period of time these committees have become more and more the tools of the national governments, who appoint civil servants whose prime purpose is, rather than being science and

Purvis

research oriented, to make sure that the plums that fall from the tree are evenly distributed between all 10 Member States. This is exemplified in the fact that these committees tend to be made up of 10 national appointees, 10 Commission appointees — who also tend to be nationally oriented — plus one independent chairman. So we end up with 21 members, quite unnecessarily, on issues which are basically of scientific and research import and could be determined much more readily by a small group of eminent scientists and researchers.

So I would like the Commission — I think it is moving in this direction but I would like to give it that extra prod that the three minutes I have will permit — to be ultimately responsible for all the decisions it makes in the research, field and not be able to palm off any blame on the advisory committees.

These management committees — or rather advisory committees (I would rather get rid of the word 'management') — are responsible to the Commission and to no one else. If there are any national appointees, they should be in the minority *vis-à-vis* the Commission appointees. The purpose of these committees is to advise the Commission in technical and scientific areas and not to divide up the work nationally. The size of the committees should be small, based on scientific prowess rather than national fairness.

The advisers should not be government representatives or civil servants so much as really independent and objective scientists.

The Parliament has the political and supervisory rôle to perform; the Commission has the executive responsibility to carry out the programmes that are provided for it. We do not want this to become the long arm of the Council of Ministers creeping into the administration of our research efforts.

Mr Harris (ED). — In speaking to this report, I think we have a bit of a cheek in this House. Here we are collectively criticizing the Commission for the spawning of all these committees. Surely we should look at our own House. Yesterday we appointed another committee here. I have just looked through the programme of committee meetings for this House between now and Christmas. According to my calculations, committees of one sort or another — including subcommittees (that is a new breed) — are going hold 117 meetings. Surely what we have got to do, whether it is the Parliament, the Commission or the Council, is to cut down on committee meetings.

Of course we need advice in certain field, but surely a lot of that advice can be given in written form.

You know perfectly well, Madam President, that when you go, with great frequency as we all do, to London-Heathrow and board a plane, a lot of the seats are filled by people just going to Brussels to take part in committees of one sort or another. We have got to put a stop to it and we have got to start right here in this House.

(Cries of 'Hear, hear!')

This morning we actually gave approval willingly for the appointment of yet another advisory committee when we passed, without question, the regulation on the pharmacy business. Another advisory committee came into being just like that without anybody questioning the need for it. Let us really make a determined attempt to tackle this problem: if we are going to do that, then surely we should knock out paragraph 10 of this report.

My dear friend Mr Price, whom I respect, is always for giving people more money and saying we have got to keep things in perspective. Very often things are symbolic and therefore I think we should — perhaps it is not a large amount of money — take a stand on it and say, right, let us start here, let us freeze the money mentioned in paragraph 10 and get moving!

Mr Price (ED). — May I ask Mr Harris whether, in view of his vote earlier this week to add between 300 and 500 million to the Community's agricultural budget, he really regards the amount at stake in this issue as being of major significance?

(Cries of 'Hear, hear!')

Mr Harris (ED). — I voted for that report on butter simply in the hope that it would bring the whole wretched thing crashing to the ground and that then we could at least get some sense into the common agricultural policy.

Mr Lange (S), chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I am sorry I have to speak again in this debate, the reason being a remark made by Mr Price. Mr Price, you are a member of the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Budgetary Control. You are aware of the division of responsibilities between the two committees. Paragraph 10 deals with a question which affects Chapter 100, and in the matter of Chapter 100 the Committee on Budgetary Control has absolutely no competence. Without taking any account of the allocation of responsibilities between the two committees, this committee has taken over something to which it is not entitled, and this cannot be allowed to pass. In the light of the rule governing our terms of reference, paragraph 10 is invalid. It must therefore be dropped.

Lange

No amendment was needed to delete paragraph 10. If you assert that this was decided by the committee with a large majority, then all I can say is that our colleagues acted without due regard for the allocation of powers already mentioned. The House cannot simply disregard this. If it did, it would have to adopt another distribution of responsibilities, and that, I think, cannot be done in this haphazard fashion. I request, therefore, that Mrs Boserup's point of view be fully accepted and that paragraph 10 be deleted.

Mr Price, you know I have a high regard for you, but please bear in mind the arrangement reached between the two committees concerning their terms of reference.

Mr Price (ED). — Madam President, I do not, in any way, question what Mr Lange says about the terms of reference of the two committees. But may I ask him whether he accepts that the House is sovereign and is entitled to express an opinion today, and therefore that it must be in order for the House to decide on this amendment and the question of paragraph 10.

Mr Lange (S), chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (DE) I would question that: that is what I have just been saying! In that case we should have to reconsider the terms of reference of the two committees, but that, Mr Price, cannot be done on the basis of such haphazard and *ad hoc* considerations as we are dealing with here. As you know, the Committee on Budgets, as the committee responsible, has taken a decision to make the funds available. It approved three-quarters, but only three-quarters, of the amount in order to support the Budgetary Control Committee's aim with the Boserup report, which is to bring the Commission finally to give a proper report, instead of undertaking desultory transfers which are subject to completely different provisions of the procedure laid down. Even the House in plenary sitting cannot do that.

(Applause)

President. — Of course, it is not for the House this morning to vote against the competences which were set out in the Vandewiele report. Where a committee has a competence, the chairman of that committee has the duty as well as the right to defend the competence of his committee in this House.

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Madam President, this debate on the proliferation of committees is one that could be held in all modern institutions, since in our democratic system bureaucracy and the creation of committees seem to go hand in hand. I feel that Mr Harris was right to point out that it is not the Commission alone that has to take the blame for this state of affairs.

The second preliminary remark that I would like to make is that not all the committees we are discussing are identical in nature. Some are institutional and must be consulted — the agricultural policy management committee springs to mind in this connection — while others are consultative and need not be convened at all, in fact. I am going some way towards replying to the point made by Mr Marck when I say that when the funds were cut back and we had to make a choice of the committees that would have to continue to meet, we picked those whose consultation was obligatory in preference to the others, even though there were times when it would have been more useful to consult the latter rather than the former.

In relation to the problem with which we are faced here, there are three principles that must be stated, and I should like to do so here and now.

The first is the need to consult the professionals. And here I would say, by way of reply to Mr Purvis, that these committees are not just a covert way of consulting Member State administrations under another guise. They are intended to involve the true professionals in the management of those affairs that concern them. It seems to me that there is a great need for this contact with the managers, the real experts, especially experts in the private sector.

The second principle has to do with the rôle of these committees. Apart from those which are institutional, I feel that they must not be allowed to take over any part of the Commission's responsibility. The Commission consults them but must remain itself entirely responsible, in accordance with the Treaty.

The third idea I would like to state is that if we are not vigilant and if we continue to create committees, which then go on to achieve permanence and whose right to continued existence is never questioned, the proliferation of these committees will become in time an intolerable burden both on the budgets and on the day-to-day lives of those who have to make them function.

Having stated these few principles and having indicated to the House that the Commission has undertaken to submit a report before 1 February 1984, I would now like, on behalf of the Commission, to make a kind of bargain with the Parliament. We will undertake to go into the problems that are agitating Parliament in this connection, to tackle them more vigorously than we have been doing up to now and to try, with Parliament's help, to put this whole area in order. We give our word to do this, and we will make a better job of it.

(Laughter)

Pisani

In return, we ask that paragraph 10 be retained, because it is just not possible to change overnight something that has been the practice. A certain period of adjustment is needed. I am delighted to have given Mr Harris something to laugh at. All I can say is that I should never laugh like that, no matter what he said.

Finally, I should like to point out to Mr Lange that it was by virtue of a decision set out in the Remarks to the budget that the Committee on Budgetary Control was instructed to consider his matter and to draw up a report. The Committee on Budgetary Control does not feel that it can come to any conclusions one way or the other and, this being the case, asks that the budget be implemented as originally planned and that there should be no change. I feel therefore that there is no question of any obstacle from the legal point of view and that the question of a conflict over the terms of reference of the two committees does not even arise. It was Parliament that delegated the Committee on Budgetary Control to study this matter and furthermore, it can revoke at any moment the powers thus delegated.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, these are the reasons why I express the hope, speaking on behalf of the Commission, that this report will be adopted exactly as it stands.

Mr Lange, chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (DE) Madam President, what I really wanted to do was to make a comment, but I am prepared to put this comment in the form of a question. Does the Commissioner, for whom I have the highest personal regard from my previous experience of working together with him, seriously think that he can recommend to the House that it bypass the terms of reference assigned to the committees? I for my part regard it as completely impossible, to put it mildly. If it were not Mr Pisani that is here, I would use a rather different expression. The Commission's stand in this matter is more than remarkable.

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — (FR) I am deeply touched by Mr Lange's public expression of his regard for me, all the more so as I hold him in even greater esteem. For the sake of completeness I should have explained that I was, in fact, quoting from the report which I had in my hand. On page 7 of the explanatory statement you will find the following: 'In the "Remarks" column of the budget, it is stated specifically that these amounts'... will be unblocked in the light of the results of an enquiry which will be conducted on behalf the European Parliament by the Committee on Budgetary Control'. Forgive me for seeming to take credit for something that had been decided upon by Parliament.

Mrs Boserup (COM), rapporteur. — (D) I should like to have the opportunity of coming back with a few short comments. I should like to begin by thanking Commissioner Pisani for having enabled us to continue our cooperation. I am very happy about this. Next I should like to thank the Chairman of the Committee on Budgets, Mr Lange, for supporting my views. I greatly regret that this has led to conflict between the two honourable and very knowledgeable gentlemen. I hope it will be put right.

At the same time, I am being less kind when I say that Mr Price should not be allowed to get away with his interpretation of what I said or did not say. I did not criticize honey or bananas although I did criticize the Commission for first stating in its answer to Mr Megahy that these two committees were unnecessary and then entering them in the budget with the remark that it would be expensive to abolish them since honey policy costs so much. To put it bluntly, that is nonsense. These two things should be taken together, Mr Price.

Apart from that, I hope that we can deal with this matter in a few moments and that we can do away with the famous paragraph 10, which Mr Price quite correctly says was adopted in committee. The committee has managed in its incredible absentmindedness to act against Parliament's rules. I feel that that should not be held against the committee. In any event, I feel that it should not figure in a resolution which has been adopted here in Parliament.

President. — The debate is closed. ¹

Paragraph 10: Amendment 1

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Forgive me for rising to speak at this particular point in the debate, but I simply wish to establish some facts. If I understood correctly — and the interpretation seems to me to have been very clear on the point — Mrs Boserup said just now that the Committee on Budgetary Control did not adopt paragraph 10. Now it would seem that the resolution as a whole was adopted by 12 votes to 4, at least according to the document that I have got. With a view to establishing the facts and nothing more than that, I should like to ask that the whole matter be clarified.

President. — I wonder if Mrs Boserup, as rapporteur, who has, of course, to give the view of her committee and not her personal view, would kindly tell the House what was the view of the committee on paragraph 10. I think this would help.

¹ For the vote, see Annex.

Mrs Boserup (COM), rapporteur. — (DA) I shall be glad to do so. Unfortunately, the President interrupted me just as I was about to begin. Paragraph 10 was adopted in committee, so I have to accept it. On my own behalf and with the support of the Committee on Budgets I added that it was a mistake. But it was adopted in committee.

Mr Kellett-Bowman (ED). — I am worried, Madam President, that you are asking the rapporteur to comment first on paragraph 10, which may mislead people as to her view on Amendment No 1, which, I agree, seeks deletion of paragraph 10, but there are in fact two separate votes.

President. — Mrs Boserup, I think, has given her position very clearly.

3. *Adjournment of the session*

President. — I declare adjourned the session of the European Parliament.¹

(The sitting closed at 11.20 a.m.)

¹ For items concerning motions for resolutions entered in the register under Rule 49, forwarding of resolutions adopted during the sitting, time-limit for tabling amendments and dates for the next part-session, see Minutes.

Seal report (Doc. 1-451/83 : Imports of beef and veal) : adopted

Mr Enright, deputizing for the rapporteur, spoke against Amendments Nos 1 and 2.

* * *

Krouwel-Vlam report (Doc. 1-495/83 : Household appliances) : adopted

The rapporteur spoke

— in favour of Amendments Nos 1 and 8 ; and

— against Amendment No 9.

Explanation of vote

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* We are in favour of the resolution as voted on, but we were really astonished to see that some groups refused to urge the Council of Ministers to push on with directives that are still in the process of being decided on.

It seems to me really remarkable that some people are reluctant to push the Council to get on with the business of enacting these directives !

* * *

Gabert report (Doc. 1-464/83 : Financial activities of the ECSC) : adopted

* * *

Boserup interim report (Doc. 1-446/83 : Management committees) : adopted

The rapporteur spoke in favour of Amendment No 1.

Explanations of vote

Mr Welsh (ED). — When I came in this morning I intended to vote for this report because that is what the Whip says and I always follow the Whip. However, there was one speech that has led me to change my mind. That was the speech by my very good friend, the honourable and gallant Member for Cornwall and Plymouth. It seems to me that in his enthusiasm for protecting the taxpayers' interests, which I recognize, Mr Harris has come to conclusions which are entirely perverse. His suggestion that all parliamentary committees are by definition a waste of time does scant justice to his own assiduous efforts on the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning and also to the excellent work by the Committee on Budgets, which enables us to monitor how the Commission is spending its resources. I really think that Mr Harris must be careful before he wipes away the one part of this Parliament that I do think actually works rather well. It is because I wish to express my extreme dissent on his views that I propose to abstain.

Mr Aigner (PPE), (in writing). — *(DE)* The main problem confronting the EEC is its entirely unsatisfactory decision-making structure. The majority decisions within the Council provided for in the Treaties have been swept aside. In addition to this, however, there has developed a process of cancerous growth of the national bureaucracies at the European level. The 600 or so management, consultative and *ad hoc* committees and working-parties are right now actually stifling the Commission's powers of taking decisions and action. This process is most clearly illustrated by the growth rates of the past two years : the consultative bodies have grown by 31 %, meetings by 22 %, the number of days set aside for meetings by 33 %, and the number of participants by over 26 %.

All this is paid for by the European taxpayer. Some participants actually declared more days' attendance at meetings than there are days in the year.

To avoid any misunderstanding, I must say that neither I nor your committee wish, by stopping this growth to deny access to Member States' expert advice. Consultation where necessary certainly, but at the same time a handing back of responsibility to the bodies provided for in the Treaty :

1. First of all there is Parliament. Precisely because of its ability to achieve compromise solutions by virtue of majority decisions it has by its very nature to clarify the different interests of the various parties concerned when it comes to legislation.

2. Then there is the Economic and Social Committee, with its wide representation of interests. Why does the Commission not make greater use of its special expertise ?

3. There is also the Council of Ministers, with its permanent representatives, which, given its special interest-based position, has to take account of the Member States' requirements and their social structures.

However, little by little the Commission — and the Commission alone — should become fully responsible for the execution of any policy, once decided. Only in this way can parliamentary supervision be truly effective.

Admittedly, this course of action cannot produce the hoped-for results overnight. However, if the Committee on Budgetary Control can secure the backing of the entire Parliament in this difficult task, our efforts should eventually prove successful.

Although my own committee has decided in favour of a total release of the frozen funds, I incline to the view of the majority of the Committee on Budgets who wish to see a gradual cutting-back and a more positive attitude on the Commission's part towards the question we have been discussing.

ANNEX

Votes

The Annex indicates rapporteurs' opinions on amendments and reproduces the text of explanations of vote. For further details of the voting, the reader is referred to the Minutes.

Bocklet report (Doc. 1-711/83 : Hops) : adopted

* * *

Irmer report (Doc. 1-605/83/I : Next ACP-EEC Convention) : adopted

The rapporteur spoke

- in favour of Amendments Nos 2, 30 and 38 (1st clause); and
- against amendments Nos 1, 3/rev., 4/rev., 6, 7 to 14, 16, 18 to 29, 31, 34 to 37, 39 to 41, 43 to 45, 47 to 55 and 57/rev.

Explanations of vote

Mr C. Jackson (ED). — This will be a short explanation of vote on behalf of my group. I am grateful for the support from opposite. We believe it is very important that the financing of the Lomé Convention be given extremely careful consideration, but we cannot agree to state now that it should be considerably increased. We take the view that the appropriations for the new Convention should at least be maintained in real terms. With that reservation, my group is pleased to support the report.

Mr Pearce (ED). — I do apologize for the earlier noise round here, but there are a lot of us here and we have been working very hard. The fact that there is more noise over here than over there is because they are not there doing their job.

(Laughter)

I would like to support what Mr Jackson has said. I would be reluctant to vote against this report, because there is a lot of good stuff in it, although we have lost a lot of amendments. But I really would like to make it plain that I personally do not wish to be associated with something which suggests that the fund should be considerably increased. I believe it is irresponsible to say that at the present time. I do not want to be associated with that thought. I shall, therefore, reluctantly vote for the report.

* * *

Malangré report (Doc. 1-485/83 : Pharmacists) : adopted

The rapporteur spoke

- in favour of Amendments Nos 1 to 6; and
- against Amendment No 7.

Explanations of vote

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (*GR*) Even though the Commission's proposal and the report by the Legal Committee both seem to recognize the real difficulties which exist, we note that they both favour freedom of professional movement for pharmacists, and this is potentially of particular harm in the case of my country, where the pharmacist profession is already over-subscribed. We note with particularly great anxiety the provision which would allow self-employed pharmacists from other EEC countries to open pharmacies in Greece. It is obvious that this could lead to abuse. New pharmacies will be represented as old ones despite the present practice and legislation in Greece, which prohibits the transfer or purchase of existing pharmacies or pharmaceutical warehouses. Consequently, we oppose the report and shall vote against it. We take this opportunity to condemn yet again the Commission's constant interference and Mr Narjes's recent provocative letter to the Greek Government, and from this platform urge the Greek Government to bring this matter — which apart from everything else, is of vital consequence for the health of the Greek people — to a close.

Mrs Hammerich (CDI) (*in writing*). — (*DA*) The report considers the Commission's proposal, which is the first step towards full freedom of establishment for pharmacists. The right to free establishment will promote the concentration of pharmacies in densely populated areas where earning potential is high — a familiar situation in England, Greece and West Germany — rather than in thinly populated areas.

In Denmark, this is determined not by the free play of forces but by the public authority (i.e., the Ministry for the Interior), which decides where pharmacies can be set up, and how many. This is motivated by concern for the health needs of the population. The tradition goes back to 1672, and we have no intention of giving way to any move to abolish it for the sake of reintroducing the EEC's law of the jungle.

Moreover, we do not believe the report's claim that 'in a market economy free enterprise and freedom of establishment are the best means of assuring unrestricted competition and thereby providing the population with the best possible service'. It is rather a question of providing the best guarantee that sick people will receive qualified dispensing of medicinal products, which is something that market mechanisms cannot achieve.

Therefore we cannot support either the report or the proposal.

* * *

Von Alemann report (Doc. 1-465/83 : Carriage of goods by road) : adopted

The rapporteur spoke in favour of all the amendments.

Explanation of vote

Mr Moreland (ED). — I support this report wholeheartedly and welcome all the work that Mrs von Alemann has put into it. I have, however, to express one reservation, and that is that it is only a very small step towards getting rid of the whole panoply of permits which dominate the international road-haulage industry in Europe and which are the cause of inefficiency in the industry. They have not helped the railways as they were intended to do. I would like to add a third reason, namely, that they have led to corruption.

This time last year Mr Narjes gave me a written answer in which he denied that there was corruption in the industry. Let me tell him from my own experience there is, because I travelled across Europe during the summer on a truck. Needless to say, apart from learning that one gets a rather sore behind on a truck, I also learned that when you cross a border, and in particular a specific border into Italy, what do you get asked? Have you any cigarettes, have you any whisky? And if you have illegal permits or false permits, you get through because you can bribe. I think that this is very serious: it is something the Italian authorities ought to look into and it is something the Commission ought to examine. Therefore I would support this report and hope that it is only one step in the right direction.

Mrs von Alemann (L), rapporteur. — Madam President, I have no idea whether this is permitted under the Rules, but I would like to point out that it is not fair that Mr Moreland, should mention only one country here as being corrupt. As rapporteur, I do not think that is right.

(Applause)

President. — That is an abuse of the procedure, I am sorry, we cannot have any debate on this. This is not a debate on the report or on the resolution ; Mr Moreland has made his explanation of vote and Mrs von Alemann, I am afraid, did abuse the procedure of this House.

I shall now proceed to put to the vote the motion for a resolution, on which I have no amendments.

Mr Moreland (ED). — Madam President, just for the sake of clarity let me say that I was speaking from my own experience of crossing one border where I came across that particular abuse. It may happen elsewhere, I agree : I do not know. I am just giving that particular experience, and I do not wish to confuse the issue here.

* * *

Marshall report (Doc. 1-502/83 : Intra-Community telephone calls) :

The motion was replaced by Amendment No 1, which was adopted.

Explanations of vote

Mr Eyraud (S). — *(FR)* I should not have been prompted to explain my vote in favour of Mr Marshall's report if I had not heard his neighbour last night making uncomplimentary remarks about Member States whose telecommunications are not in the hands of the multinationals.

For many years now, the postal and telecommunication services in France have been providing model facilities. Users are given full satisfaction, particularly in the sphere of telecommunications, where, for a long time now, half the normal rate has been charged for calls made after 8 p.m. My vote in favour of this report is therefore a tribute to the staff of PTT officials, to whom my parents had the advantage of belonging. The fact that they are employed by the State and not by some private firm does not prevent them from having a sense of duty or of honour, and indeed their day-to-day work offers proof of their great professional conscientiousness. What you have said, Mr Moorhouse, merely confirms the contempt in which they are held by the Right, and so they will help to prevent its return to power in my country.

Mr Alavanos (COM), (in writing). — *(GR)* The Communist Party of Greece agrees that the cost of telephone calls needs to be reduced. This is of particular importance for many groups of our compatriots (the families of emigrants and of students living abroad, etc.). We believe, however, that the cost of this reduction should be borne by the telephone companies of the Community countries which are host to migrants.

However, the proposal put forward by the European Conference of Postal and Telecommunications Managements, which makes reference only to the EEC countries, Canada, the USA and Israel, has a biased and provocative tone, and therefore we are unable to agree with its content.

Mrs Théobald-Paoli (S), (in writing). — *(FR)* When taking the initiative in asking this House to take steps to encourage the use of the telephone by a broader section of the population and to reduce the charges for calls made at certain times anywhere in Europe, I certainly did not expect to be given such generous support. For this I am most grateful to the rapporteur.

Since the autumn of 1981, France has been vigorously pursuing a policy of bringing into line with present-day needs the charges for calls both within the country and to other Member States. The purpose of these substantial reductions is to allow family and social ties to be tightened and enable the tissue of society, already stretched to the limit, to find some relief in an improved system of oral communication. Such facilities are a tremendous help to old people, parents whose children are studying away from home, or those who are simply lonely in a highly urbanized and automated world where human contact is dwindling more and more.

Moreover, this social, even sociological, enterprise is helping to relieve the telephone network during business hours by discouraging large numbers of private trunk-calls. Spreading these calls over longer periods means that the network is used more rationally and, properly done, obviates the need for excessive capacities that are a burden on the economy.

The French, who are very happy with the system introduced generally in 1981 but want to eliminate the bottlenecks that still remain, will soon be taking the process further, for with effect from next year charges for trunk-calls within the country may be subject to as many as four different rates applicable, in descending order, to (1) business hours, (2) the late afternoon (and possibly also the lunch hour), (3) the evening and (4) the night.

One of the great aims of the Treaties is the harmonization of living conditions in the Community, and so those Member States that still have no reduced evening or weekend rates for trunk-calls or international calls within the Community should introduce as soon as possible these social measures, which, moreover, are not costly to operate. We must put a stop to the present absurd situation where, for example, an evening call from a Belgian mother to her children on holiday in the south of France or in Corsica costs almost 35 % more than a Frenchman pays to ring up Brussels in the evening. The number of people from one Member State living in another Member State has now reached proportions which can no longer be calculated: Greeks, Italians, Frenchmen, Belgians are living in large numbers in neighbouring countries.

The United Kingdom, Germany and Italy are aware of all this, for they, too, have introduced, each in its own way found most convenient, cheap rates for calls made within the Community and within certain hours of the day. The other Member States should follow this example as soon as possible.

In their day-to-day life, and in a spirit of solidarity, the citizens of Europe should be able to enjoy equal rights which bring them closer together. One of these is the right to communicate with one another at the fairest possible cost.

* * *

Deleau report (Doc. 1-462/83 : Mobile trades); adopted

Explanation of vote

Mr Alavanos (COM) (in writing). — (GR) The Communist Part of Greece is in favour of facilitating the activities of mobile tradesmen in respect of genuinely small businesses in the national context, such as the people's fruit and vegetable markets in Greece. This can bring benefits for the working-class consumer.

However, we believe that the report by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs has entirely different objectives. By instituting a European licence and freedom of professional movement for mobile tradesmen on a Community-wide basis, it is designed to facilitate the operations of Western European monopolies which utilize the 'direct selling' method. This would be against the interests of small traders in our country, and, in the medium-term, as far as prices and the quality of goods are concerned, against the interests of the working-class consumer as well.

For this reason the Members who belong to the Communist Party of Greece will vote against the Deleau report.

* * *

**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. 78 96 44

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 PUBLOF - Lu 1322
CCP 19190-81
CC bancaire BIL 8-109/6003/300

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 8595

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
Madrid 1
Tel. (91) 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

FOMA

5, avenue de Longemalle
Case postale 367
CH 1020 Renens - Lausanne
Tél. (021) 35 13 61
Télex 25416

Sous-dépôt:

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

2182 St Catherine Street West
Montreal
Quebec H3H 1M7
Tel. (514) 937 3519

JAPAN

Kinokuniya Company Ltd

17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome
Shinjuku-ku
Tokyo 160-91
Tel. (03) 354 0131

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprise

- report of proceedings,
- annual indexes

Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg.

Annual subscription 1983/1984 ECU 52.59 BFR 2 400 IRL 37 UKL 29 USD 49

Single issue: price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

ECU 19.29

BFR 880

IRL 13.20

UKL 11

USD 19.25



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

L-2985 Luxembourg



AX-AA-83-008-EN-C